

political affairs

APRIL 1955 • 25 CENTS

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| WILLIAM Z. FOSTER | [1] | On the Release of the National Committee Members |
| JOHN SWIFT | [4] | Some Thoughts on Independent Political Action (A Discussion of the "National Guardian's" Call for a Third Party) |
| WILLIAM Z. FOSTER | [19] | Eisenhower and Keynesism |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [28] | The Informer System and Democracy |
| D. SHEPILOV | [34] | The General Line of the CPSU and Vulgarizers of Marxism |
| AL RICHMOND | [44] | Anita Whitney—Communist |
| LUIS CARLOS PRESTES | [55] | On the Program of the Communist Party of Brazil |



ANITA WHITNEY

July 7, 1867—February 4, 1955

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

On the Release of the National Committee Members

By William Z. Foster

THE RELEASE from Federal prison of Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party, and Jack Stachel, John Williamson, John Gates and Carl Winter, members of the National Committee of the C.P., marks an important stage in the life of the Communist Party. During the 44 months of their imprisonment, the Party found many severe difficulties under the government persecutions and it needed gravely their skilled and devoted leadership. Great numbers of workers will join with their families in welcoming the release of these outstanding fighters of the working class.

The long imprisonment of Dennis and the many other comrades convicted under the infamous Smith

Act, constitutes a dangerous assault upon the people's liberties, supposedly guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. It is the grossest violation of this elementary charter of civil rights, to imprison men and women for daring to speak out against the reactionary programs of the imperialist government of this country. It is one of the most dangerous expressions of the growing fascist trend in the United States.

On a par with the outrageous imprisonment of these Communists is the manner in which this has been, and is being brought about. In this respect the worst methods of the traditional American labor frame-up have been employed. The trials of the 11 national committee leaders,

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.

and those that have followed it, were a foul mess of government-perjured witnesses, of corrupt prosecutors willing to swim in the filthiest gutters in order to get convictions, of reactionary judges who spit upon the most elementary questions of law and justice, and of juries so intimidated by the prevailing war and fascist-like hysteria that they would hardly dare to bring in an acquittal verdict no matter how decisive the evidence showing the innocence of those on trial.

It was an outrage to railroad the Communist leaders to jail on synthetic, unconstitutional charges. But to continue and to intensify the persecution, the Government is confronting the released Communists with a second indictment under the Smith Act. The first convictions, on the allegations of conspiring to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government (which is a brazen lie) are being supplemented by new charges on the basis of membership in the Communist Party, with a penalty of 10 years imprisonment. This is clearly a case of double jeopardy, of being tried twice for the same alleged offense.

Never in the whole history of the United States has there been a more flagrant violation of the Bill of Rights than the second indictments faced by the prison victims of the Smith Act. And all this persecution is supplemented by the provisions of the McCarran Act, which threat-

en a long time in jail for all Communists who refuse to register themselves with the Government as "subversive"—another flagrant violation of the U.S. Constitution.

Varying the line of persecution, the Government is proceeding also to deport those convicted Communists who are not citizens of the United States (for no fault of their own). At present Jack Stachel and John Williamson, who have spent their entire lives, from early childhood, in this country, are being menaced with such deportation. Irving Potash, National Committee member and resident of the United States for 40 years, has already been deported, and several other men and women leaders now face similar persecution. This barbarous deportation policy, separating the deportees from their families, friends, and accustomed environment, also violates every American tradition of popular liberties.

When Irving Potash sailed down New York Bay on the steamer Saxonia, bound for Poland, Miss Liberty, holding aloft her torch in the harbor, might well have blushed in shame. She is an anachronism in these days of advances toward fascism in this country. Instead of welcoming "Europe's huddled millions" of oppressed, the United States today with the most reactionary government of the major capitalist countries, has its doors open only to the worst parasites and reactionaries of the world. The American working class will have to make a resolute

struggle for freedom before Miss Liberty can regain her one-time vivid meaning as the great symbol of freedom.

They are foolish who believe that the present government persecution can destroy the Communist Party. What is happening is that the Communist Party is being steeled by these hardships, as the most powerful Communist Parties of many countries, in their time of persecution, have been hardened.

The real danger of the disease of fascism in this country is to the

basic liberties of the people, to the very existence of the labor movement. The release of Dennis and the other Communist leaders should serve as a stimulus to the democratic forces everywhere to demand the release of all Smith Act and other political prisoners, to prevent the deportation of trade union fighters, such as Potash, Stachel, Williamson and others, and to wipe from the statute books the whole dirty collection of Taft-Hartley, Smith, McCarran, Communist Control and "right-to-work" acts, as well as all other such pro-fascist legislation.

Some Thoughts on Independent Political Action

A Discussion of the "National Guardian's" Call for a Third Party

By John Swift

IN THE January 10th issue of the *National Guardian*, there appeared "A Call For Independent Political Action." The "Call" appeared under the signature of John T. McManus, the *Guardian's* Managing Editor and the American Labor Party's 1954 candidate for Governor in the State of New York. The placement of the "Call" on the entire front page, its publication under the banner-head, "A Statement For Discussion by Progressives," the subsequent opening of the columns of the *Guardian* to such a discussion, all leave no doubt that this statement expresses not alone the personal views of McManus, but the official viewpoint of the *Guardian*.

The issues raised in this policy statement are so vitally important to the progressive movement that we propose to devote this article to their discussion. We shall briefly summarize the "Call." In the first place it proposes the formation of a new "national independent political party" to be "on the ballot in the 1956 Presidential elections." This party "must be a party of peace, jobs and rights." The *Guardian* adds: "It must be anti-imperialist

... friendly to world socialism and itself prepared to consider socialist solutions for our own country's welfare." Its formation "cannot wait or expect mass break-aways from presently organized groups such as the labor movement or the Democratic Party. . . . It must be undertaken now" so as to be able to participate "at every level of political argument in the 1956 campaign." Toward this end it proposes the convening of an "open caucus" of all like-minded people to take place no later than Labor Day week, 1955.

These are the concrete proposals of the *Guardian's* "Call."

What are the arguments in favor of such a new party now? The Statement makes five of them:

1) Without candidates on all levels the progressive forces will be blocked from the use of radio, TV, and other means of mass communication in the 1956 campaign. Hence the danger exists that no progressive opposition voice will be heard and that the "left of center will have been effectively and perhaps finally silenced in the fight against fascism and war."

2) The proposition that anti-fas-

cists can function effectively as "non-ballot groups" working within the two-party system "has fallen flat in the four years since this strategem has been employed."

3) There is no mass peace movement in this country "despite all efforts at regrouping and new forms which have decimated the Progressive Party of 1948."

4) The support of "liberals" for "their apparent 'anti-McCarthy' attitudes" has not won a single commitment in Congress against the Smith and McCarran Acts. Of the "dozens of Congressmen and several Senators and governors" who owe their election victory in part to the anti-Republican swing of progressive voters not one has raised his voice against the rearmament of Germany.

5) Even the way in which the question of "peaceful coexistence" has been placed for discussion before the American people in recent weeks is false and will lead nowhere, for it does not rest on the enlightened view that "more acceptable ideas than capitalism are sweeping the world and in time coming our way." Thus there is nothing to be gained from this current discussion.

Do the forces exist to fulfill this task? This question is answered in the affirmative. The forces which made up the "great Progressive mobilization of 1948" can be rallied again and with them many additional ones. "All the elements for this are at hand," writes McManus,

"only the imagination seems to be lacking. Can we stir this imagination again, as we only began to stir it in 1948?"

These are a summary of the *Guardian's* views on the next steps toward independent political action.

Since we shall take issue with some of Brother McManus' evaluations and conclusions, it is important to make plain at the outset our approach toward the *Guardian* and its editors. The *Guardian* is a non-Communist progressive weekly. It was born in 1948 during the upsurge of the newly formed Progressive Party and as an independent voice of that movement. In 1950, when Henry Wallace betrayed the cause of peace, the *Guardian*, to its everlasting credit, stood its ground and refused to be browbeaten or panicked into support of the Korean War. Its record has been that of a staunch fighter for peace, civil liberties, Negro and labor rights. It bravely came to the defense of the Rosenbergs, has resolutely stood for friendship with the Soviet Union, and even when in disagreement with the Communist Party has fought for its rights and recognized in it a progressive force. Thus it has lived up to the best traditions of American radical-progressive journalism. For these reasons the *Guardian* has well earned the hatred of reaction. For the same reasons the Communists wish the *Guardian* well, recognizing it as a progressive ally in the fight.

* * *

It is necessary to point out that while the *Guardian's* statement is entitled, "A Call for Independent Political Action," the platform for such action stands on only one leg: the formation of a new party by 1956. This is the be-all and end-all of the *Guardian's* views on what needs to be done to further the cause of independent political action.

Nothing is said about the crucial immediate battles to influence the course of events *before* the 1956 election. Nothing is said about the urgent need for intensified independent political action *now*, in the form of *organized mass pressure* upon the present Administration and Congress. This is not accidental. It flows logically from the reasoning of the "Call" itself. McManus and the *Guardian* apparently see no possibility of influencing the immediate course of events and nothing to be gained from political pressure upon Washington. Thus, independent political action today is made wholly synonymous with but one act—the immediate organizational crystallization of a new party. And this new party is to spring, not out of the natural fertility of increased mass activity and struggle around immediate issues, but full grown, like Minerva from the brow of Jupiter.

McManus places single-minded emphasis upon the need to form a new party without awaiting mass break-aways of labor and other "presently organized groups" from the two-party system. This explains, in

our opinion, why nothing was said about how to further the independent political action of organized labor.

For the sake of argument, let us concede the need for such a party even without labor's support. Would this preclude the need for special attention to organized labor? Would we not also have the task of working *with* and *within* the ranks of organized labor to promote the cause of political independence? The *Guardian* does not deal with this problem at all. How important it is we shall have occasion to emphasize later.

What kind of party is McManus proposing? He leaves us a bit confused on this score. Does he favor a broad people's coalition party based on a common united front program for "peace, jobs and rights" and directed against the economic and political dominance of monopoly, or does he favor a still more programmatically advanced, more Left, socialist-type party? Apparently he himself has not made up his mind. In the very first paragraph of the "Call" he says that the new party "must be anti-imperialist, friendly to world socialism and itself prepared to consider socialist solutions for our own country's welfare." Thus he is advocating the formation of an anti-capitalist, pro-socialist party. But elsewhere in the statement he refers to the new party as "an independent people's coalition."

It is no small matter that John

McManus and the other editors of the *Guardian* are thinking of more fundamental socialist solutions to the problems of our country. This is another proof that despite all the hysterical attempts of the ruling class to exorcise socialist ideas from the masses, these are bound to grow, for they represent the truth and are being attested to by all the myriad currents of life. And if the *Guardian's* editors are thinking along these lines, this is a further tribute to both their wisdom and courage.

But we are still puzzled over the character of the party proposed. It cannot be for "socialist solutions" and still be a "people's coalition" party. At least, not in the present stage of struggle in this country. A "people's coalition," if that phrase has any meaning at all for today, must be a combination of diverse class and social groupings, which, irrespective of differing ideologies, unite to advance a common, agreed-upon program. Any "people's coalition" which is not that is a misnomer.

But can a broad coalition party be formed without the backing of at least an important section of the organized labor movement? Since the rise of the monopolies and even prior to the turn of the century, there have been repeated third-party efforts to topple the Big Business dominated two-party system. These have invariably failed to accomplish this end. They were essentially rural and urban middle-class movements,

lacking deep roots in the ranks of the workers. Even when the La Follette movement of 1924 did get the backing of organized labor, this was not a long range decision to pursue a new path of political independence. Thus, these movements, from the Populists on, flashed like meteors across the political skies, and then just as rapidly died away. History has demonstrated that the only class capable of heading up a great people's movement against the rule of monopoly is the organized working class. Every third party movement which is not so based is doomed to failure.

Nor is there any sense in gnashing our teeth in impotent rage at the treasonable role of the labor officialdom which plays no small part in keeping labor tied to Big Business politics. It is necessary to devise the practical steps and actions by which to propel labor forward toward ever greater political independence. While *complete* political independence requires a new party, *greater* political independence can be attained short of that goal and on the way to it. Not to see the small embryonic beginnings of such independence in the political action movement of organized labor today is to fail to see tomorrow's man in today's child. It also fails to grasp the conditions under which the ruling class was able to placate the workers with economic bribes. It does not see the new period ahead in which the intense market crisis of American

capitalism will make this less and less possible. To try to build a great new coalition party without labor and against its will is like trying to build a modern skyscraper without steel and concrete girders.

It is of course possible that Brothier McManus is not thinking of a "people's coalition" party at all. He may be thinking of a more restricted socialist electoral combination. This he may believe is necessary to make up for the abandonment of that field by the Socialist Party and the inability of the Communist Party, due to reactionary laws and practices, to get on the ballot in most states. If so, this would be a brand new proposal and should be considered on its merits. But this should not be confused with a "people's coalition" party.

It is clear that a great majority of people are not at this time prepared "to consider socialist solutions for our own country's welfare." A program of independent political action cannot be limited, therefore, to those who believe in such solutions. It must have as its aim the rallying of a new progressive majority of the American people to influence the *immediate* course of events to prevent war and fascism. Hence the placing of a socialist ticket in the field, if that is what is intended, cannot be seen as the over-all answer to the problem of building a people's coalition.

What explains McManus' lack of clarity regarding the character of

the new party advocated? A real people's party, a labor-farmer party, must base itself upon the mass movement of the people and in the first place upon organized labor. But such a party is not emerging at this time. The masses are still expressing themselves through the medium of the two old parties. McManus is convinced, however, that without a national third party nothing can be accomplished to prevent fascism and war. He fears that to wait until labor is prepared to take this path may be too late. Thus, out of a feeling of desperation, the *Guardian* seeks to build this "people's coalition" party, single-handed, even if it is doomed at the outset to be a narrow grouping without a mass following.

The contradiction in the McManus position, is, therefore, the contradiction between the belief that nothing can be accomplished without a new party and the inability to achieve such. It is the contradiction between what is deemed necessary and what is deemed possible.

* * *

At the root of the *Guardian's* position lies the deeply held view that the present situation in the country cannot be altered for the better without the emergence of a new party. This underlies all McManus' arguments.

His first argument is that independent candidates are needed if the progressives are to have access to the public forum of 1956. Having candi-

dates in the field would undoubtedly make it easier to obtain the use of such mediums as radio and TV and thereby to reach the people with the real issues. Candidates in and by themselves, however, do not necessarily mean reaching the ears of the masses. The Socialist-Labor Party sect, for example, has had a presidential candidate on the ballot for many years, but it does not reach the ears of the people. Its political pitch is inaudible to them.

Furthermore, even when there was a Progressive Party presidential ticket in the field in 1952, this did not result in reaching the ears of the millions. As McManus knows from his own experience in the recent New York campaign, the mere running of a candidate does not guarantee full access to the political debate, even if his candidacy did make a notable contribution in helping clarify the issues.

We can appreciate the *Guardian's* concern as to whether the progressive voice will be heard in 1956. This still does not explain its total emphasis upon the early formation of a new party. After all, American experience gives many instances of intervention in political life by independently organized groupings short of full-fledged political parties. The Citizens' P.A.C., the A.D.A., the various non-partisan leagues, are examples of this.

To place sole stress upon a new party and upon the need for candidates "on all possible levels," is to

argue not only for candidates through whom the progressive voice can be heard. It is to argue for a sectarian go-it-alone policy. This, in effect, says that it does not matter a farthing which candidates of the old parties get elected, that candidates must be placed in the field against as many of them as possible.

The next argument of McManus makes this go-it-alone position even clearer. It declares that anti-fascists cannot influence the struggle within the old parties and that the attempt to do so "has fallen flat in the four years since this stratagem has been employed."

As to whether it is possible to influence the masses who support these parties and therefore the struggle within them, we shall touch on a bit later. At this point we are curious which "four years" period McManus means. The simple facts are that as late as two years ago, in the 1952 election, the supporters of the Progressive Party, *including the Communists*, pursued a narrow, rigid, third-party line. This brought them into head-on collision with the organized labor and Negro people's movements. This policy made no distinction whatever between old parties and their candidates, despite the fact that open pro-fascists such as McCarthy and Jenner were running. It plunked almost exclusively for the candidates of the Progressive Party (American Labor Party in New York). The result of that election was interpreted widely as a victory

for McCarthyism and a mandate for the country to go even further to the Right.

McManus apparently has missed the lessons of the 1952 campaign. If there is any ground to his charge that the tactics since then have "fallen flat," this must be doubled in spades for the sectarian go-it-alone tactics of 1952!

The third argument even further reveals the same thinking. McManus cites the lack of a mass peace movement in the country as additional indication that nothing can be done without a new party. But if there is no organized mass peace movement, this could be adduced to prove the opposite—that the time is not ripe to form a third party. But Brother McManus does not see it that way. He argues that the very attempts to form an organized peace movement "have decimated the Progressive Party of 1948."

There can be only one explanation for this reasoning. McManus apparently considers the peace issue in the country as no broader than that of a third party. Hence, for him, the very attempts to build a broader separate peace movement could only be at the expense of the Progressive Party.

Doesn't this stand things on their head? The issue of peace is by no means identical with that of a third party. It is an issue which transcends all political alignments. Peace forces exist *in all parties*. It is the job of the progressive forces to learn

how to work with them, to help make them more articulate and to raise their level of understanding. It is necessary to seek out constantly the best possible forms through which this peace sentiment can find expression. This may not result in a single unified and organized mass movement, but in multiple mass efforts, around specific peace issues, all of which play their part in pressing for a change in foreign policy.

The breadth of the peace sentiment in the country was eloquently shown in the recent election campaign, when President Eisenhower demagogically made his main pitch on this issue. To see the attempts at building a broader and more effective peace movement as in opposition to that of laying the foundations for a third party, or to see the issue of peace as synonymous with that of support for the Progressive Party, is strange thinking indeed. The *real reasons* for the decline of the Progressive Party since 1948 will have to be sought elsewhere.

Argument number four is in many respects McManus' strongest. Here he marshal's evidence to "prove" his contention that the tactics pursued in the 1954 elections have "fallen flat," and that the issue before us is: a third party, now—or else! He shows that despite support given to "liberal" candidates for their "apparent 'anti-McCarthy' attitudes," not a single commitment was won against

the Smith and McCarran Acts. Furthermore, he says, even where Congressmen were elected with the aid of progressive voters, neither the cause of peace nor democracy was strengthened thereby. If anything, things seem to be getting worse. Brownell is pressing for even harsher repressive measures, and Dulles for the same suicidal war course.

How much truth is there in these assertions? It is probably true that **not a single** commitment has been obtained for the repeal of the Smith and McCarran Acts. It is also true that there is a grave danger of even more repressive legislation passing in this session of Congress. Nor has any Congressman or Senator as yet spoken out against the rearmament of Germany.

But is this all that needs to be said? If so, how can one explain the post-election CIO Convention declaration that, "Now is the time for a counter-attack on the civil liberties front?" The CIO likewise demanded that "all federal legislation limiting what people can think and say be removed from the statute books." Is this call for a "counter-attack" accidental? By no means!

Something new did occur in the 1954 elections which makes its results somewhat different from those of 1952. As we have already said, the 1952 election was interpreted widely as a victory for McCarthyism and a popular mandate to go to the

extreme Right. This cannot be said of the 1954 election results. While these cannot be interpreted as a mandate for a swing to the Left, it cannot be denied that McCarthyism received its first major electoral rebuff. This was an unmistakable expression of the nation's growing disgust with the sickening anti-Communist hysteria of the post-war years. It is, therefore, a new fact and one of considerable importance.

Thus, the results of the 1954 election did have something to do with the stand of the CIO Convention. Had the results of the election been otherwise, had the open McCarthyites swept the field as in 1952, the chances are that the CIO leadership would have pulled in its horns even further instead of calling for a "counter-attack."

Whether such a counter-attack really takes place, whether it begins to check the destruction of the Bill of Rights remains to be seen. Much, very much, depends on what is done now, after the elections, to mount the greatest degree of mass pressure.

The 84th Congress is also a reactionary, Big Business dominated one. To see this fact alone is to draw the negative conclusion that nothing can be done until a new and different type of Congress is elected. It is necessary to see that the 84th Congress can be made more responsive to the will of the people. This depends upon a strengthened, more

conscious and more united mass struggle. After all, the 83rd Congress started out as one completely dominated by McCarthy. It ended up by convening a special session to reprimand McCarthy! The importance of this should not be exaggerated. Neither should it be minimized. It only proves that some new winds are blowing and that where mass pressure can be mounted its effects can be felt even upon a reactionary Congress and Administration.

We have said that the election result did not represent a swing to the Left. Was such a development possible in 1954? To a certain extent, yes. It was possible for example, to compel more candidates to take a stand on the issues of peace, civil liberties and Negro rights. If this did not take place on a large enough scale, one of the main reasons is that the *full weight* of the *conscious* peace and progressive forces was not thrown on to the election scales. There was still too much passive sitting on the side lines, too much shoulder-shrugging, too many Leftist excuses that "it makes no difference who wins," "nothing can be done until a third party emerges," "the Communist Control Act means that fascism is already here," etc. Thus, not every opportunity was seized for working with other progressive forces and for generating mass pressure on the vital issues before the

nation. And we make this criticism not alone of some of the followers of the *Guardian*, but in *self-criticism* of many Communists as well.

Another development which could have been interpreted as a popular swing to the Left would have been an overwhelming Democratic sweep. Such a sweep was precluded by the very nature of the Democratic Party campaign. This blurred and confused the issues before the nation and even enabled Eisenhower to once again demagogically don a peace mantle.

However, even within this overall state of affairs a mandate for a new course in foreign and domestic policies could have made itself felt more. This would have occurred had those few candidates who were identified in the public mind with more progressive domestic and foreign policies been elected. We refer in particular to Condon in California and Taylor in Idaho. A victory for Condon would have been a powerful blow at the witch-hunt. A victory for Taylor would have aroused the nation to a realization that a basic change in foreign policy was being demanded. The reactionary forces in both old parties understood this very well. That is why they joined hands to defeat them, as they did Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., in New York. The question to be asked is: Did all progressives understand it as well?

It is important to note, however,

that even in defeat these candidates showed tremendous strength. Condon came very close to election despite everything thrown at him. As for Taylor, the mere fact that he was able to win the state Democratic Party primary is indicative of a changing atmosphere within the country. After all, only six years ago he was the Progressive Party's Vice-Presidential Candidate!

Thus, it is false to assume that because no third party is in the field, election results have no significance. They have significance. In fact, without winning victories within the primaries of the old parties, without the election of more pronounced progressive-minded candidates, it will be impossible to prepare the way for a more basic political re-grouping.

Let us touch on another aspect of this problem. What about those candidates who promised to pursue a progressive course when running for election but who now conveniently forget their promises? This has happened in a number of instances with men elected last November. During the campaign these were compelled to speak out in behalf of civil liberties, for a peaceful negotiation of world differences, for Negro rights, etc. Yet these same congressmen either shamefully voted in support of the President's war-like declaration on Formosa, or abstained.

If this occurred we must ask ourselves: Is it not true that even where organized pressure compelled com-

mitments *before* election day, the same kind of pressure was not continued *after* November 2nd? But the McCarthy-Knowland "war-now" crowd never relents its pressure!

Only when pre-election work is carried over into even more intensive post-election activity can we help transform promises into deeds. This is a lesson that must be learned and before the new congress gets much older. The struggle that developed in the Senate over the President's Formosa declaration is an indication that the time is becoming ripe for breaking the solid congressional front on foreign policy. It is for this reason regrettable that the *Guardian's* call for independent political action had nothing to say about what must be done to influence the actions of Congress this year.

In speaking of candidates who were elected "without Left opposition," McManus writes that this occurred "in most cases with uncritical Left support." It is our judgment that this is too sweeping a charge. In most cases the support was critical and in some cases highly so. But it is not our intention to condone errors made in this direction any more than those in the opposite. We are ready to join with Brother McManus in the sharpest condemnation of all tendencies toward merely "tagging along" with the labor movement in its uncritical support of the Democratic Party and its candidate.

We go even further. We declare that this tendency is an exceedingly

dangerous one. In the name of a mass policy it forgets one simple thing: that it is the duty of all advanced progressives and especially Communists, not merely to work with the political action aims of organized labor and the people's movement, *but to help instill into these new forms a new political content.* This requires bringing greater clarity on the main issues, particularly those of peace, and of exerting a constant, unremitting pressure on labor-endorsed candidates, office holders, and on the political machines. It requires patient and methodical work to win the masses for an understanding that real independent political action necessitates more than a separate electoral apparatus. It necessitates the fight for a more advanced program, for greater labor, Negro, and working farmer representation, and for labor emancipation from dependence upon the Big Business-controlled old party machines.

In our opinion both the tendency of sectarian self-isolation as well as the opportunist "tag along" tendency arise from a certain loss of perspective in face of the acutely difficult and complicated objective conditions. Where these tendencies express themselves in the ranks of Communists, it is because they have not yet been won politically and ideologically for the estimate, line of policy and objectives set forth in the recently adopted Communist Party Program. This Program must be mastered by all Communists and

fought for by them in the ranks of all progressives. It is a Program around which the broadest unity is possible both for today and tomorrow.

It is one thing to oppose uncritical support and to favor independent candidates where necessary, as we do. It is something else entirely to oppose all major party candidates as a matter of principle, as does McManus. The *Guardian's* "Call" makes no distinction between McCarthyism and its opponents. But a distinction must be made, even for those "liberals" whose abject cowardice has strengthened McCarthyism. Let us excoriate these as they deserve, but let us not throw them all into the same basket.

* * *

We believe that Brother McManus has not thought through how and by what means the present drive toward fascism and war is to be blocked and then defeated. He apparently fails to recognize that the very nature of the crises confronting the American people—a crisis of their democratic system, a crisis in foreign policy, and an approaching economic crisis, must inevitably, and are already, creating rifts and cleavages in what has, up to now, appeared as one solid reactionary front. To fail to see these differences, to fail to take advantage of them in the fight for peace and democracy is shortsighted. Of course, there is always the danger of exaggerating

these differences and their significance. There is always the danger of wishful thinking which tends to see a wide chasm in every narrow crack. But even a tiny crack is of some importance and must be utilized in order to drive a wedge between the most extreme pro-war and pro-fascist forces and the rest of America.

The difference between Brother McManus' approach and our own can be seen by his fifth argument about "peaceful coexistence." We certainly agree with him that Eisenhower does not really want such coexistence. But this is not the same as seeing no significance in the fact that Eisenhower was forced to open a national debate on this issue. Nor can we agree with McManus when he makes the acceptance of peaceful coexistence identical with the acceptance of the "enlightened views" that capitalism is on the way out. To put this stress is to destroy the very meaning of the concept of peaceful coexistence.

This concept means nothing more or less than the possibility of different social systems existing side by side without entering into armed conflict. The great majority of Americans can accept this even if they still believe in American capitalism and that it is not on the way out. Thus something positive can emerge from the current mass discussion over this question. That is why the McCarthys and Knowlands so fear this debate.

* * *

McManus desires to build a strong progressive movement that would reverse the reactionary trend in the country. But this, in our opinion, can never be done by viewing the Left-progressives as the ship and all else as the sea. The launching of a third-party ship at this time, no matter how ably manned, cannot bring the American people to their immediate haven. If victory in the present fight depends upon that prospect, then there is indeed little hope of gaining it. But it is our view that victory can be won and it is our determination to win it. For this reason we refuse to go along with "last stands" which consciously or unconsciously are predicated on the perspective of defeat.

If our policy as pursued in the recent election has "fallen flat," let us ask what would have been the outcome had a go-it-alone, run-candidates-all-along-the-line, policy been pursued? In the first place, it would have meant lumping all major party candidates together, regardless of whether they were labor backed, whether they were Negroes, whether they were open McCarthyites, or men with "anti-McCarthy attitudes." Second, it would have meant that where the Left-progressives could help determine the election outcome the most reactionary candidates would have won.

This would have strengthened the most extreme pro-fascist "war-now" forces in Congress and the nation. On top of this it would have widened

the breach between the Left-progressive forces and organized labor, the Negro people and the low-income groups generally. These fear extreme reaction and, whether we like it or not, do distinguish between most Republican and Democratic Party candidates.

Nor would the result for the third party have been a happy one. The vote would have been exceedingly small, because it would have run counter to the main mass current and the fear of Republican McCarthyite reaction. Furthermore, it would have dug an even deeper moat separating the conscious progressives from the great mass of workers and farmers who must be won by them. Lastly, it would have hurt and discredited the very cause of a people's third party. It would have made it easier for the labor and other reformists to "prove" that a third-party movement is something "impractical" and "utopian" and that the present two-party system is ordained to last forever.

It is our opinion that the tactical line pursued by the Communists in the recent election was a sound one and represented the application on a nation-wide scale of the lessons learned from the 1952 elections. Recognizing that both parties represented the interests of Big Business, our Party endeavored to influence the outcome of the election so that the most reactionary forces would suffer defeat. We strove to articulate the will of the people, to bring for-

ward the main issues, to strengthen the unity of labor with its allies, the Negro people, the working farmers, and the city middle classes. Through these means we sought to lay the basis for defeating the drive toward war and fascism, for electing a new Administration in 1956, and for the emergence of a new progressive coalition leading toward the eventual formation of a great new party of labor and its allies.

McManus believes that there is one simple explanation for the decline in the Progressive Party vote since 1948—the lack of will to build it. Were he referring to the will of the masses we could agree with him. But his reference is elsewhere. It is to those in the conscious progressive camp who have, according to him, "decimated the Progressive Party."

Let us see. The Progressive Party was formed in 1948 not merely because someone had a "good idea." It arose as a result of an intense struggle between forces both outside of and within the Democratic Party. During 1947 and the early part of 1948 it appeared as if a permanent break had occurred between organized labor and the Truman Administration. Truman had broken the railroad and steel strikes. Alongside of this development there also occurred an extremely sharp collision over foreign policy. This found its reflection even within the President's Cabinet and within the high councils of the Democratic Party. In fact it was felt in every important mass

movement of that day—the labor movement, the Negro people's movement, the Farmers Union, the Citizens' PAC, the Committee on the Arts, Sciences and Professions, etc. The leader of the fight within the Democratic Party and before the masses was Henry Wallace, former Vice President under Roosevelt and head of the Department of Commerce in Truman's Cabinet.

McManus casts covetous glances backward at the year 1948 as the year of the millenium to which he wants to return. Let him, however, give consideration to these objective and subjective factors which made possible the Progressive Party upsurge of that year. If he does, he will soon realize that it *is* possible to influence the course of the struggle within the old parties, for it was so influenced in 1947 and 1948. Furthermore he will realize that the "imagination" which stirred in 1948 was not some dainty hothouse plant which can be made to bloom under artificial conditions. It was a robust outdoor wild flower, whose seeds were spread throughout the land by the mighty winds of intense controversy over foreign and domestic policy.

What appeared in early 1948 as the makings of a big-break-away from the two-party system did not so materialize. The reactionary labor leadership patched up its differences with the Truman Administration. Truman, the artful showman, made more than one political handspring

in order to steal the show—and the votes—from Wallace.

Without passing judgment at this time as to whether the 1948 third-party venture was premature or not, one thing is as clear as daylight—there have been no visible signs of a break-away since then. We cannot here go into the various reasons for this. Suffice it to say that the *main* explanation for the constant decline in the Progressive Party vote is to be found in this fact and not in a "lack of imagination." And yet, McManus writes that "All the elements for this [new party] are at hand; only the imagination seems to be lacking." If only it were so!

* * *

It therefore follows that while we laud the motives and determination of the *Guardian* to achieve the goal of a third party, we are convinced that the forces do not now exist for anything but an abortive attempt in that direction.

We agree with the great importance of guaranteeing that the voices of the conscious progressives are heard in the "political argument of 1956." However, we do not agree that this requires a go-it-alone, narrow third-party policy. We are convinced that such a policy would only weaken these voices and their influence in the land.

It is also our opinion that the conscious progressive forces must not permit themselves to be cut off from the great mass of organized labor,

despite all the efforts of the reactionary labor leaders to accomplish this. Everything should be done to further the cause of united labor action and organic unity. Everything should be done to advance labor's political action; to further unite labor's political action efforts; and to coordinate these with those of the NAACP, the Farmers' Union, the ADA, and other liberal and progressive groups. Efforts to convince the ranks of labor of the need for an all-labor political action congress are of great importance. This should be convened early enough to influence the 84th Congress and the platforms and candidates for 1956.

Above all else, it is necessary that conscious progressives use initiative and imagination in stimulating the immediate struggles of the people for a greater relaxation of world tension, for civil liberties, for Negro equality, and for jobs and economic security.

It is in the struggles around these issues and in building an ever-mounting pressure upon the Administration and Congress, that the answer to 1956 and to a more fundamental political regrouping will be found.

In the course of these struggles it is necessary to unite the ranks of the conscious progressives around immediate and long-term perspectives. It is particularly necessary to double and triple the circulation of literature and newspapers which bring to the people the truth about the Soviet Union, about Socialism and about the Communist Party.

We are convinced that in these efforts, and despite momentary differences over immediate perspective and tactics, we shall continue to march together with Brother McManus and the *Guardian* in friendship and cooperation.

Eisenhower and Keynesism

By William Z. Foster

KEYNESISM IS THE economics of monopoly capitalism in the period of the general crisis and decline of the world capitalist system. It is the theory, worked out in the main by the late John Maynard Keynes, noted British bourgeois economist, to the effect that by manipulating governmental fiscal policy by various devices, the capitalist economy can be "managed" and "stabilized," with the result that cyclical economic crises, and eventually the general crisis of capitalism itself, can be very greatly mitigated or even eliminated.* This bourgeois illusion is, of course, in contradiction to Marxist economic science and the whole perspective of socialism.

Keynesians are roughly of two variants with regard to the stress that they place upon the several types of governmental business stimulants. The Social Democratic and liberal Keynesians lay considerable weight upon strengthening the purchasing power of the working masses—by improved wages, ex-

panded social insurance, shorter working hours, and the like; whereas the big bourgeois Keynesians, with their "trickle-down" theory, more directly subsidize industry. These differences among the Keynesians largely disappear in practice, however; for as we shall see, they all tend to unite around the ultra-reactionary program of arms production as the best means of invigorating industry.

Keynesism has become the dominant economic policy not only of the government of the United States, but of all the major capitalist governments. The United Nations has also given Keynesism its blessing in its so-called program for full employment.** The first practical step in the direction of a Keynesian anti-crisis policy was taken by President Hoover at the outset of the great economic crisis (1929-33), when he launched the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and proceeded to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into it, for the purpose of subsidizing and revitalizing various sick and hungry banks, railroads, and industrial corporations. Hoover's stated

* J. M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Money, and Interest*.

** O. Nathan, *Science and Society*, Summer 1951.

purpose was that if these concerns could be made prosperous corresponding benefits would eventually "trickle down" to the millions of unemployed workers. But the whole scheme failed dismally; as industry continued to collapse, the army of the unemployed mushroomed, and actual starvation conditions developed among the masses, climaxing in a general economic breakdown.

After Roosevelt was swept into office the country, from March 1933 on, was treated to another and bigger dose of Keynesian policies designed to stimulate industry. But this time there was a somewhat different content to it. That is, without neglecting the profits of the corporations, Roosevelt, by various make-work devices, undertook to furnish some degree of improved purchasing power to the working masses. To this general end, during the next six years, he expended about \$40 billion of government funds. But this dose of Keynesian economic drugs could not revive the stricken economic system. All through the period, until 1939, when the demand for munitions for World War II revived industry, the economic system remained crippled; the unemployed in the United States ranging from 7,000,000 to 10,000,000. The Roosevelt-Keynesian measures proved quite unable to overcome what Stalin called "the depression of a special kind." The dribble that the workers got in relief and in make-work could not offset the tremendous exploitation of the

workers that was taking place in industry and was causing the economic crisis.

EISENHOWER'S KEYNESIAN PROGRAM

The Eisenhower Administration, like those of Truman, Roosevelt, and Hoover before it, is also committed to the Keynesian program of stimulating industry through fiscal manipulation, especially by cultivating government expenditures. Eisenhower shares the general illusion of the bulk of the bourgeois economists, to the effect that, with "correct" governmental policies, economic crises can be greatly reduced in severity, if not ended altogether. The "experts" no longer subscribe to the conviction, prevalent among them a generation ago, that periodic economic crises were inherent in the capitalist system and that nothing can be done about them except to let them blow themselves out.

Upon various occasions, President Eisenhower has declared emphatically that this country, under Republican leadership, will never again be allowed to slip into a serious economic crisis. He and his economic soothsayers constantly reassure the American people that the country's present "prosperity" reflects the soundness in general of the capitalist system. But they, themselves, do not take too seriously their own pollyanna propaganda. In fact they are seriously alarmed at the present uncertain economic situation, with at

least 3,500,000 workers fully unemployed and several millions more working on short time, and which the A. F. of L. experts and other conservative bourgeois economists forecasting an early increase of the unemployed to at least 4,000,000. While the Eisenhower Government would welcome a sizable reserve army of unemployed, its economic and political leaders fear that a major industrial crisis could have catastrophic effects upon the economic and political position of world capitalism. Hence, the policy of the Administration, aiming to stave off such a possible disaster, is to have increasing recourse to Keynesian measures of giving industry systematic financial shots-in-the-arm.

Alan Sweezy thus sizes up the thinking and practice of the Administration upon this general matter (*The Nation*, Jan. 29, 1955):

That serious depressions are a thing of the past has now become official Republican doctrine. In all his public statements Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has emphasized that we need not and will not allow another major depression to develop. President Eisenhower, speaking to the National Security Industrial Association on October 25, referred to the fears which have preyed upon people in the last two decades and added, "Certainly we know that one such fear—the fear of paralyzing depressions—can be safely laid away."

Time and again Eisenhower has reiterated such opinions.

The general idea of the Government, of course, is to forestall such a shattering crisis with governmental preventive measures. These include subsidizing and otherwise ruthlessly conquering foreign trade, and the manipulation of tax, interest, and installment purchase rates to favor the well-to-do and to encourage mass buying. But the Administration, to maintain industrial activity, especially relies upon wholesale government spending. In fact, the main job of the Council of Economic Advisors is, with a hand on the economic pulse of the nation, to propose the "necessary" Keynesian stimulants. These expenditures under the Eisenhower regime consist primarily of monster outlays for armaments production up to \$45 billion a year, and when even these are obviously inadequate, the development of vast programs of road-building—the \$101 billion, 10-year plan—with other big public projects in prospect, if need be.

During the Roosevelt regime the Republicans took great pleasure in ridiculing the whole New Deal make-work program as just so much "boondoggling." But now that they are in office themselves they are applying related Keynesian schemes on a far greater scale than anything ever undertaken by Roosevelt. In one year they are spending as much as Roosevelt did in ten, for this general purpose. But no longer is it a case of leaf-raking under the W.P.A.,

or of small-time project contracts under the P.W.A. Now it is a matter of Big Business, of the Federal government systematically subsidizing industry (trickle-down fashion) on a gigantic scale, and with the whole program carefully geared to the needs and interests of finance-monopoly capital.

THE KEYNESIAN ELEMENT IN ARMS PRODUCTION

The perfect example of adapting government stimulants for industry to the needs and interests of Big Business, of merging Keynesism and imperialism, is to be found in the case of Federal armaments production. The main-line policy of American imperialism is the establishment of world domination for the Wall Street financial and economic moguls by military intimidation and eventually a third, atomic, world war. This is the only possible rational interpretation of the vast military establishment that the United States is building up in this country and in its 950 bases abroad; of systematic arrogance of Washington in dealing with the Soviet Union, People's China, and the People's Democracies of Europe and Asia; and of the frenzied attempts of the United States to re-arm West Germany and Japan and to create an all-inclusive world capitalist anti-Communist alliance.

To undertake this monstrous—and foredoomed—project of world conquest, the Washington sabre-

rattlers need endless numbers of armed men and measureless quantities of munitions of all sorts. These, however, are being assembled at such a rapid pace that the standard of living of the American people is being seriously reduced, the hospital and school systems of the whole country are going to the dogs and many other essential institutions are being starved for lack of funds. What is particularly of vital importance in this whole matter is that the building of the monstrous and dangerous military machine and this exhausting drain upon the resources of the American people are being facilitated and furthered by Keynesian pressures coming from various classes of the population. These pressures arise from the widespread conviction that such vast military expenditures are necessary for the maintenance of American prosperity.

This notion of the economic necessity of arms production is held very widely. Businessmen and bourgeois government officials accept it as a commonplace that arms production stimulates industry, and they widely hold the idea that if this production were seriously to be cut off this would almost immediately result in a deep industrial collapse. This general point of view is also dominant in labor and liberal ranks. Hyman Lumer states:

Today, even "liberal" Keynesians have for the most part become theoretical apologists for expansionist policies

and huge military budgets as the principal means of saving American capitalism. Indeed, enormous military outlays and the endless expansion of the national debt are widely defended as the very cornerstone of capitalist prosperity.*

In fact, this is all in line with the doctrines of Keynes himself who defended war production as the most effective of all means for stimulating industry.**

Most dangerous, the arms-for-jobs theory is firmly rooted in the labor movement, among the masses of workers. The leaders of organized labor do not usually demand outright the increases of war production appropriations as the means to keep workers employed, but it is an open secret that this, nonetheless, is their firm policy. This is why they not only do not oppose the gigantic military expenditures of the government, but they always clamor for more—under the usual hypocritical pretext of the need of more and more "national defense." Let anyone propose to cut the war appropriations by ever so little and he will at once have the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. bureaucrats on his neck. This was Eisenhower's experience last year in his moderate cut of the air-force appropriation.

The Eisenhower government is now spending double as much for war preparations as was squandered by the Truman government (also a regime of Big Business) before

the outbreak of the Korean war. This enormous increase in military expenditures has, in no small measure, been facilitated by Keynesian considerations among the people that it makes for national prosperity. Significant of the adaptability and availability of Keynesian ideas to the program of the warmongers is the fact that in promoting his new \$101 billion road program, President Eisenhower's chief argument is that it is necessary for national defense.

Without doubt, in general, the Keynesian conception that arms production is an indispensable stimulus for industry constitutes a tremendous and continuing support to the war program of American imperialism. Without it, the warmongers would have vastly greater difficulties, if they did not find it impossible, to wrest from the American people the present colossal military appropriations and to induce them to submit to the poisonous burden and danger of the mushrooming militarism. American monopoly capital backs the war munitions program in a double sense; first, and mainly, because it is indispensable to its campaign of imperialist aggression, and second, because "it is good for business." Keynesism is thus a faithful handmaiden for American imperialism.

EISENHOWER'S KEYNESISM AND MAXIMUM PROFITS

Eisenhower's Keynesian policies also fit into the interests of mo-

* H. Lumer, *War Economy and Crisis*, p. 29.
** *The New Republic*, July 29, 1940.

nopoly capital in additional vital respects, as well as into its war program. Among other effects, his insolent give-away programs and one-sided tax policies, designed to enrich the big corporations, are quite in line with the Hoover-Eisenhower trickle-down Keynesian conception. These conceptions and policies also further the concentration of capital and the growth and political entrenchment of monopoly capital. Thus, the war appropriations, with their strong Keynesian element, are dished out by the government primarily to a handful of monopolies. "Of some \$175 billion in prime contracts awarded to 18,539 corporations between June 1940 and September 1944, no less than two-thirds went to the top 100 corporations and fully 30 per cent went to the top ten."* Besides thus building up the monopolies, the very nature of this business of grabbing government contracts facilitates what Stalin called the "subjugation of the state" by the monopoly capitalists.

In the same pro-monopoly spirit the Federal war appropriations, in which, as we have seen, there is such a large Keynesian element of motivation, especially conform to the law of maximum profits, as outlined by Stalin. That is, with lush war contracts at their disposal, the big monopolies, during World War II and in the post-war period, have been reaping profits upon an unparalleled scale. From 1936 to 1953 average yearly profits after taxes, leaped

from \$4.1 billion to \$19.4 billion. This is maximum profits on a basis undreamed of in any other capitalist country. The big monopolies got a disproportionate share of this unprecedented harvest of blood profits.

The Eisenhower Administration, we may be sure, will also organize all of its Keynesian program, so far as it can, upon a similar maximum profits basis. In this respect, it is well for us to take another look back at the Republican-big businessmen's attitude towards the Roosevelt-Keynesian make-work program. It will be remembered that while they scorned in general Roosevelt and all his works, they nevertheless had a somewhat different estimate of the Works Progress Administration (W.P.A.) than they had of the Public Works Administration (P.W.A.). That is, while they hated the W.P.A. and heaped all kinds of venom and condemnation upon it, they displayed much less viciousness toward the P.W.A. The reason for this marked differentiation in capitalist attitude was because in the W.P.A., which was almost exclusively a relief organization, the government generally hired the workers directly, with the effect that capitalist profit-making was reduced to a bare minimum and in most instances eliminated. But in the case of the P.W.A. the situation was very different. In the P.W.A., which based itself mainly upon make-work contracts let out to private enterprise, the profit-mak-

* H. Lumer, *War Economy and Crisis*, p. 209.

ing element consequently was distinctly conserved. Therefore, while the capitalists could not find words bitter enough to condemn the W.P.A., they could speak of the P.W.A. with almost a degree of tolerance, if not of actual support.

Therefore, when Eisenhower proposes a \$101 billion road program and talks of various other huge public works projects to be applied, if necessary, in order to "stabilize" the national economy in the face of the severe crisis threat, we can be sure that he has very much in mind to apply the basic law of monopoly capitalism—the ruthless quest for maximum profits. This would merely be carrying to its logical conclusion the earlier inclination of the capitalists towards the profit-making P.W.A. projects of the Roosevelt period and towards the Hoover "trickle-down" schemes of the earlier crisis years. The whole effort of the Administration in its giant road-making and other "boon-doggling" programs will be to give out the work to private contractors upon a maximum profits basis.

This is Keynesism a-la-mode, with it dovetailed completely into the basic interests of the monopolists—trickle-down theory, maximum profits grab, aggressive war program, and all. They are fundamentally mistaken who think that Keynesism is a program only of the "liberal" bourgeoisie and of various petty bourgeois and skilled labor strata, and that it

therefore cannot be applied by the monopolists. Keynesism is above all the program of monopoly capital. They, too, are mistaken who believe that the monopolists think in Keynesian terms only with regard to the production of war materials. Big Business, when it considers the economic-crisis danger grave enough, will not hesitate to grasp at various other large-scale make-work projects on the Keynesian pattern, of which the Eisenhower \$101 billion road program is an indicator. They will seek to organize all such projects upon a maximum-profits "trickle-down" basis, even as they are now doing with the production of the munitions of war.

THE FIGHT AGAINST THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

The program of the Eisenhower Administration, with its large admixture, as we have seen, of Keynesian economics, bodes ill for the American people. It cultivates all the dangerous economic, political, and military forces now menacing this country and the world. It definitely tends to exhaust the country economically and in the long run to develop contradictions which can only sharpen and deepen the economic crisis. The maximum profits element in Eisenhower's program, including so-called make-work projects, also can only result in sucking up the economic resources of the people into the maw

of the monopolists and thus to help lay the basis for an eventual sweeping economic crisis. The same is true of the "trickle-down" theory of "prosperity." This, too, is a project for enriching the monopolies at the expense of the people, and it is a fundamental builder of economic crisis.

One of the worst features of the arms production program as a panacea against economic crisis is that it also tends to tie the whole conservative top leadership of the trade unions into a bastard united front with the monopoly capitalists which hamstring the workers' capacity to struggle effectively against the war danger, against McCarthyism, against economic disaster, and against all other reactionary currents. Arms production also sows the worst sort of prosperity illusions among the masses and confuses them as to where their best interests lie.

The *Program* of the Communist Party presents a general and detailed program for fighting all aspects of the reactionary policies of the Eisenhower regime. Therefore, it is unnecessary to restate all this in the present article. Timely are only a few remarks upon the general points here raised, specifically with regard to the Keynesian content of the Eisenhower program.

Organized labor, especially in view of its new strength from the developing A. F. of L.-C.I.O. merger, and with regard to the continuing danger of an economic crisis, has a greater

need than ever to develop an effective economic program. Firstly, this program must attack the Big Business-labor bureaucracy conception that arms production is a legitimate and effective means to alleviate the crisis danger in the economic situation. It must instead, most of all, fight to strengthen the workers' purchasing power through improved wages, shorter hours, lowered taxes, reduced prices, broader social insurance, etc., that will more than substitute for the ultra-dangerous arms munitions program, and it must bring forward a whole series of measures of public works of all kinds—roads, flood control, education, health, etc.

Secondly, labor's program must also make a head-on attack against the maximum profits robbery by the monopolists, whether this manifests itself in industry, in arms production, in road-building, or in what not. The whole danger of an economic crisis and generally of low working-class living standards originates in the capitalist profit motive. The bigger the capitalist profits the greater the harm wrought to the economic position of the toiling masses. To make the greatest possible slash into capitalist profits, especially those of the big monopolies, therefore, must be a central objective of labor's economic and political program.

Thirdly, the "trickle-down" theory, which ex-President Hoover first expressed in the Keynesian subsidi-

zation of the big corporations during the 1929-33 economic crisis, is another policy and practice that must meet with the most vigorous opposition from the workers. This concept, raised to justify the worst exploitation of the workers, was expressed by C. E. Wilson in his notorious statement that what is good for General Motors is good for the United States. The militant way he was assailed for stating this characteristic big-monopoly position speaks well for the spirit and alertness of the working class. Against the barbarous trickle-down program of monopoly capital we must counterpose the cultivation of the economic interests of the workers, doubly so when it is also a case of fortifying the people against the onset of a cyclical economic crisis.

As the Communist Party has pointed out not only in its present *Program*, but also on many other

occasions, it is possible to alleviate somewhat the effects of the cyclical economic crisis upon the workers by the initiation of public works and by strengthening systematically the purchasing power of the working masses through improved wages, etc. But the arms production, maximum profits gouging and "trickle-down" practices of Big Business can only aggravate the situation in the long run and expose the toilers to an inevitable economic holocaust. In all the relief measures we may advocate against the onset of the cyclical economic crisis, we must never forget that these can be no more than palliatives. Only Socialism, by completely abolishing worker exploitation, which is the basic cause of all capitalist overproduction and economic stagnation, can finally put an end to the horrors and miseries of the capitalist cyclical economic crisis.

The Informer System and Democracy

By Herbert Aptheker

BISMARCK, A CHARTER MEMBER of the Red-baiters' international racket, knew a thing or two about informers and police spies, since these were important to his benign administration of Prussia. He had his troubles with them, however, as he explained to his wife in unburdening what passed for his heart. He wrote to her:

Owing to lack of material, police agents lie and exaggerate outrageously. . . . Bad characters among them—good characters do not accept such posts—naturally hit upon the idea that if other people will not attempt any crimes, they must be helped. For if it is impossible for them to report that something is doing, they become superfluous, and of course no one wants to be superfluous. So they help out, "correcting fortune," as the French adage has it.

Characteristic of the ruling-class arrogance and amorality in this passage is the assumption that the agents are "bad" while its author remains—Prince Bismarck. Of course, it was his policy of reactionary terror at home and violent aggressiveness abroad that necessitated, among other things, the use of stool-pigeons and informers to spread panic and

confusion, and to "justify" the jailing of those patriots who opposed his ruinous program. The procurer is contemptuous of the prostitute.

Something like this is happening today in our country as the rot surrounding the whole informer framework is being uncovered. For example, *Time Magazine* (Feb. 14, 1955), commenting on Harvey Matusow's *False Witness*,* tells its readers that, "The F.B.I. has known for years that Matusow was a squalid liar," and, "The F.B.I. now says that it dropped him in 1950."

Of course, the F.B.I. knew that Matusow "was a squalid liar"—*that is why it employed him*. And it is lying again, perhaps out of sheer habit, when it says that it "dropped him in 1950." It is since 1950 that the F.B.I. really used Matusow. Just last year, in the frameup of Clinton Jencks of the Mine-Mill Union, and in the SACB farce involving the Labor Youth League, his lying testimony was crucial. And above all, his perjuries ran through 700 pages of testimony in the 1952 Smith Act trial

* Published by Cameron & Kahn, N. Y., \$1.25 (paper); \$3 (cloth).

that resulted in the jailing of Comrades Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Pettis Perry and their eleven co-defendants.

* * *

In Matusow's triumphant days, when he was a squalid liar and a sneaking stool-pigeon, he was Big Business' Model American Youth. He was loud and glib and boastful; merciless and cynical and greedy; wily and ignorant and uncouth. He was the Success Kid, fit friend for Roy Cohn and Howard Rushmore and George Sokolsky; he was "A Great American" as the very greatest American, Senator McCarthy, assured him, in writing; he was the Mickey Spillane of the witness stand, the Glamor Boy of the witch-hunting circuit.

And he didn't only make the night-club circuit with Roy and his "girl friends," and he didn't only get stinking drunk with Low-Blow Joe. No, sir; he was a consultant for the United States Department of Justice (if Wilson's Department is of Defense, then Brownell's is of Justice), and for the *New York Times*. His expert opinion was sought out by the President of Queens College who made a special trip to visit the young savant in his home; he guided the views and acts of the Superintendent of Education of New York City and of his chief investigator; he aided the Police Commissioner of the same city; he was personally greeted by the Governor of Wisconsin.

Principals of high schools vied with each other to get him to address their student bodies; radio stations offered him time; television companies proudly brought his visage to millions of homes; the Hearst chain serialized his sterling contributions in newspapers also reaching millions; the American Legion paid him hundreds of dollars to write and speak for veterans; he became one of the censors of American culture helping to determine which artists were pure enough to perform. He helper smear and ruin and impoverish and jail men and women so far his superiors that he was not worthy to pare their toenails. And all this as the lackey of a ruling class set on the path of fascism and of world war.

Some of the sordid details of this American Success Story are in his *False Witness*. Every page records some "minor" infraction of law and of decency. Telephones tapped; the postal franking privilege violated; executive session material deliberately "leaked" to the press; money meant for the anti-Communist "crusade" used to speculate in soybeans; the subpoena powers of Senatorial Committees flouted and witnesses spirited out of the country; friendly witnesses being examined in closed sessions by Senatorial committees and, "After each question was asked, we stopped and had an off-the-record discussion about what the best answer would be."

But behind it all a policy of fas-

cism and war; behind it all the State apparatus, the courts, the prosecutors, the police, the politicians, the whole gamut of ultra-respectability with malice aforethought using venomous creatures and filthy means to whip up an anti-Communist hysteria, an anti-Soviet hysteria—a paralysis of mind and nerve, the better to put over the destruction of the Bill of Rights and the launching of atomic war.

The central means—the Big Lie of Hitler. And then, jail the Communists, smash the organized labor movement, discredit the New Deal traditions, identify dissent with treason and finally—Heil!

“I had to relive every experience I had had as a Communist—taking innocent remarks and events and making them sound properly sinister.” And with the help of the Justice Department he did the twisting, and in this book he spells out the exact nature of the lies he told that were so important in sending to jail Communists and others and forcing teachers and workers to lose their jobs.

In his general stool-pigeon activity and his “witnessing” he was, he writes, “in constant touch with management.” He worked in closest contact with General Electric and the Texas & Pacific Railroad, with major department stores, broadcasting concerns, publishing houses, aircraft firms. One of his buddies and “contacts” was a Colonel Warner, head of Ohio’s Civil Defense, who

quite conveniently also conducted a private investigating organization whose “services are sold to plants and business concerns not only in Ohio but throughout the United States.” Another was a retired Colonel Amos who lived in Washington, worked hand-in-glove with McCarthy and “had a private spy network throughout Europe,” and of whom he, Matusow, had heard “that one of Beria’s agents was in direct contact with him.”

This is his story and *this* story is substantiated with dozens of affidavits and photostats of pertinent documents ranging from Army orders to letters, telegrams, subpoenas, quotations from court and committee records. *This* story (and one feels that Matusow has still told only a fraction of what he knows) is substantiated not only by the documentation that would convince any inquiring brain, but also by detailed and consistent and credible circumstantial evidence. Moreover, fundamentally, *this* story is substantiated by the way in which it coincides with what has been happening in our country; it fits into and helps fill out the whole scheme of contemporary American history.

Communists have *known* that *all* the stoolpigeons, not only Matusow, were liars and that the whole Smith Act prosecution was a monstrous fabrication from beginning to end. They knew their Comrades who have been jailed and arrested and they knew, as they know the faces of their

children, that the whole anti-Communist campaign was and is a complete frameup in its every detail and in its entirety. But others who do not have the advantages of Communists will be helped to see something of it by this volume—an historic contribution to unmasking the nature of the administration of justice today under Attorney General Brownell. Above all, they will be helped to see, that while the Communists have been the first victims of the reactionary terror, it actually aims at every liberty and right that Americans have won, that it aims at the labor unions, at the Negro people, at elementary democracy—at worldwide war.

* * *

Something of this impact is already evident in the response that the book has evoked. Even the *New Leader* was able to squeeze out of a long “psychoanalytic” inquiry into “why Matusow did it,” this line: “If we have sent people to jail on perjured evidence, that fact is important to all of us”!

Others have done much better. Notable was the reaction of Barry Gray, a syndicated columnist and TV commentator. He found Matusow’s book to be “a shocking expose of the weakness of our investigative system.” And he went so far as to raise serious and valid demands:

Open the Matusow file with an investigation of investigations. Examine

the blacklist technique. Cross-examine every individual mentioned in his book. Let us properly allocate some of the blame—what we have left after draping it on ourselves.

Murray Kempton, in his *New York Post* column, responded even more sharply. The Matusow book leads him to write that the Smith Act trials were based upon an idea that “was nonsense on its face” and that therefore, to convict Communists it was necessary “to substitute a malignant fantasy for reality.” He says that the fantasy was concocted not by Matusow but by “Harry Truman and J. Edgar Hoover.” He calls for an awakening from the witch-hunting drug.

Especially noteworthy was the *New York Times’* editorial denunciation of the Justice Department’s attempt to ascribe the widespread opposition to the informer system to “a Communist effort.” The *Times*, after some Communist-baiting of its own, nevertheless goes on in the strongest terms to excoriate the Department for seeking in this way to silence accumulating protests against its “repeated use of totally unreliable paid professional informers.”

The increasing anti-McCarthy mass pressures, the manifestly growing popular discontent with the Big Business policy of repression, is of course basic to the production of such an editorial and to such columns as those which Messrs. Gray and Kempton are now writing.

Similarly, these pressures are the basic causes of the retractions of a Matusow and of a Marie Natvig and Lowell Watson, and those to follow.

To seek out individual motivations for a book like *False Witness* is probably illusory and is in any case, irrelevant to its historic meaning. The book reflects the wholesale perversion of justice where a ruling class drives towards fascism; that its author chose to make those revelations and that they finally found publishers and that the book is now reaching tens of thousands of people, despite frantic efforts by the F.B.I. to kill it, is likewise testimony to the developing opportunities in our country to really rout McCarthyism.

* * *

In his volume, Matusow tells how upsetting to him, during the 1952 Smith Act trials, were the faces of the defendants, for as he sat there swearing to lie after lie at the government's prodding he knew that they knew he was lying. He remarks especially the hatred and the contempt in the eyes of Comrade Claudia Jones.

Comrade Jones, at the time, before being sentenced, told the Court:

You will no doubt choose as the basis for sentence the concocted lies which flowed so smoothly from the well-paid tongues of stool-pigeons and informers who paraded before you here and gave so-called evidence which the Court has asserted was "amply justified."

"Amply justified," your Honor?

What has been amply justified? The lies of degenerate witnesses . . . "Amply justified"! Indeed! This "evidence"!

And Comrade Eugene Dennis, in his summation to the jury at the 1949 Smith Act trials, put his finger on the whole meaning and significance of lying stoolpigeon "evidence." He said, in this magnificent speech that deserves to be studied and re-studied:

The jury might draw some conclusions of its own from the prosecution's false witnesses, who testified that they covenanted with the prosecution for thirty pieces of silver, and from that time sought opportunity to betray their trade-union brothers, their own blood relatives, the family next door.

They testified that they were employed by the F.B.I., which schooled them to ply their sordid tale of falsification, provocation, and disruption. They confessed—nay, boasted—that they are without shame and scruple.

Thus the prosecution's false witnesses inadvertently proved the Marxist thesis that end and means are inter-related and inseparable. They proved that the despicable conspiratorial methods adopted by the prosecution in its desperate attempt to convict the defendants are as un-American as they are sinister.

The fact is that the only conspiracy which has been proved in this trial is that to which the prosecution and its false witnesses are party—the bipartisan conspiracy to destroy the Bill of Rights and peace.

* * *

Matusow's book, *False Witness*,

lifts just a little the covering over the sewer that is the Department of Justice and the F.B.I. That for this, and for his belated efforts to undo some of the terrible harm he has brought about, he should now have been sentenced, by an arm of that Department, to a three-year prison term, is rather ironic confirmation of the filth in that sewer.

This scandalous reaction by the Department of Justice, of compounding injustice—jailing its stoolpigeons for confessing their perjuries, and jailing them for the confessions, not for the perjuries!—is indicative of the especially foul nature of that Department after ten years of Cold War and hot reaction. It shows further

that to secure elementary justice today, exposure is but the beginning; exposure must be accompanied by and followed up with the broadest possible mass pressure to clean up the stench in the Brownell stable.

This book helps to spark a campaign for a thorough public probe of the whole informer and frame-up system of "justice" in this country, for the freeing of all political prisoners in our country, and for the repeal of the entire structure of fascist-like thought control acts which spawns the breed of spy and informer. Such a campaign can help save democracy, honor and peace for our country; to participate in it is the highest form of patriotism.

The General Line of the CPSU and Vulgarizers of Marxism*

By D. Shepilov

I

RECENTLY AMONG certain economists and teachers views began to form which are alien to Marxist-Leninist political economy and the general line of the Communist Party. These views relate to certain basic questions of the development of socialist economics.

We have before us the thesis of E. Kasimovsky, a candidate of economic science in the Moscow Institute of Finance, on the theme: "On the relationships of the tempos of growth of the two departments** of social production"; two articles submitted to the editors of the journals, *Problems of Economics* and *Problems of Philosophy*, by D. Kuznetsov, "On the relationships of the tempos of growth of departments 1 and 2** in the course of extended socialist reproduction," by E. Kasimovsky on "The relationships of the tempos of growth of the two departments of socialist production," and by P.

* This article, by the editor of *Pravda*, appeared in that newspaper Jan. 24, 1955. The translation offered here appeared in *National Affairs*, March, 1955.

** By Department 1, Marx referred to the production of the means of production; by Department 2, he referred to the production of the articles of consumption. See, Marx' *Capital*, Vol. II (Kerr edit.), p. 457.—Ed.

Mstislavsky on "Certain problems of the theory of socialist reproduction," all candidates of economic science; addresses at two discussions of the problems of extended socialist reproduction given by candidate A. Paltsev; and other materials.

The essence of the conceptions in these articles and speeches can be described schematically as follows:

In capitalist conditions the aim of production is the extraction of profits. The method of increasing profits is the extension of production. Production for the sake of production is characteristic of capitalism. Thus, production is divorced from consumption and is in deepest contradiction with it. The production of consumer goods systematically lags behind the production of the means of production because of the fall in the purchasing power of the population. Under the capitalist mode of production the law of the priority of the reproduction of the means of production means that it goes on at a far faster tempo than the production of consumer goods. The laws governing the processes of the socialist mode of production are altogether different. Here the aim of

production is man and his requirements. Therefore, the priority of development of the production of the means of production, heavy industry, these economists write, cannot be the law of the socialist mode of production; if such were the case, there would inevitably be formed, and accelerated, contradictions between production and consumption. The priority of the development of the production of the means of production, heavy industry, was therefore a necessity only in the first stages of the development of socialist society when our country was backward. Now that we have created a powerful industry the situation is radically changing. Production under Socialism is carried on for consumption. A still faster growth of the production of the means of production, heavy industry, they say, contradicts the basic economic law of Socialism. From this far-reaching conclusions are drawn: the policy which is being carried through by the Party of accelerated development of branches of heavy industry comes, as it were, into conflict with the basic economic law of Socialism, because the accelerated development of branches of heavy industry slows down popular consumption.

Crudely distorting the essence of the decisions of the Party and the government on the increase of the production of articles of popular consumption, the authors declare that since 1953 the Soviet Union has entered a new stage of economic devel-

opment, the essence of which consists, so to speak, of a radical change in the economic policy of the Party. If formerly the Party laid emphasis on the development of *heavy* industry, then now the centre of gravity has shifted to the development of *light* industry, to the production of articles of popular consumption. In an effort to put forward their prescriptions as though they were demanded by the basic economic law of Socialism, these economists propose that for the entire period of the completion of the construction of socialist society and the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism, uniform tempos be set for the development of heavy and light industry, or even to secure the priority of the development of light industry as compared with heavy industry.

If such ideas became widespread they would cause heavy damage to the whole cause of communist construction. It would lead to a complete disorientation of our cadres on the basic questions of the economic policies of the Party. In practice, it would mean that the development of our heavy industry, which is the backbone of socialist economy, would travel along a descending line, would lead to a contraction of all branches of the people's economy and not to an upturn, to a lower living standard, to the undermining of the economic power of the Soviet land and her defense capabilities.

As is well known, the Right restorationists once tried to push the

Party along this line. But the Party defeated these capitulatory prescriptions. Guided by Marxist-Leninist economic theory the Party moved ahead, at forced tempos, the production of the means of production, heavy industry, and on that basis guaranteed the mighty development of the people's economy, for the reason that heavy industry was, is, and will be the granite foundation of all branches of socialist economy and the fundamental basis of the power and popular well-being of the Soviet Union.

II

It is indisputable that in the conditions of capitalism the growth of the productive forces comes into collision with the narrow limits of popular consumption; that with the growth of social wealth, concentrated in the hands of the possessing classes, the poverty of the masses becomes ever greater; that here the contradiction between production and consumption is revealed as the main contradiction of capitalism—between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation.

It is also known that under Socialism the aim of production is not profit, but the maximum satisfaction of the growing demands of the whole of society, that production serves popular consumption, and that as social wealth grows so the well-being of the whole people is constantly raised

The essence of the matter is this, that the economists named here distort the Marxist theory of reproduction and attempt to conceal the revisionist kernel of their conceptions by false citations from Marx and Lenin.

Speaking about the laws of development of Department 1 of social production (the production of the means of production) and Department 2 of social production (the production of articles of consumption) E. Kasimovsky declares that "*Marx did not lay down any kind of law in the tempos of growth of both departments.*" This does not correspond with the facts. In the *Theories of Surplus Value*, for example, Marx wrote:

A relatively large part of the masses of the workers are utilized for the production of the means of production, and not for the reproduction of the products themselves, i.e., they are occupied in the reproduction of machine equipment (including here the means of communication and transport, and also construction), auxiliary materials (coal, gas, lubricants, drive belts, etc.) and crops which compose the raw materials for industrial products. [Re-translated from Russian.]

Marx and Lenin frequently showed that the development of the productive forces of any society indicates the increase of the share of social labor spent on the production of the means of production, as compared with the share spent upon the production of consumer goods. In cap-

italist conditions, this finds expression in the unceasing growth of the organic composition of capital which conditions the growth of unemployment and the ever-increasing impoverishment of the working people. In the conditions of Socialism, the predominant growth of the means of production serves as the basis for raising popular well-being.

Lenin taught:

In order to extend production ('to accumulate' in the categorical meaning of the term), it is necessary to produce first of all the means of production, and to do this it is necessary, consequently, to extend that sector of social production which makes the means of production.

The priority of growth of the production of the means of production in comparison with the production of consumer goods, in extended reproduction, Lenin called an economic law.

Our newly-arrived critics of the Marxist theory of reproduction attempt now to prove that these Marxist-Leninist theses apply only to the capitalist mode of production. Thus, E. Kasimovsky declares that the rapid tempos of the development of the production of the means of production, heavy industry, is a law-governed process only of the capitalist mode of production and flows from the basic economic law of capitalism. As concerns the social mode of production, the theses, it is said, changes radically. In his article he writes:

The accentuated growth of Department 1 is not a law of all processes of

extended reproduction, but is inherent only in capitalist reproduction. . . . In our opinion declarations about the necessity of the constantly accentuated growth of Department 1 are not only theoretically unfounded, but practically incorrect.

Such claims are a crude distortion of Marxist-Leninist economic theory and the decisions of the Communist Party for the industrialization of the country and socialist reproduction.

Drawing conclusions from the enormous experience of socialist construction in our country J. V. Stalin emphasized that such basic propositions of the Marxist theory of reproduction as that relating to the division of social production into the production of the means of production and the production of consumer goods, and the theses of the priority of the growth of the production of the means of production, that is, heavy industry, in extended reproduction, and so on, are true not only for capitalist economics, but have no less significance for socialist society in the planning of the people's economy. (See Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*)

Lenin and Stalin emphasized thousands of times that the decisive link in socialist industrialization is the growth of heavy industry, the production of the means of production. "*The centre of industrialization, its basis, is the growth of heavy industry (fuel, metals, etc.) and the growth, in the final analysis, of the production of the means of production, the development of our own*

machine-building." (Stalin).

They also emphasized thousands of times that in the successful development of the people's economy the rapidly accentuated *tempo* of the growth of heavy industry is of decisive importance. They exposed the theory of the Right capitulators who tried to tie the Party to a program of "cotton print industrialization" and to secure preferred tempos for the growth of light industry. Stalin declared:

This has nothing in common with Marxism, with Leninism. It is a bourgeois theory, designed to reinforce the backwardness of our country.

It is well known that in the course of the entire history of the economic development of the Soviet land the Communist Party, guided by the Marxist theory of reproduction, followed a consistent policy of accelerated tempos in the growth of *heavy* industry, machine-building. It was precisely that policy which guaranteed the transformation of our country into a great industrial power, the socialist transformation of agriculture and the constant rise of the people's well-being.

III

By revising the general line of the Party in questions of heavy industry economists of the type of Kasimovsky are creating a false subterfuge. Thus, Kasimovsky declares that the rapid and accentuated growth of the production of the means of produc-

tion, heavy industry, was necessary and was demanded by economic laws, only when our country was technically backward, agrarian. Now, things have radically changed, as it were. The still faster growth of the production of the means of production, heavy industry, cannot be the law-governed process of the socialist means of production.

Seconding him, D. Kuznetsov says:

Once large-scale industry has been created, once there exists an all-sided growth of modern machine-building and the corresponding metallurgical and power industries, then it is not necessary to set accentuated tempos of growth for heavy industry, then light industry and agriculture can develop at even faster tempos than those at which heavy industry itself grows.

Why then, one might ask, in conditions of the formation of the socialist mode of production, and from the point of view of Kasimovsky and Kuznetsov, must not the production of the means of production, heavy industry, develop at accelerated tempos, and why is it not necessary to guarantee a faster growth of the production of the means of production in comparison with the production of consumer goods?

We receive the following answer to this question:

E. Kasimovsky:

The uninterrupted growth of Department 1 at faster tempos, as a result of which the relative weight of this department is raised, in the last analysis

inevitably leads to a disproportion between production and consumption, to a violation of the demands of the basic economic law of socialism.

Up to now, for Marxist-Leninists, the theses have been indisputable that *only* on the basis of the universal development and continued growth of *heavy* industry could we guarantee the uninterrupted growth of all branches of light industry and food industry, as well as agriculture, and the steady rise of popular consumption. For Kuznetsov and Kasimovsky the growth of heavy industry acts as a brake on the growth of popular consumption, "leads to a disproportion between production and consumption," "contradicts the economic laws of Socialism."

I. Vekua, a candidate of economic science, in an article "The Economic Laws of Socialism and the Economic Policy of the Soviet State," declares likewise: "*The policy of accelerated tempos of growth for heavy industry in response to the demands of the basic economic law of Socialism and the law of planned development, in the present stage has come into conflict with the demands of these laws.*"

In a discussion with the editors of the journal, *Problems of Economics*, one of the most open vulgarizers of Marxism, A. Paltsev, declared that the cornerstone of the Marxist proposition of the theory of reproduction, to the effect that the growth of the branches producing the means of production must exceed the growth of those branches producing consumer goods, and other proposi-

tions of this theory, "came into clear conflict with the basic principles of the policy of our Party in this period."

The falsity of all these declarations is exposed completely by widely-known historical facts. Only on the basis of the powerful growth of heavy industry was our country able to overcome age-old economic backwardness and become transformed into a mighty and advanced industrial power. Only on the basis of heavy industry were the exploiting classes completely liquidated, the most profound socialist transformation carried through in agriculture, unemployment permanently abolished in the cities, along with migration, poverty and beggary in the countryside. Only on the basis of the tempestuous growth of heavy industry was it possible to guarantee a constant rise of popular consumption and the material well-being of the working people.

By 1953, the national income of the U.S.S.R., in comparison with 1913, grew 13 times (in comparable prices). From 1926 to 1953 the production of consumer goods increased approximately 12 times, and the turnover of goods (in comparable prices) almost 8 times. The real wages of the workers and employees grows from year to year, as well as the incomes of the collective peasantry. The structure of popular consumption is improving.

All this amounts to a victory in the radical improvement of the conditions of the common man, of the masses of the working people, which

history has not hitherto known, and could not have known.

Concern about the people's welfare is the highest principle of the Party's policies. This principle has guided the Party at all stages of the development of Soviet society. The law-governed processes in the approaching movements of the socialist system, the programmatic tasks of the Party, flow from the requirements of the basic economic law of Socialism—that is, the *maximum* satisfaction of the steadily growing material and cultural demands of the working people, and the Party resolves these tasks through Marxism—on the basis of accelerated growth of the productive forces, the production of the means of production, modern industrial technique and the steady rise of the productivity of social labor. That is the general line of the Party.

IV

Subjecting the general line of the Party to revision, these pseudo-economists propose to change this line for another line of economic development. What should it consist of, according to them? In his article P. Mstislavsky proposes to realize "*decisive changes in the relations of tempos of development*" of the production of the means of production and the production of consumer goods, and to establish new proportions in the people's economy. He declares that that type of extended socialist reproduction would be best

in which Department 2 of social production (that is, the production of consumer goods) grows *faster* than the production of the means of production. This type of reproduction he characterizes as best corresponding to the demands of the basic economic law of Socialism.

The Communist Party, with all its strength, once exposed as ruinous for the whole cause of Socialism the theory of the "roundabout curve" which the Right restorationists attempted to tie upon the Party, and which aimed at slowing down the tempo of growth of heavy industry. Stalin frequently declared that in the face of capitalist encirclement we cannot slow down the tempo of the forward movement of heavy industry, the foundation of socialist economy. "*We must not lower the tempo! On the contrary, we must increase it with all our power and by all possibilities. This is what our responsibilities before the workers and peasants of the U.S.S.R. demanded from us. This is what is demanded of us by our responsibilities to the working class of the whole world. To slow down the tempo — that means to be backward. And the backward are beaten.*"—(Stalin).

The priority of the tempo of growth in the production of the means of production, as a *law* of socialist economics, does not at all exclude that in certain years it is possible to display, practically, all that is necessary to liquidate backwardness in the production of consumer goods, to catch up in the light

and food industries and in agriculture. By revealing the disproportions which arise in the people's economy, the Party steadily takes measures of this nature.

However, in the expressions of the economists quoted here, the matter is not one of concrete, businesslike correction of this or that proportion between light and heavy industry. Nothing of the kind. They put before the Party a point of view which says that the rapid growth of the production of consumer goods, in comparison with the production of the means of production, is a *law* of the socialist mode of production. It is proposed to replace the established Marxist-Leninist theory of the law-governed priority of the development of the production of the means of production under Socialism, with the anti-Marxist proposition of the priority of the development of consumer goods. They proposed to replace the line of the Party, the acceleration of the development of heavy industry—as the single firm basis for the prosperity of all branches of the socialist economy, the powerful source of the growth of the people's well-being, and the impregnability of the country in a military sense—with another line of economic development.

Thus, in his article, D. Kuznetsov proposes the following:

It is fully possible, not in a short time, but, let us say, in the period of the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism, to have such an extension of socialist reproduction on the

basis of the highest technique, in which Department 1 and 2 will grow at the same tempos.

As has been stated, Mstislavsky, seconding Kuznetsov, proposes "*for the whole stated period*" principles of extended reproduction under which the production of consumer goods will outstrip the production of the means of production.

In plain language, this means: restore the privilege of accelerated development of heavy industry, machine-building, energetics, chemistry, electronics, reactor technique, telemechanics, etc., to the imperialist world where production is carried on for the sake of production and is divorced from consumption; we have already achieved the heights of industrialization and can, for a stated period, up to Communism, transfer the centre of gravity of our concern to light industry, because with us production is carried on for the sake of consumption. It is difficult to conceive of a more anti-scientific "theory," or one so rotten and destructive for our people.

It is completely clear that with such proportions and tempos as are suggested by these pseudo-economists for the development of our industry, there would not be extended socialist reproduction of any kind.

Stalin in 1952 gave the well-known definition of the necessity—possessing the quality of being one of the most important measures for the transition from Socialism to Communism—of ensuring:

... a continuous expansion of all social production, with a relatively higher rate of expansion of the production of the means of production. The relatively higher rate of expansion of production of the means of production is necessary not only because it has to provide the equipment both for its own plants and for all the other branches of the national economy, but also because reproduction on an extended scale becomes altogether impossible without it." (*Stalin, Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*).

To guarantee extended reproduction it is necessary to have corresponding socialist accumulation, and in order to accumulate it is necessary to secure the steady growth of the productivity of labor. Under Socialism this means constantly raising the specific gravity of social labor saturated with means of production, as contrasted with living labor. The uninterrupted growth of the productivity of labor can arise and develop on the basis of ever-growing and higher technique. The growth of such technique demands the guarantee of an accelerated tempo of development of the means of production, heavy industry and its heart—machine-building. If this condition is not observed, high tempos of extended socialist reproduction and the steady rise of agriculture and the light and food industries cannot be realized.

The proposals of the philistines of economic science here quoted, their "program," would result in such a "development" of socialist economics as would inevitably throttle

heavy and light industry; the curve of our economic development would go down and we would remain disarmed and helpless in an economic sense.

V

Recently the Party and government adopted a whole series of important decisions for the further upsurge of socialist agriculture and an increase in the production of consumer goods. The significance of this for the people's economy is enormous. In important Party documents it is unflinchingly emphasized that only on the basis of the further powerful development of *heavy* industry will it be possible to achieve a sharp upturn in all branches of agriculture and to increase the prosperity of the people of our country by the production of goods. The Communist Party is mobilizing the mighty energies of the people for the successful execution of these decisions.

The profound propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory, which are continuously developed and enriched by our Party, were and remain the sole tested guide of our practical work.

The basic principles of the economic policies of the C.P.S.U. are rooted in the scientific foundation of Marxist-Leninist economic theory, in the correct understanding and utilization of the economic laws of Socialism. These principles and tasks, put forward by the Party at each

stage, possess enormous organizing and mobilizing power because they are governed by the inherent material requirements of the progressive growth of socialist society.

Creative Soviet people, under the guidance of our heroic Party of Communists, are successfully resolving the titanic problems of the building of Communist society. The constituent part of this building program is the creation of a powerful, universal development of the material-productive base of Communism. This demands a gigantic multiplication of the production powers of our country; the constant growth at rapid tempos of heavy industry—the granite foundation of the edifice of Communist society; the wide electrification of our country; the insistent implanting of new techniques in all branches of the people's economy and the unflagging growth of the productivity of social labor.

All the great creative activity of the Soviet people is carried on in an international situation which demands from them the greatest vigilance. Imperialist reaction, armed to the teeth and still arming, prepares

its plans for a new world war. In such a situation the consistent and unremitting struggle for world peace and the all-sided strengthening of the power of the Soviet Union and her defense abilities, are the first sacred patriotic and international duties of the Soviet people.

The most important condition for the successful resolution of these tasks is the struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory, because any vacillation on questions of theory and especially the revision of the cornerstone theses of Marxist-Leninist economic science, can bring harm to our practical work. Marxist-Leninist theory is that mighty searchlight which illuminates our path to the creation of a new society, gives us a clear guiding light in our work and confidence in the victory of our cause.

Under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet people have built a socialist society. Under this triumphant banner our people, led by the Party of Communists, confidently march to their shining goal—Communism.

Anita Whitney—Communist

By Al Richmond

THE WELLESLEY COLLEGE senior class book of 1889 contained these notes about Charlotte Anita Whitney: "Politics—Republican; Religion—Episcopalian; Literary production—statistics; Opinion of the opposite sex—God bless 'em."

The story in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, independent Republican paper, of Feb. 5, 1955, began like this: "Anita Whitney, the wealthy, soft-spoken socialite whose life-long devotion to the cause of the worker led to prison, constant controversy and the Communist Party, died at her home here yesterday." ("Wealthy . . . socialite" is a newspaper cliché that was used with respect to her for more than a half-century, and while it had some validity when used originally, it had no relation to the facts for a good many years.)

Between those two entries lies a generous slice of California history and the story of a remarkable woman who became a legend within her lifetime; a woman of great moral strength, with quiet courage and a steadfastness of purpose that led her to become a charter member of the Communist Party and for many years her Party's best known and

most widely beloved spokesman in California.

Nowadays, when vilification of Communists is a vocation that unites the political underworld and the intellectual upper crust, Anita Whitney's life is a shining refutation of the cynics and the plain stoolpigeons who seek to distort the portrait of a Communist in their own image. Here *is* a Communist! Anita Whitney's comrades can say that with pride. But countless other Americans, who are not Communists, can also take pride in what this American was and what she did, and can feel their own lives ennobled by the richness of hers.

* * *

Anita Whitney's public life may be divided into three major progressions—social welfare work, the women's suffrage movement, and the political movement of the working class toward the historic goal of Socialism.

"SOCIAL WORKER"

It began in 1893, after a class reunion at Wellesley, when she visited the College Settlement House on

Rivington Street in New York's East Side, drawn partly by a curiosity to see what her classmates were doing there. What she saw for the first time was poverty, with all its pain and degradation. For her it was a discovery, something totally beyond the range of her own experience.

Born in San Francisco on July 7, 1867, she had been raised in the comfortable surroundings of a prominent California family. Her father, a lawyer, served for a time as state senator from Alameda county. Supreme Court Justice Stephen J. Field, a Lincoln-appointed Democrat, was an uncle. She had known the relative spaciousness of middle-class life in California, the glitter of Washington society when she visited her uncle, the cloistered New England beauty of Wellesley.

Such had been the physical surroundings, and these were flavored by the peculiar social prestige of being able to trace paternal lineage to five Mayflower pilgrims and the Thomas Dudley who succeeded John Winthrop as governor of Massachusetts Colony in 1634. On her mother's side it was the Van Swearingen family which settled in Maryland in 1640.

That was her background for an encounter with the East Side, the vast immigrant ghetto, in 1893, the year of the Great Panic.

She came to visit Rivington Street for a week, but she stayed on. "Here," she explained later, "cer-

tainly some cog in our social system had slipped. I wanted to know about it, I wanted to help change it. Here at last was something vital to be done and I wanted to have a part in it."

It took another 20 years for her to realize that it wasn't a cog, but the social system. But in the beginning at the age of 26, she resolved to become a social worker, and it wasn't easy.

"The first time I went into a rear tenement," she later recalled, "I stood at the door and peered into the darkness till I could see the rickety staircase ahead of me. The whole place was sickeningly odorous from dampness, from lack of ventilation, from the fumes of the accumulated lives of so many people. As I stood there I felt that I was on the brink of a perilous adventure. Could I go up to that room on the third floor to which I had been sent and get out alive? I was sure that I could not, but a thousand deaths were better than the ignominy of going back confessing fear."

She remained in social work until 1911, a good bit of that time as secretary of the Associated Charities of Alameda county, a post in which she helped initiate such reforms as providing detention quarters for juveniles separate from those for adult criminals. She served for a while as the county's first juvenile probation officer. Another high point of her welfare work came in providing relief and finding jobs for thousands dispossessed by San Francisco's great earthquake and fire of 1906.

A colleague of those years wrote later:

She worked long hours at \$85 a month, dyed her suits, economized on her luncheons, and gave more generously than she could afford from her own funds to alleviate distress that could not always be cared for through regular official channels. She was keen, intelligent, impatient of sham, fraud, deceit, or delay in action of public officials. . . .

She worked hard on the social treadmill of organized charity, but began to have doubts about whether she was getting anywhere. Finally, as she later wrote, "I became convinced that no real solution lay along the route of organized charities, and I definitely abandoned the profession that I had hoped was to be my life's work, and I was left adrift again, with more questions to be answered. . . ."

SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN

Adrift for a while, she then threw herself into the battle for women's suffrage and was elected state president of the California Equal Suffrage League, one of the important groups in the campaign that won approval of the vote for women in California in a special election in October, 1911.

Selina Solomons, who wrote the history of the campaign, *How We Won the Vote in California*, described Anita Whitney as among the "ablest and most indefatigable work-

ers . . . a young woman of the finest femininity, much personal magnetism and great executive ability."

Mrs. Genevieve Allen later said:

As executive secretary of the California Equal Suffrage League, when Anita Whitney was president, I spent practically a year in close daily association with her. To my mind, she has been the kind of person who would never sacrifice principle for expediency. She is a noble and wonderful woman, and I feel the feebleness of words when I try to express my admiration for her heart and mind and character.

Anita became a national figure. At the convention of the American Equal Suffrage Association, held in Louisville, Ky., after the California election, she was chosen second vice president, serving with such noted American women as Anna Howard Shaw, president, and Jane Addams, first vice president. As a field organizer she helped lead the campaign that brought Oregon and Nevada into the fold of "free" states, as the suffragettes phrased it.

LABOR STRUGGLES

During those years she was increasingly drawn to the working-class movement, stirred by such famous labor orators as Eugene V. Debs, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Arturo Giovanitti and Jim Larkin. She learned much from accounts of the class war as it had been fought at Paterson and Lawrence and Ludlow,

from their revolutionary analysis of capitalist society and their militant affirmation of the socialist solution of the problems she had tried to solve, only to land in a dead end of futility. Her first venture into a labor battle was in defense of Herman Suhr and Blackie Ford, I.W.W. organizers railroaded to prison in the aftermath of the Wheatland Hop Riot of 1913. The next step came in 1914. She joined the Socialist Party.

"Imperceptibly and unconsciously," she wrote later, "I passed over the line, the invisible line, which divides mankind into two different groups, the group which stands for human exploitation and the group which stands for the fullness of life here and now, for human welfare. I was not sure how it was to come about and I probably did a great deal of false sentimentalizing about it, but I had taken the road from which there is no returning and with whatever hesitations and stumblings I have tried ever since to follow."

A subsequent milestone on the road she had taken was the founding convention of the Communist Labor Party in California, held in Oakland on Nov. 9, 1919. Anita had actively opposed U.S. participation in World War I and voted with the Left-wing majority of the Oakland Socialist Party Local to enter the Communist Labor Party. She was an active delegate at the convention; served on the credentials and resolutions committees and was

elected an alternate member of the new party's state executive committee.

That convention was the prelude to a dramatic high point in her life. Less than three weeks later she was arrested under California's Criminal Syndicalism Law. History indulges its own sense of the appropriate, and the arrest occurred right after she had spoken to the California Civic League, largest women's club in Oakland, on "The Negro Problem in the United States," an address intended to stimulate support for a nationwide campaign then under way to halt the wave of lynchings disgracing the United States.

FRAME-UPS

This being an age of trials, it is permissible to dwell on two facets of the Anita Whitney trial, the cruder frame-up technique and the guilty-by-association device, which foreshadowed today's court proceedings.

The baldest frame-up revolved around what the newspapers called the "red flag" incident. The story was that at the Communist Labor Party convention there had been a glass bookcase or cabinet which contained an American flag, and during the noon recess a red cloth had been draped over the case so that the American flag was hidden by the "red flag."

Edward U. Condon, the famous scientist who has been having "security" troubles with the govern-

ment over the past several years, played an ambiguous role with respect to that "red flag" incident. He was then working his way through the University of California as a reporter for the *Oakland Enquirer*, and in that capacity covered the Communist convention. He testified before the grand jury that indicted Anita, and was called as a prosecution witness at the trial, rehashing the newspaper versions of the "red flag" incident.

During cross-examination by Defense Attorney Thomas H. O'Connor, the following colloquy occurred:

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Fenton Thompson? (Thompson was a police inspector who arrested Anita.)

A. I do, yes.

Q. Did Fenton Thompson ever tell you that a plant that he had at that meeting draped that flag?

A. He did, yes.

Q. He did?

A. Yes.

Q. In other words, then, the red flag that you talked about this morning as having been thrown over the American flag was placed there by a dupe that Fenton Thompson had in that convention. Is that the fact?

A. That is what he told me.

The guilt-by-association was hardly less crude. The Communist convention had adopted a resolution which "recognized the immense effect upon the American labor movement of the propaganda and example

of the Industrial Workers of the World, whose long and valiant struggle and heroic sacrifices in the class war have earned the affection and respect of all workers everywhere." This, the prosecution argued, meant the Communist Labor Party approved of the I.W.W., and therefore it was permissible to offer testimony about the alleged criminal syndicalism of the I.W.W. as evidence against Anita.

Two professional anti-I.W.W. reformers, John Dymond and Ernest Coutts, were placed on the stand and they told the story they had told in I.W.W. trials across the country; a lurid tale about burning haystacks and barns, a tale to influence a middle-class jury in the prevailing anti-I.W.W. hysteria.

AMNESTY BATTLE

Anita was convicted, but the seven-year battle to void the conviction and nullify the maximum 14-year prison term was probably the most remarkable tribute ever accorded any individual in California. Something of her own moral grandeur is reflected in what was said by those who saw her and rallied to her defense.

There was, for instance, the special feature story in the *New York Times* by Alma Reed, a reporter for the old *San Francisco Call*, describing the day of sentencing and the trial that had gone on before.

"As she entered the courtroom to receive her sentence," Miss Reed wrote,

"I was present to witness the silent tribute of 300 men and women prominently identified with the leading social service and public welfare agencies of the state. They arose as she passed down the aisle to her seat, and they remained standing until sentence had been pronounced. . . .

"Throughout the trial—throughout the ordeal of her conviction and sentence—this frail, quiet-mannered, soft-voiced woman maintained a stoic poise which was conceded to be remarkable."

Miss Reed visited Anita at the county jail and reported:

"Her attitude—in its calmness, its poise and its perfect freedom from resentment or bitterness—is worthy of the great philosophers of ancient times, or of the Christian martyrs.

"In fact, she seemed to hold a rightful place in that select company of the earth's noblest souls as she told me of her life, her traditions, her principles and ever so modestly her achievements.

"Why should I not be calm and happy?" she asked with a smile while I expressed surprise at her cheerfulness. "I feel that I have done no wrong and I can feel no oppression. I have simply walked a path.

"... things have come to me and I have done them, and I would have been a coward if I had not. . . . After all, the greatest satisfaction in life comes from obeying your own conscience and helping in your own small way to make the world a little better for someone else because you have lived."

Most remarkable, especially in retrospect, was *The Monitor*, organ of

the San Francisco Catholic Archdiocese, which described Anita as

"A woman . . . of distinguished family, who has spent her life in doing good for others and acting as Secretary for charity boards, befriending the poor and oppressed, fighting for liberty of conscience and speech, the champion of downtrodden and enslaved races . . . an exquisite and charming friend of humanity, a noble and beautiful character who would not crush the broken reed nor quench the burning flax. . . .

"To this gentle woman of peace and charity, Miss Anita Whitney, who was sentenced to an indeterminate term in prison, only sympathy is extended as a martyr victim to the present wave of un-American hysteria and illiberalism which is sweeping the United States, encouraged by all the reactionaries and profiteers in the land. They are sowing dragons' teeth. As in the early Church which stood for the poor and lowly ones of earth, the blood of martyrs is the seed of a new and better order of things where true democracy and Christian justice shall reign."

Some years later San Francisco's own poet, George Sterling, wrote three sonnets to petition the governor for a pardon. Some lines read:

*She is most innocent. She did no wrong
But in her calm defiance of the strong,
Whose hearts were set on war as hers
on peace. . . .*

There was a flood of such expressions from prominent people—churchmen, politicians, cultural figures—but equally significant was the variety of Anita's associations and

activities which found reflection in the protest movement.

The *Irish World* called her conviction "a sample of hideous injustice" and recalled that "Miss Whitney took up the cause of struggling Ireland and did gallant service in organizing the Irish women of San Francisco." (In 1919, Kathleen O'Brennan, a brilliant Irish patriot, organized some Irish women in San Francisco into the American Irish Educational League, and Anita was invited to become chairman of the organization. She accepted, explaining later that she expected "to keep the chairmanship only a limited time until some woman in whose veins flowed Irish blood could be found who had time to carry it on." The league was formed at the crest of the Irish independence movement and it organized some meetings that jammed Dreamland Rink, then the city's largest auditorium.)

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People came to her defense. (When an N.A.A.C.P. branch was formed in the San Francisco Bay Area before World War I, she accepted an invitation to serve on its executive committee, and remained in the N.A.A.C.P. for more than 15 years.)

People in the social welfare field, former suffrage leaders, social reformers all spoke up for her, each recalling her association with the movements they represented.

Most fundamental by then was her identity with the working class, and

the Labor Defense League, representing some 40,000 organized workers, was the first to champion her defense. The league, formed to seek repeal of the criminal syndicalism law, said:

We maintain that the real reason for her arrest lies in the fact that she is treasurer for the Labor Defense League. . . . Her arrest in the opinion of this league is merely an incident in a nationwide campaign to crush all labor organizations whether conservative or radical. As Miss Whitney has never been found absent when labor was in jeopardy so will she now find the thousands of workers connected with the Labor Defense League at her side.

Before the fight had run its course both the San Francisco and Los Angeles Central Labor Councils demanded that she be pardoned, as did Paul Scharrenberg, then secretary of the State Federation of Labor.

For seven years the case dragged through the courts, going twice before the U.S. Supreme Court, the court disclaiming jurisdiction the first time, and on the second test upholding the criminal syndicalism law, with a concurring reservation by Justices Holmes and Brandeis who speculated that if the "clear and present danger" theory had been advanced, possibly the application of the statute might have been unconstitutional.

But the bar of public opinion ruled otherwise, and on June 20, 1927, Gov. C. C. Young issued a par-

don, volunteering his belief that "the criminal syndicalism act was primarily intended to apply to organizations actually known as advocates of violence, terrorism, or sabotage, rather than to such organizations as a Communist Labor Party."

In all those years, while the shadow of a 14-year prison term was over her, Anita was the focus of national attention, the big eastern papers following the case, and some, like the *New York World* and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, marked the injustice. But she, typically, went about the daily chores of an active Communist, modest and unassuming, distributing leaflets in West Oakland; setting up there what probably was the first progressive bookshop on the Pacific Coast, exercising her democratic right to hire a hall, this being Fraternity Hall in the Negro community, as the first Communist headquarters in Oakland. Her small, trim figure, now in its late fifties, was a familiar sight in West Oakland, where she once went as a charity worker, and now returned with the stuff of struggle, of agitation and organization, always a leaflet, or a paper, or a pamphlet in her hand.

Facing prison herself, her concern was for others already behind the bars, like Tom Mooney and J. B. McNamara and many more because California's ruling class was vengeful and violent. Then far off the case of Sacco and Vanzetti claimed her attention, a case that paralleled her own in time, began when hers did, and

ended some two months after hers did, but of course, tragically. She struck up a warm friendship with McNamara, whom William Z. Foster hailed as "a splendid example of the invincible working class spirit with the sheer courage and loyalty that goes to make a Dimitroff," and she shared the honor with Foster of being one of the two people for whom McNamara had the highest regard and affection. She made the rounds of the Oakland unions, speaking in behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti, and on the night of their execution she spoke to the women's auxiliary of Carpenters Local 36, the menfolk adjourning early so that they could join the women and hear Anita.

This battle for the victims of the class war naturally led her to International Labor Defense in which she worked closely with Ella Reeve (Mother) Bloor, who came to the Coast for the I.L.D.

COMMUNIST FIGHTER

In 1928 she was nominated for the U.S. Senate, and although the Communist Party was not on the ballot she stumped the state, the first of several campaign tours that were to take her to virtually every town and city in California. In 1934, coincident with the great maritime strike and the E.P.I.C. political upheaval, the Communist Party won a place on the ballot, and Anita, as the Communist candidate for state treas-

urer, polled 100,820 votes. She was the Party's standard bearer in 1938 and 1940, each time receiving a shade under 100,000 votes.

She was elected the Communist Party's state chairman in 1936, to the Party's national committee in 1940, and as long as she was physically able, remained in the Party's state leadership.

Virtually to her dying day she was an active agitator for Socialism, for peace and democracy. Bedridden in her 87th year, nonetheless she never wasted a pamphlet, a leaflet, a working-class paper or other publication. She couldn't any longer go out and distribute these, as she used to do, but no craftsman, tradesman or salesman ever entered the house without receiving some piece of literature to take with him. The rest she mailed to some acquaintance or associate.

To her last days, as in her first association with the working-class movement, she exhibited a special concern for her comrades behind prison bars, and her final public appearances, on the occasion of her 86th birthday, were dedicated to appeals for amnesty for political prisoners.

How mean and base and false the common anti-Communist slanders seem against the grandeur of Anita Whitney and her life! Foreign agent? A pawn in an alien conspiracy, or a robot manipulated from on high? What relationship is there between such distorted images of de-

based minds and the epic story of this great American woman?

Her Americanism wasn't a matter of genealogy. It was shaped by the California pioneer folklore that excited her imagination in childhood, by the New England of her youth where she thrilled to the beauty of the countryside and felt a warmer kinship with Thoreau and Emerson, whom she read at the time. Her Americanism was shaped by the slums of New York and South Boston and West Oakland; by the lonely mining camps of Nevada and the rolling farm country of Oregon where she stumped for women's suffrage.

Always there was a deep pride in the American democratic heritage. During the ebb and flow of the criminal syndicalism case, when it appeared in 1922 that imprisonment was inevitable, she told a newspaper reporter:

I go without retrenching one bit upon the platform of my life. I tried to uphold the Constitution. Why can't everyone read the Declaration of Independence and believe in it? It is the finest rule of life we have. . . .

Again and again that theme occurred in her public statements and private conversations. That sort of Americanism, drawing upon the revolutionary democratic tradition of the American nation, was so deeply ingrained that it was an essential part of her, like some physical member without which the body cannot live.

Hers was a bold and independent spirit, like that which impelled those who made the hazardous crossing in the first years of colonial settlement, and those others who came later to push the frontier across a continent.

When first she saw the hideous face of poverty in 1893 she could have fled from it and insulated herself in the comforts of middle-class life. Instead she made the more difficult choice that required the greater independence of mind and spirit, and decided to battle poverty with such weapons as she knew. When she finally became convinced that social welfare work did not strike at the roots of poverty she pulled up stakes again. So it was with the various social reform endeavors associated with the women's suffrage movement. Hers was an independent quest, and when she arrived at Socialism in 1914 she knew this was it, and the conclusion flowed from her own trial-and-error experience, her own searching observation of American society.

Crossing then what she called the "invisible line" that divides those who stand for human exploitation and those who stand for "the fullness of life here and now," the crowning 40 years of her life were motivated by the logic of the struggle for Socialism and her identification with the working class. The exigencies of battle taught her discipline and she became a disciplined Communist. Present-day bourgeois

society cannot comprehend a discipline that is not based on compulsion because behind all the talk about "freedom of choice" there is compulsion, as witness the phenomenon of McCarthyism, the rash of loyalty oaths and "security" programs and all the other instruments of intellectual terrorism. With Anita, as with any Communist worthy of the name, discipline was a conscious and voluntary act. That, as her life showed, was the only discipline she could accept.

Perhaps the most preposterous of slanders when balanced against Anita is the one about Communists being immoral. This is the common accusation of those who have embraced the morality of the renegade and informer, and is also a favorite theme of our most moral Secretary of State whose beatitudes range from "Blessed are the meek" to "Blessed is the Hydrogen bomb."

Mr. Dulles is a great one for Western Civilization, by which he implies that Christianity and Greek philosophy are virtues of modern imperialism in general, and of American imperialism in particular, and may be found in any well stocked General Motors frigidaire. Mr. Dulles is a pious man who will never be confused by what is Caesar's and what is God's because he considers himself the anointed of both, and we give him less than nothing when we say: let him keep his morals and his spiritual values. We'll take the morality of Anita

Whitney, the Communist.

It is of exceeding interest that back in the 1920's when bourgeois correspondents and Catholic publications tried to describe Anita they so often resorted to parallels with the early Christian martyrs and the ancient philosophers. Within their own frame of reference these sources tried to say that they saw in her the embodiment of all that is best and finest, all that is beautiful and lofty in the span of human history.

They saw well, these sources, within the limits of their vision, but if they could have looked beyond their own horizons they would have seen that Anita's embrace of Socialism was the perpetuation and extension of that which is best in mankind's heritage.

Her points of first departure were Christianity, the American democratic heritage and its eloquent expression in Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, and the humanism of the great 19th century writers. A half century out of Wellesley she still remembered a Biblical inscription in the college chapel: "Also I heard the voice of the Lord saying: Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I: send me." There were other New England shrines that never were forgotten, Concord and Lexington, Wayside Inn and Walden Pond, Faneuil

Hall and Bunker Hill. In her late 70's she still recalled the thrill of discovery upon first reading Tolstoy at Wellesley.

LIFE'S TRIUMPH

Those were the points of departure, and it is the triumph of her life that in the course of the battle against poverty, oppression, exploitation and injustice she went far beyond the beginnings, discarding that which was false and futile, retaining that which had positive meaning for our day, finding her way to Marxism, breaking fully and irrevocably with the class of her origin, and identifying herself with the working class.

She personalizes a great truth of our time. The working class is heir to the best in the bourgeois heritage; the rest, as with the ancient Pharaohs, will be entombed with the bourgeoisie. To the class of the socialist future belongs the finest legacy of the past. Anita Whitney is a glorious attestation to that truth.

Millions of Americans, who might not share her political views, may nonetheless join her comrades and close co-workers of the California State Committee of the Communist Party in saying:

"We do not grieve at her death, we rejoice in her life."

On the Program of the Communist Party of Brazil

By Luis Carlos Prestes

We print below the full text of the Report made by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Brazil to its National Committee in December, 1953. The Report analyzes the Draft Program of that Party, which was published in the July 1954 issue of Political Affairs.—Ed.

IN THIS MEETING of the National Committee of our Party, we shall complete the task of working out the proposed Party Program, a proposal that will be made known to and discussed by the entire Party and, finally, submitted for approval by the Fourth Party Congress.*

With the preparation of this scientific document, a summing-up of the aims and the tasks of the working class in our country, we furnish a new and solid basis for all our Party's activity; we shall have at our disposal a powerful tool.

This proposed Program opens a new phase in the development of our Party. We are making a great step forward and there is no doubt that, to the degree that we assimilate this program and make it our own, we shall feel ourselves stronger and firmer to face the great events that are approaching. This is the historical significance of the document that we must approve.

I

The proposed Party Program, now

* The Program was approved at the 4th Party Congress held late in 1954.—Ed.

open for discussion, is correct because it is based on the scientific analysis in the light of Marxism-Leninism of Brazilian realities at the present time.

The proposed Program begins with a correct description of Brazil's economic and political situation. It shows the semi-colonial nature of the country and vigorously points out that the most serious problem that confronts the Brazilian nation today is the increasing colonization of Brazil by the North American imperialists. The proposed Program also shows how Brazil is dominated by the owners of large estates and big capitalists linked up with the North American imperialists, their fear of the people making them choose the North American monopolists, to whom they are selling the country in exchange for support in their battle against the people to save the large estates and the feudal and slave survivals in agriculture. On the other hand, the North American imperialists, in their policy of subjugating Brazil, rely on the internal support of the owners of large

estates and the big capitalists of Brazil, whose representative for the moment is the present Vargas government.*

The proposed Program correctly points up the intolerable situation of the Brazilian people, above all the proletariat and the peasants, as a result of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal position of the country and of the policy of war preparation on the part of the government of owners of large estates and big capitalists linked to the American imperialists.

The proposed Program clearly points out that the revolutionary struggle in Brazil is inevitable and correctly describes the Brazilian revolution in its present phase as an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution. In the present state of the country, that is, the proposed Program limits itself to rousing the popular masses of Brazil to fight against the domination of the North American imperialists and against the large estates and feudal survivals, and aims at uniting around the working class all the progressive, democratic, popular forces of national liberation in the country.

On this basis, the proposed Program presents, as the main task, the replacement of the present government, a government of the owners

of large estates and big capitalists linked to the North American imperialists, by the democratic national liberation government. "The democratic changes our people needs and longs for," the proposed Program states, "can only be attained with a government in which there participate, besides the working class, the peasants, the intellectuals, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie."

The proposed Program calls the new regime a "popular democratic" one and the new government one of "democratic national liberation." The essence of the regime we are fighting for is popular democratic; but with the specific conditions that actually prevail in Brazil, it is entirely correct to call the new government one of democratic national liberation, since our people's fight for liberation is basically directed against the foreign oppressors, that is, against American imperialism.

Liberation of the country from the domination of the North American imperialists, putting a peace policy into operation, carrying out basic democratic changes, are the primary objective of Brazil's future democratic government. Correctly holding that under present Brazilian conditions North American imperialism is the chief oppressor, the mortal enemy of our people, the proposed Program does not raise the question of the confiscation of the capital and enterprises belonging to American monopolies operating in Brazil.

Among the democratic revolutionary changes that the proposed Program takes up, it gives special importance to effecting an agrarian reform. Considering the ideas of the large masses of peasants, who want to own land, who are in favor of the distribution of the land as private property, the proposed Program does not raise the question of nationalizing the land and confines itself to the confiscation of the huge areas belonging to the great estates and their free distribution among the peasants with little or no land and all those who want to work the land.

In view of the fact that under present conditions in the country with the struggle of the people for Brazil's national liberation a large part of the country's capitalists could show their support of the people or at least take a position of benevolent neutrality, the proposed Program does not raise the question of nationalizing the banks and the country's big firms. That is, we are not aiming at the confiscation of the enterprises and capital of the nation's business men. However, those big capitalists who have taken the road of treason to the country at the side of American imperialism, will suffer the inevitable consequences, will be treated as enemies of the people. This is shown in the proposed Program when it stresses that the "big capitalists who have betrayed the nation's interests and allied themselves with the American imperial-

ists" will have their capital and enterprises confiscated and nationalized by the democratic national liberation government.

The proposed Program lays especial emphasis on a whole series of important practical measures for meeting the desperate situation of oppression, exploitation, poverty and hunger that the working class is in. The future democratic national liberation government has for one of its primary objectives a radical improvement in the living conditions of the working class.

The proposed Program sets the character of the new power of the democratic popular political regime. It gives a clear definition of the democratic features of its system of government, which assures the people full liberty.

Finally, the proposed Program raises the question of forming the democratic united front of the country's patriotic popular and democratic forces, with the working class in the van. The government of owners of large estates and big capitalists linked with the North American imperialists will not give up its place without a struggle. The victory of the patriotic forces will only be possible if they unite in a broad anti-imperialist and anti-feudal united front, in a broad democratic national liberation front, based on the alliance of workers and peasants, the chief and invincible force of the Brazilian revolution. The democratic national liberation front will be the

* Subsequently differences developed between President Getulio Vargas and U.S. imperialism over control of Brazil's oil resources and other issues. Under pressure of the masses, Vargas refused the unconditional surrender which the State Department demanded. Washington's efforts to oust him finally caused Vargas to commit suicide in August, 1954.—Ed.

guarantee of Brazil's salvation, the only power that can lead our country and our people to a happy and bright future.

The proposed Program voices the demands of all Brazil's progressive, liberating, national, democratic and popular forces. Under these conditions it can and must be transformed by the Communists from a Party Program into a genuine program of the Brazilian people, of all the forces that can fight for the independence and progress of the Brazilian nation. This is the important task of the Communists, of each Party member: the Program of the Party, to be put into effect, has to become familiar, be studied and assimilated.

II

In approving the proposed Party Program and bringing it to the knowledge of the Party, the working class and the Brazilian people, our National Committee must at the same time frankly point out the false and incorrect elements in our former positions, especially in so important a document as the August Manifesto, which up to now has served as the basis for all the Party's activity.

There are great differences between the two documents, between the new proposed Program and the program we put forward in 1950 in the August Manifesto.

Let us take, for example, such an important problem as the Party's

position with respect to the national bourgeoisie. We now expressly proclaim that "the democratic national liberation government will not confiscate the enterprises and capital of the national bourgeoisie," while in the August 1950 program we demanded the nationalization of the banks and "all the big industrial and commercial enterprises of monopolistic nature or having a predominant influence on the nation's economy." We also called for the "complete nationalization of mines, water power and all public utilities." This means that whereas in the new proposed Program we do not attack the bases of capitalism, we committed the error in August 1950 of thinking it impossible that a considerable part of the national bourgeoisie could, under the conditions of the people's fight for liberation from the imperialist yoke, take a position supporting the people or at least one of benevolent neutrality. That is to say, we had a wrong idea of the nature of the revolution in our country at its present moment. Although we never failed to recognize the semi-colonial character of our country, actually, in formulating the August program we glossed over the difference between the two phases of the revolution in colonial and dependent countries. And yet, in 1927, Comrade Stalin had shown the basis on which Communist Parties should study the problems of the revolutionary movement in the colonial and dependent countries, saying:

It consists in setting up a clear-cut distinction between the revolution in imperialist countries, in the countries that oppress other peoples, and the revolution in colonial and dependent countries, in countries suffering from the imperialist oppression of other states. The revolution in imperialist countries is one thing: in them, the bourgeoisie is an oppressor of other peoples; in them the bourgeoisie is counter-revolutionary at all stages of the revolution; in them, the national factor is lacking as a factor in the struggle for emancipation. The revolution in colonial and dependent countries is a different thing: in them, the imperialist oppression by other states is one of the factors in the revolution; in them, this oppression cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie as well; in them, at a given stage and at a given period, the national bourgeoisie may support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism; in them, the national factor, as a factor in the struggle for emancipation, is a factor in the revolution.

Not making this distinction, not understanding this difference, identifying the revolution in imperialist countries with the revolution in colonial countries, means departing from the Marxist road, the Leninist road and taking the road of the supporters of the Second International.

Without starting from this theoretical basis it is impossible to form a correct idea of the nature of the revolution in our country. The Party leadership did not adequately digest these basic teachings of Leninism and thus, in formulating in 1950, the

program of the August Manifesto, it failed to take into account all the characteristics of the democratic popular revolution in the colonial and dependent countries, which is an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution.

In practice, therefore, with the 1950 program we took a sectarian and "Leftist" position that is reflected in other passages of the same program, in the general Party line and in its activity up to now. In the new proposed Program we correctly center our fire on the national struggle for liberation against the North American imperialists; in the August 1950 program we raised the question of confiscating and nationalizing enterprises and capital "belonging to imperialism" in general, thus unnecessarily enlarging the camp of the enemies of the revolution. In the present proposed Program we define, with the precision it requires, the democratic nature of the national liberation government and the structure of the new state; this basic question was not taken up in August 1950. The August Manifesto had an incorrect and Leftist interpretation of the nature of the new regime and government we were fighting for. As a result of the false idea we had of the nature of the revolution in our country at its present phase, we did not correctly present the problem of the united front and in practice excluded the national bourgeoisie from the democratic national liberation front, whereas the semi-colonial

nature of our country called for the unification of all the progressive, democratic, national, popular liberation forces so as to have a chance of success in the revolutionary anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle.

The program we put forward in the August Manifesto, a document that was the basis for all the Party's activity up to the present time, helped strengthen the false sectarian and "Leftist" positions that have hurt our Party's entire activity in the last few years. Here we shall only cite, and they are examples enough, the boycott of the elections that was so clearly felt in the October, 1950 elections and still present in the city elections of Sao Paulo in March, 1953; the abandonment of the unions and lack of persistence in the struggle for the organization of the great masses of workers; the mechanical way of raising the question of power with the masses, the use of a "revolutionary" phraseology and putting out slogans and appeals that were far from the reality and the existing relationships of forces; the "adventurist" attitude among the peasants, causing premature struggles and, from the outset, on a level far above that of the awareness of the great masses of peasants; abuse of the strike call, started many times without the conditions for any kind of success; the tendency to raise the level of the mass struggles without the primary care of broadening and consolidating the mass organizations; the inability, still very great in our

ranks, to carry on patient and systematic work among the masses, taking into account the level of the masses' awareness.

In calling attention to these wrong positions, we do not by any means want to deny the successes gained in our activity over the last few years. But these successes are less than the possibilities that exist and are increasing every day.

The August Manifesto has the merit of having made it possible for our Party to break with the remains of reformism left in its political orientation. It called the attention of the entire Party to the problem of the struggle for power and just for that reason contributed toward our strengthening our own forces and feeling more strongly the need of fighting for the ideological development of the Party. The majority of the Party's membership, for their part, spared no effort to put the August goals into effect and showed once more, in the face of the brutal police reaction, their self-sacrifice and the heroism of which they are capable.

But at that time, as we can see today, because of the errors contained in the August Manifesto, the leading cadres of the Party had not sufficiently digested the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. We were unable to make a sure and steady application of Marxist-Leninist theory to the study of Brazilian realities and therefore, we based our activity in large part on subjective

conceptions, which took us sometimes into empiricism, sometimes into dogmatism, into a mechanical parallel with other countries or repetition of theoretical formulas into which we often tried to force the objective reality. Subjectivism led us to pay insufficient attention to the experience of the international communist movement, to the experience of the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to the experience of the popular democracies and the historic victory of the Chinese people; it led us to underestimate the study of the experience of the mass struggles of our people and neglect to generalize our own experience. That is why when we started, from 1948 on and especially in the August 1950 Manifesto, to make efforts towards getting our Party away from its former Rightist positions, we arrived at equally wrong and harmful sectarian "Leftist" positions.

It is because we were not afraid of openly recognizing our errors, because we made efforts to discover their causes, trying to analyze attentively the situation out of which they arose, along with methods of correcting them, that we were able to go forward and work out the proposed Program we are now discussing. Of course, the struggle against the basic causes of our mistakes is hardly beginning. We have to do much more in order to raise more rapidly the theoretical level of our leading cadres and intensify the struggle for their ideological develop-

ment. With the new proposed Program we are now better equipped than ever to eliminate from our ranks both the sectarian and "Leftist" errors and the Rightist errors.

The assimilation of the new Program by our entire Party requires that we be able to make vigorous use of the weapon of criticism and self-criticism against all the manifestations of "Leftism" or Rightism in our ranks, that we be able to make criticism and self-criticism an organic and indispensable part of the Party leadership and a permanent method of Party leadership. It is only in that way that we shall be able to apply in practice the tested programmatic, strategic and tactical principles set up in the new Program—a scientific document that marks a historic stage in the life of our Party and the victorious march of the revolution in our country.

The struggle for the assimilation of the new Program by the Party should thus constitute a new and powerful factor in the organic political and ideological consolidation of the Party, in reinforcing the Party's unity, an important factor in linking the Party with the masses.

III

Once the new proposed Party Program has been approved the task will be to bring it to the great masses of all the country's population, in the first place to the working class and the peasant masses. This is the new and

extremely important task of the entire Party.

Our Program is not a document that interests only the Communists and sympathizers with our Party. The problems it raises are the problems of our people; they are the questions that at the present moment most sharply and directly concern the best masses of the country's population, the patriots and democrats of all classes and social strata. We can prevent the North American imperialists from making a complete colony out of Brazil; we can free our people from the menace of imperialist war.

Our Program shows all patriots, clearly and convincingly, how to free Brazil from the imperialist yoke, how to make our country the great, prosperous and powerful nation we all desire it to be. To all the Brazilian people, that has always fought for liberty but that has never known genuine democracy, our Program points out the new regime of democracy for the people and points out precisely the road to win it.

Our Program appeals to the hearts of all Brazilian patriots; it is the Program of national salvation.

Therefore, comrades, let us be able to bring to the great masses of all our country's population, with Communist energy and decision, with patriotic enthusiasm and ardor, the great objectives of the proposed Program that we are now approving. From now on this is the primary and most important task of all Com-

munists, a permanent task whose performance will be a duty of honor for every militant, an integral part of his reason for living, by means of which he will show his true qualities as a revolutionary combatant and political leader of the masses, who has confidence in the creative ability of the masses and knows how to win them over with patience and tenacity.

The broad masses of the people must be roused for the struggle in defense of peace and democratic liberties, against the oppression of the North American imperialists, against Vargas' government, for the nation's independence and sovereignty; they must be convinced in the course of their struggles of the correctness of the Party Program.

We now have to pay special attention to the work of propaganda and agitation that will have to have as the center of all its activity the organized struggle for the broadest diffusion of the proposed Party Program among the masses of the people. It is not merely a question of bringing the masses the printed document in the form of pamphlets or leaflets, either the whole Program or only a part of it, but of organizing the discussion and explanation of the document as a whole and in each of its points. Toward this goal, the Party press is the principal tool we have to bring our proposed Program to all the classes and strata of society. All through the Party, from top to bottom, there is still

a great deal of underestimation of the role of the press as the decisive and irreplaceable tool, capable of bringing the word of our Party to the broadest masses. This underestimation has to be conquered quickly if we want to get the Party Program effectively and as soon as possible to the knowledge of our entire people. By means of the press we can explain, day by day the various points of the Program, orient public discussion, spread all over the country the result of round-table discussions, etc., public inquiries and interviews, as well as spreading the various questions treated in the Program by means of articles explaining and defending it. Finally, it is essential that with the spread of the Party Program we make our press take a step *forward toward becoming a true people's press*, especially the press of the working class and the great masses of peasants, able to respond quickly to the needs of the people, to spread the feelings and the demands of the broad masses of the people, to fulfill its primary task as educator of the masses, mobilizer and organizer of the people.

But to bring the Party Program to the masses, to make sure that it becomes the Program of our people, of all the progressive, national and liberating forces, agitation and propaganda are not enough. Action is indispensable, the permanent, constant and persistent activity of the Communists among the masses in their workshops and homes, in mass

organizations of every kind, including individual work with every man or woman, young or old. That means that we must give especial attention to the Party's base organizations and take practical measures toward a rapid improvement of its activity. The political life of our base organizations is still very weak, and inadequate efforts are made toward linking up with the masses.

There is no doubt that we have achieved certain successes since we started giving greater attention to organizing the Party in the shops, but a large number of the Party's base organizations still live turned almost exclusively toward themselves. The blame for such a state of affairs is almost entirely ours, that is the leading sections of the Party, beginning with the National Committee, for not giving more effective, concrete and functional aid to the base organizations and in general we were reconciled to the weaknesses of our work among the masses, on the pretext that our base organizations were feeble or that the political and ideological level of their leaders was low. Experience itself, meanwhile, has shown us what a single militant can accomplish among the masses if he has mastered the Party's line, has initiative and a spirit of responsibility.

The success of our efforts to bring the Party Program to the masses and make it a people's program requires us to make the Party's base organizations in every enterprise, in every

district and peasant village a real political leader of the masses, able to rouse and mobilize the masses, to unite and organize them.

We have to put an end to complacency and conformity; we have to instill in our ranks the sense of collective and individual responsibility for the Party's tasks, stimulate the spirit of initiative and combat "practical opportunism" in those who are afraid of responsibility and can only act under the pressure of instructions and orders from above. By studying the new Party Program, by mastering its theses and central ideas, every Communist is equipped not only to take the new Program to the masses but also to win them over to the positions defended by the Party and get them into the fight for the Party's objectives.

The new proposed program sets our Party immense tasks that require great initiative on the part of all militants, together with an ever greater power of leadership on every level in the Party. But winning the masses for the new Party Program means at the same time advancing toward the organization of the broadest democratic national liberation front. The two things are inseparable. This united anti-feudal and anti-imperialist front, as the proposed Program states, "will be the guarantee of Brazil's salvation, the only force that can set up the democratic people's regime in the country, the only force that can lead our

country to a happy and bright future."

To advance toward the democratic national liberation front, we must fight for unity in action in every field, in order to broaden and strengthen the mass organizations that already exist. The Party organizations and every Communist must boldly take the initiative in getting into the ranks of the democratic front all those who for one reason or another are against North American imperialism, against the Vargas government and its policy of war preparations, of treason to the nation, of hunger and police reaction against the people. Always taking exact knowledge of the opinions and demands of the various strata of the people as their starting point, the Communists must be able to show the correct road to solve each of the people's problems and to put themselves unhesitatingly at the head of the people in the struggle for the satisfaction of their requirements. To understand the importance and the necessity of the united front and put the Party in its true role as vanguard, not merging it in the united front—are the two indispensable conditions for the success of our efforts to unite and organize the masses. We have not made much progress thus far in organizing the great masses because, on the one hand, tendencies toward acting on the spur of the moment are still strong among us and, on the other hand, toward making the organiza-

tions of the united front into legal Party organizations. The unity of action and the united front of the masses will not appear spontaneously and they will only prosper to the degree to which we Communists are able to set an example of the democratic spirit, eliminating all dictatorial methods. For this it is necessary to have confidence in the masses and in the scientific truth of the solutions we are presenting.

It is only by daily systematic work, effectively directing the struggle for the immediate interests of the masses, making use of the slightest manifestations of protest on the part of the working and peasant masses, of the intellectuals, of the petty bourgeois and the national bourgeoisie that we shall be able to create the broad democratic national liberation front, unmask the Vargas government and all the demagogues in the service of the North American imperialists, develop the worker-peasant alliance and, under the leadership of the working class, rouse our people, all the progressive and liberating

forces of the country, to the decisive struggles for democratic popular rule in Brazil.

It is only by its concrete actions that our Party can show to the great masses of the people that it is truly a Party of patriots, of fighters for national liberation from the imperialist yoke. We have to show in practice, prove to the Brazilian people, that it is only our Party that can save the country, that only our Party can actually solve the serious problems of the nation and lead the way to the basic economic and social changes that the supreme interests of the nation demand.

We cannot, therefore, even for a moment abandon our struggle to reinforce our Party, that is, to increase its numbers by means of systematic, organized recruiting and to raise constantly the political and ideological level of its cadres and militants. . . .

With the Party Program, under the leadership of the National Committee, we march, united and firm, to the struggle and to victory.

TWO GREAT APRIL BOOKS—

HISTORY OF THE THREE INTERNATIONALS

by WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

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

International Publishers, \$6.00

•

THE 13TH JUROR

by STEVE NELSON

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

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

•

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3