

political affairs

JUNE 1953 • 25 CENTS

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[1] Fighting War with Peace
and Democracy

MARK LOGAN and
SAM DOUGLAS

[10] The Anatomy of McCarthyism

ALEX H. KENDRICK
and JEROME GOLDEN

[26] Lessons of the Struggle Against
Opportunism in District 65, I

SAMUEL ROSEN

[38] Zionism and Bourgeois
Nationalism, I

PETER COLTON

[49] On Labor and the Democratic
Party

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

[59] Brother Bill McKie
(*Book Review*)

[65] LETTERS FROM READERS

SPECIAL 31-PAGE SUPPLEMENT

Reader's Guide to

Stalin's "Economic Problems of Socialism in U. S. S. R."

NEW AND RECENT TITLES

THE COMMUNIST PARTY: VANGUARD FIGHTER FOR PEACE, DEMOCRACY, SECURITY, AND SOCIALISM	\$.25
Summation to the Jury by Pettis Perry	
COMMUNISTS AND THE PEOPLE	.25
Summation to the Jury by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	
ISRAEL AND DOLLAR DIPLOMACY	.25
by Victor Perlo	
THE PARTY OF NEGRO AND WHITE	.05
by Pettis Perry	
THIS IS MY HUSBAND	.25
by Esther Cooper Jackson	
THE STALIN HERITAGE	.05
by G. Malenkov, V. M. Molotov, L. P. Beria	
RESISTANCE AGAINST FASCIST ENSLAVEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA	.35
by Alphaeus Hunton	
THIRTEEN COMMUNISTS SPEAK TO THE COURT	.35
Speeches before sentence	
LABOR AND ANTI-SEMITISM	.10
by George Morris	
WE CAN HAVE PEACE AND JOBS	.05
by Bernard Burton	
THE VOLUNTEERS—A Personal Narrative of the Fight Against Fascism in Spain—By Steve Nelson	Paper \$1; Cloth \$2.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 BROADWAY • NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



Vol. XXXII, No. 5

JUNE, 1953

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Fighting War with Peace and Democracy

By William Z. Foster

THE BOURGEOIS world is now boiling with speculation, ranging from the incongruous to the ridiculous, regarding the recent proposals of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China to settle the Korean war, and the whole train of peace events that have accompanied them. The pen-pushers and windjammers of capitalism are ever on the hunt for "Red plots," and all sorts of sinister and subtle manifestations in the situation. The "Reds," they say, are only maneuvering for time, are seeking to put the capitalist world off guard, so they can seize upon a key moment to strike, and so on. But such speculations are rubbish. The general meaning of the situation is very simple and constructive; namely, that the Soviet and Chinese peoples, in line with their basic Socialist peace policy, have raised their efforts to establish peace to a new level. They are fighting the war drive of American imperialism and its allies with a great strengthening of their own drive for peace.

WALL STREET'S PUSH FOR WAR

For several years past our Party has been pointing out the key facts that American imperialism is aggressively striving for world domination, and that it accepts as a foregone conclusion that such international mastery can be established only through a major anti-Soviet war. All important post-war U.S. policy, at home and abroad, has been actively based upon this general assumption. Not only has Wall Street considered another world war to be inevitable, but it has been definitely striving to bring about such a war. There can be no other possible rational explanation of the general complex of aggressive American policy. To assert that this policy is for defensive purposes, as the Government would have us believe, is utter nonsense.

The general political substance of what has been happening during the postwar years is this: The United States, forging ahead with its pro-

gram of imperialist conquest, has cunningly misrepresented the indignant revolutions which produced the Eastern European People's Democracies and People's China as being only so many parts of an alleged drive of the Soviet Union for mastery of the world. With this bugaboo as its ideological weapon, the United States has been feverishly organizing the capitalist world for an early all-out capitalist assault against the U.S.S.R. and the whole world peace camp. This is the anti-Soviet crusade, Hitler-fashion, and it has been carried out under hypocritical slogans of the defense of world peace and democracy.

The Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of Asia and Europe, true to their Socialist character, have steadily countered the war drive of the United States by active policies of peace. The preservation of world peace was thus the heart of their long series of proposals—for international control and outlawing of the atom bomb, for the unification of a democratic Germany, for progressive universal disarmament, for an immediate cease-fire in Korea, etc. Despite these peace policies of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, however, the United States, on the basis of its great wealth and production, was able to create a synthetic war scare, a phony crusade against Communism, and a ferocious world armaments race. Thus, it succeeded in developing a dangerous international tension. It was not, however, able to provoke the anti-Soviet war that

Wall Street was planning. In these basic facts, as we shall see, lies the explanation of the dramatic peace proposals now being put forth by the Soviet Union and People's China.

THE FAILURE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The reasons why the United States, despite all its fabulous outlay of money and its furious anti-Soviet campaign, has been unable up to date to provoke a world war are fundamental. To wage war against such powerful countries as the Soviet Union, People's China, and the European People's Democracies, it was imperative that the United States should have the whole-hearted support of the American people for such a war, and also, and especially, that it have behind it the more important capitalist countries of the world. Wall Street, however, has not been able to accomplish either of these objectives, much less both of them together.

For several years past our Party has been pointing out, correctly, the growing failure of American foreign policy. By this, in the most basic sense, we have meant that the United States, under the dictation of the Wall Street monopolists, was failing in its attempt to precipitate a world war under conditions in which it believed it might have at least a ghost of a chance for success. In this broadest respect, its Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Nato, etc., in short its whole foreign policy, has failed.

American foreign policy has suffered an especially dramatic failure since the advent of the Eisenhower Administration to power. There can be no doubt that Eisenhower, Dulles, and company, with the support of the loyal Democratic opposition—Stevenson, Truman, et al.—planned immediately to spread the Korean war into a general attack upon People's China. This was the clear implication of their intensification of the war in Korea, their increased shipment of arms to Chiang Kai-shek, their plans to develop an invasion of the Chinese mainland from Formosa. But this whole project struck a two-pronged snag. First, the American people displayed unmistakable signs of alarm at the beligerent attitude of the new Administration, and second, capitalist Europe and Asia were outspoken in their opposition to the war line of American imperialism — more so than at any time since the United Nations was formed. Even the wildest atomaniacs in Washington had to pay heed to this widespread popular resistance here and abroad.

THE INTENSIFIED PEACE CAMPAIGN

The peace camp of the world is obviously drawing some concrete conclusions from the continued bankruptcy of American foreign policy, which has been so dramatically illustrated since Eisenhower took office. Their conclusions would appear to be about as follows: first, that it is the peace resistance of the peoples of the world, those in the Socialist

countries and those in the capitalist lands, that is stalling the war campaign of American imperialism; and second, that, therefore, by an intensification of this peace resistance, the drive of Wall Street to war can definitely be halted. The peace efforts that were made previously by the peace-loving peoples were able to slow up American imperialism considerably, but not to stop it. The new peace pressures, however, are calculated to do just this.

The dramatic moves for peace being made during recent weeks by the countries of Socialism and People's Democracy are obviously part of a general pattern to maintain world peace despite the Wall Street warmongers. They include such important steps as those for the exchange of war prisoners, for an immediate armistice in Korea, the Berlin conference for the regulation of air traffic into that city, the acceptance of the American proposals as a basis for discussion of world disarmament, the agreement upon the election of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, etc.

The success of this current intensified peace campaign has been very marked. Generally, the peoples of the world are accepting the U.S.S.R.-Chinese peace steps as bonafide efforts to guarantee the peace of the world. Consequently, many capitalist governments have been compelled to state that they were taking these moves at face value. Never were the Wall Street war plans and war alliance so shaky as they are now.

CONSTERNATION OF THE AMERICAN WARMONGERS

On the other hand, the peace offensive of the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the European People's Democracies has thrown the American war camp into confusion and dismay. Big Business, in fright about a major economic crisis, got a real "peace scare" and stocks tumbled in Wall Street in a manner not seen since the Great Economic Crisis of October 1929. The Federal government, obviously highly embarrassed by the prospect of peace, could not openly oppose the U.S.S.R.-Chinese proposals, so it proceeded to throw cold water on them, to sow pessimism as to their genuineness, and generally to sabotage them. Never in the history of the United States has there been such an organized, concerted effort by all the organs of propaganda to discredit a proposition as that now being directed against the peace proposals of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies. Every possible effort is being made to recreate the old atmosphere of international tension.

At this writing, it looks as though the bloody Korean war will finally be settled, upon the initiative of People's China and the U.S.S.R. The Wall Street warmongers are watching with alarm and consternation the approaching possible end of this, their beloved war, which has brought them at least \$50 billion in profits and which they hoped to expand into a general war against China, with possibilities of a world war. Consequent-

ly, in the face of a mountainous world peace sentiment, they are trying to raise many new issues as obstacles to a Korean armistice, such as the unification of Korea as a precondition to a cease-fire, the linking of peace in Korea with peace in Indo-China, a demand for an all-Far Eastern settlement, etc. The McCarran decision against the Communist Party and the attack upon the twelve progressive organizations, by which it hoped to smear the Soviet Union as interfering in the life of the United States, are part of the general attempt to muddy the world situation and to re-develop international war tension.

President Eisenhower, in a desperate effort to gain the world political initiative, laid out American foreign policy in his speech of April 16. This pronouncement, while loaded heavily with peace phraseology, consisted essentially of a long series of ultimatums to the U.S.S.R. along the established lines of aggressive American policy. As a sample of these demands, Eisenhower had the insolence to insist in essence that capitalist rule be again established in the People's Democracies. There was not a single concession to peaceful relations in the whole speech. If anything constructive ever comes out of this speech, this will be entirely because of the peace efforts of the U.S.S.R. and China. The speech in fact, was hailed all through the American press and radio virtually as a "peace ultimatum," with many threats that the Soviet Union must bow to Eisenhower's demands, "or

else." Obviously, American Big Business conceives the Soviet Government's conciliatory position as a sign of weakness and is proceeding upon that basis. This is a political mistake of the first magnitude, for the present Soviet peace campaign is conceived in strength, not weakness. The events of every passing day, such as the firm reply of the *Pravda* editorial of April 25, confirm this fact.

Every effort is being made to blow up the Eisenhower speech into a great peace pronouncement; but what is really thought of it around the world was voiced by Aneurin Bevan in England, who said (*N. Y. Times*, April 19): "If we want conciliation we don't demand everything and give nothing. You are not going to get peace in the world if you insist on the Soviet Union accepting a whole range of humiliating conditions and giving nothing at all." The arrogant response of the United States to the peace proposals of the U.S.S.R. and People's China, by flouting world peace sentiment, can lead only to further embarrassments and defeats for American foreign policy.

GENERAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE SITUATION

Bourgeois writers and commentators, in their frustration and confusion, are trying to interpret the current peace moves of the Soviet Union as a repudiation of Stalin's policies. But this is nonsense. Stalin was long a brilliant champion of the conception that it is possible for Socialist

and capitalist countries to co-exist peacefully in the world. In his very last public utterances—at the time of the 19th Congress of the C.P.S.U.—Stalin reiterated this theory and he also stressed the fact that it is possible for the masses to halt the war drives of imperialist powers. What is happening now in the Soviet peace campaign is the concretization of these basic policies of Stalin, the great Marxist-Leninist theoretician and leader. The present peace offensive, stemming from the 19th Congress, is the fruition of the historic peace policy of the U.S.S.R.

The peace developments of the past few weeks constitute a major victory for the peace forces of the world, and by the same token, a serious defeat for warlike American imperialism. To what degree this people's victory will block the world war plans of Wall Street remains to be seen. The great lesson to be learned from it now is that it demonstrates that when the masses of the world militantly speak out for peace the plans of the warmakers are thrown into disarray. The effective halting of American imperialism's war drive would create a whole new world situation, which it is needless here to try to forecast.

FIGHTING WAR WITH DEMOCRACY

Besides fighting war with peace, the U.S.S.R. is also fighting it with democracy. The latter phase, closely related to the first, is one of the most important aspects of the whole current peace offensive.

One of the marked features, during recent years, of the political life of the U.S.S.R. has been its highly centralized and disciplined character. This has developed for a twofold reason: first, as a defense against malignant external enemies and their internal agents; and second, in order to facilitate the carrying through of the enormous tasks of Socialist construction and general national effort that the U.S.S.R. has faced during this whole period. This strong, self-imposed democratic discipline is a tremendous weapon in the hands of the U.S.S.R., something that no capitalist country can hope to develop. This explains why the capitalist world has been at such great pains to discredit it in the eyes of the workers of their countries. They have denounced the U.S.S.R. as "a police state," and thereby dedicated to a war policy. They have sought by every means in their power to identify the U.S.S.R. with "fascism." On this basis, they have tried to pin upon that country the responsibility for the danger of another great war.

But all this is sheer slander. The Soviet Union is now, and always has been, the most democratic country in the world. Its Socialist democracy, based on the people's ownership of the means of production, and the workers' control of the government, is upon an altogether higher level than can possibly be achieved under the capitalist system. Soviet democracy received its concrete formulation in the Stalin Constitution, adopted in 1936. This Constitution,

besides guaranteeing the rights of free speech, assembly, worship, etc., also establishes the right to work, education, leisure, and complete social security—rights which do not exist anywhere in the capitalist world. The Stalin Constitution also establishes complete equality of women with men, before the law and elsewhere, and it places on a plane of equality and harmony all the many peoples and nations who comprise the Soviet Union.

With the development of the Hitler menace, the Soviet people found it necessary to adopt an extensive voluntary discipline. During the war, under the guidance of the powerful Communist Party, this discipline reached its highest development. It was one of the most basic factors in generating the enormous power of the Soviet Union, which was decisive in winning the war and in saving the world from fascist slavery. Some elements of this strong national democratic discipline in the face of dangerous foes have continued over into the post-World War II period, under the imperative necessity of resisting the violent war drive of American imperialism for world control.

Now, however, the Soviet people, as part of their heightened fight for world peace, and in line with their advance into Communism, while increasing *political* vigilance, find it possible to relax, to a greater or lesser extent, many of the democratic controls which have been indispensable during the past years of hard struggle against capitalist at-

tack and threatened encirclement. Various signs of this have been recently in evidence. First, there was the wholesale amnesty of prisoners in the Soviet Union, coupled with a call for a re-examination of the Soviet penal code. Second, there were the heavy reductions in prices of the people's necessities—a sure sign that the Soviet Union is not following a war policy. Third, there was the dramatic dismissal of the case against the 15 doctors—it was a misfortune, of course, that this case developed in the first place, but the democratic way in which the Soviet Government dismissed it and frankly recognized the error that had been made, was without parallel in world democratic history. Fourth, there was the reception of the group of American small-town editors in Moscow, an event which clearly indicated the desire of the U.S.S.R. to ease travel and tourist conditions between the West and the East. And fifth, there was the editorial in *Pravda*, again sharply criticizing bureaucracy and one-man leadership tendencies in the Soviet Union.

This relaxing of war-born disciplines and controls in the Soviet Union is an organic part of the intensification of the peace campaign. It is tearing to shreds the capitalist lies that the U.S.S.R. is a police state, based on secret police, concentration camps, and guarded by an "iron curtain." The Soviet people have clearly understood the democratic character of their national disciplines, but indisputably tens of millions of people in the capitalist

world, deluged by hostile imperialist propaganda, have grossly misunderstood these disciplines. But this serious misunderstanding will be liquidated. The U.S.S.R. is standing forth more clearly than ever as the great world champion of peace and democracy, and all the power of the world capitalist propaganda machine will not be able to obscure this basic fact.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Obviously the Communist Party of the United States, situated as it is in the heartland of American imperialism, has grave responsibilities in the present critical world situation. Its first great task is for itself to understand clearly what is taking place in the world, and then to carry this understanding militantly to the masses. We must realize profoundly that the peace forces of all countries are making a determined effort to save the peace of the world, and that the warmongers, gathered under the leadership of American imperialism, are making a desperate effort to break up this peace offensive, to keep the Korean war going, and to intensify the general war orientation upon which Wall Street and its Washington agents are basing all their plans and hopes.

The world peace forces have won a tremendous victory so far in breaking the log jam in Korea, but the struggle is by no means yet won. Especially, we must try to prevent the masses from being fooled by the "peace" demagoguery of Eisenhower,

Dulles, and others. We must make them understand that Wall Street wants war and is organizing for war, and that the Eisenhower Administration is orienting entirely on this basis. At this moment, the heart of American foreign policy is to prevent an armistice in Korea.

The Draft Resolution of the National Committee, which is now being discussed by the Party, gives the correct general tactical line for our tasks during this critical period. This is no time for sectarian isolation. Nor should we be stayed by the new attacks from the McCarran Board and Department of Justice. In substance this line needs to go to the broad masses of the working class, the Negro people, and all other peace-loving forces, organized as they are by the millions in their conservative-led organizations. At the same time, every progressive organization in the country should make it the center of its attention to establish closer relationship with the masses, who are now aroused by a new hope for the establishment of peace in the world. Conferences, national and local, should be organized to reach out to the masses in all organizations with the message of peace.

One of the most important of the many specific peace tasks confronting us is to liquidate the prevalent fear among the working masses that the ending of the Korean war and of the armaments race would necessarily mean the growth of a huge mass unemployment. This reassurance can be accomplished only on

the basis of a program which will show the way to jobs in a peace economy. The fear about jobs is so acute that even the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. have been forced to pay attention to it, in their programs and in Reuther's proposal to Eisenhower for a Government-sponsored national conference on the question. But the key thing is to move the masses in the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions in the struggle for a practical peace-economy program. This would help to overcome their fear about jobs and strengthen their pressure for peace. At the same time, this situation presents a splendid opportunity, as well as an urgent duty—for the independent industrial unions to come forward with a program of peace and jobs, together with proposals of a general labor conference and of united-front activity to achieve labor's demands. So far, however, these unions have failed to adopt such a comprehensive program and united leadership.

In the present situation we Communists must be very well aware that we have to do with an important change in the world situation, and with still more far-reaching changes in the offing. If the peace forces can bring the Korean war to an end and otherwise slow up the American-led warmakers, this could be of decisive importance in the maintenance of world peace for an indefinite period. If, on the other hand, the war forces can break up the present peace offensive, as they are seeking desperately to do, then the danger of war will be greater than ever.

Reader's Guide to Further Study

The foregoing article deals with the following questions relating to new international developments in the fight for peace and their significance for the United States, as well as the underlying conditions for the further expansion of socialist democracy:

1. What is *new* in the current peace proposals of the Soviet Union and People's China? Why were they put forward at this time? Do they represent a basic change in the foreign policy of these countries?
2. How did the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U., and Stalin's work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* lay the basis for the present peace proposals of the Soviet Union?
3. How should the response to these proposals by the U.S. Government be evaluated? By other capitalist governments, especially that of Great Britain? What general conclusions should be drawn from this for labor and the people's forces in the U.S.?
4. How is the further development of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union today related to the political and economic strengthening of the Soviet Union? How is it related to the perspective of transition from Socialism to Communism, as projected by the XIX Congress?
5. How does the extension of socialist democracy contribute to the fight for peace?
6. What new opportunities have opened in the fight for peace in the U.S.? How can the advanced peace forces utilize these opportunities to extend peace activity? What weaknesses and mistakes, both of Right-opportunist and "Left"-sectarian nature, must be overcome to guarantee the broadening of the peace movement?

SUGGESTED SUPPLEMENTARY READING

- Joseph Stalin: *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 27-30.
 G. M. Malenkov: *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 24-30.
Constitution of the U.S.S.R. (pamphlet).
 V. J. Jerome and Betty Gannett: "The People Can Win The Battle for Peace," in *Political Affairs*, May, 1953, pp. 11-15.
 Pauline Hosek: "Some Problems in the Fight for Peace," in *Political Affairs*, May, 1953, pp. 59-65.

The Anatomy of McCarthyism

By Mark Logan and Sam Douglas

A NEW WAVE of alarm growing out of a genuine concern for the democratic liberties of the nation is spreading across America. Trade-union leaders, church dignitaries, prominent artists, scientists, educators and some noted political figures are speaking up to challenge "the ministry of fear in our country"* and are urging resistance to McCarthyism.

In a speech delivered at Howard University, James B. Carey of the C.I.O., who not so long ago urged Americans to join with fascists to defeat Communism, warned:

Virtually all the investigations of alleged Communism are conducted by men who are not simply anti-Communist. They are anti-labor, pro-reaction. . . . The menace lies in the fact that the mental set of the professional anti-Communist is essentially one that would eventually suppress all dissent, all free inquiry.**

He charged that the goal was "driven young sheep such as we saw Hitler and fascism produce by thought control."

A. Phillip Randolph, president of

* Averell Harriman, quoted in the *N. Y. Post*, May 5, 1953.
** *Daily Worker*, April 12, 1953.

the A. F. of L. Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and editor of the *Black Worker*, the union's official organ, wrote on March 15, 1953: "McCarthyism is . . . a symptom of fascism. Its methods and tactics negate democracy."

The two-page, center spread, editorial went on to say:

McCarthyism, with a frenzy, fury and fanaticism worthy only of the lowest order of tribalism, would howl down all protests; all criticisms; all dissent; all popular ideas; all independent thought; all political differences.

As the victims under fire multiply, and as every aspect of public life and liberal thought is menaced, new voices are raised in protest. Characteristic is the note sounded by Senator Herbert H. Lehman on April 29th speaking at the New York State Democratic Party Dinner:

Step by step we have retreated in the last four years. . . . The investigators, who might better be called the inquisitionists, have taken over. . . .

What a spectacle we must present to the rest of the world! We have convinced our own people that this great

democracy of ours is honeycombed with traitors, spies, subversives and sexual deviates. . . .

The "sordid antics" of the McCarthys, Jenners, Veldes and McCarrans have directly affected the security and personal liberties of tens of thousands of Americans. Their storm-troop assaults are now battering down those who but a year ago thought they were untouchable. Fear of McCarthyism—but also the growing desire to fight back—therefore arise not only among those who have already come under attack but also from new millions who now recognize they *can* be next.

It is heartening to note that many new forces are beginning to recognize that McCarthyism does not threaten Communists alone. The new voices raised in protest, calling for courage, for an end to retreat, for no further concessions to McCarthy, is a welcome development. Today, it is not the Communists alone who recognize that all who surrender to McCarthyism will be devoured by McCarthyism. All of this represents an advance over yesterday.

Nor are these new voices content with protest. They are asking questions which they had previously shied away from. They ask: how have we come to this pass? How can we halt this ominous development before all democratic liberties are engulfed? Asks Sen. Lehman:

Why this panic? Why have we given

over to the McCarthys and Jenners the awful power to prosecute and to judge not only public servants but private citizens, on the basis not only of their beliefs but of their association, past and present?

Why have we so exposed ourselves to international ridicule as to permit our country to be stampeded by these Congressional Vigilantes?

Though many of these voices do not yet fully understand the nature and essence of McCarthyism; though the development of the movement is uneven and disunited; though it does not yet project a clearly defined program, the first important steps in reversing the trend are being taken. It would be the height of folly and fatal to the further development of the anti-McCarthy movement to minimize these developments. On the contrary, the defeat of McCarthyism demands that these new trends be encouraged and supported.

II

The fight back movement is under way. However, the future of this movement, its ability to reverse the pro-fascist trend, requires a more fundamental understanding of the nature of the enemy. It requires a more thorough-going examination of the anatomy of McCarthyism, the soil upon which it thrives, the interests which it furthers and how it came to be so powerful.

Senator Lehman asks: why have

we permitted our country to be over-run by these Congressional Vigilantes? This is a very important question. But it takes into account only one phase of the attack. It justly lashes out at Congressional Vigilanteism, but ignores the total developing pro-fascist direction of all branches of the government. It sees McCarthyism as an isolated phenomenon, expressing itself through Congressional inquisitions and divorced from the political climate and policies under which McCarthyism flourishes.

What is McCarthyism? True, it is Joe McCarthy. But is it he alone? Is it he, plus his Congressional imitators, the Jenners, McCarrans and Velde? Can anyone seriously believe that the lone efforts of a junior Senator from Wisconsin could in the course of a few short years so profoundly change the whole political climate of the country? The very absurdity of such a proposition is testified to by no less a man than Truman's Secretary of Air, Thomas K. Finletter. Sharing the same platform with Senator Lehman, he declared:

An evil force is loose in the land. *The leading spearhead and symbol of this force*, at the moment is a Senator. But the evil lies deeper than any one man. A small minority of Americans want to destroy our civil liberties in order (so they say) to protect ourselves from Russian subversion—but in reality I wonder for what personal end or personal power? (Italics added)

The concept of McCarthy as the "leading spearhead and symbol" is a profoundly acute observation; a view which Communists have long been urging upon the nation. Mr. Finletter is also quite right when he argues that "the evil lies deeper than any one man." However, though there is some validity to the view that ruthless lust for personal power and profit are involved, this is far from the whole picture or even the most important part of it.

Joe McCarthy is certainly an unscrupulous demagogue and adventurer. That he has profited from his activities, has been attested to by a Senate Committee report (quickly suppressed) which revealed that he has accumulated bank deposits of \$172,623.18 in the last four years, (while receiving a government salary of \$15,000 a year). Hardly any one doubts that McCarthy has a tremendous thirst for power and seeks no less than the Presidency of the United States.

However, though this portrait of the self-appointed *fuehrer* is true to life, it does not explain McCarthyism. It simply describes the man who personifies McCarthyism. What then is McCarthyism?

It is a *technique* of the Big Lie; a technique which seeks to effect a state of national paralysis by an unending and mounting stream of fantastic lies revolving around the central lie that our country is endangered by an "internal and ex-

ternal Red menace." As Comrade Foster has written:

McCarthy's sharp weapon is Red-baiting. With this he has built his national notoriety. He not merely attacks Communists and other Lefts, but everyone who has in him even a trace of liberalism. Such is the logic of the anti-Communist crusade, which is the Hitler Anti-Comintern Pact brought up to date. Red-baiting is not just legitimate criticism of the Communists, just as anti-Semitism is not criticism of the Jews—both are violently reactionary political attacks. . . . (*Daily Worker*, April 24, 1953.)

McCarthyism is a *method*—a method of terror and frameup, of character assassination and guilt by association. Its victims are bullied and smeared. And those who refuse to be browbeaten, it seeks to destroy.

Mrs. Agnes Meyer gives a vivid example of this method.

The plan is to expose any teachers who look suspicious and may even be guilty of Communist affiliations. Then with the support of an aroused public opinion behind them, our Congressional inquisitors will attack any or all professors whose opinions they dislike. That will be the moment when McCarthy will move into the bullring to do his stuff. As in the past, he will produce his professional ex-Communists such as Budenz to say that Professor X was known to them as a fellow-Communist. Before the poor man can recover from shock, his name will flame in every headline, his college branded as harboring Communists and encouraging Communism. Financial contributions will fall off at once.

Faculty morale will be shot to pieces. . . . *

But more than this. *It is a spearhead. It is a fascist detachment. It is an instrument of compulsion and pressure, designed to counter and paralyze popular resistance, to soften up and prepare the ground for fascism and to force the nation along this path.* More specifically, and within the framework of the present situation, it seeks to propel the Eisenhower government ever more to the Right and to transform it into a fascist regime. It strives to create a mass base without which fascism cannot come to power in America, any more than in any other part of the world. *McCarthyism is all of this.*

The validity of this characterization emerges clearly as we examine political developments under the Eisenhower Administration. Is there anything in the record of this regime to indicate that McCarthyism pursues an independent policy—a policy which contains principled differences? There is not. And the record easily proves this.

The Eisenhower Administration advances as its basic premise the theory that our country is menaced by Communism, at home and abroad. Let us put aside for the moment the validity or honesty of this premise, but merely study its consequences.

In foreign policy Eisenhower

* Address to the 79th convention of the American Assn. of School Administrators on Feb. 17, 1953.

pursues the policy of "the soldier's pack," of aggressive measures that can only extend the war, of negotiation by ultimatum. Dulles and Stassen are sent to Europe to "firm up" wavering allies in the war camp, while pressing for the remilitarization of Japan and Germany, as the Administration continues to brandish the atom bomb. The agreements of Yalta and Potsdam are renounced in practice, as efforts of the Soviet Union to achieve peaceful co-existence are met with evasions and rebuffs. The adventurist thesis of "liberation" war has alarmed the world.

Each step of the way, anti-Soviet incitements and frameups at home are used to heat up the cold war to prepare the way for the next war-mongering moves.

These are the policies of the most powerful, most warminded sections of monopoly capital. And they are executed by the Eisenhower Administration, the chief instrument of these monopolists.

And what of domestic policy? With the advent of the Eisenhower Administration, the attack on civil liberties has been intensified. Under the guise of fighting the internal Communist menace, the Department of Justice has added 62 new organizations to the Attorney General's subversive list, thus bringing the total to 254 organizations. Twelve additional organizations have been cited for action under the notorious McCarran Internal Security Law. New loyalty decrees have

been announced which remove the last vestige of due process. Attorney General Brownell announced during April that 12,000 non-citizens and 10,000 naturalized citizens were under investigation for deportation.

A host of viciously reactionary bills are now before Congress, including the legalization of wire-tapping and its use as evidence in so-called "espionage cases," endorsed by Attorney General Brownell, and also a bill to destroy the Fifth Amendment and its provisions to safeguard citizens against self-incrimination.

Eisenhower and Taft, Dixiecrat darlings, proved in the opening days of the new Congress, if proof was needed, that the GOP-Dixiecrat alliance would not only prevent new civil rights legislation, but that new attacks on the rights of the Negro people were under way. Legal lynchings and frame-ups thrive in the political climate of the Eisenhower administration. The FBI has been revealed as having entered into a pact of silence with local police departments (as in New York City) on the growth of police brutality.

In this kind of an atmosphere, it is small wonder that the beginnings of mob actions against other strata of the population are starting to take place. The press in recent weeks reported mob actions from New York, Chicago, against a Jewish Cultural Center in Pittsburgh, and the burning down of a union hall and a miner's home in Grant

County, New Mexico. The FBI is not found investigating these instances of force and violence or the Congressional vigilantes that incite such actions.

The most ominous attack in preparation is against the organized labor movement. With Taft given the job of "revising" the Taft-Hartley Law, labor knows what it can expect. The right to industry-wide contracts and strikes is under attack.

Powerful forces from both parties in Congress are pushing the Goldwater-Rhodes Bill (S-254 and HR 3993) which would give the government life and death power over every union in the U.S.

Glen Slaughter, Research Director of the A. F. of L.'s Labor League for Political Education, said of this bill:

In practice it would give a fishing license to the McCarran Act Control Board to probe into the affairs of unions everywhere and decide which unions and employees it wishes to purge. It would order out of business any union that ever advocated anything the Communist Party advocated, including income taxes and public schools. No bill in recent years has so closely resembled the thought control so characteristic of totalitarian regimes.

A sober evaluation of the deeds and policies of this Administration can lead to only one conclusion, the conclusion stated in our Party's Draft Resolution, that the Eisenhower regime is the instrument of

and "does in fact strengthen the hand of the most reactionary, pro-fascist, pro-war elements of monopoly capital." Through the G.O.P., its preferred party, the monopolists in their "feverish search for maximum profits . . . seek a way out of the deepening crisis of U.S. and world capitalism through aggressive imperialist adventures, attacking democratic rights and instituting reaction. . . ."

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., no mean Red-baiter in his own right, has this to say about the Administration:

Let us be clear about it: This government is far from the dignified and responsible conservatism dreamed of by its more hopeful friends. There has not been such a collection of plutocrats, profiteers and pirates in office since the lamented reign of the Great Engineer. Washington today is falling into the hands of men who would eagerly sell the Capitol if they thought they could get away with it. . . . *

And who are these "plutocrats, profiteers and pirates?" They are the men of General Motors, Rockefeller Oil, DuPont war chemicals, the economic royalists of the country.

Will this crew be an obstacle to McCarthyism or do they seek to use it? Are there any fundamental differences that put McCarthyism in conflict with these forces?

Thus the source of McCarthyism, the breeding ground from which it has sprung and on which it thrives is the foreign and domestic policies of the dominant and most reaction-

* N. Y. Post, April 26, 1953.

ary sections of monopoly capital whose main instrument is the Eisenhower Administration.

However, *McCarthyism and the Administration are not one and the same thing*. The particular tactical role of each is different. The tempo each pursues is different. And some of the methods are different. They are related, yet a division of labor exists. This division of labor is not accidental but flows from and is required by the sharpening contradictions and the growing crisis of monopoly policy.

The growing resistance of the people has further deepened the crisis of policy. McCarthyism serves a very special purpose in this situation. The more powerful groupings of monopoly capital have been moving in an ever more reactionary direction. While they operate mainly through the Eisenhower Administration as a whole, McCarthyism has been serving as the spearhead of these developments. The McCarthyites prepare the ground today for those positions which the monopolists wish the Administration to take over tomorrow—if necessary. McCarthyism has the task of softening up, scattering and paralyzing people's resistance and at the same time of building up a mass base for more pro-fascist policies.

The most casual appraisal of what has been taking place even before the advent of Eisenhower gives overwhelming proof that the "extremist" positions of a McCarthy on one day become the "respectable" policies of

the administration on the next day. Today McCarthy smears and indicts. Tomorrow the Attorney General prosecutes. This is true in the Latimore case and more recently in the deportation action against Cedric Belfrage, editor of the *National Guardian*.

Of no small advantage to the monopolists is the fact that the McCarthyites serve to some degree as a lightning rod, drawing the fire away from the sinister and oppressive acts of the Administration itself.

The McCarthyites are thus valued, utilized and given friendly advice by the real powers in Wall Street and Washington, sometimes openly, sometimes covertly. Dulles works with McCarthy, Brownell works with McCarthy. They are at the moment the main links between the most virulent expressions of McCarthyism—the Congressional vigilantes, and the official policy of the Eisenhower "Zillion Dollar Cabinet."

The Eisenhower Administration not only remains silent and makes no criticism of, but cooperates with and facilitates the advancement of McCarthy. It has added to his personal power with new important Congressional appointments, an enlarged budget, even tolerating him at times as unofficial Secretary of State.

Thus, McCarthyism has become a formidable power in its own right.

Three years ago, McCarthy was

virtually a political nobody, but now he's a real power in the land, able to dictate policies to powerful newspapers and broadcasting concerns, to infringe upon the foreign policy prerogatives of the President and to terrorize large sections of the population. . . .

The spectacular advent of McCarthy and McCarthyism go to illustrate the dangerous strength of fascism in the U.S. This reactionary has been able to give leadership to all the fascist and near-fascist forces of the country, and thus to bring them into focus where they can be more clearly seen and appraised.*

The most spectacular and shocking demonstration of his role and growing power was his savage attack on the Churchill proposal for a Big-Power meeting and his call from the Senate floor to sink British ships in trade with China. The fascist McCarthyite technique is now being unleashed in all of its fury in the international arena and the field of foreign policy. This new phase, which came into focus with the Bohlen and Greek ship owners incidents, takes place at a time when peoples' pressure for easing international tensions is growing everywhere, including in our own country; when Soviet peace proposals can no longer be rejected out of hand without exposing the real aims of American imperialism.

McCarthy's fight against Bohlen, his associations with Roosevelt and Yalta, were intended to act as counter pressure to the peoples' mount-

ing peace demands and to create an atmosphere in which any negotiations with the Soviet Union would be considered an act of treason.

This heir apparent of Goebbels now presumes to speak as the voice of America. Yet not one word of rebuke, not to speak of repudiation, is forthcoming from Eisenhower. This highlights the role of McCarthyism as spearhead and as fascist pressure grouping whose purpose is to forestall the possibility of compromise or retreat under growing pressure from the democratic and peace forces.

Frictions, however, do develop and lead at times to momentary tactical collisions. The Administration does at times find itself in embarrassing situations. These frictions are due in part to McCarthy's driving lust for power. More important they arise from the desire of the monopolists to retain at all times complete power of decision as to when they shall advance and when to mark time. As the mass revulsion and resistance to McCarthyism develops, and as all contradictions are intensified, the tactical problems which the bourgeoisie faces become even more complicated. However, this never permits it to lose sight of the valuable role of McCarthyism in their overall drive.

McCarthyism thus acts as a spearhead and as a fascist pressure grouping, whose purpose is to forestall the possibility of compromise or retreat under growing pressure from the

* William Z. Foster, in *Daily Worker*, April 24, 1953.

democratic and peace forces. This inevitably leads to momentary tactical collisions. This creates some difficulties for the monopolists who wish at all times to retain complete power of decision as to when they shall advance and when they should mark time. However, this never permits them to lose sight of the invaluable role of McCarthyism in their overall drive.

Among the many new voices expressing alarm over the attack on democratic freedoms, there is a growing awareness of the fascist danger. However, because the role of the Eisenhower Administration is not fully understood, the menace of fascism is seen in a limited and one-sided way.

McCarthyism is seen as the only source or at the very least as the main carrier of fascism. They fear that McCarthy will grow even stronger and come to power as the head of the American government. This possibility cannot be ruled out. And those engaged in the struggle against McCarthyism must constantly keep this danger in mind.

However, we must never ignore the fact that today Eisenhower is moving rapidly along the road of McCarthyism; that the gap between Eisenhower and McCarthy will close rapidly unless the people intervene and that the "Eisenhower era" can be both the transition to and the coming into power of fascism.

The virulent and advance guard role, the open fascist character of

McCarthyism as well as the level of the resistance movement dictate that the *main fire* in the struggle for democratic liberties be directed against McCarthyism. The movement cannot, however, achieve success without greater recognition that the *main threat* comes from the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital who operate through the Eisenhower Administration and who use McCarthyism as their spearhead.

III

In the presidential elections of last November, most workers, because they feared a G.O.P. victory and the strengthening of the power of Big Business reaction, voted against Eisenhower.

Most labor, Social-Democratic and liberal leaders urged support of Stevenson as an alternative to Eisenhower. Some of these leaders are now counseling support of Eisenhower as an obstacle to McCarthyism. Thus, an Eisenhower Administration, yesterday portrayed as a major threat, is today pictured as not only separate and distinct from, but as a roadblock to McCarthyism.

It is a tragic fact that these reformist leaders of labor and Social-Democrats, as well as many liberal spokesmen, have not learned from the experiences of the German people. From the very inception of the Truman Administration, and to this very day, they have counseled a course of retreat—a retreat which

now Senator Lehman notes in his speech of April 29th. They misled the people into believing that the Truman Administration was liberal, serving the interests of the people and fighting Big Business reaction and McCarthyism. They covered up the basically reactionary character of the Administration and the fact that McCarthyism was growing because of the policies of this Administration.

Already under Truman many areas of public life were under attack and the dismantling of the whole structure of bourgeois democratic freedoms got well under way.

One need only mention a few examples to make the point: Originally six organizations were listed by Truman's Attorney General as "subversive." By 1952 the list included more than 150 organizations. The indictments and prosecutions under the thought-control provisions of the Smith Act were initiated. The Communist Party was ordered before the McCarran Internal Security Board with the aim of depriving it of its few remaining legal rights. Loyalty oaths, widespread harassment of foreign-born, frame-ups like the Rosenberg case, were all Truman products. A National Education Association report in 1951 already spoke of the fear of teachers to deal with controversial subjects.

Already in 1951, Walter White, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and David W.

Petegorsky, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, declared in the report, *Civil Rights in the U.S. in 1951*, issued by both these groups:

The excesses of many of the loyalty investigations and the unreasonable character of much of the federal and state legislation have intensified the tendency to identify support of unpopular or controversial causes with subversion. The blacklisting, official or otherwise, of persons suspected of unorthodox opinions or associations has had an intimidating effect. Opposition to segregation or discrimination has too frequently been cited as an indication of disloyalty or unreliability. Thus while the core of leaders in the struggle for civil rights may have remained unaffected by this distortion of their legitimate aims, many persons have refrained or withdrawn from active participation in or identification with the cause of civil rights.

Truman, the "friend" of labor used the Taft-Hartley Law to break strikes and the application of this slave act cost the trade unions over 55 million dollars in major fines and court settlements.

The New Republic, like a number of other active defenders and apologists for the Truman administration, has taken a second look at the Truman policies, and declared on December 15, 1952: "Truman opened the dike to the flood waters of political oppression which are now upon us."

Truman was in fact the main architect of the Cold War and witch-

hunt era. Truman was responsible for the Korean war. It was Truman who initiated the large scale use of the Big Lie of the "Red menace" and who hailed a Dr. W. E. B. DuBois into court for leadership in the peace movement, and who put the Hollywood Ten and officers of the Joint Spanish Anti-Fascist Committee into jail.

In spite of this, Truman and Acheson were made into oft-riddled targets by McCarthyites. Aside from narrow partisan considerations, the sharpness of the McCarthyite attacks against the Truman Administration was dictated by the realities of the situation. The launching of the cold war atmosphere, coming so soon after the anti-fascist war, after an era of growing Soviet-American cooperation, was bound to provoke mass resentment. The rapid transformation of the political climate demanded extremely sharp measures. The now notorious methods of McCarthy served to speed the process: it acted as a pressure force and at the same time furthered the illusion that the Truman Administration was a liberal one. The Social-Democratic and reformist leaders, by helping to continue this illusion and by supporting the Truman war program, paralyzed the largest sections of the labor movement, and deprived it of its ability to find a real people's alternative to the developing threat of McCarthyism.

The policies necessary to advance the Big Lie had a logic of their own.

They not only produced Truman reaction and laid the basis for the Eisenhower victory, thus intensifying reaction, but also spawned McCarthyism. Though the Truman-Acheson Administration was provoked into criticism of McCarthy, it could be little more than shadow boxing. It was a weak-kneed defense of their own partisan and vested interests. And so long as methods, not aims, were being challenged, Truman's only argument could be that "I can fight Communism better than you." And on these grounds he was the inevitable loser.

IV

Though the anti-McCarthy movement and the will to resist is growing each day, it has not yet come to grips with the crucial issue of the Big Lie and rights of Communists. The failure to do so weakens the movement of resistance, prevents effective joint action, gives aid and comfort to and strengthens McCarthyism. This issue is at the very heart of the question of civil liberties. No movement for democratic freedom can possibly hope to achieve a decisive and lasting victory unless and until it faces up to this question.

The Big Lie in its most blatant and virulent form has always been the secret—and not so secret—weapon of McCarthyism. In this it runs true to form to all fascist and nazi movements. The central thesis of the Big Lie is that Communism is a con-

spiracy and plots force and violence; that the Communist Party is an agent of a foreign power; that Communism, both at home and abroad, imperils our nation.

This, however, is only the beginning. Like all peddlers of the Big Lie, the McCarthyites realize that their counterfeit wares cannot stand too close scrutiny. In order to guarantee that no genuine and honest examination of this central thesis take place, they keep padding it and surrounding it with more lies. But more than this. The Big Lie has little chance of success unless all dissent is labeled heresy and all who even dare question the methods of McCarthy are denounced as conspirators. Thus, the division of millions of Americans into various shades of "red" and "pink" has become one of the most effective weapons of McCarthyism.

According to McCarthy's table of classification there are: Communist card holders; Communists without cards; Communist sympathizers; Communist dupes; fellow travelers; *ad infinitum*. The *Washington Post* according to this system of classification, is the Washington edition of the *Daily Worker*, and Bishop Oxnham is "a man of the cloth on Sunday and a Communist frontier on all other days."

Most critics of McCarthy and for that matter most Americans will thus be found in one or another of these categories. What likelihood is there of halting this vicious assault if each

man is engaged in defense of his own category and in recriminations against all other categories? What chance is there of defeating McCarthyism if its table of classification is accepted as valid in even one single aspect?

Apropos is a story which appeared in the April 15th issue of *The Advance*, Amalgamated Clothing Workers Paper.

There is a story circulating here (Washington, D. C.) about a squirrel who came upon a rabbit frantically digging a burrow in the ground. The Squirrel asked the rabbit, what all the frenzy was about. "My God, where have you been," the rabbit said. "Haven't you heard, McCarthy is going to investigate all antelopes next month? If I were you, brother, I'd be looking for the highest tree I could find."

"Are you crazy?" the squirrel said. "I'm no antelope and neither are you."

"That's right," said the rabbit. "but I'm digging anyway. I don't know how I'd PROVE I'm not an antelope."

Many anti-McCarthyites however argue as follows: it's all right to deprive Communists of their civil liberties. What is wrong with McCarthyism is that it attacks innocent bystanders. Therefore they argue, let the Department of Justice and the F.B.I. take care of the Communists and let's have an end to the inquisition.

This view is incongruous, dangerous, is based on false premises and is ultimately self-defeating.

First, those who would deny Communists their full constitutional rights, already voluntarily agree to abridge the Bill of Rights for some people, and accept a large part of the Big Lie which is the chief stock in trade of the McCarthyites.

Second, they overlook the fact that the Justice Department has its own table of classification and is prosecuting not only Communists, but also men like Professor Lattimore. They close their eyes to the terroristic methods of the F.B.I. and its system of dossiers, invasions into the private lives of millions of Americans, their use of provocateurs, professional informers and wire tapping—the notorious techniques of the political police.

Whom would these opponents of McCarthyism hand over to the F.B.I.? Who is to determine who is a Communist, a Communist “frontier” and the other categories established by McCarthy and mirrored in Brownell’s growing subversive list? Do they believe in the establishment of a special Department of Thought Control in the Eisenhower cabinet to act as final arbiter on such questions? For that matter, are all anti-McCarthyites agreed among themselves as to who is a Communist sympathizer?

Many honest individuals are finding that the problem cannot be so easily resolved and that the neat formula—let the F.B.I. handle the Communists—is not the cure-all. For example, Dean Ackerman, of the

Columbia University School of Journalism, deeply disturbed at the experiences on his campus, declares that he will not voluntarily cooperate anymore with the F.B.I. and their methods in their wholesale investigation of students. Does Dean Ackerman by this act become a Communist frontier?

The diverse elements that oppose McCarthyism cannot borrow one or more pages of McCarthyism and still hope to remain a cohesive and united force that can strike back effectively.

The growing unity and clarity of the anti-McCarthy movement is threatened by those who, while calling for McCarthy to be driven out of public life, vie with him in how best to destroy the civil liberties of those they consider Communist and Communist “frontiers.”

Thus, the “anti-Red” constitutional amendment sponsored by Reuther and adopted at the recent Auto Worker’s Convention, the line of Sidney Hook, and some of the testimony of James Wechsler before the McCarthy Committee (including the handing over of names of members of his own *N. Y. Post*) can only disrupt, and mislead into impotent channels, the growing peoples’ resistance to McCarthyism.

That some anti-McCarthy forces are beginning to recognize that they must come to grips with this question is indicated in the address of Rev. John Paul Jones, chairman of the Board of the N. Y. Civil Liberties Union, delivered on Lincoln’s

Birthday.

Dr. Jones points out that Communists are now excluded from the protection of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. He further asserts that the present mood of the American people is one which would throw not only Communists but all “dissenters and objectors” to the wolves: “Give ’em the works—the whole batch of them.” But, urges Dr. Jones:

Let us think about it a moment. Leaving aside a vast group of people mistakenly accused, vilified and injured, what about the thoughtful, honest and sincere person who believes in Communism . . . we know that elsewhere in the world, and quite outside of Communist-dominated countries, there are multitudes of people who do not share American assumptions and ideals. And in the world as a whole there are many millions who embrace the Communist dialectic as the key to the future with a fervor and sacrificial devotion that often puts our enthusiasm to shame. It is conceivable that some thoughtful and honest Americans may share the same convictions.

We cannot, within the framework of this article, discuss Dr. Jones’ views of Communist philosophy or the state of the individual Communist’s soul, which he also treats at great length. It is extraneous to the common struggle for democratic freedoms as he himself asserts.

Dr. Jones is obviously well-acquainted with the stock arguments that are most frequently used to be-

fuddle and prevent many Americans from waging an all out fight against McCarthyism.

In one portion of his address he asks:

But does it not still matter that all Communists, for whatever reason, are committed of necessity to ways of revolution and violence? Yes, it matters greatly. But citizens of a nation which achieved its independence in revolution and violence cannot on principle condone such things only for its ancestors. . . .

Dr. Jones presents here a basically correct thesis, but one which at the same time contains a dangerous fallacy.

The Communist Party is a revolutionary party, but Communists are not “committed” to “ways of violence,” either as a Party or individually. William Z. Foster, National Chairman, writes as follows in his *History of the Communist Party, U.S.A.*:

The Communist Party projects and works for a democratic conduct of the daily class struggle and also of the advance to socialism. The preamble to the Constitution of the Party states this policy as follows: “The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States constitution and its Bill of Rights against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and popular liberties. . . .”

Communists are the chief fighters against the two major threats of violence in modern society—imperialist in-

ternational war and fascist civil war—both of which emanate from the capitalists. . . . The danger of violence in the daily class struggle and in the inevitable and indispensable advance of the workers and the nation to socialism could come only from the capitalist class, which, seeing its profits threatened and itself being deposed from its rich dictatorship, then uses every means possible to thwart the democratic socialist will of the people. For as the great Marx has truly said, there is no case in history where a ruling class has yielded up its domination without making a desperate struggle (p. 551).

Dr. Jones takes a giant step forward when he dissociates himself from the false view of many would-be champions of civil liberties who hold that the Communist Party is a conspiracy. He justly is wary of this trap when he argues: "For one thing we must be extremely cautious of the neat but oversimplified contention that the Communist Party is not a true political party but a conspiracy. It is too ambiguous and too narrow a characterization."

But it is far more than that. It is completely untrue and without foundation in fact. It is the chief ammunition of those who propose and support measures like the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, and all other repressive legislation. This baseless and self-serving charge has been used by tyrants from time immemorial against all revolutionary movements for social progress.

One need not agree with the socialist solution to mankind's social problems, or with historical and dialectical materialism, to understand that the Communists don't advocate violence or operate as a conspiracy or an agent of a foreign power. One need not agree with Communism to believe in the civil rights of Communists. One need not believe in Marxism to recognize that the danger to American democracy comes from the fascist threat and that defense of the civil liberties of the Communists is the front line of the fight for freedom.

* * *

Yesterday, millions of Americans thought that the attacks were meant for and directed solely against the Communists.

Today, there is increasing recognition of the fact that what goes under the name of an anti-Communist drive is one which is in fact directed against the entire nation.

The growing awakening and resistance is far from uniform. The level of understanding is uneven. Most significant, however, is that the mood for resistance continues to grow. It is of supreme importance that we carefully note and study all trends, understand them, seek to bring greater clarity in the common struggle as we seek common ground, and thus strengthen and propel ever forward the rallying of the American people in the fight for democratic freedoms. *The main objective of the*

movement at this moment is to end any further encroachments upon democratic liberties and to bring McCarthyism to a halt. This is the concrete path to curb the fascist development and to prevent the transformation of the Eisenhower government into an open fascist regime. This movement will grow more powerful as it parallels and ultimately merges with the movement for peace. This movement can be successful as the forces of organized labor take their rightful place and play their historic role as leader of the struggle for bourgeois democratic freedom in this period.

The immediate and broadest rallying ground in the struggle for democratic liberties is the fight against McCarthyism. This means the fight against Joe McCarthy the individual, against each and every McCarthyite—the Jenners, Veldes and McCarrans—and against all manifestations of McCarthyism.

We must support and encourage every single individual and movement that is prepared to battle McCarthyism, even though on the most elementary level. So, too must we be on the alert to challenge all conceptions within the anti-McCarthy camp that weaken the struggle and divert it into a blind alley. As the struggle

develops, and as we play a truly vanguard role, millions of Americans will come to realize the truth of our contention that the Eisenhower Administration facilitates and invites the development of McCarthyism.

The fight against McCarthyism must take place in the shops, in the neighborhoods, in the mass organizations and in the field of political action.

Senator Lehman in the address already cited, declared, somewhat belatedly:

It may be that a frontal attack on McCarthyism is not the way to political victory. But regardless of its effects on our prospects in 1954 and 1956, we cannot compromise with this evil thing. If we can save the cause of freedom by risking defeat in the next election, let us take the risk.

This is the beginning of wisdom. This approach will not only win over McCarthyism but will win elections too. And the key to such victories lies in attacks that are not only frontal, but *united*.

A great and militant united front of struggle, embracing every honest democrat who is concerned with the preservation of American liberties has become imperative if the nation is to be saved from the Gehenna of fascism.

Lessons of the Struggle Against Opportunism in District 65*

By Alex H. Kendrick and Jerome Golden

INTRODUCTION

IN MAY, 1952, District 65 Distributive, Processing, and Office Workers Union held its convention in Atlantic City, N. J.

David Livingston, President of the District, gave the main report. This report adopted as its own the central thesis of the "liberal" warmongers who seek to justify U.S. imperialist war policies by the foul lie that Communism and fascism represent twin dangers to the working class. In the following words this thesis was applied to the situation in the Union:

On the one hand, we have had an organized group who seem to take their leadership from Victor Riesel and the *Daily Mirror* . . . another organized group has come to the fore whose object is the same, but who approach their work from a different angle. This group seems to take its leadership from George Morris and the *Daily Worker*.

Having borrowed the main thesis of his report from the arsenal of Dubinsky, the *Forward*, and the *N. Y. Post*, Livingston proceeded to further ape his new found teachers by projecting a sweeping offensive

modeled along the lines of the Taft-Hartley Act against Communists and other militants in the union. This foul-mouthed renegade, after referring to Communists as "liars and diversionists," called in his report for the union to "adopt an attitude toward the diversionist groups." He proposed that the union membership pledge be utilized as a loyalty oath so as to provide a basis for mass expulsions. Speaking of the opposition in the union to the "new course" of the Dist. 65 leadership, Livingston proposed: "If they persist in their disruption, let us use our grievance machinery to remove them."

The insane and doomed drive of Wall Street to achieve world mastery through the organization of a Third World War has brought with it a ferocious attack aimed at destroying the Communist Party, softening up and corrupting the trade unions, and intimidating the Negro people. To this end the government is using the Taft-Hartley law, the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, Congressional Committees and sub-committees, prosecutions for "perjury," etc., to jail

* This article was written prior to the present moves of District 65 for merger with the C.I.O.

Communists and other militants in the unions.

In the face of these attacks, some have deserted to the war camp, fleeing to the supposed safety of the servants' quarters of Wall Street.

The renegacy of a number of the officials of District 65 is such an instance. It represents a capitulation by a corrupted group of trade-union officials, many of them Party members of long standing, to the mounting pressure of Wall Street imperialism's war measures.

In this article, we wish to analyze the 65 story so that the lessons which it holds for the Party and the labor movement may be understood.

* * *

Local 65, especially during its formative and early years, established an impressive record in the labor movement. Founded in the early thirties, it started among the small wholesale and jobbing shops in the dry-goods industry in New York City. During these years, the conditions of work in these places were miserable and fiercely competitive. The hours were long, stretching to as many as seventy a week. The pay was low, as hunger forced the worker to accept. These desperately bad sub-standard conditions of pay and work gave rise to highly militant trends among sections of the workers. At the same time the workers in this industry were not confronted by powerful trusts as in basic industry. Under these conditions, militant organizing and strike tactics, even

though they might involve only a relatively small number of workers, brought quick results.

These were circumstances that facilitated the emergence and growth of Local 65 as a fighting militant union. From its earliest days it included Communists in its top ranks and was always closely associated with the Left and Communist forces in the city. It carried on vigorous organizing campaigns and struggles. It participated in every working-class struggle. It generated great loyalty and devotion among its members.

In the course of time, Local 65 expanded to sections of workers beyond the wholesale and jobbing shops in the dry-goods industry and became what is now known as District 65. Through organizing campaigns and mergers it grew to 35,000 members and has come to encompass important sections of workers in corrugated box production, department store, drug, office and related fields. This growth brought significant changes in the composition of the Union, adding important sections of Negro, Italian, Puerto Rican and Irish to the original primarily Jewish base in small wholesale and jobbing dry-goods and textile shops. These new sections of workers were largely without previous union experience and contact with progressive forces and therefore brought with them many backward prejudices and illusions.

The top core of 65 did not reflect the changes in the membership com-

position and industrial character of the local resulting from its growth through the years. Top leadership control of the local remained on a closed shop basis in the hands of a small group of the early organizers of the union coming out of the small wholesale and jobbing shops. The main base of the top leadership of District 65 and of its organizing cadre remains to this day this oldest but least decisive section of the union.

The plethora of small jobbing and wholesale shops in the textile market of New York constitutes a classical example of petty non-productive industry. Workers in this type of industry are subjected to extreme petty-bourgeois pressures. In tiny shops they have constant direct relationship with the boss. In selling or buying ends they are constantly under pressure to adopt the accepted ethics and practices of business, to rook whomever you can for as much as you can. They live in the atmosphere of shady dealing and black marketing that prevails in these industries and a few are corrupted by it. Because of the relatively small amounts of capital involved, some workers develop ambitions to leave the working class and become business owners. In this type of industry a significant number of small businessmen are constantly being forced down by competition into the ranks of the workers. Arthur Osman (long time head of Local 65 and now President of the International) for example, was a business owner in the dry-goods market until

he went busted, re-entered the ranks of the working class and participated in the founding of the union.

It is this environment which results in workers in petty non-productive industry being a special source of petty-bourgeois ideas and trends in the labor movement. A special factor intensifying this in the wholesale and jobbing market of New York is the powerful pressure of Zionism which tends to obscure class lines and to insure the domination of bourgeois ideology.

The fact that the top core of leaders of the union (Osman, Livingston, Paley, Sherbell, etc.), as well as a decisive section of the rest of the large paid staff of the union, came out of and retained their main connections with the petty non-productive jobbing and wholesale industry is an important aspect of the material conditions which promoted opportunism and renegacy in the leadership of the union.

There are, of course, a number of other factors. Among the most important of these is the fact that, especially during the war years, District 65 began to grow from a militant struggling "poor man's" union into a rather wealthy union.

The union acquired property: a valuable building, a large treasury, and later on a welfare and security fund which now amounts to more than \$9,000,000. The standard of living of the staff of the union gradually grew away from the standard of the bulk of the members in the

union, particularly those in the large shops, in corrugated and processing. Staff members began in the early post-war years to buy homes in Long Island, deep freezers, cars, etc. The old base of the union, in drygoods and textile, remained the base of the officialdom, and to these workers too, the war years, plus a union wage policy aimed at cultivating them as the chief base of the local leadership, brought a considerable rise in their standard of living beyond the general rise among the working class as a whole or that of the large number of 65'ers in the other sections of the union.

Particularly among the union staff did the mode of living and outlook become increasingly petty-bourgeois. Large salary increases raised their incomes beyond the incomes of the working class and the membership. Osman himself has an expensive car, a \$1,000 TV set, a duplex apartment, and is in Florida several months a year. His salary is \$200 a week plus expenses.

There was an attempt by the union to acquire a seat on the Stock Exchange in order to invest the \$9,000,000 security fund. The attempt failed. But meetings of the Security Fund Board, consisting of the union leaders, a large staff of union functionaries as technical advisors, and employers, take place in the atmosphere of wealthy Catskill Mountain resorts such as Grossingers.

Thus, an outlook and a way of living developed among the leadership

which softened up and corrupted them.

Careerism developed as a result in the cadre and staff of 65, for a union job turned into a "good thing."

A tendency inevitably grew to protect this property and way of life.

Confronted by the violent attack of the imperialist ruling circle upon the Party and the Left, faced with the danger of raids by C.I.O. and A. F. of L., investigated by a Grand Jury and given a taste of jail, faced with McCarran Act and Taft-Hartley Act "perjury charges," they acted to preserve their way of life.

They felt that the wealth of the union, and their own position were imperiled, and they concluded, with the German Social-Democrat, Bernstein, that "The movement is everything, the goal nothing."

The ruling class always uses the two methods of dealing with the working class: the carrot and the club. The leaders of 65 capitulated. They took the carrot. The price of the carrot was renegacy: a purge of the Left policies and forces of the union, and the adoption of a Red-baiting, class-collaboration line.

The path of renegacy was paved by the whole process of corruption and softening-up briefly described above. But it was prepared long before the open desertion, by many other factors throughout a long preparatory period.

65 WAGE POLICY

Expressive of Local 65's healthy militancy during its early years were its class-struggle wage policies, especially its determined fight to raise minimum scales in the industry. One of the fundamental expressions of the growth of opportunism in the officialdom of 65 has been the abandonment of this class-struggle wage policy, and the gradual substitution of class-collaboration wage policies modeled in many respects on those pursued by the ILGWU leadership.

Never in the U.S. (and we dare say in the world) has any union leadership shouted so often, so loud, and so long about the eminently satisfactory working conditions and unparalleled high rates of pay of workers whose interests it is supposed to fight for, as does the leadership of District 65. The fact is that this shouting is nothing more than demagogic hogwash. It is true that there exists an "unparalleled" (except perhaps in ILGWU) differential of wage scales in 65, with a narrow strata of commission salesmen making well into the hundred dollar bracket. It is true that in recent years the wage policies pursued by the top leadership of 65 have consciously sought to enhance the differential and enlarge the base of the minority grouping of high-paid workers as its chief prop of support. The fundamental fact is, however, that the wage levels of the bulk of

the workers organized by 65, the workers in the big shops, the mass of Negro, Puerto Rican, Irish, Italian and Jewish workers, are substandard.

In its early years the focal point of Local 65's wage policies was the fight to raise the minimum in the industry. In this period the rule was "the minimum must increase as much as the wages increase." If a contract did not provide for this it was rejected. This meant basing policy on the support of the bulk of the membership and especially the lowest paid categories. In recent years the fight to raise minimums has been largely shelved and is honored mainly by lip service. Wage policies have moved in the direction of facilitating the emergence of wider pay differentials. This means basing policy on the support of a narrow strata of higher paid workers. This represents a conscious movement by the top leaders of 65 towards creating a main base of support for themselves among a narrow stratum of highest paid workers, somewhat along the lines Dubinsky has done in the ILGWU.

The "live and let live" line developed by Osman summarizes a trend that has long been developing so far as the relations with the employer are concerned. It was first projected in this connection as far back as 1946 by Osman in a column in the union's paper.

This slogan is a classic formula of "class peace," of the substitution of

"good relations" with the boss for a militant policy of struggle, of being able to see the boss's point of view and problems.

The results of this line have been that "reorganizations" of businesses are allowed, an old stunt in the garment industry. A business is "reorganized" under a new name, or with a new brother-in-law as partner. The old crew of workers is fired, and since it is a "new" business, the employer hires his new workers at the minimum scale, cutting the wages he pays considerably. This lets the boss live, at the workers' expense.

This line is linked with the theory of "keeping the boss in business," one of the most pernicious policies in the labor movement, and long practiced in the needle trades, where there are large numbers of competitive, petty enterprises.

This policy keeps the boss in business by cutting the wages of the workers in the shop, to allow the boss to "meet competition." Thus, boss A competes with boss B. Boss B tells the union that he can't stay in business at the present wage rate he must pay. If he goes out of business, twelve workers will lose their jobs. Therefore, in order to save the jobs of these twelve workers, their wages will have to be cut.

If the union leadership goes along with this policy, then they agree to lower the wages to "keep the boss in business." Boss C of course hears of this, and then makes his announ-

cement that he will go out of business because of "competitive disadvantage," and the process is repeated.

The competition between the bosses is transferred to the workers. Boss B competes with Boss C by having the workers of Boss B sell their labor power to him more cheaply than the workers of Boss C. This process drives wages to the ground. And the union defeats its basic function, which is to eliminate the competition between workers.

The "reorganization" policy is this theory, one step removed and under a different name.

Another slogan that appeared several years ago, was "a fair day's work for a fair day's wage." This slogan, officially put forth in the union paper, is of course the old A. F. of L. shoddy, intended to justify speed-up in a plea by "labor statesmen" for "employer statesmanship." It simply throws out the the class struggle and the facts of exploitation. It fits in with the "live and let live" theory and marks the development of the opportunist line that increasingly relies on "good relations" with the boss rather than united, militant struggle for winning wage increases.

Thus, also, the fringe demands replaced across-the-board wage increases, substituting for them rather than adding to them. The Security plan is a case in point. The 65 Security Plan has many good features. It has been used by the leadership of 65, however, as a substitute for a

militant wage policy aimed at securing maximum direct wage increases.

The exaggerated importance which the officialdom of 65 attaches to the Welfare Plan arises from the fact that it places an enormous sum of money at their disposal and also tends to tie the workers closer to the union administration, as does a similar plan in Garment. This is particularly so of the older workers who fear that they may lose the security fund benefits by opposing the administration.

Another evidence of the developing opportunism on the wage question was the use of the escalator clause as a substitute, again, for direct wage increases won through struggle. This was dropped in the face of the resistance of the rank and file, after a number of contracts had incorporated it. The escalator clause, *if it only moves upward* with the cost of living index and accompanies an annual wage and contract negotiation where direct wage increases are won, is all right. For then it simply raises the wages further, beyond the increase, as the cost of living index used goes up. What is bad about it when it substitutes for direct wage increase, is that it freezes the worker's standard of living, for it raises his wages only after and always less than prices go up.

The changed wage policies of District 65 express the reliance of the District officialdom on a narrow stratum of higher paid sections of the workers for support of their class

collaborationist policies. The interests of the low paid workers in the larger shops, of the non-selling workers, of the Negro and Puerto Rican, Irish and Italian and of the bulk of Jewish workers who are also underpaid, are increasingly ignored. This is the classic tactic of opportunism—to make its base among the higher paid workers most closely influenced by the capitalist class.

JEWISH NATIONALISM

A most monstrous feature of Hitler fascism was its policy of extermination towards people of Jewish background and faith. The heroic role and unprecedented sacrifices of the Soviet Union, under the leadership of the immortal Stalin, brought defeat to Hitler Germany and its fascist allies, thereby saving from annihilation peoples of Jewish origin everywhere. Inspired by the example of the Soviet Union and the teachings of the C.P.S.U., Communists and Communist Parties have always been the most resolute and militant fighters against all theories of racial inferiority and all practices of racial discrimination. As the voices of the McCarthys, McCarrans, Byrds and Jenners grow louder in our country, our Party again, as it has consistently in the past, shoulders the responsibility of being the foremost fighter against all forms of chauvinism and race prejudice.

One consequence of the brutal murder of six million Jews by the

Nazis was the stimulation of the feeling of identity and of a greater desire for unity among Jews everywhere, including the garment and textile markets of New York. This was further stimulated by the fight for the establishment of the State of Israel which was regarded by the mass of Jewish workers as in the first place a fight to establish a safe refuge for the millions of displaced Jews of Europe.

The desires of the Jewish masses, however, did not play the determining role in the movement for the State of Israel or the upsurge of Jewish nationalism. The decisive role was played by big capitalist elements among the Jews, especially those in the U.S., in league with the basic forces of U.S. imperialism. Utilizing Zionism as their main instrument they have made of Jewish bourgeois nationalism a pliable tool of U.S. imperialism's war measures.

Jewish nationalism, like all bourgeois nationalism, undermines class consciousness. National identity becomes the touchstone of relations, rather than class. A bond is created between a Jewish worker and a Jewish boss that excludes the non-Jewish worker alongside. National consciousness encroaches upon and displaces class consciousness.

An important factor in the ideological corruption of some of the leaders of District 65 has been the influence of Zionism and Jewish bourgeois nationalism. Jewish nationalism was particularly dangerous

in 65 because many employers, particularly in the distributive field, are Jewish. Many joint ventures in Jewish charities, aid to Israel, etc., brought union leadership and employers together.

The top officials of 65, particularly Osman, Livingston, Paley, and Sherbell, rejected the path of struggle against the ideology and policies of the big capitalist elements who administer the "Aid to Israel" and Jewish Charity Funds and drives. On the contrary, they have striven with might and main (and the liberal use of union funds) to win acceptance as respectable junior partners of the capitalist elements in these "aid" and "charitable" enterprises. In so doing, they have not been averse to accepting the ideology of the class enemies of the working class.

Toward non-Jewish workers, nationalism expresses itself as distrust. Thus, in 65, non-Jewish workers were promoted, but never into genuine top operational leadership. Some were kept as "composition," window dressing—while being kept from any real responsibility or leadership. They were treated patronizingly. They were permitted to degenerate in some cases, without criticism or check of any serious kind. In some instances, they were, in fact, encouraged to degenerate, for thus they became more reliant on the good graces of the leadership. There is a connection here between the failure to organize some of the big

warehouses in the industry, such as J. C. Penney, and the Jewish bourgeois nationalism of the leadership in 65 as reflected in its most peculiar and distorted policy of promotion of non-Jewish workers.

Toward the Negro workers, Jewish nationalism compounds white chauvinism, aggravates it. Thus, the rejection of the Marxist position regarding the necessity of a strategic alliance of the working class and the Negro people, and the development of chauvinist attitudes toward Negro workers by the officials of 65, is also related to their surrender to Jewish bourgeois nationalism.

OPPORTUNISM AND THE NEGRO QUESTION

An integral aspect of the growth of opportunism is the surrender to ruling-class attitudes and practices of white supremacy. In fact, insofar as many of the officials of 65 are concerned, white chauvinist attitudes and acts constituted the most advanced expression of their ideological and political degeneration.

During its early life, the policies of Local 65 towards Negro workers and staff members were decisively influenced by the advanced scientific program of the Communist Party on the Negro question. It was during this period that the Local achieved recognition as being one of the most advanced unions in the city in the struggle for Negro rights. This advanced position was not dissipated

quickly or easily. It was undermined gradually, step by step, and over a number of years.

The overwhelming bulk of the Negro workers in 65 are in the lowest paid categories of jobs. Their interests have been most adversely affected by the shift in 65 wage policies described earlier. The substitution of wage policies fostering the emergence of widening pay differentials for wage policies based on the fight to raise minimums has not only been a blow to the economic interests of the Negro membership of 65. It has also had other consequences. As this trend of policy meant increasing reliance of the officialdom of 65 on support of a narrow stratum of higher paid workers, almost exclusively white, it resulted in a growing catering to backward chauvinist prejudices existing among this stratum of workers.

A number of officials of 65 began to take the path of shifting from a struggle against white chauvinist attitudes and practices to a defense of such attitudes and practices. Among the most important events highlighting this shift was the struggle that took place around the expulsion of Busch and Portnoy from the Party in 1948. In order to buy homes in a middle class housing project on Long Island, they signed anti-Negro restrictive covenants. Under the leadership of Livingston, Osman, and Paley, strenuous (although at that time still largely covert) ef-

forts were made to mobilize the paid staff of the union as well as others in defense of this chauvinist act. On the heels of the struggle, the top leadership of 65, utilizing many pretexts and camouflages, intensified a policy of reprisals and dismissals against militant and staunch Party members on the staff and in other important positions.

Especially shameful was the chauvinist policy of the top officials of 65 towards a number of militant and staunch Negro organizers. This policy (also employed on occasion against staunch white progressives) consisted of carrying through a number of union "reorganizations" and "administrative" shifts, in the course of which these Negro organizers were shifted away from their base of support in the union and frequently given impossible assignments in which a "poor record of accomplishment" was inevitable. In due course of time, charges of incompetency would then be forthcoming against these progressives and they would then be demoted or dismissed. Hand in hand with the development of this offensive against these capable and militant organizers, the top officials of 65 pursued a policy of adding a number of less politically advanced and experienced Negro workers to the paid staff. Then, reducing the vital question of Negro working class cadre to a matter of statistics, they shouted from every available rostrum that the representation of Negro workers in the lead-

ership of 65 was increasing.

The growth of opportunism in the officialdom of 65 and the D.P.O. led to the rejection in practice (although camouflaged by an acceptance in words) of the concept of the Negro question as a national question. The organizing drive in the South centering on the Reynolds Tobacco Co. of Winston-Salem was abandoned as just another unprofitable union-organizing drive. The development of relations between the members of 65, especially Negro members, and the Negro Labor Council was fought by the leadership. Livingston denounced such relations as "dual unionist and factional." The officials of 65 rejected the concept of the national character of the Negro question, saw no need for a Negro liberation movement, and of course no reason for the leading role of organized Negro workers within that movement. Instead they feared the organization of the membership along that line.

CAPITULATION ON THE QUESTIONS OF WAR AND FASCISM

As the government's preparations for war and fascism were stepped up, the officials of 65 developed with increasing frequency moods of petty-bourgeois panic. This was expressed in loss of working-class perspective, loss of confidence in the strength of the working class and its allies, and capitulation to ruling-

class propaganda of the inevitability of a Third World War and fascism in the U.S. These petty-bourgeois moods of desperation and panic found expression in conversation and in meetings, and in statements by 65 officials such as the following ones by Osman at two union meetings:

"We must be prepared to live through a war."

"We will live through the storm," referring to fascism.

Now our Party understands very well the need for measures which ensure that the struggle against war and fascism will continue and develop under any and all conditions. Such preparations in the midst of the struggle—for the purposes of guaranteeing the continuity and development of the struggle—are fully in the interests of the working class. The officials of 65 adopted a course diametrically opposed to this correct working-class policy.

The officials of 65 proceeded to make their own preparations for the "inevitable" storm by undertaking to demonstrate to the imperialist warmakers their "loyalty" and "respectability." They began to clamp down on those activities in the union designed to mobilize forces to prevent the "storm." They began to purge the staff of members who resolutely refused to have any truck with spineless concepts that the task of the labor movement today is to prepare to live out a World War and a fascist regime tomorrow.

The Wall Street instigators of war work very hard to propagate the lie that war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union is inevitable. In this way they try to generate moods of hopelessness and surrender among the people and to break up any fight for peace. They also use the lie about the inevitability of war with the Soviet Union to create an atmosphere of "national emergency" in which to prepare for the "inevitable" war. Under the cloak of the "national emergency" they plunder the country, move to destroy all opposition to their program, pursue their efforts to transform the labor movement into a subservient tool. This pernicious theory of "inevitability" is a major weapon in the arsenal of Wall Street, a weapon trained against the working class, the Negro people, and the nation. The Osmans, Livingstons, Paleys and Sherbells succumbed to this ideological weapon of the ruling class and have now wound up by adopting it.

Their "preparations" of living through the "storm" by demonstrating their "loyalty" to the ruling class have led the officials of 65 to develop a rather extensive "third force" demagoguery. They lump together the filthy pro-fascist writer and labor spy Riesel with the able Communist labor journalist and leader, George Morris. In their pipsqueak fashion they carefully and pontifically measure out an ostensibly even-handed condemnation of both fascism and Communism. They seek to establish

themselves as a sort of middle force, neither fascist nor Communist, neither pro-Left nor pro-Right, neither pro-war nor anti-war. They seek to cloak each move to the Right, each step into the war camp, with radical-sounding phrases of third force demagoguery.

This "third force" demagoguery is a special device that Osman and Livingston have borrowed from Social-Democracy and Tito. Social-Democrats and Titoists developed this third force demagoguery in order

to camouflage their roles as lackeys of Wall Street. Having chosen to play a similar role it is only natural that the Livingstons, Osmans, Paleys, and Sherbells would borrow a brand of demagoguery already in existence.

* * *

NOTE: The concluding section of this article, to appear in our next issue, will cover the following topics: the path of transition to open anti-Party struggle, the cancer of opportunism, and lessons of the struggle. —Ed.

Zionism and Bourgeois Nationalism

By Samuel Rosen

THE LIE OF SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

SOME FOUR YEARS AGO, the American people were confronted with the degrading spectacle of the entire capitalist press engaged in a sordid game of bigger and better lies about alleged anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and the New Democracies. At the time, a number of journalists, still possessing some sense of honesty and decency, protested bitterly against this blatant campaign of lies. Thus, a well known Jewish journalist, William Zuckerman, declared that to "rush to reprint jubilantly such falsifications and rejoice in the discovery that another sixth of the world which has outlawed anti-Semitism has turned anti-Semitic, seems to be a case for psychopathology."

For a brief moment there was a lull in this campaign. But in 1952 it was revived with even greater fury. And when the announcement came that nine doctors, among them a number of Jews, had been arrested in Moscow, the floodgates of abuse and vilification were opened wide. Suddenly Jewish people found themselves surrounded by a whole host of "friends." State Department head, John Foster Dulles, financier of Nazi

bankers, who was not averse to a bit of anti-Semitism in his campaign for the U.S. Senate against Herbert H. Lehman, began to shed tears over the "fate" of the Jews in the lands of Socialism. And that great "defender" of Jewish rights, the *New York Journal-American*, lamented: "The trial reveals that the Kremlin is making no attempt to conceal its anti-Semitic bias" (Nov. 24, 1952).

Even some writers, like I. F. Stone, who have in the past evinced some understanding of the role of the Soviet Union jumped into the fray to lend credence to the lie.

On April 1, the Soviet Government announced that the charges against the doctors were unfounded; that they had therefore been released and those responsible for instigating the entire affair had been arrested. The Soviet statement declared: "The desperate adventurers of the type of Ryumin, through their fabricated investigation, attempted to inflame in Soviet society, which is forged by moral and political unity and ideas of proletarian internationalism, feelings of national antagonism which are profoundly alien to the Socialist ideology." In other words, the Soviet Union had nipped in the bud an attempt by anti-Soviet elements to spread anti-Semitism.

The *N. Y. Times* (April 5) expressed profound astonishment "that the Kremlin should so dramatically repudiate one of the biggest of its big lies and lay so open before the world the corruption and the brazen disregard for truth which are so basic to Soviet power." This pious bit of hypocrisy is particularly nauseating when one recalls the callous disregard for even the most elementary standards of decency and honesty that the *Times* has displayed in its own efforts to spread the Big Lie. Let us refresh our memories. On April 20, 1949, the *Times* "expert," Harry Schwartz, broke into print with the accusation that the Soviet magazine *Krokodil* had printed a cartoon of an individual with a hooked nose and had "juxtaposed the name Lippmann—which is usually Jewish in the Soviet Union—with the word 'Zhid', a derisive Russian term for Jews used by Russian-speaking anti-Semites."

On May 20, 1949, the *Daily Worker* exposed this lie. It reprinted the cartoon and showed that there were two words in the cartoon, not one, and they were "André Gide," the name of the French novelist. Did the *Times*, so concerned with morality and truth, hasten to inform its readers of the big lie it had perpetrated? It did print a retraction. But whereas the lie was spread prominently, the retraction was buried in a small item in the back pages. Nor did the editors see fit to inform the readers that it was its own Harry Schwartz who had spread the lie.

Many more such instances of *Times* "integrity" can be cited. Let us here note only one more. On March 26 of this year, the *Times* ran a lead story on page 1 entitled: SOVIET SAID TO OUST 30 JEWS IN HUNGARY IN PURGE OF REGIME. On April 22, however, the *Times* carried a very different tale under the heading: PURGES IN HUNGARY HELD EXAGGERATED. The retraction was not considered as newsworthy as the original lie. So it was buried on the inside pages.

Neither in 1949 nor in 1953 did the *Times* consider it to be its moral obligation to criticize Schwartz or any of its other writers for these fabrications, let alone warn its readers to be on guard against hysterical campaigns of slander and calumny. Yet this paper has the gall to speak of "corruption and brazen disregard for truth" in the Soviet Union.

The capitalists and their propagandists neither care to, nor are capable of, understanding the principles on which the Soviet Union is based and the meaning of socialist justice. The Soviet Union had no hesitation in publishing the fact that there had been a miscarriage of justice in the arrest of the nine doctors. It had no fear that it would undermine confidence in the Soviet Government. Under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet people have been brought up to regard public and honest criticism and self-criticism and the immediate and frankest rectification of

mistakes as a very law of socialist development. It had no fear of publicly stating that an attempt had been made to spread national antagonism. Soviet leaders, from the very day the Soviet Union was born, have been educating the people to engage in vigorous battle against every remnant of anti-Semitism or of any other form of racism. What was noteworthy here was the speed and decisiveness with which this plot was exposed, and the manner in which the entire people were immediately drawn in to study and to learn from the experience.

Yet, even after this inspiring and decisive act, one without parallel in the democratic history of the world, against those who dared to foment national antagonisms, the rabid anti-Soviet baiters still froth at the mouth about "Soviet anti-Semitism." What a strange way the Soviet Union has of "encouraging" anti-Semitism! It immediately arrests those who dared spread it; publicly warns the Soviet people to be on guard against any such plots and holds up as an object of public scorn and contempt those who maligned the memory of a noted Soviet Jewish artist, Solomon Mikhoels.

There is one other point to be noted. I. F. Stone in his *Weekly* (April 11) asks: "If the charges were false in the case of the doctors, six of them Jewish, might not similar charges in the Slansky and other trials have been equally false?" This, within the framework of some snide

remarks about "those who have been trained to believe everything they are told, so long as it comes from Moscow and party higher-ups." At some future date, we shall be most happy to enter into debate with Mr. Stone on the question of freedom of criticism and whose interests the type of criticism he is engaging in, serves. At this juncture, we would like to limit ourselves to answering the question he poses. What are the facts? These doctors were charged with certain offenses, and were arrested on the basis of these charges. Preparations were being made to bring them to trial. *The trials had, however, not yet taken place.* Meanwhile a thorough investigation of the charges was under way. They were found to be false. The doctors were thereupon immediately released. *The trials did not take place.* In the Slansky case, a thorough investigation was made, the charges were corroborated. Then a public trial was held where the accused were again heard, the testimony gone over in great detail and only then, and on the basis of all of the facts, the decision arrived at.

Mr. Stone is a bit naive, to say the least, when he attempts to infer that all previous trials are now suspect. Particularly is he naive when he insists that much of what has taken place in the Soviet Union is due to the fact that "Russian policy has too long operated on the half-truth that the Soviet Union was ringed by enemies." Mr. Stone, who

has himself in no small measure helped to expose the plots of American imperialism against the peace, should know better. Were the armies of intervention that trampled on Soviet soil at its birth a figment of Soviet imagination? Was the Soviet Union having hallucinations when it warned that Chamberlain and Daladier were aiding Hitler in order to have him march against the Soviet Union? If Mr. Stone has no faith in Soviet pronouncements, will he perhaps take the word of Joseph Davies, one-time Ambassador to Moscow, and of Mr. Churchill who agreed on the basis of their own independent findings that Tukhachevsky, Radek, etc. were guilty of conspiring to undermine the Soviet Union? Are the Dulles proclamations of "liberation" the ravings of a lunatic, or official American policy? And just what is "Operation X"? An act of friendship? And the 100 million dollars allocated by Congress for Central Intelligence activities, which Congressman Kirsten publicly stated was to be used for "aiding the underground organizations that may now exist and may come into existence in the future"?

Mr. Stone is certainly as aware as we are of the daily public proclamations of the aims of American imperialism, as of the fact that every fascist scum, every pogromist, every torturer and hangman of the old feudal and fascist regimes of eastern Europe who fled from the honest wrath of the people, is now being

financed and organized by Washington.

If Mr. Stone sincerely desires the truth let him read the statement of the Soviet Government that appeared in *Pravda* a little more carefully. He would then realize that what took place was quite different from the picture he presents. What he overlooks is that there was a plot—a plot to foment anti-Semitism—an anti-Soviet and anti-Socialist plot. It was quickly uncovered because of the vigilance of the Soviet Government. Such plots have taken place before. Again and again, Lenin and Stalin warned that as Socialism grows stronger, the class struggle will be intensified, not lessened. Imperialism will more desperately try to do everything to destroy Socialism. It will act from without and seek to use every weak, unstable and anti-Soviet element from within to foment trouble.

And the Soviet government's statement points this up with particular clarity.

In the Soviet Union the exploiting classes have long been liquidated. Therefore foreign reactionary forces, in their attempts to carry out subversive activities against the Soviet state, cannot have inside the Soviet country any considerable social support.

But the Soviet people know that, while the capitalist encirclement exists, there are and there will inevitably be in the future attempts to send spies and diversionists to us; there will also be attempts to use for anti-Soviet ends

individual renegades, bearers of bourgeois ideology and degenerates. Against those true, overt and covert, enemies of the people, the enemies of the Soviet state, the powder must always be kept dry. The party teaches Soviet people to be always vigilant.

BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM

It has long been evident that one of the major ideological weapons used by the imperialists in their effort to organize their conspiracy against the lands of Socialism is bourgeois nationalism. The latest findings of the Soviet Union in the case of the doctors do not in any way obscure or minimize the dangers of this ideology. On the contrary, the very plot against the doctors was an expression of bourgeois nationalism in its most reprehensible form. In order to really understand the dangers of this ideology and its tragic consequences for the people, we must study its economic basis and its class roots. Only then will we fully grasp its purpose and understand whose interests it serves.

A few months ago, C. E. Wilson of General Motors and now head of the Defense Department, arrogantly declared before a Senate Committee that "what is good for General Motors is good for the country." This statement is typical of the outlook of the bourgeoisie. The interests of General Motors and its owners, says C. E. Wilson, are in the best interests of the American people. More than this, according to his views, they are identical. But since they are identical

and since the criterion of what is good for the country is determined by what is good for General Motors, it logically follows that the monopolists who control this giant outfit are the best judges of what is good for the country. Hence, it also follows that they are the ones to whom the American people should gratefully entrust their destinies.

But what are the interests of General Motors? Their interests are bourgeois interests. They exploit the working class in order to extort ever greater profits for themselves. But General Motors, like all of the bourgeoisie, is never content to exploit its "own" workingclass alone. The very logic of its drive for profits leads it all over the world, to the exploitation of workers of all countries and to the subjugation of all peoples. The very logic of its class interests dictate on the one hand that it support the bourgeoisie of other countries in their efforts to exploit their own workers, and on the other hand, to engage in constant warfare and rivalry with these bourgeoisies in order to squeeze them out and to take over their markets.

Thus, General Motors, whose empire is a far-flung one, exploits not only the workers of Detroit but of Germany and Japan, of France and Israel, of Asia and Africa. It seeks to use its economic power as well as the political and military might of the United States, to further its own rapacious greed for maximum profits.

Thus, John Foster Dulles found no difficulty in giving financial aid to German bankers and thereby hastening Hitler's rise to power. No more than he does now in aiding the Syngman Rhee regime in Korea which guarantees greater profits for International Nickel in which Mr. Dulles has interests. In both cases, the economic interests of Mr. Dulles and his fellow monopolists, lead to war, to the killing of millions of people including thousands of American youth. But Mr. Dulles has no trouble in reconciling himself to the tragic consequences for the vast majority of the people, since for him as for all of the bourgeoisie, patriotism and national interests have meaning only to the extent that they advance their ability to make profits.

As far back as 1902, Lenin pointed out in his *What Is to be Done*:

Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology being developed by the mass of workers in the process of their movement then the only choice is: either bourgeois or Socialist ideology. There is no other middle course (for humanity has not created a "third" ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or above-class ideology).

On all questions, therefore, the determining factor is the class struggle and class interests. And it is on the basis of class struggle and class interests that all other questions are decided. This is true of the national

question as well. The bourgeoisie develops one ideological approach to the national question, the working class another. Even as there is an irreconcilable gulf between the class interests of the bourgeoisie and the working class so too with regard to their concept of the nation and the national question.

Bourgeois nationalism—this is the ideology of the bourgeoisie. Proletarian internationalism—this is the ideology of the working class. "There is no other middle course."

The bourgeoisie seeks to establish, as we have shown in the case of C. E. Wilson, that the interests of the bourgeoisie and of the nation are identical. It hopes thereby to deceive the mass of the people into identifying themselves with the interests of the monopolists and to accept them as the leaders of the nation.

As the bourgeoisie grows more rapacious, as it intensifies its search for markets and maximum profits, it increases its nationalistic propaganda a millionfold. And where this leads to, the world has had ample and tragic evidence. Hitlerism and fascism—this is the logical road of unbridled nationalism. Thus, bourgeois nationalism is a dagger at the heart of the working class and the overwhelming majority of the nation. Inevitably it leads to ever greater oppression of the working class, to the betrayal of nations and their deepest interests, to vicious racism and anti-Semitism, to war

and genocide, to the extermination of peoples.

Bourgeois nationalism—this is the breeding ground of chauvinism, racism, jingoism and anti-Semitism.

Bourgeois nationalism—this is the weapon of the camp of war and fascism.

Some thirty years ago, Carlton J. H. Hayes, well-known bourgeois American historian and one-time Ambassador to Spain, wrote (*Essays on Nationalism*, pp. 73-74):

Some of the bourgeoisie, particularly bourgeois politicians, made a very interesting discovery about the phenomenon of nationalism. They found that the masses when brought under its spell not only were less inclined to criticize their leaders but also were more disposed to accept the "status quo" in economic matters. On the multitudes nationalism could be made to act as a sort of laughing gas. If a laborer could be induced to take a long, deep breath of it, he would feel quite exhilarated and for a long time at any rate he would forget about overwork and underpay in factory, field, or mine, and lose the reality of his own squalid habitation in the dream of national greatness. A sustained inhalation of nationalism, as in time of national election or international war, might even deaden the noise of socialists, anarchists and other apostles of social revolution or economic unrest.

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

As against the ideology of the bourgeoisie the working class puts forward its own ideology—proleta-

rian internationalism. The working class, which seeks to free itself from exploitation, has no reason to sow distrust and enmity between peoples. On the contrary, such enmity prevents the working class from freeing itself. It sees no contradiction between its own interest and that of its own nation and that of other workers and their nations. To achieve its own freedom it fights against all foreign oppressors. But knowing that it cannot be free if others are enslaved, it fights against the oppression of any other nation or people by its own nation.

The bourgeoisie, which in its heyday and in the course of its struggles to create national markets, welded peoples together, helped spread national consciousness and brought nations into being, has now turned its back on the nation. It seeks to prevent the mass of the people, who constitute the nation, from advancing to quantitatively and qualitatively greater democracy. But in order to prevent any advances it finds it must expunge every progressive tradition and act of the past. And so it turns about and tries to destroy the militant traditions and the bourgeois-democratic liberties it had itself championed in an earlier day. For the sake of the marketplace it created nations. But it has now traveled full cycle. Today, for the sake of markets and maximum profits, it sells out and betrays the interests and the independence of the nation.

Today, there is only one force that can lead the nation in its struggle for freedom and independence and for its real interests. And that is the working class. Every democratic and progressive tradition of the past is dear to the working class and to all the democratic sectors of the people. The working class seeks no profits nor markets, but only its freedom and the freedom of the overwhelming mass of the nation. Thus, as Stalin pointed out at the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U.:

Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard. There is no doubt that you, representatives of the Communist and democratic parties, will have to pick up this banner and carry it forward if you wish to be patriots of your country, if you wish to become the leading force of the nation. There is no one else to pick it up.

Proletarian internationalism, the ideology of the working class, combines within it the only true patriotism and the only true international outlook of our times.

Socialism and racism, Socialism and anti-Semitism are two opposite poles, two mutually exclusive outlooks. Socialism rejects the outlook of the bourgeoisie and with it every bourgeois device for the division of peoples. Socialism, the highest expression of proletarian internationalism, brings freedom to nations and

peoples. Socialism liberates the working class, the class which cannot free itself without at the same time freeing all oppressed groups in society. Under Socialism there can be no oppression.

In an interview with the Jewish Telegraphic Agency in the late thirties, Stalin declared:

Anti-Semitism is the most extreme form of chauvinism; it is the most dangerous survival of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism is useful to the exploiters as a shock absorber, pulling capitalism out from under the blows of the working class. Anti-Semitism is dangerous to the working class as a false path leading them off from the correct road and leading them into the jungles. Therefore Communists, as consistent internationalists, cannot but be irreconcilable enemies of anti-Semitism. In the U.S.S.R., anti-Semitism is most severely prosecuted as a phenomenon deeply inimical to the Soviet order.

This is the ringing denunciation of racism by the greatest leader and the greatest proletarian internationalist of our times. Under his guidance, a country that was once a "prison of nations" was transformed into a land of Socialism, into a land of friendship and fraternity of peoples such as the world has never known. To dare accuse socialist countries of anti-Semitism is one of the foulest lies that only twisted, distorted and hate-ridden minds could conjure up. When one hears these foul slanders on the lips of

those who are today reviving the Wehrmacht and preparing for a new war, it reminds one of the angry outcry of Emerson against Daniel Webster who dared defend the Fugitive Slave Act and at the same time speak piously of liberty. "The word liberty in the mouth of Mr. Webster," said Emerson, "is like the word love in the mouth of a whore."

The bourgeoisie of an oppressed nation, like all bourgeoisies, is concerned with the fight for markets and for profits. Its concern is not for the oppression and the persecution of the masses of its "own" nation but for its ability to capture the national market for itself so that it, rather than other bourgeoisies, may exploit the working class. To the degree that the bourgeoisie is prepared to engage in struggle against the foreign imperialist oppressor, its struggles help to weaken imperialism and therefore aid the working class and the mass of the nation. Under such circumstances, the working class can form a united front, even though it be for only a limited period, with its bourgeoisie in order to advance the struggle for liberation. But today the working class can never accept it as the leader of the struggle—let alone accept its ideology. The bourgeoisie, once it has achieved its own aims or once it sees the working class becoming too militant and strong, will turn against the freedom struggle of the nation and join forces with the foreign oppressor in order to halt the working class.

ZIONISM

Having briefly surveyed the general aspects of bourgeois nationalism, let us now turn to an analysis of one of its Jewish variants: Zionism.

At the dawn of the nineteenth century, Jews in various lands faced different conditions. Their status was not dependent upon nor the result of any objective wishes or desires but upon concrete economic and political conditions. Thus, in most West European countries, as a result of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions of 1848, Jews achieved formal equality before the law.

In these countries (such as France and England) Jews were gradually being assimilated. Aside from the question of religion, there was not very much, in the political, economic and social sphere, to distinguish them from their neighbors. In Russia, on the other hand, Jews still lived in ghettos and under the strictures and discriminations of a feudal regime. Here, as in Poland, a number of national characteristics (though not all) emerged. Thus, their cohesiveness or lack of cohesiveness, the emergence of certain national characteristics or their absence, depended not upon any subjective wish or desire, but upon the concrete conditions they dwelt in.

As the general European working class began to mature and to put forward its own class demands, the bourgeoisie became frightened and began to retreat from even the lim-

ited bourgeois-democratic measures it had championed when it was fighting for power. And as one method of throttling the rising working class movement and to divide its ranks, it turned to racism and anti-Semitism. In Germany, the forces of reaction developed the pseudo-science of racism to a fine art and together with it stepped up the attacks upon the Jewish masses. In France, the counter-revolutionary forces saw anti-Semitism as an important weapon in their efforts to crush the working class movement. The Dreyfus affair stands to this day as a symbol of these efforts. In tsarist Russia the attempt to hold back the surging movement of revolt led to brutal pogroms.

This was the period in which a Jewish bourgeoisie began to develop in various countries. Because of historical reasons, it developed at a later date than the general bourgeoisie. And unlike the general bourgeoisie, it had no "national" market of its own to exploit. As a result its area of operation in each land was a restricted one. For the most part, it developed in auxiliary positions, serving as traders and manufacturers, catering and subservient to the dominant bourgeoisies of the respective countries in which they lived.

The bourgeoisie of an oppressed nation engages at times in struggles to drive out the foreign bourgeoisie in order to capture the national market for itself. But the Jewish bourgeoisie, in various countries, though having certain national char-

acteristics, was not a national bourgeoisie.

Being without a territory or a national market of its own and dependent upon the dominant bourgeoisies, the Jewish bourgeoisie in each country recognized that it could advance its own narrow, egotistical aims only if it could demonstrate its value and perform certain services for the dominant imperialist ruling classes.*

Intensified anti-Semitism and persecution had brought thousands of Jewish workers closer to the revolutionary movements of their lands. To isolate the Jewish masses from the revolutionary movement, to convince them that the working class generally was foe and not friend, and that their salvation depended upon unity with their own bourgeoisie and its "solutions," was the goal of the Jewish bourgeoisie. By achieving these aims, it could advance its own interests and those of its imperialist masters. It was no small matter for the imperialists to have at their disposal a force which could, through its own special forms of bourgeois nationalism and demagoguery, disrupt the working class and people's movements.

This basic purpose of Zionism was clearly revealed from the day it came into being. From the very outset,

* It is true that a small handful of Jews, such as the Rothschilds of France, Melchettis of Britain and Lehman of the U.S., did win entry into top bourgeois circles. In such cases it would not be correct to speak of them as agents of imperialism but as fully and completely a part of the imperialist ruling class of these countries.

Theodore Herzl, one of the founders of political Zionism, went to great lengths to prove the reactionary purposes of the movement. Following the officially inspired Kishinev pogrom, Herzl wrote to the tsar's Minister of the Interior, the notorious hangman and pogromist, Von Plehve, and offered the aid of Zionism to destroy the influence of the revolutionary movement among Jewish youth. In his diary for September 29, 1898, he viewed the French Jews as "obviously beyond salvation" because they were "seeking protection among the Socialists and disrupters of the present bourgeois order." For his part, Von Plehve was quick to see the service Zionism

could render the tsarist regime. "We were sympathetic to your Zionist movement," Herzl quoted Von Plehve as saying a few months after the Kishinev pogrom, "as long as it helped further emigration. You don't have to begin justifying the movement to me."*

* * *

Note: The concluding installment of this article, to appear in our next issue, develops further the analysis of Zionism, discusses the past and present status of Israel, and places the whole question of Zionism and bourgeois nationalism in the context of the struggle for peace.—Ed.

* Quoted by A. B. Magil, in *Israel in Crisis* (International Publishers, 1950), pp. 54-55.

On Labor and the Democratic Party

By Peter Colton

AS THE DRAFT RESOLUTION emphasizes, the decisive factor in shaping political perspectives and building a mass political coalition for peace, security and democratic rights is the *fight to strengthen labor's independent political role*. This is not only a matter of electoral policy. For in its broadest sense labor's independent political role involves every aspect of mass activity, not alone the parliamentary. However, labor's independent role in the specific legislative and electoral sense is a vital element and presents many problems whose further discussion is likewise essential in implementing the Resolution.

Some of these problems center around the following questions: *What are labor's present relations with the old parties, especially the Democratic Party? How, concretely, can labor's independent role best be furthered in view of these relations?*

A useful point of departure for the discussion is *The CIO and the Democratic Party* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1952) by Fay Calkins, research assistant for CIO-PAC. Although based on the 1950 elections (and published before the 1952 Presidential

elections), this book provides important material on labor's present electoral policies. It consists of five "case-studies" of election campaigns in key mid-west industrial areas so chosen as to illustrate various types of relationships between the CIO and the Democratic Party.

The first is the Ohio Taft-Ferguson senatorial race where CIO-PAC, in the words of the author, simply "supplemented" the Democratic Party campaign. In the second case, the Ohio 18th District (Steubenville) Congressional campaign, PAC operated as a "balance of power" between the old parties and thus "had more influence on the party than did the Ohio PAC." In the third example, the Illinois Fifth State Senatorial District, PAC undertook to *fight the Democratic machine by running its own Democratic primary candidate*, the UAW leader, Willoughby Abner.

The fourth case is the heavily Republican Illinois 16th Congressional District (Rockford) where PAC *entered the structure of the Democratic Party on a county level* and in combination with other forces "was able to elect top party officers and com-

mitteemen and thus control the party."

The fifth and climactic case is Michigan where PAC *entered the State Democratic Party* and in "1950 was an important member of a coalition in control of the Michigan State Central Democratic Committee.

Against the background of these studies, the final chapter outlines generally the political paths open to labor. Apart from a passing reference to the tremendous difficulties in the way of forming a new party, the summary confines itself to methods of influencing existing parties and their platforms, candidates and campaigns.

These methods it groups under two main alternatives. The first is for labor to "build its own independent political organization to advise, supplement, balance power, or win primaries." The other is to "enter and use the organization already created by the parties" and this requires as in Michigan the formation of a "coalition with reasonable like-minded groups."

* * *

Whatever may be the limitations of Miss Calkins' analysis (and leaving aside any question of the detailed accuracy of her case-studies), her book does re-emphasize one *fact*, a fact which fighters for labor's independent political role too often ignored in the past. This is that labor, in the main, operated politically in 1950 *within the framework of the Democratic Party* and that it did so

because it felt that in this way it could best fight for its most pressing needs.

This remains the case today, as the Draft Resolution makes clear. The '52 election returns "confirm the fact that, despite important defections, the alliance of the bulk of the organized workers, the Negro people and poor farmers that constituted the popular base of the Democratic Party since 1936 in the main remained intact behind Stevenson. There is no immediate outlook for a mass popular desertion of the Democratic Party."

What *is* immediately in prospect, as the Draft shows, is the "unfolding of important struggles among the masses who form the base of the Democratic Party." And these struggles, centering in the CIO, A. F. of L. and other mainstream people's organizations will find their political reflection, for the present, chiefly in the form of sharpening struggles within the arenas of the old parties, especially the Democratic Party.

As to the question of estimating labor's independent role—and the bearing upon this of labor's present relations with the Democratic Party—Miss Calkins' study is less helpful.

Her concrete descriptions of labor-Democrat relationships do furnish some elements of evaluation. Thus, she sees the essential futility of labor's playing tail to the Democratic kite as in labor's purely supplemental role in the Taft-Ferguson campaign. (Although, here too, her

judgment that this was the only practicable role reflects her general tendency to evaluate campaigns from an uncritical PAC-staff viewpoint.)

She sees in part the limitations of the balance of power tactics which commonly result in an unprincipled shuttling back and forth between the two parties. She writes with evident sympathy of the PAC campaign to nominate its own candidate in the Chicago State Senatorial Democratic primary. Her favorable picture of the Michigan UAW-Democratic relationship is particularly worthy of separate extended study.

But generally her approach is technical and academic. It is largely divorced from the national political scene and the central issues of peace, security and democratic rights. It fails to examine the basic role of monopoly capital and how it operates its control of the national policies, leadership and activities of the two major parties. As a result it provides no fundamental basis from which to estimate labor's independent role and the perspectives and measures for strengthening that role.

For no basic evaluation of labor's electoral policies can be made which does not take as its point of departure the *danger to labor and the people which stems from monopoly capital's program of war and reaction and its control and utilization of the two-party system to advance that program.*

It is this danger—today in the

specific form of the Big Business Eisenhower Administration (and its Dixiecrat and other Democratic supporters)—which establishes the urgent need for a political realignment, a realignment which can be brought into being only by strengthening labor's independent role and its relations with its natural allies, the Negro people, the working farmers and other democratic forces.

Lacking a basic understanding of the programmatic need for advancing labor's independent role in the fight for a political realignment, Miss Calkins is unable to explore the problems raised by the conflict between this role and labor's present relations with the Democratic Party.

* * *

Thus two conclusions arise from a brief outline of Miss Calkins' study. The first is that labor, particularly in the major industrial states, continues to carry on its electoral activities primarily within the framework of the Democratic Party, however varied its specific activities in that arena may be. The second is that these extensive ties with the monopoly controlled two-party system seem to—and in a fundamental sense do—stand out in sharp conflict with the basic need to strengthen labor's independent role in the struggle for a new political realignment.

The Draft Resolution should make clear once and for all that Left-progressives cannot "resolve" this conflict by a sectarian electoral

policy which denies, ignores or minimizes these ties. This has been done pretty generally over the past several elections with the result that the Left has been largely isolated from the mainstream of labor in the electoral field and unable to influence broadly the development of labor's independent role. Labor, especially at the state and local level continues to express its political demands within the Democratic Party and, as the Resolution points out, will no doubt "seek to extend its influence in this party" in the aftermath of the Eisenhower victory.

Just as clearly is it impossible to "resolve" this conflict by an opportunist electoral policy which rejects or slurs over labor's independent role. Such is the tendency of those who interpret the Resolution simply as a call to "go into the Democratic Party." This vulgarization of the line of the Resolution leads in effect to liquidating the independent position of labor.

Such policies "resolve" the conflict by denying one or another of the conflicting factors. The first isolates the Left from the main currents of labor's political action and thus surrenders the mass of labor to the capitalist politicians and their Right-wing Social-Democratic aides. The second arrives at the same result by surrendering altogether the fight to advance labor's political independence.

In most general terms, Left-progressives can contribute to a real

resolution of the conflict through a broad electoral policy which would operate somewhat along the following lines:

(1) It would continue unwaveringly to take as its *central aim* the strengthening of labor's independent role.

(2) It would, however, see the furthering of that role, under present political conditions, as a *two-pronged* affair, taking place *inside* as well as *outside* the two-party system, the Democratic Party in particular. (*Independent* is not to be equated with *outside*.)

(3) It would place its *main weight* upon strengthening labor's independent role outside the parties. It would do this by building both in the shop and in the community the independent political action arms of labor (P.A.C., L.L.P.E., etc.), and of labor and its allies, the Negro people, the farmers and other democratic forces. Otherwise no growth in independence can be achieved either inside or outside.

(4) It would direct labor's independent political organization at present towards influencing *in a pro-labor and pro-peace direction* the platforms, candidates and campaigns of the state and local Democratic parties, and in certain areas the Republican. It would seek to extend this influence by ensuring labor's active participation in the struggles on issues taking place within these arenas. It would press for policies in the interests of labor and the peo-

ple and for candidates drawn more largely from the ranks of labor and its allies, particularly the Negro people.

(5) It would likewise in the present period encourage trade-unionists *to fight for labor's program by playing an active part as trade-unionists within the clubs and committees of these parties*. It would seek to form coalitions with Negro and other democratic forces directed against the pro-war reactionary elements. It would champion the formation of pro-labor blocs in Congress, the State Legislatures and City Councils.

Thus, the two sides of the policy should be seen not as contradictory but as essentially interconnected. For, they are two aspects of an electoral outlook which seeks to fit the present status of labor's relationship to the two-party system and yet at the same time to ensure the strengthening of labor's independent role as the key to a new political realignment. *It is therefore a policy which can enable the Left forces in the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. (as well as in independent unions) to explore new possibilities for united labor action in the legislative and electoral field.*

Similarly, the Left forces working in Progressive Party political committees and electoral bodies by taking the above approach into account, can help these advanced bodies find effective means for bringing their advanced thinking on political programs and perspectives, especially on the decisive issue of peace, to the

attention of broad sections of labor. This is a task of the greatest importance and justifies necessary steps to strengthen the role of the Left in helping these bodies perform that task. The impact of these political centers upon the mainstream of labor will stem not only from their initiative in projecting issues but also from their independent and parallel actions—as well as from their support in the electoral field for the general principle of strengthening the independent role of labor both inside and outside of the two-party system.

It may be argued that this is all very well but that differences in the labor movement both on the question of the eventual form of realignment as well as on program will prevent, any effective unity on this two-sided electoral policy.

Differences indeed exist. Many forces in labor hope to be able to transform the Democratic Party, many look to a liberal realignment of the two parties. Others, including the Left, while not proposing the formation of a new party of labor and the people generally as an *immediate* perspective, nonetheless regard it, as the Draft Resolution points out, as a historic and *necessary* perspective. They regard it as a perspective which can be realized only through the struggle to advance the united and independent political role of labor and its allies.

Thus these differences need not be barriers today to unity on the

immediate and necessary measures to strengthen this independent role. Broad agreement on the question of eventual forms of realignment will come only through further exposure of the two-party system in the course of unfolding this two-sided movement to advance labor's leading political role. Such agreement is not—and must not be permitted to become—a *prior condition* to united action in the labor electoral field.

As to program, a broad basis for unity already exists with regard to most immediate labor and economic issues, as well as questions of civil rights and civil liberties. This is reflected increasingly in the main labor conventions and in the labor press.

It is on the question of peace that the main problems of policy and tactics appear. But here too the Left must see what is new in the situation. As the Draft Resolution forecasts, the Big Business-Eisenhower offensive is creating *new possibilities for extending the growing unity against reaction to include struggles against many key aspects of the Administration's war drive.*

This is most strikingly seen in the foreign policy declaration of the recent U.A.W. Convention which condemns the Eisenhower threat to spread hostilities and urges a Malenkov-Eisenhower meeting to resolve through negotiations all outstanding differences. Broad mass activity to implement this and other labor peace expressions—and especially to bring

their weight to bear on labor-influenced Democratic Congressmen and other political forces—can create a further basis for labor peace action in the legislative and political arena.

Thus, while many differences exist and the road to unity is by no means free from obstacles, broader sections of labor are coming to understand ever more clearly the immediate need and fundamental basis for advancing the independent role of labor and its allies. This is the great significance of the Resolution on Political Action adopted at the U.A.W. Convention, March 1953 (see George Morris' column in the *Daily Worker*, April 4, 1953).

Calling upon the American people to meet "Wall Street's new challenge," the U.A.W. Resolution states that "only through a determined and unwavering opposition to the reactionaries in the new Administration will the liberal forces be able to draw the lines on which the campaigns of 1954 and 1956 must be waged in order to obtain a clear mandate for the cause of human progress and world peace." On this basis, it favors a "new realignment of political forces" to be realized through "the rapid development of cooperation and mutual confidence among farm, labor and other liberal forces in an independent political action movement which will give support to the liberal forces in both parties until a complete realignment of political parties has been achieved."

To implement this outlook, the

Convention voted to urge the national C.I.O. "to explore with other groups the possibility of calling a national conference of labor, farm and other liberal forces in the Spring of 1956—prior to the convening of both party conventions." *More immediately, it proposed the calling of such conferences on a state scale every two years—and hence early in 1954—for "mapping plans in state and Congressional elections."*

The general goal set forth is an "independent political action movement" in the form of a "coalition of liberal forces" to wage battle against the "Dixie-G.O.P. coalition of reaction." The U.A.W. locals are called upon to initiate such "joint political action" and at the same time to build their own independent political machinery, on a ward, precinct, block and neighborhood level in every Congressional District where the union has membership.

It is the needs and activity of the membership and not speculations concerning the motives of Reuther which will determine the real value of these declarations. Clearly, as George Morris pointed out in his *Daily Worker* column, the U.A.W. Resolution "reflects a realistic estimate of things as they are and a basis for getting maximum unity and action on the political field."

* * *

The Communist and other Left forces in the mainstream of labor are in the best position to contribute to the rapid development of labor's

political role. But to do so they need to help dispel some wrong ideas that exist generally among the Left and tend to create needless obstacles.

Thus, it is said time and time again that "nothing is happening" in the field of labor political action. But this is simply not true. As a matter of fact a great deal is happening, especially in connection with state legislative sessions, municipal problems and local campaigns in the principal states such as Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, New York and New Jersey.

What is true is, first, that much that happens is *not known to the Left or the Left press.* This is because the isolation of the Left from the mainstream of labor is as yet far from overcome. Not the least feature of the present period is that many things are happening—even where the Left is not present. All the more can labor's political action be strengthened when and where the Left is fully at work and active in the mainstream.

Second, there is a tendency among the Left to recognize as labor political action only that which bears the P.A.C. or L.L.P.E. label. The result is to ignore a great volume of political action that takes place through legislative and other committees—in A. F. of L. Central Labor Unions and C.I.O. Councils, as well as in local unions—rather than through the formal apparatus of P.A.C. and L.L.P.E.

This is not to deny that the situa-

tion is very uneven with respect to the growth of labor's own political arms, P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. However, it should be noted that the new dangers flowing from the Big Business-Eisenhower Administration are beginning to generate a demand for an expansion of labor's political action. Thus, national P.A.C., in February, sent directives to its 443 local affiliates to enter actively into the municipal elections as a "proving-ground" for 1954. And the A. F. of L.-L.L.P.E. has decided to undertake work in 1953, including special programs among women voters, and not wait till the '54 Congressional elections.

In this more favorable atmosphere, the contribution of the Left forces towards the building of P.A.C., L.L.P.E. and other independent forms can be further enhanced if the following considerations are born in mind:

(1) P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. grow best where they are viewed not simply as election campaign instruments, but as instruments of year-round political action and are best built in close connection with and as outgrowths of the numerous current labor activities on legislative issues, wage movements, etc.

(2) That initiation and broadening of P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. organization is best achieved not by general pleas for political action but around such concrete immediate issues as a local rent-control fight or a campaign of a labor candidate for local office, etc.

(3) P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. have their indispensable base in the shop and local union; but there is renewed and growing interest in extending organization to the neighborhood, ward and precinct.

The '53 municipal elections in New York, Michigan, Ohio, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and other states, together with the state legislatures and the Congress, provide the main arenas for labor's political action. *And the growing political problems and demands of the Negro people, the working farmers and other allies of labor provide new opportunities for labor to initiate broad independent political conditions on the state and local level—as called for by the U.A.W. Convention and as required by the approaching vital electoral struggles of 1954.*

* * *

Finally, with regard to advancing labor's independent role within the Democratic Party there exists considerable confusion in Left circles. This is not difficult to understand. For at its root are a number of very real problems, as well as a general lack of information upon which to base correct estimates.

The Left today in any event needs urgently to *reacquaint itself with the real situation in the local and state Democratic Parties (and in many areas the Republican Party)*. It needs to make a painstaking examination of the trends, relationship of forces, and the clubs and committee struc-

tures. In particular, *the Left needs to examine concretely, area by area, the facts as to labor's role in these parties, as well as the participation of the Negro people and labor's other allies.*

With this background, Left forces will more readily agree that a correct electoral policy cannot lie in staying aloof from the key mass forces in the Democratic Party, nor in drawing mechanical conclusions from the correct general premise that monopoly capital controls the national Democratic Party as well as the Republican. Nor is it too helpful at this moment to enter into abstract debates as to whether a liberal-labor coalition can or cannot "capture" this or that state Democratic Party.

The real point is that while the two parties are *both* controlled by monopoly capital, the *mass base* of the Democratic Party is maintained traditionally among labor, Negro and other democratic forces. These forces remain there because they hope thereby to protect and advance their most immediate interests and needs.

What the Left needs to see more clearly is this: that although it is an instrument of reaction, the Democratic Party nationally and locally, as a consequence of this mass base, is also *an arena of mass struggle*. It is an arena of struggle in which the mass forces of labor and the Negro people do battle against the Dixiecrats and other reactionary anti-labor elements, as seen most clearly in a number of southern states.

It is therefore a necessary condition to the growth of labor's political leadership that labor lead, extend and sharpen these struggles. For, only in the course of these struggles can illusions concerning monopoly capital and the two-party system be removed and the foundation laid for genuine and broad political realignment led by the main sections of labor.

At this particular moment, what is especially needed is for labor to marshal its considerable influence—and that of its allies—in the Democratic Party, to fight not only against the Dixiecrats but also against *certain dangerous trends among the labor-influenced Democrats.*

These latter in the Senate and House, with few exceptions, seem today to be reacting *in reverse* to the new possibilities for peaceful negotiations arising from the recent Soviet peace initiatives. They are calling attention to the "danger" not of war but of peace. They are "accusing" the Republicans not of warmongering but of favoring reductions in arms. They are sitting out the anti-McCarthy struggle on the "brilliant" theory that it is a Republican "family-fight" from which they will benefit if only they remain silent. They swallow without protest the spectacle of a Stevenson (whose role is clearly to "contain" not lead the opposition) embracing Chiang Kai-shek and touring the Far East as a special Eisenhower ambassador of Wall Street's "good-will."

It is clear that these trends in no way correspond to the feelings of the labor movement as reflected in the U.A.W. Convention foreign policy resolution.

What the Left must help labor to see is that in its relations with liberal pro-labor Democrats it must exert its own *independent* influence in the direction of peace and in the direction of compelling large sections of the Democratic Party to speak out now for a truce in Korea and for an all-out struggle against McCarthy and his crowd. Similarly, in addition to placing its own demands, labor must throw its full weight behind

the civil rights and other demands of the Negro people and the demands of the poor farmers, the women and the youth.

No other course can correctly reflect the needs of labor and the people. No other course can command the full support of the rank and file of labor itself or strengthen labor-Negro unity and labor's relations with the working farmers and other democratic forces. No other course can place labor and its allies in a position to deal a telling blow to Republican-Dixiecrat pro-war reaction in the quickly approaching 1954 Congressional and state elections.

BROTHER BILL McKIE

By William Weinstone

Brother Bill McKie, by Phillip Bonosky, International Publishers, 192 pp. \$2.25 (Cloth); \$1.50 (paper).

Brother Bill McKie is the swift moving and heartwarming story of an heroic factory worker, who, over a period of 14 years, took a leading part in the hard, bitter and successful battle to organize the world's biggest plant against the world's worst exploiter, Henry Ford.

It is the epic story, told in living prose, of the major strikes and historic marches, of the great demonstrations and sharp battles in the auto capital of America during the stormy years of the depression, and of the period of the vast labor upheaval that followed—the time of labor's greatest advance.

Most important, it is the story of a Communist worker, in fact of the Communists in Ford's and, to a degree, of the Communists in the auto industry. Many books have been written about the auto workers and about the great union advance in the 30's and early 40's, some by progressive writers. But the role played by the Communists was either ignored, misrepresented or lightly skimmed over. The blunt truth is that the Communists were a decisive force in smashing open-shop slavery and in founding the C.I.O. In auto, the Communists were not only pioneers, doing the patient spade work and building the foundation of the

Book Review

union, they were also in the most decisive struggles that established the union—the General Motors and Ford battles—the actual and practical leaders.

Bonosky does not trim or hedge on this central fact. He makes this the theme of the book, courageously and honestly presenting what a real Communist is like, and thereby, at this time of anti-Communist hysteria, performs a great service for the labor and progressive movements.

The book is important for another reason. It recognizes the vast significance of the rank-and-file worker in the building of the labor movement and the workers' fight for freedom. Much has been written, and rightly so, assessing and praising the contributions of the topmost militant leaders of labor—many of whom rose from the ranks. But too little or virtually nothing at all has been written of the ordinary worker, of the rank-and-file leader, who goes through the daily grind, faces the harassment of boss, foreman and Red-baiters, in the shop and union, courageously unites the ranks, and in critical struggles stands in the forefront and decides the outcome of the battle.

Without the McKies, without these rank and file privates, corporals, sergeants, who rise to leadership, where would the generals be?

"The times have passed," wrote Stalin in his address to the Congress

of Collective Farm Shock Workers in 1933, "when leaders were regarded as the only makers of history, while the workers and peasants were not taken into account. The destinies of nations and states are now determined, not only by leaders, but primarily and mainly by the working millions. The workers and peasants, who work without fuss and noise, . . . who feed and clothe the whole world, they are the real heroes and creators of the new life."

It is well to underscore this, to write of these heroes, to describe their work, particularly at a time when mass work in our Party is undergoing critical review. This is especially important for union work. If a Communist Party is to advance into a mass party, as Stalin pointed out in 1925, its members must link themselves with the trade unions, work systematically and patiently in them to strengthen the solidarity and unity of the working class in its fight against capital. In that way, the conditions will be created that will enable the Communist parties to rely upon the support of the trade unions.

Obviously this means that the Party must in truth be a party of a new type, base itself on the working class, make the turn to the shops and unions, particularly those that are reformist-led, and pay central attention to organizing and leading the struggle of the workers, as was done in the 30's, but under the new conditions of an organized working class chiefly under Social-Democratic and reformist leadership. Toward that end the Party must do everything to raise the importance and leadership of the rank-and-file industrial worker in the Party. It can learn much from *Brother Bill McKie*.

McKie came to the United States from Scotland in 1927 to visit his married daughter. He intended to stay only one year and return home. But he changed his plans after the first day's work at Ford's. He decided to remain in the country and unionize Ford's. He was aghast at what he saw in the shop. Unforgettable is the scene with which the book opens, of the six thousand men waiting in the cold, some all night, to be hired. Unforgettable is the description of the Ford Silence, the convict-like labor in the shop and what happens when the shift is over—the workers running as if they were being chased by a madman "until the shadow of the factory is off their backs, until they cannot hear or see Ford."

McKie had been a worker from the age of 12, a self-educated socialist workingman who had read in Marx and other socialist works in the old country, who had organized meetings for William Morris, the great socialist poet and agitator, and for George Bernard Shaw. He had been a union man since 1894, a skilled sheet-metal worker, 53 years old at the time he entered Ford's.

Bill began organizing on the very first day he worked. In his search for a union, he came upon a *Daily Worker* on a newsstand and to his unbounded joy learned that there were activities going on to organize the auto workers. In that way McKie found his way to the independent Left auto workers union. He joined under an assumed name and devoted every moment of his day and night to the single task—the unionization of Ford. He stayed with that task until Ford's was organized, and has remained true to the workers' cause to the present day.

Blacklisted and unemployed but steadfastly and lovingly assisted by his

wife, McKie carried on his organizing work in the face of severe hardship and suffering, sometimes receiving nothing and living off his meager life's savings, often going hungry, never making more than \$20 or \$25 dollars a week as organizer. And after Ford was defeated he fought his way back to the job from which he had been fired seven years before, returning to the shop to the great joy of the workers. As Bonosky beautifully tells it:

"He was old Bill McKie back to work as an expert sheet metal man. He came back as that and as a Communist. 'There goes Bill McKie!' they echoed up and down the plant. 'He beat Ford!' And as they touched him passing by, they knew they were touching themselves in this Communist. And so they handed him, smile by smile, down the pathways of victory through the shop."

I shall not detail the work and struggles which so endeared him to the workers and which brought the great victory. That is the guts of this splendid book.

In this review I do want to bring forward some lessons from the life of this worker. First of all, as William Z. Foster wrote in the introduction to the book, Bill McKie "is a veritable symbol of the indomitable fighting spirit of the working class and of its determination eventually to emancipate itself." There are hundreds and thousands of Bill McKies and potential McKies in the ranks of the working class if we will but see them.

Secondly, Bill fought not only persistently but with courage and understanding. Though he joined the Communist Party eight years after he entered Ford, unionism and socialism had been his creed for a long time, in fact,

they were the dominant principles of his life. He had a profound faith in the working class and a knowledge of the laws of history which made him confident that the workers would be organized. He knew too that no progress is made without struggle and sacrifice. Courage marked all his work. For example, in the first years, despite fear—"Ford's other product"—fear of stool-pigeons, dismissal and blacklisting which dominated the workers, Bill, in the years of so-called prosperity, when the tide of workers' struggle was still relatively low, distributed the union paper in the shop, slipped leaflets, against speed-up and other grievances, into the workers' coat pockets, combatted the pessimism that "Ford could never be organized" and formed small secret union groups.

Thirdly, though a skilled worker and profoundly attached to unionism, Bill was no narrow pure and simple craft unionist. He was a battler for all the workers, particularly the most oppressed. When the economic crash came, still working, he pitched into the fight of the unemployed for relief and helped organize unemployed councils. He slipped out of the plant to take his place among the marchers in the famous Ford Hunger March in 1932, which he helped prepare, and which was turned into a massacre by the Ford gunmen. Seventy thousand took part in the funeral of the four young workers—two Communists—killed on that day. Bill fought for the Negro unemployed, against Jim Crow in the shop and for Negro-white unity. Not in words alone but in deeds. He acted on the lesson he had learned, as Bonosky writes, that "Ford fell each time a white worker joined hands with a Negro worker and fought at his side. This

lesson sank into Bill's bones." It was lessons like that, learned in day-to-day struggle, that, taken together, made possible the ultimate victory.

Fourth, Bill worked at all times in the closest touch with the workers, no matter what Ford and reformist leaders did to isolate him. Both in personal relations and in terms of policy he retained this sense of identity with his fellow-workers. In 1953 when the Left-led auto workers union shifted over to the A. F. of L., McKie became president of the A. F. of L. union local at Fords. This was an important change in tactics of the militant Communists necessitated by the fact that a million workers from basic industry had poured into the A. F. of L., radically changing the situation in that organization. By joining the A. F. of L., the auto workers helped the fight for industrial unionism inside that organization which led to the split in the A. F. of L. officialdom and to the rise in 1935 of the Committee for Industrial Organization. After their expulsion from the A. F. of L. (not walk-out as the book says), the Committee became the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The A. F. of L. auto locals affiliated with the C.I.O. Bill McKie warmly greeted its formation and worked harder than ever.

But while working cooperatively with the leaders of the C.I.O., who at that time moved in a progressive direction, some very haltingly, Bill and other militants, nonetheless, relied mainly on the workers for victory. And well for the struggle that they did. With the coming of the C.I.O., the rebellion of the workers, already under way, reached new heights. The resounding General Motors victory in 1937 created a flood tide of organization, preparing the ground for the defeat of Ford. But

valuable time was lost by the sabotaging work of Homer Martin, UAW president, who was secretly working with Ford, and by the unprincipled factional fight among the union leaders.

When the C.I.O., however, tackled Ford in real earnest, sitdowns involving 15,000 workers broke out all over the Ford plant and then came not a sit-down but an outside strike with the gates closed tight by the thousands of pickets. In charge of the critical Gate 5 was Bill McKie. After a hard ten-days' battle, Ford surrendered.

And, finally, there is this basic lesson: Bill accomplished so much because he was a Communist.

He was 60 years old when he joined the Party and was without a job, but he "never felt happier, more contented in his life. . . . He had carried out the logic of his thinking and his struggles by joining the only party he believed could ever bring the workers into their own." Also he was convinced that "only as a Communist, would he ever be able to organize Ford's."

Life proved him amply right in that and other conclusions. McKie and the militants won the strike because they applied the fighting policies taught by the Communist Party—the policies of rank-and-file unionism, Negro-white unity and militant methods of struggle. They brought out the masses and organized a solid strike while the leaders, like Thomas and Reuther, feared the struggle and approved the strike only when they could do nothing else.

Especially valuable is the picture the book gives of the opportunist, Walter Reuther, particularly of his early years before he became President of the U.A.W. Reuther had come on the scene about 1935 after a one or two year visit to the Soviet Union, which

land he had hailed in letters to the U.S. as one of "genuine proletarian democracy." Upon his return to the United States he was not known in the industry. Sensing the rising tide of organization and pretending to be a Communist, he approached the Communists, offered to work in close cooperation with them, at the same time retaining membership in the Socialist Party—ostensibly to win the latter to united-front work with the Communists. In reality, however, in characteristic fashion, he was playing both sides of the street.

Reuther was helped by the Communists to get a footing in the union. McKie worked with Reuther and gave him opportunities to speak to workers, but he noticed his laxness in going through the hard daily grind of organization and his eagerness to be in the spotlight. Bill was glad to use all forces that wanted to build the union, but felt uncomfortable about pushing Reuther forward into office until he showed his mettle, sensing in Reuther characteristics of an over-ambitious self-seeking and dangerous opportunist who worked with the Communists solely to advance himself. He complained about him to the Party.

In time, when Reuther, with the help of the Left-wingers and Communists, became president of the West Side local he surrounded himself "with the college-bred socialists" and yes-men, while he fired militant leaders like Frank Manford and Bill McKie from the staff. When the strike at Ford took place, "Reuther had climbed onto an automobile at union headquarters in Michigan and pleaded with the men to go back to work." In time, Reuther, who had traded liberally on his visit to the Soviet Union, became an open Red-baiter

charging Bill McKie and others with "taking orders from Moscow."

I knew Reuther when I was the District Organizer in Michigan in 1934-38 and I must say in self-criticism that I should have paid greater attention to the correct criticism by McKie and other comrades regarding him. Among other things, this offers a lesson on the great need for Party leaders to encourage and heed criticism from below.

* * *

The book is not without some weaknesses. Its value would have been enhanced if the tactical problems which were faced in the struggles had been described more clearly. Also the General Motors sit-down strike was deserving of fuller treatment since, as Foster correctly wrote in his *History of the Communist Party of the United States*: "It is no exaggeration to say that the General Motors strike organized the United Auto Workers Union, indeed, this may also be said within limits, of the whole C.I.O. for this strategic strike produced such a wave of enthusiasm and fighting spirit among the workers throughout the basic industries that their organization into the C.I.O. unions became largely routine."

But most important is its inadequate treatment of the Party. As I indicated above, the great merit of the book is its truthful and favorable account of the Communists in action. In the last analysis it is what the Communists do, that will determine their influence. But it is not enough to show what individual Communists do, it is important to explain and show the Party itself in action. This is not done sharply enough.

Individual Communists cannot for any length of time do effective work among the masses without the closest

contact with, activity in, and guidance from the Party organization. It is the Party that enables the Communists to work properly as class-conscious, working-class fighters, defending the daily interests of the masses and strengthening the workers ideologically, organizationally, and politically. Why this is so, what the Party is, how it helped the masses, and why therefore it must be built, might have been more adequately shown and explained in a volume about Bill McKie. What is not sufficiently presented is the Party's overall policies and work which animated, guided and helped McKie and the workers generally to attain their successes. As a vanguard Party, it works out and puts into effect, at any given time, a line of policy corresponding to the needs of the workers' struggle at a particular stage of development.

In the period after 1935, the main line of the Party nationally was the united front and people's front policy against war and fascism. This was a great unifying, mobilizing and organizing program which united workers, middle class and all democratic elements. In behalf of it, the Party, as a vanguard, concentrated its main forces in the shops and unions and gave leadership to the workers' struggles. The Party also stimulated political as well as economic action by the workers, which helped defeat the Liberty League and elect the Roosevelt Administration. The Party played a decisive role in winning unemployment insurance, the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and gains for the Negro people, etc.

The Party's initiative and activity brought about the cooperation of Left and center forces, thus basically account-

ing for the giant strides of the C.I.O. The united-front policy of the Party envisaged unity, both top and bottom, but stressed above all unity from below—the development of mass actions by the workers.

The Party established close ties with the workers' organizations and formed active groups in the shops, which in many places became the kernel of the unions. It educated and trained workers' leaders as a matter of principle, practiced, to a limited extent, criticism and self-criticism, and thus was a dynamic organizational force, stimulating the struggle all down the line.

It was these and other features of a vanguard Party—applied, not without weaknesses and mistakes—a Party in contact with the masses and marching at their head—that made the work of Bill McKie and others so fruitful. At a later stage, these successes of the Party were seriously undermined by Browderism. The book itself deals almost in its entirety with the earlier period, but it would have been well to have paid some attention to this destructive anti-working class policy and program.

Despite these shortcomings, *Brother Bill McKie* is an inspiring book attesting to the deep working-class consciousness and background of the author himself. This book shows us what a Communist is. It should be read, sold, discussed by all Party members and by all progressives, by workers and by the youth. To spread this book is to contribute in an important way to the building of our Party and to its struggle to raise labor to its essential place of leadership in the great fight for peace and democracy.

Letters from Readers

Chicago

Dear Editor:

This is a long overdue note to say how much we welcome the changes that are taking place in the magazine. We know a lot of other readers who feel *Political Affairs* has really begun to grapple in a healthy "investigative" way with the manifold problems the American Marxists face at present. . . .

In the past, too much of *P.A.* material seemed to most readers to be "pronouncements" of Marxist principles, and the use of real life and its complex and rich developments was relegated to being "examples" to back the truth of Marxist generalizations. Other articles seemed aimed to show the reader that the writers could capably recapitulate Party program and policy and then "link-up" the particular subject matter of this or that article. Each of these latter articles tried to cover so many angles, tried to be so "balanced" that as a result the magazine's most important readers (club, section, mass workers) couldn't discover the main link of the particular problem.

With the publishing of Gus Hall's article, "Communist Cadres" (January, 1952), followed by the Swift articles, the Brewster-Colton article, we feel a healthy change was initiated in *Political Affairs*. . . .

Your readers are looking for objec-

tive facts about American life; they are looking for down-to-earth discussion of our experiences that make an honest attempt to use Marxist method to analyze these experiences and to then make some generalizations that would help us all move forward.

A few suggestions that we would like to offer (modestly indeed—since we can well imagine the difficulties of editing and publication today):

1. Each month (if possible) a short, simple article that will present the facts of some phase of American economic, political or social life. . . .

2. Directing the reader occasionally to those Marxist classics that aided the author in examining the problem he (or she) is writing about. . . .

3. That the more consistent contributors to *P.A.* begin setting the example for a style of writing that breathes of the great truth: that everything we do, write, discuss and criticize is done humbly in the service of the American people.

4. That articles on some one problem don't begin with paragraph after paragraph restating our whole general position and then finally get to the specific problem. . . .

But best wishes—*Political Affairs* can and must become our guide and searchlight.

Mr. & Mrs. G. S.

READER'S GUIDE

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R.

By Joseph Stalin

INTRODUCTION.

TOPIC ONE:

The Nature of Political Economy and of Economic Laws.

TOPIC TWO:

The Basic Economic Law of Modern Capitalism.

TOPIC THREE:

The Basic Economic Law of Socialism.

TOPIC FOUR:

The Transition from Socialism to Communism.

TOPIC FIVE:

The General Crisis of Capitalism and Formation of Two Parallel World Markets.

TOPIC SIX:

The Struggle for Peace.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS.

Special Supplement—Political Affairs

June, 1953

INTRODUCTION

There have been many requests for a guide to help both individuals and groups in the study of J. V. Stalin's great theoretical work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* This guide is intended to meet these needs, with primary emphasis on a systematic program of *self-study*.

The study of this work, which served as the theoretical basis for the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U., is fundamental to a Marxist understanding of the main problems and tasks facing the world working-class movement today. In it, Stalin has given a magnificent analysis not only of the major questions facing the Soviet Union in the transition from Socialism to Communism, but also of the most important developments in the capitalist world, and above all, the United States.

The enormous significance of Comrade Stalin's theoretical works is that they warn us against skimming over the surface, go deep into the heart of phenomena, into the very essence of the processes of the development of society; teach us to see in embryo the phenomena that will determine the course of events, make Marxist prevision possible. (Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, p. 93).

Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. was written as a critical commentary on a draft textbook in political economy, and on the discussion which took place around the draft text. This accounts for its particular form. Because many readers may be unfamiliar with certain of the concepts, we have tried to provide some background. We have listed special references which will help explain one or another economic law, or concept, and have also tried to provide American material on these questions. In addition, we include a simple glossary of terms. These should not be confused with full explanations, as they are intended only to give the reader a brief definition of terms used.

It should be borne in mind, moreover, that this guide is not intended to provide a complete course in political economy. For those who have never studied the subject, this guide may serve as an introduction, which should be followed by systematic study of the field. For those with some previous knowledge of political economy, it should provide an opportunity to review and deepen their understanding.

The guide divides the material into six topics. For each of these, a minimum of two nights' study or its equivalent should be planned. This should be enough in most cases to cover the outline, the general reading, and the questions. Additional time would be required, however, for study of the material listed under "Special topics." Bearing this in mind, each individual should work out his or her own plan of study, based on his particular needs and time schedule.

Before beginning study of the six topics, the reader will find it helpful to get something of an overall approach to the material, and to the method. We therefore suggest the reading of three fairly short articles by way of general introduction. The questions discussed will be returned to in a much more detailed way, so that the purpose in reading them will primarily be to get a general picture of the study being undertaken.

The three articles are: 1. "Stalin's Method," by John Swift, *Political Affairs*, April, 1953; 2. "Stalin and American Imperialism," by William Z. Foster, *Political Affairs*, February, 1953; 3. "Window on the Future," by James S. Allen, *Masses and Mainstream*, December, 1952.

Topic One: The Nature of Political Economy and of Economic Laws

- I. The scope of political economy: the science which studies the laws of economic development of various social systems. (Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 47, 54-56)*
- II. The nature of economic laws:
 - A. Economic laws are *objective laws* which reflect processes of economic development that take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover and utilize, but cannot destroy or create, new economic laws. (Stalin, pp. 7-9)
 - B. Distinguishing features of economic laws, compared to laws of natural science:
 1. Majority of economic laws operate for a *definite historical period* after which they lose their validity due to new economic conditions which give rise to new economic laws. (Stalin, pp. 9-10) However, some economic laws are *common* to all social systems, as for example, the law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces. (Stalin, pp. 54-56)
 2. Discovery and application of new economic laws encounter

* Hereafter all references to Stalin's writings are to this work, unless otherwise indicated.

powerful resistance from outmoded social forces with whose interests they conflict. Thus, a *social force* able to overcome this resistance is necessary to insure application of such laws. (Stalin, p. 10)

- III. The practical significance of economic laws; their conscious utilization:
 - A. Under Socialism:
 1. Economic laws are utilized for construction of Socialism and for transition to Communism; they cannot, however, be created or "transformed" at will. (Stalin, pp. 10-12)
 2. Failure to understand that objective economic laws operate under Socialism and how to correctly utilize these laws lead to errors in policy, either to adventurism (efforts to leap ahead of what is actually possible under given conditions) or to lagging behind (failure to achieve what has become possible). (Stalin, p. 12)
 - B. Under Capitalism:
 1. Economic laws are to one degree or another utilized in the interests of society not only under Socialism, but also under other economic systems. Such utilization always has a class background, and in all cases the force fighting for the utilization of economic laws in the interests of society is the advanced class, which is opposed by the outmoded classes. (Stalin, pp. 39-40)

Examples:

1. Role of rising U.S. capitalist class and allies in overthrow of British domination at time of American Revolution. (See Foster, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, pp. 121-134)
Role of industrial capitalists and their allies in abolition of chattel slavery in the U.S. (See Foster, *Ibid.*, pp. 268-287)
2. The working class is today the social force which must fight for the utilization of economic laws in the interests of society, against the resistance of the capitalist class. Development of understanding of these laws, leadership to the struggle to utilize them is part of the role of the Communist Party.
 - (a) Correct tactics in the sphere of the economic struggle (program for peacetime economy, wage policy and related questions in the unions, a correct farm program, program on economic aspects of Negro liberation struggle, etc.) require a grasp of political economy, an understanding of objective economic laws of capitalism.
 - (b) Development of class consciousness of working class involves conscious efforts by Communists to help workers acquire

understanding of basic nature of capitalist system, of operation of economic laws which explain its development and which give rise to objective necessity for abolition of capitalism.

3. Failure to understand these economic laws may lead to serious errors in principle and in policy on the part of working-class movements.
 - (a) Lovestoneism, Browderism in ranks of Communist Party of the U.S. involved a rejection of operation of objective economic laws of capitalism and adoption of concept of "American exceptionalism." (See Foster, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, pp. 270-275, 422-438)
 - (b) Influence of bourgeois economics in ranks of labor movement, in form of Keynesism, can serve to hamper development of economic struggle. (See Foster, *Ibid.*, pp. 481-484, 541-549)
 - (c) Study of political economy therefore of great importance to Communists in the United States, and to all advanced workers and progressives.

General reading:

Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*

Scope of political economy—pp. 47, 54-56

Nature of economic laws—pp. 7-12, 39-40, 63-65

Productive forces and relations of production—pp. 40-41, 46-50

Special Topics:

On historical materialism, the law of conformity of productive forces and relations of production:

Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, second half especially. Can be found in *History of the C.P.S.U.* (Start with page 119: "What then is the chief force . . ." and continue through page 131).

On utilization of objective economic laws by capitalist class of U.S.:

Foster, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, pp. 121-134 (American Revolution) and pp. 268-287 (Civil War).

On utilization of economic laws by working class in U.S. and struggle against influence of bourgeois economics:

Foster, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, pp. 270-275 (Lovestoneism), pp. 422-438 (Browderism), pp. 481-484 (Keynesism) and pp. 541-549 (development of class consciousness of working class).

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION:

1. What is meant by the statement that economic laws are *objective* laws? Does this mean man can do nothing about their operation?
2. In discussing the possible development of an "economic recession" in the event of a Korean truce, the president of the Dow Chemical Company stated: "The greatest danger may be psychological. If business gets panicky, the country could think itself into serious trouble" (*Newsweek*, April 13, 1953). Evaluate this statement from a scientific standpoint.
3. It has sometimes been said that only under Socialism can man utilize economic laws in the interests of society. Is this true? In your answer, draw upon experiences in the United States.
4. Comrade Stalin points out both the similarity and the differences between economic laws and the laws of natural science. Why is the *difference* between economic laws and laws of natural science of importance?
5. What is the practical significance of knowledge of economic laws in a socialist society? What errors were made by some people in the Soviet Union on this question, and what would be the results if these errors were not corrected?
6. How did Browderism deny the existence of objective economic laws? With what practical consequences?
7. Why is a knowledge of economic laws necessary for the adoption of correct policies in the economic struggle today? Give concrete examples from your own shop and industry, or, if you are not an industrial worker, from your own sphere of activity.

Topic Two: The Basic Economic Law of Modern Capitalism

- I. Requirements of a basic economic law of capitalism:
 - A. Must be a law which determines all the main aspects and principal processes of capitalist development—which determines the "essence of capitalist production." (Stalin, p. 3)
 - B. Law of value is not *basic* law of capitalism; it existed prior to capitalism, will operate for a period after capitalism, and does not determine essence of capitalist production. (For explanation of law of value see reference under "Reading")
 - C. Other economic laws of capitalism which cannot be considered the

basic law, because they do not determine the essence of capitalist production, are the law of competition and anarchy of production, and law of uneven development of capitalism. (For explanation of these laws see references under "Reading")

II. The law of surplus value:

- A. This law, discovered by Marx, is the law of the origin and growth of capitalist profit, the motive force of the capitalist system. (For explanation of this law see reference under "Reading")
- B. This law does determine the basic features of capitalist production such as cyclical crises, the historical development of capital accumulation, origin and nature of profit, interest, and rent, etc.
- C. But it is too general a law to cover problems which have arisen with the development of monopoly capitalism. In particular, it "does not cover the problem of the highest rate of profit, the securing of which is a condition for the development of monopoly capitalism." (Stalin, pp. 31-32)
- D. Operation of the law of surplus value under conditions of pre-monopoly, competitive capitalism was connected with law of the *average* rate of profit. Under conditions of competition, when the rate of profit rose above the average rate in one or another branch of industry, capital would move into this line of industry, and production would increase until supply equaled demand, bringing a fall in the prices of commodities in this industry, and a reduction in the rate of profit. The opposite development occurred in those lines of industry where the rate of profit fell below the average rate. In this way, the rate of profit tended to be equalized to an average rate throughout all spheres of capitalist production. (For fuller explanation see references under "Reading") In addition, the average rate of profit had a tendency to decline owing to the rising organic composition of capital—although this tendency was checked by various counteracting influences which have become more and more important. (See references under "Reading")
- E. The development of monopoly capitalism demands, however, not just an average rate of profit, but *maximum* profits. Thus, "the law of surplus value must be made more concrete and developed further in adaptation to the conditions of monopoly capitalism." (Stalin, p. 32)

III. The basic economic law of modern capitalism—the law of maximum profits:

- A. Main features of this law—"securing of maximum profits through the exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits." (Stalin, p. 32)
- B. The development of monopoly capitalism makes it *possible* for the monopolists to secure a rate of profit far above the average rate by virtue of their domination of the domestic economy as well as their penetration and domination of the economies of other countries. Not only do they strive to intensify the exploitation of the wage workers (through increased speedup, reduced real wages, higher prices, taxation, etc.); they also suck additional profits from the smaller capitalists, from the farmers, from capitalists of other countries, by driving the rate of profit for these capitalists below even the average rate.
- C. The development of monopoly capitalism also *requires* the securing of maximum profits. Development of monopoly does not eliminate competition; rather, it results in the development of a gigantic struggle between huge, rival monopoly groupings. Victory, and even survival, in this struggle require the amassing of profit on a scale equally huge, on a scale far greater than the mere average rate of profit would permit. The scale of investment required, the vast scope of the struggle between monopoly groupings extending throughout the capitalist world, the growth of parasitic elements in the economy, etc., require that monopoly capital strive for maximum profits. Corporations realizing only an average rate of profit soon fall behind in the struggle of giants.
- D. Maximum profits represent more even than the "superprofits" which imperialism secures through the exploitation of colonial and semi-colonial peoples, where the rate of exploitation is higher than in the "home countries." Maximum profits include not only such superprofits, but also the "milking" of the entire domestic economy, and exploitation of even developed capitalist countries. They reach their highest peak in the development of war economy.

IV. United States monopoly capitalism and the law of maximum profit:

- A. The law of modern capitalism applies with particular force to U.S.

monopoly capitalism. The development of both the domestic economy and the drive of American imperialism for world domination are based upon "the motor of monopoly capitalism"—the drive for maximum profit.

B. The *aim* of law of modern capitalism—securing of the maximum profit—fully reflected in the case of United States monopoly capitalism.

1. Rising rate of profit for U.S. industrial corporations

1940 . . . 10.2% (*Labor Fact Book 10*, pp. 15-16)

1948 . . . 16.0%

1950 . . . 17.6%

2. Rising rate of profit in specific industries (percent return)

Industry	1940	1951	
Steel	8.1	12.3	(Economic Notes, March, 1953, p. 8)
Petroleum Ref.	6.7	15.7	
Tires and tubes	9.0	16.3	
Industrial Chem.	13.9	17.3	

Of 25 industries analyzed, the rate of profit rose in 19, from 1940 to 1951.

3. Total profits *reported* by U.S. corporations during 20-year period from 1933 to 1952 reached huge figures of \$380 billion before taxes, and \$200 billion after taxes. This is roughly equal to total of all capital invested in the U.S. in 1933.

C. *Methods* for securing maximum profits include:

1. "Milking" the entire domestic economy through a variety of means:

(a) Intensified exploitation of the working class and the masses of the people through speed-up, drop in real wages, monopoly prices, inflation, taxation, etc.

Examples: *Rise in consumer prices, 1939-1952*. (BLS index)

Period	All items	Food
1939 (monthly av.)	99.4	95.2
1950 — June 15	170.2	203.1
1952 — June 15	189.6	231.5

(1935-39=100)

(*Economic Notes*, September, 1952, p. 3)

Example: *Increase in taxation*

Per capita taxes—U.S.—annual average

1900—\$3.88

1953—\$472.00 (*U.S. News and World Report*,
Feb. 1, 1952)

Worker actually pays much higher rate. Roughly one-third of workers' income goes into direct and indirect taxes today. (*Economic Notes*, March, 1953, p. 4)

(b) Special exploitation of the Negro people

Average income of Negro families in the U.S.—1950—\$1,869

Average income of white families in the U.S.—1950—\$3,445

Additional annual profit from special, added exploitation of the Negro people in the U.S.—roughly \$4 billion.
(Perlo, *American Imperialism*, Chapter IV)

(c) Exploitation of small and middle farmers

Operation of the "price scissors"—high monopoly prices for commodities bought by farmers, lower prices for commodities they sell.

Growth of large-scale capitalist farms; squeezing out of small and middle-sized farmers.

(d) Forcing smaller capitalists to accept lower rate of profit

Example: In 1950, corporations with total assets under \$250,000 showed profit rate of 9.6%; those with large assets had a higher rate, the top group, with assets over \$100,000,000, rising to 17.6% (*Labor Fact Book #10*, p. 16)

See also *Economic Notes*, March, 1953, p. 8

2. *Exploitation of Other Countries and Drive of U.S. Imperialism Toward World Domination:*

(a) Plundering especially of colonial and semi-colonial peoples through the robbery of their natural resources, lower wages, lower prices for raw materials, high prices for goods sold to them, etc.

(b) Conversion of independent capitalist countries into dependent countries from which additional profits are extracted through export of U.S. capital, forcing payment of high prices for imports, low prices for exports, etc.

Example: Rate of profit on U.S. corporate investments in various parts of the world—1948

	(percent)
Europe outside of Marshall Plan countries	7.6
Canada	14.0
Marshall Plan countries	14.5
American Republics	17.4
Colonies of Marshall Plan countries	20.0
Other countries (mainly Middle East)	31.3

(Perlo, *American Imperialism*, p. 72)

3. *Militarization of the economy and wars* which "to the magnates of modern capitalism is the 'business' best adapted to the extraction of maximum profit" (Stalin, p. 32). In the U.S. this includes:
- (a) Fat war contracts: from July 1950 to June 1952, war contracts worth \$73.8 billion were allotted by U.S. government. Top 100 companies received 62% of these. During World War II, war contracts of \$175 billion were let. Top 100 companies received 67% of total. Largest war contract receiver was General Motors, with \$5.5 billion to date during Korean war. (See *Economic Notes*, March, 1953, p. 9)
- (b) Huge tax concessions. Rapid tax write-offs on capital investment worth \$28 billion already granted during Korean war.
- (c) Government investment in war industry, worth many billions, turned over to monopoly corporations either on a fee basis, or for a few cents on the dollar. Example: \$7.5 billion investment in atomic energy industry from which largest monopoly groupings (especially Morgan and du Pont) profit heavily.
- (d) War-time price inflation—rising prices and profits. (See above.)
- (e) Interest on government debt, now totaling roughly \$7 billion annually on federal government debt—paid to banks, large corporations, and wealthy individuals.
- (f) Outright subsidies—merchant marine, etc.

Note: War profits of U.S. monopoly capitalism in last three wars have totaled :

	Before taxes	After taxes
World War I	\$25 billion	\$20 billion
World War II	107 billion	48 billion
Korean war	123 billion	58 billion

General Reading:

Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 31-33, 58-59.

Special Topics:

For material illustrating operation of law of maximum profits in the United States:

Perlo, *American Imperialism*, especially chapters III, IV, VIII, IX and X. Labor Research Association, *Labor Fact Book* #11.

Labor Research Association, *Economic Notes* (Monthly issues—1953). Foster, "Stalin and American Imperialism," *Political Affairs*, February 1953, pp. 8-10.

Kashkarov, "The Drive for Maximum Monopoly Profits" *New Times*, January 7, 1953.

For further analysis and explanation of economic laws referred to:

Commodity production and law of value:

Eaton, *Political Economy*, Chapter II. (Intermediate.)

Rochester, *Nature of Capitalism*, Chapter III. (More elementary explanation.)

Marx, *Capital*, Volume I, Chapters I, II, and III. (For advanced study.)

Law of surplus value. (Read at least *one* of these references):

Eaton, *Political Economy*, Chapter IV. (Intermediate.)

Rochester, *Nature of Capitalism*, Chapter IV. (More elementary explanation.)

Marx, *Wage-Labor and Capital*. (Intermediate.)

Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapters IV through IX, also XXIV and XXV to p. 117. (For advanced study.)

Law of competition and anarchy of production:

Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, Chapter III. (Intermediate.)

Law of uneven development of capitalism:

Eaton, *Political Economy*, pp. 151-152. (Elementary to intermediate.)

Law of the average rate of profit:

Eaton, *Political Economy*, pp. 124-131. (Intermediate.)

Marx, *Capital, Volume III*, Chapters XII, XIV, and XV. (For advanced study.)

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION:

1. Marx discovered the law of surplus value. Explain this law in your own words, and in terms of your own experience.

2. In formulating the basic economic law of modern capitalism, Stalin states that, "it is precisely the maximum profit that is the motor of monopoly capitalism."
Hasn't the drive for maximum profit always been the driving force of the capitalists? Why is this a *new* law?
3. What are the main sources of maximum profits? How is U.S. monopoly capitalism utilizing each of them?
4. Why is a war economy the *best* means for securing maximum profits? Prove this on the basis of U.S. experience.
5. Stalin states that: "The importance of the basic economic law of capitalism consists, among other things, in the circumstance that, since it determines all the major phenomena in the development of the capitalist mode of production, its booms and crises, its victories and defeats, its merits and demerits—the whole process of its contradictory development—it enables us to understand and explain them." Bearing this in mind, how is the operation of the law of maximum profit leading to the development of economic crisis in the United States?
6. Stalin points out that the capitalists sometimes "appear as the standard bearers of the most advanced techniques," and that at other times they "resort to hand labor." He explains this "howling contradiction" by the law of maximum profit. Give an example of each of these, if possible from your own experience, and show how it relates to the law of maximum profit.
7. How does the operation of the law of maximum profit affect the possibility for formation of a broad peace coalition in the United States? Relate this to your own shop, industry, or community.

Topic Three: The Basic Economic Law of Socialism

- I. Basic economic law of Socialism discovered by Stalin:
 - A. "The essential features and requirements of the basic economic law of Socialism might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques." (Stalin, p. 33.)
 - B. Two elements of law:
 1. *Aim* of socialist production—satisfaction of material and cultural requirements of man.

2. *Means* for achieving this aim—continuous growth and improvement of socialist production on basis of higher techniques. (Stalin, p. 59.)
- C. Basic economic law of Socialism came into operation as result of abolition of capitalist relations of production and creation of new, socialist relations of production, task carried through by the Soviet government.
 1. Soviet government, however, did not "abolish" existing economic laws nor "create" new ones. It was able to perform its historic task because it understood and utilized objective economic laws, in first place the law that relations of production must necessarily conform to the character of the productive forces. (Stalin, p. 10.)
 2. Subordinate to the basic economic law of Socialism, other economic laws also operate, including the law of balanced, proportionate development of the national economy. (Stalin, pp. 33-34.)
- II. History and development of economy of U.S.S.R. over past 35 years reflects operation of basic economic law of Socialism, and conscious reliance of Soviet government upon this law, together with other, subordinate economic laws. Main features of this development are:
 - A. Steady growth of industrial production with major emphasis on output of means of production. (Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 32-41.)
 - B. Development of socialist agriculture. (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, pp. 41-51.)
 - C. Development of consumer goods industry, and raising of whole level of material and cultural life of the people. (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, p. 59.)
 - D. Special attention to economic development of previously backward nations, as integral part of national policy of the C.P.S.U. and Soviet government. (Beria, *Communism and Peace*, pp. 10-21.)
- III. Operation of the law of value under Socialism:
 - A. Law of value, which arose prior to capitalism, and developed to its widest scope under capitalism, continues to operate under Socialism—but within a restricted sphere, the sphere of commodity production. (Stalin, pp. 12-18, pp. 41-42, beginning with, "the third point.")
 1. Commodity production and circulation restricted to:
 - (a) Products of collective farms, sold as commodities;
 - (b) Consumer goods, primarily articles of personal consumption;
 - (c) Products entering into foreign trade.

2. Continuation of such commodity production and circulation necessary primarily because it was only form of economic tie to town and industry which was *acceptable* to the peasants. Thus played a positive role in the development of national economy as a whole.
 3. Commodity production and circulation stripped of exploitative features.
 - (a) Excludes means of production (machines, land, factories) except for those items of machinery entering into foreign trade.
 - (b) Trade not in hands of private individuals, but conducted by the state, the collective farms, and cooperatives.
 - (c) Labor power not a commodity.
 4. Thus, commodity production cannot lead to development of capitalism in the Soviet Union, but on the contrary, actually serves the development of socialist society for a certain period.
- B. Operation of the law of value occurs in the following specific spheres:
1. Commodity circulation—purchase and sale of consumer goods—where it serves within certain limits as a regulator. (Stalin, p. 18.)
 2. Production of consumer goods, sold as commodities, and agricultural raw materials, where the law of value *influences*, but does not regulate, production and formation of prices. (Stalin, pp. 18-20, 43-44, beginning with, "the fourth point.")
 - (a) Law of value, properly understood and utilized, enables Soviet business executives and economic planners to conduct their operations along efficient lines, through cost accounting, etc.
 - (b) However, it does not regulate production, does not determine the distribution of labor among the various lines of industry. Distribution of social labor is determined on the basis of the basic economic law of Socialism, and the law of balanced, proportionate development of the national economy, which must be utilized for the correct working out of the national economic plan. (Stalin, pp. 20-22.)
- C. Thus, sphere of commodity production and circulation, and operation of law of value, are curtailed in the Soviet Union by the operation of the basic laws of Socialism and by the national economic plan which reflects these laws. The outlook is for further limitation of their sphere of operation, over a protracted period of time, and for their eventual elimination in the second stage of Socialism, communist society.

General Reading:

- Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 33-34, pp. 56-60, pp. 12-22, pp. 41-44, pp. 60-62.
 Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 31-68.
 Beria, *Communism and Peace*, pp. 10-21.

Special Topics:

- For explanation of Marx' theory of reproduction, referred to by Stalin on pp. 60-62:
 Eaton, *Political Economy*, Chapter VIII. (Intermediate.)
 Marx, *Capital*, Volume II, Chapters XX and XXI. (For advanced study.)

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION:

1. In your own words, compare the basic economic law of Socialism and the basic economic law of modern capitalism. Why are economic crises impossible under Socialism?
2. Was the basic economic law of Socialism "created" by the Soviet government? Give the reasons for your answer. Explain the economic role of the Soviet state.
3. In discussing the basic economic law of Socialism, Stalin distinguishes between the *aim* and the *methods* embodied in the law. How are these two aspects of the basic economic law expressed in the development of the national economy of the Soviet Union, and in its present five-year Plan?
4. How has the development of the national economy of the Soviet Union implemented the national policy of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet government?
5. What is the relation between the annual and five-year Plans of the Soviet Union and the law of balanced proportionate development of the national economy?
6. Why does commodity production still exist in the Soviet Union? What is the role of the law of value under Socialism? What is its practical importance?
7. (For more advanced students of political economy): Why is Marx' theory of reproduction valid for a socialist economy?

Topic Four: The Transition from Socialism to Communism

- I. The U.S.S.R. now stands on threshold of transition from Socialism to Communism.
 - A. Socialism—the first stage in historic transition from capitalism to Communism.
 1. Under Socialism, relations of production are socialized, corresponding with social character of production. Exploitation of man by man has been abolished, and the oppression of one nation by another eliminated.
 2. Certain historical limitations that are still to be overcome:
 - (a) Further development of the productive forces is required to create the foundation for a society of abundance.
 - (b) The elimination of all vestiges of capitalist ideology and the all-round development of the individual.
 3. Under Socialism, slogan which expresses economic level of development: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."
 - B. Communism—higher stage of new society:
 1. Can be achieved only "after labor, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more freely." (Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, p. 10.)
 2. The slogan which expresses economic level of Communism is: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."
 - C. "Fulfillment of the Fifth Five Year Plan will be a big stride along the pathway of advancing from Socialism to Communism." ("Directives of the XIX Congress, C.P.S.U.") (See Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 31-68.)
- II. Three main preliminary conditions necessary to pave the way for transition to Communism:
 - A. Continuous expansion of social production with the major emphasis upon production of the means of production, which is the key to expansion in all other lines of production. (Stalin, p. 51.)
 1. This is based on conscious application of basic economic law of Socialism, as well as law of balanced, proportionate development of the national economy.
 2. Practical achievement based on systematic fulfillment of Five-Year Plans of the Soviet Union. (Malenkov, *Ibid.*)

- B. To overcome essential distinction between town and country, industry and agriculture. (Stalin, pp. 51-52.)
 1. Involves reliance on economic law that requires that social relations of production must conform fully to productive forces.
 - (a) At present, relations of production in Soviet Union fully correspond to growth of productive forces and aid in their development.
 - (b) But this does not mean *no* contradictions exist between productive forces and relations of production. Certain contradictions do arise, owing to a lag in development of relations of production (especially in agriculture) but these will not grow into *antagonisms*, into conflicts, if proper and timely measures are taken to overcome them.
 2. Lag in development of relations of production in agriculture based on fact that property of collective farms is not yet *public* property. The *products* of collective farms belong to collective farmers, and take the form of commodities (although main *means of production* of collective farms—land and machines—are publicly owned by the state). (Stalin, p. 52.)
 - (a) While collective farm property and commodity circulation are of benefit today and in the near future in the building of socialist economy, they are beginning to hamper the fullest development of the productive forces, because they create "obstacles to the full extension of government planning to the whole of the national economy, especially agriculture." (Stalin, p. 52.)
 3. Necessary to recognize such "incipient contradictions" and take timely measures to overcome them. (Stalin, p. 52.)
 - (a) In this case, contradictions should be resolved by gradual measures which will convert collective farm property to *public* property through including all products of collective farms into the system of products-exchange between state industry and collective farms, and through thus establishing one all-embracing production sector under central direction of a single national economic body. (Stalin, p. 52.)
 - (b) In projecting this line of development, Stalin rejects proposal to convert collective farm property into state property on grounds that this would be considered as expropriation by the collective farmers, and also that this is not necessarily the

best form of nationalization, since eventually the state itself will wither away and the heir of public property will be society itself through a central, directing economic body. (Stalin, pp. 65-71.)

C. To overcome the essential distinction between mental and physical labor and to insure the all round development of all members of society. (Stalin, pp. 52-53.)

1. The *objective* must be such many-side development of the individual that he or she will be an active agent of social development, and able freely to choose an occupation and to change occupation, instead of being tied to one type of work for life.
2. The *means* to be adopted:
 - (a) Shortening the working day to six, and eventually five, hours.
 - (b) Introduction of universal, compulsory, polytechnical education.
 - (c) Radical improvement of housing conditions.
 - (d) Doubling of real wages of workers.
3. Important measures in this direction are included in the current Five Year Plan. (See Malenkov, *Ibid.*, pp. 59-64.)

General Reading:

Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 46-54, 65-71, 12-18, 22-26, 40-42, and p. 34.

Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 85-93.

Allen, "Window on the Future," *Masses and Mainstream*, December, 1952, pp. 24-51.

Kaganovich, "Report on proposal to revise Party program," *Communism and Peace*, pp. 41-44.

Special Topics:

On requirements for transition from Socialism to Communism:

Marx, *Critique of Gotha Program*, pp. 3-13.

On the role of the state in transition from Socialism to Communism:

Lenin, *State and Revolution*, Chapter V.

Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism*, pp. 49-61 (in which Stalin modifies Engels' formulation on role of state in socialist society).

On the distinction between contradiction and antagonism:

Stalin, *Marxism and Linguistics*, pp. 14-15.

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION:

1. Why is it impossible to make an immediate transition from capitalism to Communism?
2. What are the main, specific problems which must be solved in the Soviet Union to make possible the transition from Socialism to Communism?
3. What role does the existence of objective economic laws play in the transition from Socialism to Communism?
4. Stalin speaks of the fact that certain contradictions exist between the productive forces and the relations of production even under Socialism, but he says that these contradictions will not grow into antagonisms "given a correct policy on the part of the directing bodies." Explain this statement. What is the difference between *contradiction* and *antagonism*? Does this distinction have any importance outside of problems of a socialist economy, that is, in other fields? Can you cite any examples of this from experience in the United States?
5. Stalin speaks of collective farm production as *socialist* production, but points out that it is not yet *publicly owned* production. What is the distinction between these two concepts?
6. Why is it necessary gradually to raise collective farm property to the level of public property? Why does Stalin reject the proposal that collective farm property should be transformed into *state* property?
7. How did the difference between mental and physical labor arise? Why does it still exist in the Soviet Union? What is necessary to abolish the essential difference between these two forms of labor?

Topic Five: The General Crisis of Capitalism and the Formation of Two Parallel World Markets

I. Nature of the general crisis of capitalism:

A. The general crisis of capitalism—an "all-round crisis of the world capitalist system, embracing both the economic and the political spheres." (Stalin, p. 45.)

B. Two main stages of the general crisis. (Stalin, pp. 44-45.)

1. From World War I to World War II, in which general crisis began particularly due to withdrawal of Soviet Union from the capitalist system, signaling beginning of the breakup of the capitalist system.

2. World War II on, in which general crisis deepened still further owing to withdrawal of the People's Democracies of Europe, and Chinese People's Republic from the orbit of imperialism, leading to formation of a united, powerful socialist camp confronting the camp of capitalism.
- C. Roots of general crisis lie in increasing decay of world capitalist economic system and growing economic strength of countries embarked on road of Socialism. (Stalin, p. 45.)
- II. Disintegration of single world market, the most important economic consequence of World War II and of deepened general crisis.
- A. Reason for formation of two parallel world markets; split of the world into two opposite camps:
1. Economic cooperation and mutual assistance between countries making up the democratic, socialist camp—the basic element. (Stalin, p. 26.)
- B. Two world markets developing in opposite directions.
1. Democratic world market, based on operation of basic economic law of Socialism, is expanding and developing. (Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, p. 10.)
Volume of trade among Eastern European countries, including the Soviet Union, has increased 10 times over 1938, and the increase of trade between these countries and China is "no less spectacular." (*Report of United Nations Economic Commission*, November, 1952.)
 2. Imperialist world market narrowing: one-third of earth's surface eliminated from imperialist orbit; further disintegration of colonial system; operation of law of maximum profits and law of uneven development of capitalism.
 - (a) U.S. trade with countries of democratic, socialist camp is less than one-tenth of the 1937 figure; British trade is one-sixth, and French trade under one-fourth of the 1937 level. (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, p. 12.)
 - (b) Trade between capitalist nations is also declining. Pronounced decline in foreign trade of Great Britain and France is taking place. Total U.S. exports are also declining despite military shipments. Excluding the latter, the decline in exports is even more pronounced. In case of non-military exports, there was a decline of 30% from 1947 to 1950, an increase in early stage of Korean war, and renewed decline in 1952. (Articles by Bernard Burton, *The Worker*, January 4, 11, 18, 25, 1953; *Labor Fact Book* #11.)

- (c) Difficulties in imperialist world market include not only decline in exports and imports, but also increasing difficulties in foreign investment.

III. Sharpened antagonisms between countries within capitalist world following World War II:

- A. Operation of law of uneven development of capitalism: relative strengthening of position of U.S. imperialism at expense of other imperialist powers; growing conflict between U.S. imperialism and other imperialist countries.
1. Economies of other imperialist nations weakened and undermined as result of World War II. U.S. imperialism took advantage of this to expand investment and trade at their expense under guise of "economic aid."
Only U.S. private foreign investment increased from 1950 to present. By 1950, private foreign investments of U.S. exceeded combined total of all other capitalist countries. (Perlo, *American Imperialism*, pp. 27-28.)
 2. Rival imperialist powers seeking to regain their economic positions and achieve high profits. (Stalin, pp. 28-29.)
 - (a) Chief antagonism among imperialist powers is between U.S. and Great Britain. (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.)
Penetration of direct U.S. private investment in British empire has grown from a little under \$3 billion in 1943, to over \$4.5 billion in 1950. If we add British "spheres of influence," U.S. private investment grew from \$3.5 billion in 1943 to \$5.5 billion in 1950. (*Survey of Current Business*, December, 1952.)
 - (b) British and French imperialists seeking to break loose from U.S. domination; Germany and Japan also beginning to rebuild their economic position and to attempt to struggle out from under U.S. domination. (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.)
- B. Disintegration of colonial system of imperialism (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.)
1. Breach of imperialist front in China, Korea, Viet Nam. Victory of Chinese people's revolution a major blow to colonial system.
 2. Rising tide of liberation struggle, especially in Africa and Asia.
 3. Efforts of U.S. imperialism to penetrate colonies and "spheres of influence" of older imperialisms intensifies crisis of colonial system.
Increase in direct U.S. investment in Africa. Has risen from

\$140 million in 1943 to over \$320 million in 1950 and is now over half a billion dollars.

Role of U.S. imperialism in instigating and intensifying attacks on peoples of Africa, as well as efforts to defeat liberation struggles in Asia.

4. Continued retarding of economy of colonial countries: chronic crisis of agriculture; decline in exports of colonial countries.

IV. As result of these developments, two theses concerning capitalism are no longer valid.

A. Stalin's thesis developed during the 1920's regarding the possibility of a temporary and relative stabilization of capitalism no longer is valid. The further limitation of the capitalist world market, the sharpened inter-imperialist antagonisms, the disintegration of the colonial system, etc. make even a temporary and partial stabilization (such as that from 1922-1929) impossible today.

B. Lenin's thesis, put forward in 1916, that despite the decay of capitalism under imperialism, capitalism on the whole is growing more rapidly than before, is also no longer valid.

1. In this thesis, Lenin referred especially to the continued development of capitalism which was taking place in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, as they were drawn into the capitalist system through the penetration of imperialism, as well as the continued rapid expansion of certain lines of industry within imperialist countries. (See Lenin, *Imperialism*, pp. 65, 97, 125.)
2. Following World War II, however, tendency toward decay has become more dominant, colonial system is disintegrating, capitalism confined to an ever smaller sphere. Hence, while capitalism may still develop rapidly for a period in one or another line of industry, on the whole it is no longer "growing more rapidly than ever before."

Period	Annual rate of growth of world capitalist industry
1860-1880	3.1%
1890-1913	3.7%
1913-1929	2.4%
1929-1949	1.3% (approximate)

V. Militarization of the economy—U.S. imperialism's "solution" to the deepening crisis.

A. Militarization of the economy to provide a market for U.S. imperialism.

1. Growth of direct military expenditures of U.S. government:

Fiscal year 1937-38	\$1 billion
Fiscal year 1952-53	\$58 billion
2. From June 1950 to June 1952—U.S. government let \$73.8 billion in arms contracts.
3. From end of World War II through 1952—roughly \$40 billion in economic and military "aid" expended for prosecution of "cold war" and war in Korea.
4. War profits of U.S. corporations (see topic two).

B. Militarization of economy paves way for new and deepened economic crises.

1. Increases disproportion between productive capacity and purchasing power of the masses.
Since 1945, productive capacity of U.S. industry has risen 50%. Purchasing power of masses cut through rising prices, taxes, fall in farm income (see Topic Two, p. 71).
2. War economy, while producing a temporary increase in industrial production primarily of the heavy, war industries, gives a one-sided, distorted character to development of national economy of capitalist countries, which ultimately deepens crisis.
Growing financial crisis (France, Great Britain).
Intensified agrarian crisis. (Farm income in U.S. down 12% in 1952.)
Developing crisis in consumer goods industries. (Textiles.)
3. Eventually factors making for economic crisis assert themselves in even sharper form, resulting either in new cyclical crisis or spreading of aggression and war.

C. Militarization of the economy is also associated with the rapid growth of state monopoly capitalism. The "subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies," becomes characteristic today. (Stalin, p. 35—"point 4.")

1. In the U.S.—character of Eisenhower's cabinet. (See *Economic Notes*, January 1953, pp. 7-8.)
2. Control over state machine involves control of hundreds of billions of dollars in industrial investment, in national debt, war contracts, subsidies, tax concessions, "foreign aid" expenditures, government lending and credit agencies, etc.

Examples—the \$7.5 billion atomic energy war industry
 —the synthetic rubber industry
 —the government subsidies to the merchant marine industry.

(See Blair Bolles, *How to Get Rich in Washington*, for some picture of the scope of state monopoly capitalism, which he incorrectly terms “war socialism.”)

- VI. The alternative to war economy and economic crisis.
- A. While basic cause of economic crisis and of war lies in nature of capitalist system itself, and cannot be eliminated without ending that system, there is a realistic perspective for development of a peacetime economy in which masses of the people would be protected from worst effects of economic crisis.
- B. Program for such a peacetime economy would include:
1. Restoration and extension of world trade on vast scale, based on restoration of a single world market. (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, p. 28.)
 2. Development of a large-scale domestic economic program aimed at increasing mass purchasing power of workers, small farmers, and middle classes through higher wages, reduced taxes on the masses, etc., and at providing jobs through large-scale public construction of housing, schools, highways, and other public works.
- C. Realization of such a program would require an effective struggle to curb the power of monopoly capital, and to block their effort to place the full burdens on the backs of the masses.
- i. Such a struggle could be effectively undertaken and won only through the forging of a broad coalition, led by the working class, and comprising the Negro people, the small and middle farmers, the professional and city middle classes etc. (See *National Resolution on the 1952 Elections*, National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.)

General Reading:

Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 26-27, 44-45, beginning with “the seventh point,” and p. 35 “point 4” and “point 6.”
 Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 6-17.
 Foster, “Stalin and American Imperialism,” *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1953, pp. 5-11.

Special Topics:

- On the general crisis of capitalism:
 Foster, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, pp. 530-540.
 Eaton, *Political Economy*, Chapter XII.
- On U.S. war economy and development of economic crisis:
 Swift, “The Parasitism of the U.S. War Economy,” *Political Affairs*, March 1952, pp. 51-64.
 Hall, *Peace Can Be Won*, pp. 3-19.
 Bittelman, “New Economic Dangers and How to Meet Them,” *Political Affairs*, May, 1953.
- On two world markets and problems of foreign trade and investment:
 Burton, *The Worker*, special articles on the two world markets, January 4, 11, 18, 25, 1953.
 Labor Research Association, *Labor Fact Book # 11*, chapter on foreign trade.
 Labor Research Association, *Economic Notes*, all issues for 1952 and 1953.

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION:

1. What is the “general crisis of capitalism”? Is it the same as the periodic or cyclical crises of capitalism?
2. Why is the disintegration of the single world market the most important economic consequence of World War II?
3. The spokesmen for U.S. imperialism speak constantly about the “menace of Soviet imperialism.” How does the character of the new, socialist world market disprove this statement? Explain fully.
4. Malenkov states: “. . . the expansion of war production is inevitably leading to the maturing of a new, deep-going economic crisis.” Discuss this in terms of the United States.
5. In what concrete ways is the “subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies” proceeding in the United States today? What are some of the forms of U.S. state monopoly capitalism in domestic economy? In the international sphere?
6. “While the American and British bellicose circles keep reiterating that only the armaments drive keeps industry in the capitalist countries going at full capacity, there is in actual fact another prospect—the prospect of developing and extending trade relations between all countries, irrespective of differences in their social system, which would keep the factories and mills in the industrially developed countries working to capacity for years, that could ensure markets in other countries for the goods in which

- some countries are rich, promote economic advance in the under-developed countries and thereby establish lasting economic cooperation." (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, p. 28). Discuss this in terms of the United States, and in terms of your own shop and industry.
7. What kind of domestic economic program should labor and its allies support as an alternative to the war economy? Discuss this in terms of your own industry and union, or your own occupation (farm, professional, etc.)

Topic Six: The Struggle for Peace

- I. The character of the war danger today.
- A. The principal aggressive power is the United States, whose goal is world domination, which it seeks to achieve by economic, political and military means.
1. American imperialism seeks to direct a new war against the Soviet Union and other countries of the peace camp "since the U.S.S.R. is the main opponent of another war." (Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, p. 18.)
 2. Attack of U.S. imperialism on Korea "marked the transition of the U.S.-British bloc from preparation for aggressive war to direct acts of aggression" (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, p. 18; Gus Hall, *Peace Can Be Won*, p. 3).
 3. In practice, the aggressive drive of U.S. monopoly capital is aimed not only at the democratic, socialist nations, but is also directed at securing domination over its "allies" in the guise of "struggle against Communism."
- B. Stalin corrected erroneous conception that danger of war arises only from contradictions between socialist and capitalist nations, that U.S. imperialism has united entire imperialist camp under its "leadership," and that war between capitalist countries no longer inevitable. (Stalin, p. 28.)
1. Operation of law of uneven development of capitalism inevitably generates conflicts between capitalist nations.
 - (a) Lenin pointed out that operation of this law invalidated Kautsky's thesis of "ultra-imperialism" (Lenin, *Imperialism*, Chapter VII).

- (b) Britain and France on the one hand, Germany and Japan on the other, will not indefinitely accept domination of U.S.; will seek to reassert their independence, struggle for markets and for profits. (Stalin, pp. 28-29.)
 2. While in general, contradictions between capitalism and Socialism are more basic than those between capitalist countries, in practice during a given period, contradictions between capitalist countries may prove more acute (Stalin, p. 29).
 3. Possibility therefore exists for protracted period of peaceful coexistence of capitalist and socialist world.
 - (a) Soviet Union and peace camp as a whole actively work for this perspective.
- II. Character of the peace movement today:
- A. Peace movement today more powerful than in any previous period of history.
1. Headed by the Soviet Union, it includes Chinese People's Republic, Eastern European democracies, the rising colonial liberation movement, the working class and people's forces fighting for peace in the capitalist countries.
 2. Stalin corrected erroneous conception that increased strength of peace camp has invalidated Lenin's thesis that imperialism inevitably generates war. "To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism" (Stalin, p. 30).
- B. Objective of present-day peace movement—"to rouse the masses of the people to fight for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of another world war" (Stalin, p. 30).
1. Is different from peace movement at time of World War I, which pursued socialist objectives.
 2. Success of present peace movement would mean preventing a *particular* war, temporary preservation of a *particular* peace, replacement of one or another pro-war government by one committed temporarily to maintain peace.
 3. Such a peace movement is extremely broad in character, is capable of embracing broadest strata of the population, including sectors of the capitalist class in many countries.
 4. The peace movement must utilize the growing contradictions within the imperialist camp, especially the rising resistance of certain capitalist powers to U.S. domination, as well as differences within the ranks of the capitalist class in each country.

- C. The main task of the peace movement is "to activate the popular masses still more, to strengthen the organization of the partisans of peace, to expose the warmakers tirelessly, and not allow them to enmesh the peoples in a web of lies" (Malenkov, *Ibid.*, p. 23).
1. Great new opportunities for ending of Korean war and of preserving peace now unfold as result of the peace initiative taken by the Soviet Union. Opportunities can be realized only by mass struggle of peoples for peace, by popular intervention to compel U.S. government to negotiate agreement on a series of issues, especially ending of Korean war, establishment of a united, democratic, independent Germany, recognition of People's Republic of China, and resumption of East-West trade.
 2. Major attention must be given to struggle for peace in labor movement and Negro people's movement. New developments in both these movements offer favorable opportunities.
 3. Fight for peace connected with struggle to restore and defend democratic liberties. (See Stalin's speech to XIX Congress, in *Political Affairs*, October, 1952).

General Reading:

- Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 27-30.
 Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 17-30.
 Foster, "Fighting War with Peace and Democracy," *Political Affairs*, June, 1953.
 Stalin, Speech to XIX Congress, C.P.S.U., *Political Affairs*, October, 1952.
Resolution on National Elections, National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.
 Rockman, *Broaden the Fight for Peace and Democracy*.

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION:

1. Stalin warned against a superficial approach to problems which sees "the outward phenomena that come and go on the surface" but fails to see "those profound forces which, although they are so far operating imperceptibly, will nevertheless determine the course of developments." (Stalin, p. 28.)
 How have international events confirmed this statement?
2. Following World War II what contribution did American Communists make in estimating the role of U.S. imperialism and the war danger? What were some errors committed in relation to this question?

3. The most basic contradiction in the present-day world is that between capitalism and Socialism. If this is true, why is the peaceful coexistence of the capitalist and socialist worlds possible? Explain your answer.
4. How do the present series of peace proposals by the Soviet Union flow from the theoretical analysis of Stalin in his work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*? Do they represent a basic change in the peace policy of the Soviet Union? What is new in them?
5. Can the present Eisenhower Administration be compelled to make certain concessions in regard to negotiations for peace? On what questions? What is required to bring a *basic* change in the foreign policy of the United States?
6. How can the peace movement in the United States be broadened? How would you apply this to your own shop, union, or mass organization? What errors of a Right-opportunist nature have you observed in the fight for peace in your own sphere of work? Of a "Left"-sectarian nature? What are you doing to correct these errors?
7. What is the relation between the fight for peace and the struggle for democratic rights? How can the struggle for democratic rights be developed in your union or mass organization?

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

MODE OF PRODUCTION—The method of procuring the means of life, the material values, necessary for human existence—food, clothing, shelter, instruments of production. It is this which determines the character of any social system, and which is the chief force in the development of society from one system to another. The mode of production includes two elements: productive forces and relations of production, and is embodiment of their unity in the process of production.

PRODUCTIVE FORCES—These deal with the relation of men to nature in the process of production. They include the instruments of production with which material values are produced, and the people who operate the instruments of production with the experience, skills, and techniques required. Productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary element of production. Changes in production begin with changes in the productive forces, especially the instruments of production.

RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION—This deals with the relation of men to each other in the process of production, that is, how men are organized socially to carry on production. Relations of production are synonymous with

property relations—that is, who owns and who does not own the means of production. Relations of production change in accordance with the changes and developments in the productive forces. The sum total of production relations constitutes the economic base of society on which arises the political and legal superstructure. Five main types of relations of production are known to history: primitive communal, slave, feudal, capitalist, socialist.

MEANS OF PRODUCTION—This refers to the land, natural resources, raw materials, instruments of production, structures used for production, means of transportation and communication, etc.

INSTRUMENTS OF PRODUCTION—The tools and machines used by men in the process of production.

COMMODITY—A product of human labor which has both use value and exchange value; that is, it must be useful, able to satisfy human wants, and produced for the market. Commodity production began with the development of division of labor among men, long before capitalism; it reaches its highest level of development under capitalism when labor power becomes a commodity; it continues to exist in a more restricted sphere under Socialism, and will eventually be eliminated under Communism.

VALUE—Exchange value of a commodity, which is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor required to produce it.

PRICE—The value of a commodity expressed in terms of money.

LABOR POWER—The worker's ability to labor which appears as a commodity for sale on the market under capitalism; its value is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor required to maintain and reproduce the worker; roughly, the value of his subsistence.

WAGES—Under capitalism the price of labor power, its value expressed in money terms, paid to the worker by the capitalist.

SURPLUS VALUE—That value which the worker creates over and above the value of his labor power and which is appropriated by the capitalists. Surplus value is the source of profit of the capitalist class. It represents the unpaid labor of the workers.

RATE OF PROFIT—The relation or ratio of surplus value to the total capital invested by the capitalist.

DEPARTMENT I AND II OF PRODUCTION—Department I refers to those industries producing the means of production; Department II refers to those industries producing consumer goods.

Published by Masses & Mainstream

THE ART OF CHARLES WHITE

A FOLIO OF SIX DRAWINGS

by the distinguished Negro artist

"These lithographs of Charles White's introduce mankind," writes ROCKWELL KENT in his introduction to the folio. "They transcend, as only true art can, the means—the stone and crayon, black and white, the lines and masses—of which they are contrived. . . . They introduce mankind."

You will treasure these magnificent prints. Eminently suited for framing, they measure 13 by 18 inches. The most advanced technique has been utilized to secure the finest possible reproductions. *They belong on the walls of your home.*

Special Packaging for Mailing

Price: \$3.00

LETTERS TO AMERICANS

By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

Covering a half century, from 1848 to 1895, the letters range over a wide field dealing with many events and themes of historical interest and with the views and activities of many personalities in the United States and Europe. They were written to pioneer American Marxist leaders like Joseph Weydemeyer and Frederick Sorge, to the great social reformer, Florence Kelley and to many others in the working class movement.

This new classic of Marxism-Leninism will be welcomed by advanced workers, educators and students, as a powerful contribution to the further development of theory in the working-class movement.

Price \$3.50

At all bookstores or by mail from

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 BROADWAY • NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

BORN OF THE PEOPLE

By LUIS TARUC

With an introduction by PAUL ROBESON



Here is a truly great book in the tradition of Julius Fuchik's immortal *Notes From the Gallows*. It is a living, pulsating document about a man and his people striving for liberation—autobiography that is history, and history that is literature. Here is an epic of the Filipino people fighting to break forever the yoke of imperialist oppression.

In his introduction to this remarkable book, Paul Robeson calls it "proof that the richest humanist tradition is inherited by, and will be continuously enriched by, the working class."

"A long-needed addition to the history of American imperialism," is how Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois characterizes this account of the Hukbalahap movement by its leader, Luis Taruc.

And Frederick V. Field, comparing the Philippine story to that of China, sees in it "the virile deeply-rooted beginnings of the emancipation of another great people."

Paper \$1.75 • *Cloth* \$3.00

*A major campaign will be launched behind
this new INTERNATIONAL book.*



ORDER FROM YOUR LOCAL BOOKSHOP OR BY MAIL FROM:

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

