

political affairs

NOVEMBER 1948 • 25 CENTS

GEORGE SISKIND

Wall Street-Washington Peace Panic

AL LANNON

The West Coast Maritime Strike

OLIVE SUTTON

Greece: The American People's Tasks

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

On the Party's Work Among Women

BOLESŁAW BIERUT

The Nationalist Deviation in the
Polish Workers' Party

Toward the Party's 30th Anniversary

Manifesto of the Wroclaw Congress

ERIK BERT

Family Farm Fantasy: *Book Review*

The Unconstitutional Smith Act:

From the Defense Briefs

PEOPLE COME FIRST

By JESSICA SMITH

Jessica Smith made a six thousand mile tour of the Soviet Union soon after the end of the war. She was in Moscow, Leningrad, Gorky, Stalingrad, Baku, Rostov-on-the-Don, and in collective farms in the outlying districts. She visited schools, nurseries, factories, theaters, libraries, sports arenas, and homes. She talked to people in every conceivable occupation. She saw the vast devastation and the terrible human costs of the war. And she saw the almost miraculous reconstruction of the land where "people come first."

All this Miss Smith amplifies from her many years of previous travel and experience in the Soviet Union. Soviet life is presented in its latest phases and in its full development. The story is told with the immediacy and intimacy of first-hand contact and with understanding that comes from rich experience and years of continuous touch with Soviet developments. Price: \$2.50

Just published

NEGRO LIBERATION

By HARRY HAYWOOD

A new and fundamental study of the Negro question in the United States. Taking the plantation system of the South as the core of Negro oppression, the author discusses history and conditions in the Black Belt, the structure of the Southern plantation system, the struggle of the Negro people for land, the economic link of the Southern oligarchy with Wall Street, and the historical emergence of the Negro people as a nation. Price: \$2.25

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

A magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism

EDITORIAL BOARD

V. J. JEROME, *Editor*

ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, JACK STACHEL, MAX WEISS

VOLUME XXVII, NO. 10

Contents

NOVEMBER, 1948

The Wall Street - Washington Peace Panic	George Siskind	951
The West Coast Maritime Strike: Showdown for Labor	Al Lannon	962
Greece and the American People's Tasks	Olive Sutton	969
On Improving the Party's Work Among Women	William Z. Foster	984
For an End to the Nationalist Deviation in the Polish Workers' Party	Boleslaw Bierut	991
Approaching the 30th Anniversary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.		1006
From the Briefs on the Unconstitutionality of the Smith Act		1013
Manifesto of the Wroclaw Congress		1033

FROM THE TREASURY OF MARXISM:

"A Hideous Blasphemy Against Nature and Man"

Frederick Engels 1035

BOOK REVIEW:

Family Farm Fantasy

Erik Bert 1038

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.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

Due to circumstances over which the publishers had no control, the October issue of *Political Affairs* has been omitted. All subscriptions will, therefore, be extended by one issue.

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

THE WALL STREET- WASHINGTON PEACE PANIC

By GEORGE SISKIND

ON THIS 31ST anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, increasing millions throughout the world recognize that the Soviet Union stands out as the indomitable bulwark of world peace, democracy, and the sovereign equality of all nations big and small.

The history of our epoch bears ample testimony to the fact that friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union is the clearest criterion of the intentions of any state: whether that state is bent on war, aggression, and domination, or whether it is committed to a policy of peace.

Realization of this decisive fact by all peace-loving Americans will immeasurably advance the forces striving to maintain world peace, and will help save our country and mankind from the horrors and devastations of a third world war.

* * *

Future historians may be expected to record that American capitalism narrowly averted disaster on the week-end of October eighth. On that fateful week-end the Pentagon shook as if seized by the ague. The big boss of the Security Council rushed

to Washington in panic haste, and arrived in the nick of time—for, judging by the press and radio, had he arrived a day later, a fate worse than death would have overtaken the “Western world.” But to the immeasurable relief of Wall Street and Washington, of Bevin, Blum, Dubinsky and Norman Thomas, Secretary Marshall saved the day—the threatening catastrophe was averted. Chief Justice Vinson was not sent to Moscow for discussions with Stalin. The “outbreak” of peace was stopped cold in its tracks, and the “inept” Chief Executive became the object of a bombardment of advice and admonition to be more careful in the future, to refrain from hazarding the fate of the U.S.A. and of the world with moves that might, heaven forbid, lead to peace. “The position is restored,” boasted Tom Dewey, Ann O’Hare McCormick and the A.D.A. The President is full of remorse and events in Paris can now follow their normal course.

THEY FEAR PEACE LIKE THE PLAGUE

On October eleventh the State Department spokesmen in the Security Council cracked the whip. The “6-Power compromise plan” to refer the Berlin situation to the Big Four Foreign Ministers for negotiation was arrogantly rejected by the U.S.A., Britain and France. Austin, Jessup and Bevin made it clear that the question of outlawing the atomic bomb and destroying bomb stock-piles simultaneously with establish-

ing a system of controls, was beyond discussion and negotiation. Ditto for the further Soviet proposal that the big powers reduce their armaments by one-third. Thus the bipartisan agents of Harriman Bros., Dillon, Reed and Co., the Chase National Bank, and the Du Pont dynasty sought to seal even the slightest cracks in their frenzied war program through which might blow the faintest breath of peace.

The war incendiarism of American finance capital is made doubly clear when we bear in mind that the Truman-Vinson episode was not the first exhibition of a peace panic. Peace-loving humanity still feels the shock of the cynical rebuff by the men of the trusts to the Soviet offer to negotiate all outstanding differences, on the occasion of the demagogic and obviously insincere note presented by Ambassador W. Bedell Smith. Nor can Americans afford to forget the unrestrained hate and slander unleashed by the ruling class against Henry Wallace when he heroically struck out for world peace in his exchange of letters with Stalin.

Manifestly, the eight ruling financial dynasties, the Wall Street overlords, fear peace like the plague. "A peaceful agreement with the Soviets will ruin business," wail the merchants of death, the dollar pirates and robber barons bloated with profits of war and inflation. Without a war economy priming the pump to the tune of seventeen to twenty billion

dollars annually, we cannot avoid economic collapse, aver the economic experts of the reactionary N.A.M. and the pseudo-liberal academic Keynesians. Negotiation of differences with the Soviets and consolidation of peace abroad are not conducive to a war economy at home. Hence, peace means disaster and must be averted at all costs—that is the conclusion of a profit-mad and insane capitalism.

THE WAR DANGER IS OVER GERMANY, NOT BERLIN

All the imperialist sound and fury notwithstanding, the decisive fact remains that the war-breeding hysteria over the so-called Berlin crisis is a fraud, simply because there is no Berlin crisis. The Soviet Union has repeatedly offered to supply all the required food and coal for the whole of Berlin. As it is, the Soviet Union has allocated 100,000 tons of wheat, 10,000 tons of fat, and 60,000 tons of coal, insuring the supplies of the population of greater Berlin, including its western sectors. The war danger is not over Berlin, but Germany. And the German crisis is deliberately planned and precipitated by the imperialists of the U.S.A. and Britain because Germany is at the center of the world-domination ambitions and war plans of American imperialism.

Clearly, any Big Four Foreign Ministers negotiation of the German question until agreement is reached

carries with it the "danger" of mutual concessions. For, concessions on the part of the U.S.A. would of necessity lie in the direction of the Potsdam agreement for a unified, democratic, de-nazified, de-militarized Germany freed from the grip of the cartel war incendiaries. Such a Germany would help assure the peace of Europe; such a Germany could not very well serve as a basis for Wall Street domination and enslavement of Europe, nor as the main base for preparing another world war. Hence peaceful negotiation of the German question must not be!

But the way is thornier for the Marshallites than was their reckoning. The bipartisan Marshall-Dulles-Vandenberg struggle against the "danger" of peace is creating difficulties for Wall Street's satellites in the United Nations. With the Marshall Plan undermining their economies, and their working classes reduced to semi-starvation, the governments of France and a number of small capitalist countries fear that U.S. imperialism is driving to war too fast and too hard. Their quivering ruling classes have been made keenly aware of the mood of the masses. They sense the people's hatred for American imperialism, their alarm at the increasing forfeiture of their national sovereignty, and their certain unwillingness to fight against the land of socialism, the land that contributed most to saving mankind from fascist slavery. It is in the light

of this "sobering" fact that one must assess the new overtures for a rapprochement with fascist Spain—Senator Gurney's visit to Franco and that of the Pope's mundane representative, Jim Farley, as well as Marshall's secret talks with Bevin and Schuman aimed at reversing the 1946 U.N. decision to end diplomatic representation in Franco Spain. The inclusion of Spain in a military alliance of the "Western democracies," would, among other things, vastly increase the pressure on France to toe the mark without hesitation.

However, the war drive of the Western bloc headed by the U. S. has suffered a series of reversals which no amount of disguise by the bourgeois press can hide. On October 20, the Political and Security Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, while endorsing the U.S.-dominated majority's plan on atomic energy, simultaneously overrode the American proposal to end the Atomic Energy Commission. And on the Berlin question, the defection of a number of small powers was even more pronounced: the hysterical effort of the U.S., Britain and France to censure the U.S.S.R. for allegedly violating the peace by "aggressive" action, was rejected. Nevertheless, one should not take this to mean that the misleaders of these smaller countries have ceased to lend themselves to the war plans of American imperialism.

Behind these developments clearly lurks the contradiction between the

atomic war-fever of the imperialists and their inability to wage war at the moment, between their fear of peace and their unreadiness for war. Therefore: more frenzied war preparations, accompanied by the intensification of the drive toward fascism. Therefore: the Marshall Plan must be transformed into an open "Martial" plan, stripped of pious pretensions.

The American people are already confronted with the sinister details of the new lend-lease program for the armies of the bankrupt, shaky satellites of American imperialism. The table-fare of the American people, to the tune of ten to fifteen additional billions, is to be converted in great haste into implements of war to turn Western Europe into an armed camp for Wall Street. The Marshall Plan tobacco diet of hungry European babies is to be supplemented by tanks, tommy guns, poison gases and the finest quality Du Pont disease germs. Thus the great dollar war crusade gets under way.

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

The overlords of a dying system and their ideological hirelings are carrying on an unrestrained campaign of war incitement which drives them to the most hypocritical lengths. They proclaim, for example, that the teachings of Lenin and Stalin to the effect that capitalism inevitably breeds war, mean of necessity that the Soviet Union is un-

able to live at peace with the capitalist world.

This old song is given a new rendition on every possible occasion. It is a theme which is reiterated with mock obliviousness of the decisive refutations of this argument which are to be found in both the principles and the policies of the Soviet Union.

Picture, then, Mr. Warren Austin, permanent U.S. delegate to the United Nations, as he is compelled to expose the demagogic face of U.S. imperialism before the Political Committee of the General Assembly on October 12. Pilloried by Andrei Vishinsky before world opinion as incendiaries of war, the U.S. State Department spokesmen presume to find refuge in Leninism for justification of their shameless war-mongering. Thus Austin quotes N. A. Voznesensky, Chief of the State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R. and author of the recent *War Economy of the U.S.S.R. in the Patriotic War*, as follows:

Lenin and Stalin warned the Socialist homeland again of the inevitability of historical battles between imperialism and socialism and prepared the peoples of the U.S.S.R. for these battles. Lenin and Stalin explained that wars which a working class, having defeated its own bourgeoisie, wages in the interests of strengthening and developing socialism, are lawful and holy wars. . . .

To prevent the possibility of appearance within a future period of new imperialist aggression against the Socialist homeland, and the beginning of

a third World War, it is necessary that the aggressor imperialist countries be disarmed militarily and economically, and that the anti-imperialist democratic countries rally together.

Austin then continued with pathos:

When we hear Soviet representatives talk about the peace offensive, we recall that in April, 1948, a Communist Party publication in Paris, defined "final victory over war" as "victory over capitalism." Is this not a ghastly definition of peace?*

The scheme is really simple enough: the actual criminal shouts "Stop Thief" and assumes the injured pose of a pretended victim. This is how the imperialist buccaneers who shape and direct the Wall Street program for world domination, who daily engineer the most brutal crimes to accomplish their piratical ends, assassinate the truth when they are exposed before the tribunal of world opinion.

To hear them, one would have to assume that the advent of the socialist state upon the stage of history, the existence of the Soviet Union, injects a war spirit into the world—breaks up the harmonious relations between states! What prevents this thesis from "clicking," however, is the troublesome reminder that two world wars broke out involving two camps of imperialist rivals sharing a basically identical imperialist ideology. A further obstinate fact is the

* *New York Times*, October 13, 1948.

historical record that the Second World War could have been avoided, had the collective security front urged by the U.S.S.R. not been shattered by the Munich policy of the Western imperialist powers. Nor does this thesis explain how, notwithstanding the profound differences between the socialist and capitalist systems and ideologies, the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance came into being and successfully consummated the military destruction of the aggressive Axis powers. For certainly, the Soviet Union rested on the same socialist foundations during the anti-Axis war, and the U.S.A. was as thoroughly capitalist in structure and ideology in the Roosevelt period, as is the case today. Do not the war years prove that different social systems can peacefully co-operate?

The agents of imperialism charge that the Soviet leaders are dishonest because they predict the long-run inevitability of war so long as imperialism exists, and at the same time conduct a peace offensive. In the chauvinist language of a Warren Austin, is not this "an Oriental maneuver"?

No, Mr. Austin, the condition against which you inveigh so passionately—the inevitability of war under imperialism—is not the creature of someone's imagination, but an objective fact. That fact is presented in your very quotation from Voznesensky: "It should not be forgotten that the capitalist economic system abroad itself produces aggres-

sive wars and the leaders of such wars. . . ." Indignant anger is in order—but directed where it belongs, against the war-breeding capitalist system. However, one can hardly expect such candor from imperialists and their henchmen. *Their* indignation is an outburst at the exposure of the imperialist source and responsibility for wars.

For is it not a fact that *lasting, perpetual peace* is incompatible with the existence of capitalism and requires the abolition of that predatory system? Is it not true that the U.S.S.R. stands consistently at the head of the fight for peace, for the extirpation of fascism, and for the security of nations? Is it not crystal clear that exposing the danger and real source of war does not at all mean advocating war or hastening its outbreak, but the very opposite: sounding the tocsin against war, checking its outbreak, arousing the peoples to struggle against it? Are we therefore to condemn the Soviet leaders when they now warn their people and all of peace-loving humanity that atom-bomb "diplomacy" imperils the peace?

The first act of the newly arisen Soviet power was the promulgation of its Decree of Peace. The first reaction of the imperialist powers—the United States among them—to that historic fact was military intervention to destroy the workers' state which arose from the struggle against imperialist war and which, by its very nature, sought from its

birth to promote world peace and the amity of nations.

Over the years, the Soviet people have in fact experienced a *succession* of armed interventions. It began with the bloody Churchill imperialist intervention, the so-called "March of the Fourteen Nations," in 1918-1920. It continued with the British- and French-financed Pilsudski campaign of 1920-1922. The attacks further took on the form of blockades and embargoes, *cordons sanitaires*, frontier provocations and reactionary clerical "crusades" directed by the Vatican. Internally, the imperialist powers attempted to wreck Soviet power by Fifth Column conspiracies with White Guards, Mensheviks, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and other saboteurs, wreckers and assassins. The U.S.S.R. witnessed the Anglo-American financing and arming of Hitler-Germany to spark the avowed Nazi *Drang Nach Osten*; the cynical rejection of all disarmament and collective security proposals made by the U.S.S.R. in the League of Nations; and the Munich betrayal, which climaxed the international imperialist conspiracy for the destruction of the Soviet Union.

History bears eloquent witness to the indisputable fact that the socialist Soviet Union does not resort to aggression against the capitalist world. The socialist world is committed, in principle, to a policy of friendship and peace with all states that demonstrate the same attitude toward it. For the Soviet leaders, notwithstanding

the profound contradiction between the two systems of economy and ideology, the practical perspective has always been one of co-operation. Soviet spokesmen have declared on innumerable occasions that they stand undeviatingly for peaceful co-operation with the capitalist countries. Moreover, they have never failed to implement this stated policy by deeds, by openly indicting the real incendiaries who plot against the peace, by exposing the seeds of war nourished in the soil of imperialism.

There is no contradiction whatever between a policy of steadfastly campaigning for peaceful relations between the spheres of socialism and capitalism, and simultaneously warning that imperialism inevitably strives toward war. The point is that it takes *two* sides to co-operate, and the history of our times conclusively proves that it is the imperialist powers which have persistently pursued a policy of alternating "cold war" and "hot war" against the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. has made it amply clear that she not only desires to co-operate and settle all differences by peaceful negotiations, but is also willing to compromise whenever necessary in the interest of safeguarding the peace. The burden of proof that the two worlds can live at peace therefore devolves on the capitalist powers.

That Austin was bent on wilfully misconstruing the Soviet position on the possibility of peaceful co-existence is clear from Stalin's well-known in-

terview with Harold Stassen on April 9, 1947. At that time, Stalin showed how baseless was the view attributed to him that the two systems of economy could not co-operate. Stalin said:

It is not possible that I said that the economic systems could not cooperate. Cooperation ideas were expressed by Lenin. I might have said that one system was reluctant to cooperate, but that concerned only one side. But as to the possibility of cooperation, I adhere to Lenin who expressed both the possibility and the desire of cooperation. . . .

There was not a single party congress or plenary session of the central committee of the Communist Party at which I said or could have said that cooperation between the two systems was impossible. I did say that there existed capitalist encirclement and the danger of attack on the U.S.S.R. If one party does not wish to cooperate, then that means that there exists a threat of attack. . . . As you see, this concerns the sphere of desire and not the possibility of cooperation. It is necessary to make a distinction. The possibility of cooperation always exists but there is not always present the wish to cooperate. If one party does not wish to cooperate, then the result will be conflict, war.

These words are plain enough, and no amount of isolated (and distorted) quotations can change the recorded words and deeds of the Soviet leaders on the one hand, or of the capitalist states on the other.

As the representative of U.S. im-

perialism which, in its drive for world domination, is tearing up the Yalta and Potsdam peace documents to which our country stands solemnly committed, Mr. Austin himself bears testimony to, and confirms the political wisdom and historical accuracy of the citations he seeks to misconstrue. What can an honest student of history say concerning the relations between socialism and capitalism when imperialism actively prepares war against the socialist state? Under such conditions is it not clearly the duty and obligation of the socialist state toward humanity to expose imperialist aggression, to lead the struggle against the warmakers, and to "warn . . . of the inevitability of historical battles between imperialism and socialism. . . ."

By his quotation from the French Communist publication, Mr. Austin sought to confuse the question of the class struggle in individual capitalist countries with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union in its relations with other states. It may be presumed, however, that Mr. Austin is well aware that the Soviet Union is not responsible for the contradictions and evils of the monstrous system of capitalist exploitation which inevitably, by its own inherent laws, lead to its abolition and replacement by socialism. Certainly the cited publication is fully correct when it defines the "final victory over war" as the "victory over capitalism." Can there be more conclusive proof of the organic and indissoluble connec-

tion between capitalism and war than the rabid and unceasing warmongering of Austin and other leaders of U.S. capitalism? Insofar as the class struggle is concerned, that is the affair of the working class in the various capitalist countries. A century ago—seventy years before the Soviet Union came into existence—the *Communist Manifesto* made it clear that "The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie." The Soviet Union scrupulously refrains from interfering in the internal affairs of other states.

From the viewpoint of its fundamental nature, which at all times strives to intensified reaction, domination, annexation, conquest and war, imperialism can reconcile itself to peaceful relations with the socialist world only under certain conditions.

The uneven development of capitalism and the consequent sharp inner imperialist antagonisms may split the front of imperialism and temporarily preclude the possibility of intervention against the socialist world. Under conditions of a grave threat to the interests of one imperialist camp from a competing imperialist group, peaceful co-existence and even co-operation of one part of the capitalist world with the world of socialism is rendered possible.

However, as long as imperialism exists, the threat of war for the re-division of the world, for colonies, markets, raw material resources and

spheres of influence—in a word, for plunder and monopoly profits—will hang over humanity. Therefore, the *only guarantee* for the peaceful co-existence of the capitalist and socialist systems, the most important condition for world peace today, is the mass struggle of the people to stop the war incendiaries, to isolate and defeat the monopolist enemies of the people.

MASS STRUGGLE THE ONLY GUARANTEE OF PEACE

Wall Street's drive for war carries with it the most serious threats to the living standards, security, and liberties of the American people. An extended war economy means an accelerated inflationary spiral. An expanded Marshall Plan for the arming of Europe will consume the substance of America and lay the basis for a devastating economic crisis. Wall Street cannot pursue a policy of aggression and the murder of democracy abroad without trampling on the rights and liberties of the working class and the people at home. Taft-Hartley union busting, thought control, and Nazi-like persecution of Communists, foreign-born, and ever-widening circles of progressives are inevitable accompaniments of the Marshall Plan drive for imperialist world domination and war.

But war is not inevitable! The forces of peace and democracy are infinitely stronger than the forces of imperialist reaction, aggression and

war. The American people must draw all the vital conclusions from the November elections. The vital issues involved in the election campaign are still to be fought out in the day-to-day struggle for peace, for the liberty, welfare and security of the people.

Historically, there can be no doubt that regardless of its outcome, the recent election campaign can boast of a great, permanent achievement—it initiated the rallying of the people's forces of peace and democracy around the new Progressive Party.

But the struggles must now be extended and deepened. The vast majority of Americans ardently desire peace and abhor fascist slavery and barbarism. History can brook no delay in the crucial task of consolidating the mighty front of the people against the warmakers—the front of peace and freedom. Labor, the first to suffer from war and fascism, must occupy the front ranks of the peace coalition. Upon labor devolves the special responsibility of providing leadership, cohesion, and consistency to the new people's anti-monopoly party of peace and democracy.

An indispensable condition for labor to assume its rightful place in the peace camp, is the wide recognition by the working class of the intimate relation between foreign and domestic policy. It is clearer than ever today, despite the treacherous surrender to imperialism by the Social-Democratic Reuther-Dubinsky cabal and the Murray-Green variety of la-

bor reformist leaders, that it is impossible to support the war program of the monopolies and at the same time defeat the Taft-Hartleyite enemies of labor. It is impossible to chain labor to the parties driving America toward fascism, and also preserve the labor movement. It is impossible to support the imperialist Marshall Plan, and simultaneously prevent the inflationary assault on the living standards of the working class. The broad masses in the shops, mines, and mills must impress upon their union leaders the simple truth that the road to fascism is paved by Red-baiting; for anti-Communism is the main tool for splitting and undermining the labor movement and the people's forces.

The perspectives for struggle against the monopolist warmakers in the period which lies ahead have been presented in the stirring appeal by the National Committee of our Party to "Fight and Vote to Stop Atom War":

"...The American people built their hopes for peace on the United Nations, whose cornerstone is American-Soviet negotiations and big power unanimity. Let the people now brand as warmakers all who would convert the machinery for peace into a tool for organizing war against the Soviet Union. Democrats, Republicans or Progressives—those who truly want peace will demand a peace mission to Moscow, the negotiation of a peaceful settlement of the Berlin differences, and will de-

fend the Charter of the United Nations.

"The bipartisans who put 20 billion dollars of the people's money into a war budget, and gear the country's economy to the military requirements of a new world war, do not want peace. Those who want peace will join in voicing the American people's acceptance of the Soviet proposal for reduction of armaments, outlawing of the atomic bomb and genuine United Nations control and inspection of atomic energy production. And they will demand the ouster of munitions makers and cartelists from strategic posts in the government.

"Those who want peace do not so soon forgive the criminals of World War II. The American people are not party to the bipartisan pardon of Krupp, Thyssen and Schacht. Let them then demand the full penalty for these Nazis, and for the beast of Buchenwald, Ilse Koch. The Potsdam and Yalta agreements, now dishonored by Truman and repudiated by Dewey, laid the basis for a four-year peace treaty with a unified, peaceful and democratic Germany. Let the people in whose name and with whose approval Roosevelt made those agreements now demand that they be carried out, and the way opened for the withdrawal of all occupation forces from German soil.

"The bipartisans are already inflicting the force and violence of imperialist war on Greece and China. Let all who want peace call a halt to these

criminal wars, and demand the immediate withdrawal of all American military aid and personnel.

"The word 'peace' is profaned by the bipartisans who in the same breath speak of the butcher Franco as 'our ally.' Let all peace-loving Americans denounce the fascist Franco, and repudiate the western European military alliance for which his allegiance is being sought.

"The bipartisan betrayal of the Jewish people betrayed peace in Palestine. But the American people are not committed to the Bernadotte sell-out. Those who want peace can demand fulfillment of the U.N. decision to establish independent Jewish and Arab states in Palestine. Those who want peace will unite in calling for an end to the embargo of Israel, and in defending the independence and territorial integrity of the new Jewish state.

"Those who want peace do not draft and regiment America's youth for war. Those who want peace will now redouble their efforts to repeal the draft, and to abolish immediately all Jim Crow practices in the armed services and government agencies.

"Those who want peace do not persecute anti-fascists and the champions of Roosevelt's peace policies. Those who seek to outlaw the Communist Party are always and everywhere bent on war and preparing fascist terror. Let those who want peace put an end to Congressional witch-hunting and government heresy trials, to the deportation drive and the attempts to nullify the Bill of Rights. Let all who remember the Reichstag Fire Trial as the beacon fire for World War II demand the dismissal of the frame-up indictments against the twelve leaders of the Communist Party. . . ."

THE WEST COAST MARITIME STRIKE: SHOWDOWN FOR LABOR

By AL LANNON

"The chips are down—we have declared our independence of communism both on ship and on shore—this is war to the bitter end."

With this arrogant declaration the ship-owners, on September 1, carried their postwar offensive against maritime labor into a new stage.

At this writing (October 12) five maritime unions on the Pacific Coast have been locked out more than five weeks, with the ship-owners conducting an unprecedented campaign of Red-baiting and slander against the unions, especially against the outstanding maritime labor leader, Harry Bridges.

Refusing to negotiate the modest wage and union security demands of the workers, the ship-owners are attempting to cover up their union-smashing drive by claiming they cannot do business with "irresponsible Party-line leaders" who refuse to comply with the anti-Communist provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act—the same leaders with whom they have had to do "business" over the past thirteen years.

The ship-owners are out to destroy all the gains won by the maritime workers over the past thirteen years, gains which were secured and upheld because the struggles of maritime labor were anchored in the strategic foundations of united and progressive unionism on both coasts—the National Maritime Union on the Atlantic Coast and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union on the Pacific Coast.

Encouraged and strengthened by the defeat of the progressive forces in the recent N.M.U. elections, which has considerably weakened the unity and strength of maritime labor's anchor on the Atlantic Coast, the ship-owners have now dared to unleash the full force of a long-planned showdown attack against the very fountain-head of progressive unionism in the maritime industry—the West Coast longshoremen, headed by Harry Bridges.

In 1934, it was the struggle of the longshoremen on the West Coast which spearheaded the nation-wide struggles that led to the organization of the great mass production industries, to the birth of the C.I.O. nationally, and to the rise of progressive unionism in the maritime industry. The outcome of the 1934 maritime struggles on the West Coast opened up a new page in the social and economic gains of American labor.

It was these struggles and these advances of labor, galvanized by the West Coast maritime struggles of 1934, which were a very important factor in defeating the attempts of

Big Business at that time to take the reactionary and pro-fascist way out of the economic crisis, and in helping initiate the period of the Roosevelt-labor coalition in the country.

As in 1934, so again in 1948, the West Coast maritime workers are in the forefront of a struggle whose outcome will shape the course of the fight to preserve collective bargaining and bona-fide unionism in the United States. The outcome of this battle will undoubtedly influence the course of the labor and people's struggles against Wall Street's present bipartisan program of war and fascism.

At this stage, the struggle of the West Coast maritime workers represents a climactic phase of the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act. *Its outcome will be of key importance in determining the course of the struggle for the right of any labor organization to exist without capitulating to the Taft-Hartley Act.*

It will also determine, to a large degree, whether rule by injunction, police terror and stool-pigeon provocation shall become the common fate of all unions, regardless of their policies, leadership or affiliation.

Unless the American trade unionists, in the first place the Left-progressive forces, understand this struggle and the stakes involved, and as a result succeed in rallying that kind of labor and people's support which will defeat the plans of the ship-owners, American Big Business will smash the West Coast unions and thus will succeed in speeding the

nation still further along the path toward fascism and war.

THE COMMITTEE FOR
MARITIME UNITY TORPEDOED
BY CURRAN

The postwar period has witnessed the launching of one successive attack after another by the ship-owners against the progressive maritime unions. These attacks began with the six months' deadlock in negotiations in 1945-46, which was not broken until the unity of maritime labor was brought to new heights by the formation and united action of the Committee for Maritime Unity.

The C.M.U., as a front of common action by seven of the most progressive maritime unions, was able to bring about a greater degree of industrial solidarity in action between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. than has ever been achieved in any other major industry.

The result was a major setback in the time-table of the anti-union strategy of the ship-owners and the defeat of Truman's attempt to apply in the maritime industry the formula which had been successful in breaking the 1946 railroad strike a few weeks previously.

Even more important than the unprecedented economic gains won under the banner of the C.M.U. was the trend it spurred toward industry-wide joint action as a bridge toward industrial unionism. Had this trend continued, it would have put an end

to the organizational vulnerability of the maritime workers, who are divided into more than a dozen different unions and crafts and still further divided in affiliation among C.I.O., A. F. of L., and independent unions.

It was this perspective, more than anything else, that the ship-owners feared. That is why they took the lead in initiating the bipartisan Big Business union-busting drive under the guise of a "Crusade against Communism."

As if geared to the Red-baiting offensive of the ship-owners to destroy the C.M.U. and to break up the developing unity between the East and West Coast maritime unions, the forces of capitulation, led by Joseph Curran, unleashed a violent campaign of disruption within the N.M.U. All this in the name of fighting "Communism."

It is significant, however, that it took more than Red-baiting for the ship-owners or Curran to succeed in torpedoing the C.M.U. The C.M.U. was sunk with the promise of still "greater unity" coming from Curran's lips.

Instead of the fulfillment of Curran's false promise of "greater unity" there is today the poisoned fruit of his Red-baiting disruption, threatening the very life of the N.M.U. as well as all other maritime unions.

Unable in the case of the I.L.W.U. to make the advances by internal disruption that they have made in the N.M.U., the ship-owners have opened

a frontal assault against this bulwark of progressive unionism.

Preparation for this assault was evident in the fact that during the period of the injunction, from June 15 to September 1, the ship-owners stalled and evaded giving even the semblance of negotiations.

Then, on the eve of the expiration of the injunction, the ship-owners undertook the pretense of negotiating with the five unions they were preparing to lock out. They issued a number of press statements to the effect that progress was being made and that an agreement would be reached with the unions.

This cover-up tactic was devised in order to hide from the workers and the public the fact that the ship-owners had no intention of arriving at an agreement, regardless of the compromises made by the unions, compromises short of surrender to the ship-owner demand to abolish the hiring hall and weaken the economic position of the workers.

Behind the smoke-screen of sham negotiations and press hand-outs the ship-owners made intensive preparations for a lock-out, seeking at the same time to shift the responsibility for interruption of shipping onto "irresponsible" union leaders.

This is proved by the fact that a few hours before the midnight deadline of September 1, on the heels of talking settlement, the ship-owners walked into a meeting of the I.L.W.U. Negotiating Committee with a written contract, acceptance

of whose terms would have meant capitulation by the unions on the issue of the hiring hall, as well as on most of the other issues under dispute.

This contract was offered as an ultimatum to the I.L.W.U. leadership, to be signed by midnight without any consultation with its membership or with the other unions which had as yet made little or no progress toward an agreement with the ship-owners.

To the request of the I.L.W.U. for a little more time and effort to avert a tie-up of shipping, the ship-owners replied: "Sign, as is, by midnight—or else."

Failing to blackjack the I.L.W.U. into accepting an ultimatum that would have ended the hiring hall and left the seagoing unions holding the bag, the ship-owners walked out of the negotiations. The next day they issued a statement that the only issue was the refusal of the I.L.W.U. leadership to comply with the anti-Communist affidavit section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The truth is that this issue never once arose, at any time, during the entire period of negotiations. It was introduced *after* the lockout to confuse the real issue: the refusal of the union to sign an ultimatum that would have meant the surrender of the hiring hall.

The union-controlled hiring hall and a democratic rotary system of hiring are the very foundation for union security and survival in the

maritime industry. Without the union hiring hall it would be impossible to defeat ship-owner attempts to bring back the days of shipping crimps, victimization and blacklisting, and to turn every pier into a slave block for maritime workers.

What the locked-out West Coast maritime unions are facing today is, in one form or another, more and more the burden being imposed on all unions regardless of leadership or affiliation.

The employers are using the Taft-Hartley Law not only to destroy Left and progressive union leadership. The minimum aim of Taft-Hartleyism is to dictate to all labor organizations, not only the choice of union leadership, but also the choice of what policies they adopt and put into action.

That this is so, and that it raises the issue of a common problem facing all unions, is evident from the fact that the leaders of three of the locked-out unions complied with the anti-Communist provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act months before the lockout began.

TAFT-HARTLEYISM JEOPARDIZES ALL UNIONS

The West Coast maritime struggle points up the fact that all the Right-wing forces, who have been conducting a bitter war against the Left-progressive forces and unions, are themselves faced with a crisis situation today.

They are face to face with the hard and inescapable fact that the very existence of collective bargaining is at stake, that they risk the survival of even the semblance of collective bargaining, if they fail to throw the full weight of their strength behind the locked-out maritime workers.

Failing to recognize this fact, the most that these Right-wing forces can hope for as a reward for their surrender to the bipartisan anti-labor drive of monopoly is no longer collective bargaining, but the "bargaining" of a new type of state-controlled company unionism.

Despite the smoke-screen of anti-Communism, including spy circuses, Congressional witch-hunts, and the use of Taft-Hartleyism for raiding and disruptive purposes by those in the labor movement who act Taft-Hartley while speaking against it, it is becoming ever more apparent that the "anti-Communist" drive of the employers, of Congress, and of the Administration is not limited to an attack upon the Left forces and unions.

This attack is rapidly enveloping every section of the labor movement. Big Business and its political servants are arrogantly demonstrating that they will neither pause nor be restrained in their labor-smashing aims by any demonstrations of anti-Communism and "respectability" on the part of labor leadership.

Those forces that continue to use anti-Communism and Taft-Hartleyism because of the illusion of partisan advantage within the unions and for

the purpose of labor cannibalism in raiding, instead of uniting with fellow unionists against a common danger, will, in the coming weeks, stand more and more exposed as the open agents of the bipartisan, Big Business drive to destroy the labor movement.

Thus, the initiation of a referendum in the N.M.U. with Curran advocating compliance with the anti-Communist affidavit sections of the Taft-Hartley Act, can be interpreted as nothing less than a direct stab in the back of the West Coast unions locked out on the *pretext* that they are refusing to do what Curran is simultaneously calling upon the N.M.U. membership to do.

Curran's call for compliance, coinciding with the lockout, was issued despite the unanimous vote of the N.M.U. convention last September against compliance and despite the fact that the membership of the N.M.U. had already rejected compliance in a previous referendum. His action represents another direct step along the path of class collaboration with the ship-owners.

The stand taken by Jack Lawrenson, N.M.U. Vice-President, against compliance with the anti-Communist affidavits, is an indication of the growing awakening of the rank and file to these facts. It is a reflection of the fact that the rank and file are beginning to sense the meaning of the suicidal union-destroying course upon which Curran embarked when he began to crusade against "Communism."

If Lawrenson, and any others, wish

to express consistently the growing alarm of the maritime workers and to fight for their interests, they must not only reject compliance with the Taft-Hartley Law. They must break with the policies of union misleaders who continue to use the anti-Communist techniques of the Taft-Hartleyites to disrupt the ranks of the N.M.U. by warring upon and expelling militant fighters in the union.

To be consistent, Lawrenson, or anyone else, must also reject the ship-owner-inspired policy which is breaking the unity of maritime labor on all coasts. Full support and joint action with the locked-out maritime unions on the West Coast is today the acid test of the will to struggle against Taft-Hartleyism.

A FOCAL POINT IN STRUGGLE AGAINST TAFT-HARTLEYISM

While the West Coast struggle is without question the focal point of the struggle for the survival of all those forces refusing to capitulate to the Taft-Hartley Act, the real meaning of the struggle is that it is a determining phase in the fight for the existence of collective bargaining in the country as a whole.

The demand of the ship-owners, or any other employers, for union compliance with the Taft-Hartley Law, is, in effect, a demand that no union, whether Left- or Right-led, shall continue to function except on terms dictated by the employers and supported by the state.

This means company unionism in

a new sense, in the sense that accounted for Philip Murray's original characterization of the Taft-Hartley Act as a "long step towards fascism."

It would not be company unionism in the old sense of individual employers selecting the leadership and determining the policies of individual organizations controlled by this or that corporation. It would be company unionism in the sense of the entire labor movement being brought under the collective control of Big Business.

This new type of super-company unionism would be enforced by the Government through all of its agencies of coercion, including the courts and the armed forces.

This is why failure to struggle against the Taft-Hartley Act and to support unions such as the West Coast Maritime Unions, which are now bearing the full brunt of the state-sponsored offensive of the employers, adds up to acceptance of the rise of an American counterpart of the "trade unionism" practiced under Adolph Hitler and Robert Ley.

It is their limited knowledge of these facts which explains the hesitancy of some anti-Communist trade-union leaders to capitulate completely to the Taft-Hartley Act. If the Communist and progressive forces understand the significance of this and develop a correct united front approach within which the mobilization of the workers and the public for support of the West Coast struggle is pursued, it will be possible to

defeat the lockout and transform the West Coast struggle into the basis for a broader, nation-wide counter-attack against Taft-Hartleyism.

The West Coast showdown can, therefore, either be the starting point for a chain of defeats for labor which would wipe out unions in all ports and in many industries, or it can result in a victory which will push forward the struggle to regain the right of collective bargaining that was lost

with the passage of the Taft-Hartley Bill and the destruction of the Wagner Act.

It is the bounden duty of all sections of the labor and progressive movement, especially of the Left-progressive forces, to champion unitedly the cause of the West Coast unions and to spark that broad, united action of labor which can and must bring victory in this struggle.

“History tells us that the development of fascism and the establishment of fascist dictatorship does not follow an identical pattern in all countries. The forms and methods of fascist rule also differ from country to country, determined by differences in the relation of class forces, national traditions and the economic position of monopoly.

“But despite the specific features that mark the development of fascism in this or that country, there are certain general features which it displays always and everywhere.

“Thus, while the way fascism has come to power differs in this or that country, in every country the drive toward fascism and its victory have been accompanied by extensive preparations for imperialist war, especially for an anti-Soviet crusade. Thus, too, while the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in certain countries has been preceded by the development of fascist mass movements, in every country it has been preceded by the growth of capitalist reaction and by the adoption of a system of reactionary measures to cripple and smash the trade unions, to outlaw the Communist Party and ruthlessly to oppress all national minorities.”

Eugene Dennis in the *Main Political Report to the Fourteenth Convention, C.P.U.S.A.*

GREECE AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S TASKS

By OLIVE SUTTON

A SERIOUS DANGER exists today that the U.S. imperialist bloc will send troops, under the guise of United Nations auspices, to take an active part in the struggle against the Greek people. On September 12, shortly after the Athens government precipitated a series of provocations on the northern border and issued inflammatory statements in connection with them, the New York *Herald Tribune* wrote: “Demands from Greece for more vigorous U.N. action against its Slav neighbors and rebel guerrillas—including an international force to seal the 500-mile border—loomed ahead for the coming General Assembly.” The U.S. representative to the United Nations, Warren Austin, in a radio broadcast on September 10, endorsed the Trygve Lie proposal for the creation of an “international constabulary force,” adding that “some guard units” could be used in the Balkans. Such a force would, of course, be essentially an appendage of the Western Bloc in the U.N. subservient to U.S. imperialist designs.

This new drive for large-scale in-

tervention in Greece is a result of the political, economic and military failure of the Truman Doctrine. The leader of the Greek Communist Party (K.K.E.), Nicolas Zachariadis, in an article broadcast over the Free Greek Radio on September 15, gave the following picture of the situation, after the much heralded 1948 “offensive” of the Wall Street-directed monarchist army:

The monarcho-fascists completely failed in their military campaign in 1948, since they neither succeeded in annihilating nor achieved the weakening of the democratic forces in Grammos. A new Grammos has now been created in Mourgana and Vitsi, while in the Peloponnese, Roumeli (Central Greece) and Thessaly the Democratic Army has extended its control over greater regions. The repercussions of these developments are shaking the foundations of Americanocracy in Athens. The bankrupt regime is trying to cover up its military, political and economic failures with an intensification of terrorism.

In contrast to the U.S. scheme, which would try to extricate Wall Street from its predicament in Greece by throwing in more military forces and heightening the danger of world conflagration, the Free Greek Government has now submitted a memorandum to the U.N. General Assembly in Paris asking for a negotiated honest peace and the restoration of independence and democracy in Greece, on the basis of a plan which the United Nations should elaborate.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GREECE IN THE IMPERIALIST PATTERN OF WORLD DOMINATION

These events cannot remain without important repercussions in the United States, since Greece has become during the last few years one of the major battle grounds between the Greek people on the one hand and the American-British imperialists on the other; between the progressive forces and the imperialist camp. Since the proclamation of the notorious "Truman Doctrine" in March, 1947, which assumed British colonial commitments in Greece, no important event in that country can leave the American people and American progressives unaffected.

Why has that small country, with its 50,720 square mile area and a population near the seven million mark, situated on the southernmost tip of the Balkan peninsula, in the strategically important area of the north-eastern Mediterranean, assumed such importance in world events?

Greece has become the first major testing ground of the aggressive, imperialist policies of Wall Street and is, at present, the first and only European country where the people are resisting those policies with a successful armed struggle. The *New York Daily News* commented editorially on September 13 that in Greece we have witnessed: "... the small sized father of the king size Marshall Plan," and concludes pessimistically:

"If we have stubbed our toes so often and so awkwardly in Little Greece to date, how colossally may we fail on the big Marshall Plan?"

Greece was used as the first territory for the adventures of the Wall Street war policies, in the first place because of its great strategic military and political importance in the pattern of imperialist domination, and secondly, because of its possibilities for exploitation by finance capital.

The British Empire for generations recognized Greece's attributes in these respects, and manipulated the country's internal governments ruthlessly to its own advantage. During the war, Britain maintained its grip on Greece through the government-in-exile in Cairo, which fled when the Nazis invaded, and attempted to demolish the heroic record of the resistance movement with reports that the Greeks were fighting among themselves; the terms E.A.M. and E.L.A.S. were even banned from the airwaves of the British Broadcasting Company.

The Greek "airplane carrier," as it has been aptly termed by the American commercial press, is aimed directly at the heart of socialism, the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies of Eastern Europe. As a military bridgehead to the Mediterranean basin, it also constitutes a key position for the Middle Eastern and Asiatic oil and colonial policies, with great bearing on the struggle of the colonial peoples for national independence. Already, as the Plenum

of the Central Committee of the K.K.E. pointed out on July 29, the American imperialists "... are rapidly organizing this new colony into a war base and military springboard. Under the pretext of organizing the entertainment of the American forces in the Mediterranean, they are already building military camps in Greece for the American armed forces."

Politically, American intervention in Greece presents a most important pressure point against the consolidation of the Balkan and the Eastern European People's Democracies. It but continues the Churchillian policy of opening a "second front" in the Balkans, to stop the advance of socialism in Eastern Europe, which brought about the British armed intervention against the Greek resistance forces in December, 1944.

Greece, with its reservoir of cheap labor and great unexploited natural resources, also presents to some extent an important region for investment by finance capital. There is an abundance of mineral resources, of high quality chrome ore, bauxite, etc., which, together with a vast potential reservoir of hydro-electric power, could form the basis of an important heavy and light industry in the Eastern Mediterranean area. Agricultural products, like tobacco, olive oil, currants, and fruits, of high quality, are tempting to the big capitalist trading trusts, as the American Tobacco Company can well testify. Special reports on this matter

were prepared by U.N.R.R.A. for the International Bank, by the Food and Agricultural Organization, as well as by other agencies, which all present lucrative propositions for the Wall Street financiers.

The failure of British imperialism to hold out in Greece, *because of the resistance of the people*, and the intensified aggressiveness of American finance capital, gave birth to the "little Marshall Plan," the well known "Truman Doctrine." The issue of Greece transcended its geographical boundaries, and as a result of foreign intervention became a vital peace problem for progressives all over the world and especially for the American people.

GREECE AS AN IMPERIALIST COLONY AND MILITARY BRIDGEHEAD

The social context of Greek life has been lucidly set forth by Nicolas Zachariadis, before the war, as follows:

Greece is an agrarian-industrial country with a medium capitalist development and with semi-feudal remnants in its agrarian economy. The economic structure of the country has as its fundamental peculiarity the important political dependence of Greece on foreign capital. This dependence, together with the preservation of the feudal remnants in the village, has held the country in its economic and general backwardness. . . . The oncoming revolution in Greece will in the light of the problems it has to solve, begin as a bour-

geois-democratic revolution, with a more or less rapid passage to the socialist revolution.

The 130 years' history of the existence of the Greek state pivots about these two fundamental problems, viz., the semi-colonial dependence of the country on foreign capital and the semi-feudal remnants of the agrarian economy. The Greek capitalist class, fearing the people, sold out the country's life to foreign imperialists (foremost among whom were the British until the U. S. entered the scene), and betrayed its historic role by coming to terms with the feudal lords. With the emergence of the Greek working class and its highest form of organization, the Communist Party (K.K.E.), the historic task of leading the people in the accomplishment of bourgeois-democratic reforms and onward to the socialist revolution, has devolved on these new leaders of the progressive forces in history.

The struggle of the people in Greece has been rendered after the war even more acute because the country has been transformed into a virtual colony by wholesale foreign intervention.

To date nearly one and a half billion dollars have been poured down the Greek rathole by the imperialists since September, 1944. British troops openly fought the Greek resistance forces with tanks and rocket bombers for thirty-three days in December, 1944, and approximately 5-

000 British troops are still stationed in Salonika. 408 U.S. Army and Navy officers not only lead the monarchist forces, control its organization, ordering the removal of officers they do not like, but actually participate in the fighting. 210,000 tons of war materiel have been delivered in one year alone by the U.S. to its fascist allies in Athens. As the Wall Street apologists, the Alsop brothers, candidly admit, America is now "in the business of breaking and making" the various Athens governments.

The American note of June 15, 1947, which constituted the "agreement" between the two countries for the application of the "Truman Doctrine," exacts the following conditions from the Royalist puppets: that the U.S. missions to Greece will "participate in the development of revenue and expenditure policies, approve government expenditures . . . take part in the planning of the import programme and approve the use of foreign exchange. . . . In general, the Greek Government will wish [*sic*] to consult with the missions before taking any economic steps which might affect the success of the American aid program." The U.S. officials in Greece thus exercise veto power over the country's foreign exchange, payment of loans, exports, imports, natural resources and labor. The U.S. economic chief, Eugene Clay, a nephew of General Lucius Clay, recently broke into a meeting of the ministerial council, according to the Athens pro-government paper

Ta Nea, and ordered that no wage increases be granted to striking workers. The members of the American mission and representatives of the U.S. firms in Greece, as well as their personnel, have been granted extra-territorial rights and immunities by special decree. Many U.S. corporations have already received important economic concessions.

Another pro-governmental Athens paper, *To Vima*, commenting on the subject some months ago, wrote:

With each passing day, the Greek people is becoming more convinced that the rights of its government are being continuously diminished, while, on the contrary, the rights and powers of the American missions are steadily enlarged. Any category of Greek citizens desiring to discuss any matter with the Greek government or its Ministers has to have talks beforehand with the American Ambassador and members of the American mission.

And *Eleftheria*, another pro-imperialist publication, concludes:

The Americans consider it most natural to announce in advance changes in the [Royalist] Army command. . . .

In spite of this intervention, the democratic forces are more powerful today than ever before, since the promulgation of the Truman Doctrine. This fact, brought out by the Plenum of the Central Committee of the K.K.E. at the end of July and repeated by the Party's Political Bureau on August 25, indicates that

"today the smashing of Greek Monarcho-Fascism is nearer than at any other time, provided that every Greek patriot does his duty."

THE WORLD PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT AND THE K.K.E.—THE BASIS FOR THE RESISTANCE

The Greek democratic movement would never have reached its present greatness, without the existence of a strong Communist Party and the moral force of the advancing world-democratic camp.

While the resistance of the world progressive forces counteracts the imperialist designs, the Greek people have their rear safely covered from the imperialists along their northern frontiers, where friendly countries follow their struggle with deep interest and extend them moral and political support. The treachery of the Yugoslav leaders has undoubtedly created some difficulties, but as the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Democratic Government, Petros Roussos, stated:

We are in the camp of democracy and peace, together with the Soviet Union, and whoever belongs to this camp is invincible.

At this point the allegation that "foreign assistance" is extended to the Greek democratic forces by their neighboring countries should be answered. For, with the help of commissions steamrollered through the United Nations by the imperialist

camp's voting machine, this contention has been used to justify American and British open intervention in Greece, and to obscure its grandiose dimensions. The Greek people have received no assistance from the neighboring governments, except that which would be extended to any democrat regardless of his origin, who might seek sanctuary within their borders or that which constitutes a philanthropic aid to the victims of fascism. General Markos Vafiadis, the Premier of Free Greece, speaking to the *Herald Tribune* correspondent, Homer Bigart, stated emphatically:

We have not received a single cartridge from across the northern frontier. Believe me, if we had all the help Athens says we are getting from our neighbors the situation would be vastly different. With half the artillery and air support which the fascists are getting from America we would be in Athens today instead of sitting here.

As Markos explained, the Democratic Army gets all its supplies by capturing them from the enemy during battles and raids.

After all, it remains an incontestable fact that the first foreign intervention after Greece's liberation from the Nazis, was British armed intervention in December, 1944, when no allegation of any interference from the new democracies could possibly have been made.

The second fundamental prerequisite for the Greek people's successful

struggle, has been the existence of a powerful Greek Communist Party, the K.K.E., which through its magnificent leadership against the Nazi occupation grew from a minor to a major party, undoubtedly the biggest and most important political grouping in postwar Greece. When elections were held in the trade unions under conditions of terror and intimidation in 1946, the workers voted solidly—ninety per cent—for the slate supported by the Communist Party. As for the peasants, their alliance with the working class was welded and tempered during the anti-fascist struggle when they learned the benefits of a people's regime through their own experience in the free areas held by the resistance forces.

The K.K.E. today leads the wide coalition of workers, peasants and middle-class elements—of all patriotic Greeks—in the struggle for national liberation. It is the dominant force in the Democratic Government and Army, and the brunt of the fight is carried by members of the Communist Party.

The K.K.E. succeeded in becoming the leader of the Greek people through its correct policy, its struggles for the people's cause and the examples set by its leaders and its members. After the liberation from the Nazis, it adopted as its fundamental policy an objective for "normal and peaceful democratic development," to let the people freely decide their future. But the British oc-

cupiers, and the predatory American imperialists who finally took over completely, feared the strength of the people, and embarked on a policy of civil war. While the coalition of E.A.M. (National Liberation Front) parties was calling for reconciliation of the people, for an end to the civil war, for peace and democracy, a fascist regime was fitted out by the foreigners to exploit and oppress the people in the most inhuman way. As a result, the people knew by their own experience the real instigators of civil strife, and understood that they had to put up an armed fight if they wanted to survive.

This policy of reconciliation which sprang from the demands of the people themselves into the basic slogan of the Party, has been illustrated by Zachariadis as the progressive forces extending their one hand for an honest agreement to all those, irrespective of their political beliefs, who want peace, while in the other hand they hold their rifles to defend themselves from every attacker. Reaffirming this policy, the Democratic Government has adopted a law granting wide amnesty to the misled and allowing them to hold to their own political beliefs. It has also repeatedly issued peace offers, stating that it would agree to a democratic peace, on one condition—an end to the foreign intervention and the establishment of democracy in Greece.

The sacrifices of the Greek people in the struggle have been immense. From April, 1945, to April,

1948, 2,150 were executed by firing squads; 5,900 (incomplete) murdered by Right-wing bands; 60,000 imprisoned or exiled, including nearly 20,000 soldiers and officers.

Heroism in Greece has become an event of everyday life, while the American-sponsored terror by far surpasses everything the Hitlerites did in that country. And this is no overstatement. The people follow the spirit of the answer given to the Turkish invaders, more than a century ago, by a Greek leader:

You may cut down our woods. You may burn our houses. You may not leave a stone unturned. But we will not bow before you. . . . Even if you cut and burn down our trees, you will not be able to carry away the soil. And this same soil that nourished them will remain ours and will bear them again. If one Greek remains we will still continue to fight. Abandon all hope that you will be able to make this land yours.

Today the battle goes on under the slogan: "All to arms! Give everything for victory!"

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE ARMED STRUGGLE OF THE GREEK DEMOCRATS

The armed struggle of the Greek people was resumed in March, 1946, under the pressure of foreign imperialist intervention. It is but a continuation of the armed struggle which the Greek people undertook in 1940 against the fascist-nazi in-

vaders and which received a temporary setback, entirely due to British armed intervention in 1944.

What have the people's revolutionary forces achieved during the last two and a half years of armed struggle?

The first major achievement has been the creation of an armed people's military force with a centralized general headquarters, the Democratic Army of Greece, now fighting all over Greece, even on the rugged Aegean islands. This army has grown from insignificant small units of citizens who took to the mountains in self-defense against the monarchist terror, into a first class revolutionary force capable of successful frontal battles against opponents far superior in number and materiel. It is only recently (September 16) that Athens had to admit that in the Vitsi area its forces were pushed back five miles in a frontal battle with the guerrillas.

Today tens of thousands of men and women, not only Greeks, but also drawn from the Slavo-Macedonian and Turkish minorities, participate actively in the battles. According to the estimates of the monarcho-fascist Minister of War, George Stratos, 300,000 persons fight on the side of the democratic forces, either as soldiers or as free lancers and saboteurs in the enemy's rear.

Still, the fascist forces are superior in numbers and materiel. Since the monarchists were able to grasp control of the state machine through

the British armed intervention, they are able through their policy of terror and intimidation to muster greater numbers of men in their forces, estimated as follows (*Inside Free Greece*, by Evdos Ioannides): 130,000 soldiers; 60,000 national guards; 20,000 units for village "defense"; and 40,000 gendarmes who constitute the core of reaction—a grand total of 250,000. As for the Democratic Army's forces, not including the free lancers, saboteurs and other resistance fighters, the U.S. mission estimates them now at 20,000-30,000—a low figure obviously intended for disparagement.

Truman Doctrine assistance has given the monarchists an absolute preponderance in air and sea, while the heavy materiel and other equipment of their land forces by far surpass those of the Democratic Army, *which has to fight and capture its arms from the enemy.*

But the Democratic Army is able to counteract these tremendous odds, as its leader, General Markos, has stated, by the fact that ". . . it is part and parcel of the Greek people. . . . The Democratic Army is a revolutionary army. It is an army of the people and, as such, has superior tactics and strategy to the enemy. It can move about freely, and it can hit where it wants to because it enjoys the full support of the Greek people. Without that support it cannot exist."

The second major achievement of the Greek democratic forces is the

liberation of wide territories of the country. "Seven-tenths of the whole area of Continental Greece is under the permanent or semi-permanent military control of the Democratic Army," stated General Markos in an interview to the *London Daily Worker* last June. "In those seven tenths of the country the people rule themselves by their own elected councils, get justice through their own people's courts." And as the crux of all these successes, in December, 1947, the first Provisional Democratic Government was instituted and now leads the armed struggle, administering the free territories until the day when the people will freely elect a Constituent Assembly. The progressive forces all over the world are now looking toward this government, headed by General Markos, as the only true representative of the Greek people.

At this point it must be stated that as regards the question of territories held by the Democratic Army, many false reports have been given the American public, some of which have even gained credence among the progressive forces. To cover up the failure of the bipartisan war policies in Greece, the imperialists have attempted to create the impression that the democratic forces have been defeated and the territory which they hold has shrunk. Events prove these reports false on every count. Today, for example, the Democratic Army has regained possession of all the territories it held in Central

Greece (Roumeli), according to the Free Greek Radio, and has extended its gains in that area. The U.S. military chief in Greece, General James Van Fleet, however, had pronounced Roumeli definitely cleared from the "bandits" six months ago.

The epitaph on the whole Wall Street-sponsored military campaign of this year was written by the monarchist Minister of War, when he said after the big Grammos battle (supposedly the final blow against the guerrillas) that the fascist forces were "called upon immediately to fight 'two other Grammoses—Vitsi and Mourgana.' He said that when these battles were won, the Greek Army would be called upon to fight 'yet more Grammoses and so on'" (*New York Times*, September 10).

The Democratic Army is now fighting continuously all over Greece and not only in the regions the reactionaries choose for "offensives." "Its purpose is," as General Markos said, "to wear down the enemy, to compel him to keep garrisons in every town, to force him increasingly into the defensive, to undermine his morale by constant attacks, and then to overthrow him." In this way, at the appropriate moment and in the appropriate region, the Democratic Army will launch a strategic counter-attack.

TWO WORLDS, TWO CAMPS MEET IN AN ARMED STRUGGLE

Two forces are confronting each other today in Greece.

On the one side there are the progressive forces and Free Greece, which represent the interests of the working class, the overwhelming majority of the peasantry, middle class elements in the towns and patriotic Greeks in general, who do not cherish the "bounties" of foreign intervention and civil war. Politically these forces are united in the E.A.M. (National Liberation Front) coalition of Parties, in which the Communist Party is the main force and the A.K.E. (Agrarian Party of Greece) its chief ally. This coalition was formed and tempered in the struggle against the Nazis. The K.K.E. in the recent Plenum of its Central Committee stated that it "remains faithful to the popular democratic co-operation which is expressed and realized within the political coalition of E.A.M., a coalition which is based on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and the brotherly co-operation of the K.K.E. and the A.K.E."

While today in the Provisional Democratic Government, the Communist Party is most impressively represented, the forces of the remaining E.A.M. parties (Agrarian, Radical Republican, Socialist, Democratic Union) participate in the struggle, together with the forces of the Left-wing Liberals and some other middle-class representatives. These parties are not officially represented in the Free Government, since most of their leaders of any importance have been arrested and now face

courageously together with the Communists and other democratic fighters the hardships of exile on the barren islands of the Aegean.

Certain other middle-class elements, headed mainly by the Socialist Party—E.L.D. (which is recognized by the European Right-wing Socialists) are following an opportunistic policy. So far, despite the heavy pressure brought upon them by the Athens government, they have not taken a stand against the Democratic Army. On the other hand, while criticizing American intervention, they have failed to align themselves with Free Greece. While the policy of the leadership has been passive, the rank and file of the E.L.D. constitutes a potential ally of the democratic forces.

The progressive forces in the liberated areas have launched a series of social reforms, which are the basis for the solution of the bourgeois-democratic problem and formation of a people's democracy. An agrarian reform gives land to the peasants, who constitute two-thirds of the population; another abolishes concessions to foreign capital; a bill of rights guarantees the people's interests. Other measures provide: popular democratic institutions and elected people's councils, popular justice, universal elementary education and the means to achieve this; the breaking up of the financial-feudal stranglehold of the banks on the peasantry; the achievement of equal civil rights for the Slavo-Macedonians and other

minorities, as well as for women; the protection of small enterprises against big capital; the institution of trade-union liberties and labor laws. All these achievements account for the democratic forces' appeal among the wide masses of the Greek people. The persistent efforts of the progressive forces for a reconciliation of the Greek people to put an end to civil war and its application in their everyday policy, is another major source of their strength among the masses.

President Truman, Secretary of State Marshall, and American officials in Greece have boasted time and again that if it had not been for American interference, Greece would have gone "Communist"; that is—it would have entered the progressive camp long ago. This is true. For the existence of the forces of reaction in Greece is wholly dependent upon armed foreign intervention. These forces represent in the first place the interests of foreign capital in Greece and of the more general military-political designs of imperialism. They are the forces of Greek finance capital, the big banks, the royalty and court, the feudal lords, the high clique of the civil service, the *soldateska*, the various executives, collaborationists, black marketeers, and a large following of other social degenerates. Their support from the people is insignificant, and many misled and honest elements are increasingly attracted to the policy of persuasion and reconciliation

of the Democratic Government.

Politically this unholy alliance of everything that is rotten and corrupt, expresses itself in a coalition of all the old, "historic" parties, as they are sometimes called, *i.e.*, the traditionally reactionary feudal-capitalist Populist Party of Tsaldaris and the Party of the big-bourgeoisie, the Liberal Party of Sophoulis. Some other splinter parties of reaction fall more or less into the same pattern and the extreme Rightist "X-ites," as well as the secret military organizations, center around the Palace and have strong ties with the Populists.

In the field of civil liberties the fundamental stipulations of the Greek Constitution have been suspended and special courts martial, dealing out summary justice, instituted. Trade-union liberties are nonexistent. The death penalty looms over every striker. Nevertheless, as the 4th Plenum of the Central Committee asserted:

In Athens and the other cities a mass popular movement of protest and a strike wave against the plutocratic exploitation are growing and breaking out. The great military failures of the monarcho-fascists and their insistence on civil war, despite the offers of an honest peace repeatedly made by the Democratic Government, are increasing the indignation among the wide popular masses.

In the economic field, American intervention has brought havoc. Inflation continues unchecked; prices

have nearly doubled during the "Truman Doctrine" era. Production in the basic industries is almost nil, while the general production index stands at about 60-70 per cent because of a larger luxury and consumer industry output. Unemployment is growing. Wages are at an average level of \$1-\$1.20 a day, while the cost of living is many times higher than the soaring living cost in the United States. In general the earnings of workers and employees are estimated at about thirty per cent of the exceedingly low prewar income of these classes.

As for the peasants, they fare even worse. The monarcho-fascists have forcibly uprooted 700,000 peasants from their land and homes in an effort to prevent them from supporting the resistance movement. These 700,000 are refugees in the cities and larger towns, without assistance or relief, deprived of the means to earn any kind of living. Other hundreds of thousands are obliged to desist from cultivating their land or reaping their crop, as a result of the U.S.-sponsored civil war. Agricultural producers, as for example tobacco producers, who used to furnish 65 per cent of Greece's income from foreign trade, have been cut off from their natural market outlets in central Europe as a result of the Marshall Plan. American tobacco companies have achieved a virtual monopoly in Western Germany, one of the chief Greek tobacco markets, while they also press down the price

of raw tobacco in the international markets making the lives of 1,500,000 tobacco producers and their families unbearable.

American intervention has been so blatant, that even the Greek plutocrats, who are among the most corrupt and degraded in the world, sometimes feel the urge to protest. United States capitalists have achieved a series of important economic concessions from the country's wealthy resources; they have also received extra-territorial rights, after exertion of State Department pressure. Recently the Association of Greek Manufacturers—the N.A.M. of Greece—published a carefully worded statement criticizing the American Mission's intervention in the economic affairs of the country.

As for reforms, which are sorely needed, in American-occupied Greece, even the Keynesian rigamaroles which were tried for a time after the war, have been scrapped as "socialist."

As a result of these policies during the first year of the Truman Doctrine, 2,200,000 Greeks, nearly 30 per cent of the population, were classified as indigents by the monarcho-fascist Ministry of Welfare, because their monthly income did not exceed \$2.50—approximately \$30 a year! Those who have a yearly income of \$31 are classified as self-supporting!

The significance of the differences between the policies of the Democratic Government and the American-sponsored Athens Government

for the present struggle has been set forth by Nicolas Zachariadis:

The objective conditions and possibilities in Greece are absolutely favorable for our democratic movement, since both the foreign occupants and monarcho-fascism can only bring enslavement, hunger, impoverishment and destruction to the working people—95 per cent of the population of this country. . . .

On the contrary, the strategy of the Democratic Army is scientific and viable because, in spite of its inferiority in number and materiel, it serves the policy of the people, the policy which comes from demands of the people and therefore absolutely corresponds to their interests. Only with the domination of this policy can an independent, free, strong, democratic Greece exist and stand. This gives the Democratic Army that moral superiority and supremacy which, in the last analysis, is determining and decisive for victory.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GREECE FOR THE PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT AND THE U.S. PEOPLE IN PARTICULAR

The significance of the struggle in Greece cannot be over-emphasized. In the first place, in the United States it is of vital importance to the progressive movement, whose interest is to see the trusts defeated and weakened, in order to win the domestic struggle against reaction. The statement of Marx that no people oppressing other peoples can be free, applies with full emphasis today to the American policy in Greece.

Therefore the struggle in Greece must be considered as one and the same battle which the American people today wage against Wall Street.

The example of Greece can become an all-powerful weapon in the hands of every progressive for bringing home to the American people the real purposes of the Truman-Marshall Doctrine and what is in store—both for the peoples of the Marshallized countries and the people in the U. S.

In the second place, Greece is the first country in Europe where the American war policy has met with armed resistance. The outcome of this struggle is of significance to all peoples of the world because the resistance exposes the fundamental weakness of imperialism, which today cannot subjugate even a small country and shows the tremendous possibilities the progressives forces have, if compelled by the Marshall-planners into open, armed struggle.

Finally—and most important—the struggle in Greece is a struggle for peace, to thwart the imperialist plans of aggression against the Soviet Union and the new People's Democracies and to liberate one more nation from the chain of foreign capitalist enslavement.

The Greek people today face great problems. They feel that their battle is just and that it is fought in the interest of all the peoples in the world. Most of these problems must be faced and solved by the Greek people themselves, and there can be no doubt

that they will prove equal to the task. But in this battle they have the right to expect the support of the international labor and progressive forces, especially the American working-class and progressive forces whose country is in the main responsible for the present situation in Greece, and who therefore bear the main moral responsibility toward the Greek people. General Markos, in a cabled message to the National Conference for American Policy in Greece, held last June in New York, declared:

Our people have the right to expect that the American people will assist them in a positive way in their struggle so as to bring about the collapse of the imperialist plans of Truman and of all those supporting them.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any honest democrat that since the American imperialists are insolently aiding the Athens monarcho-fascists, the workers and all who stand for democracy and peace have both the right and the duty to help the Greek people. The starting point of such assistance must be the demand for the immediate withdrawal of the British troops and American officers from Greece, for an end to American intervention, in order to bring the civil war to a close and permit the establishment of a free and democratic Greece. Such international solidarity needs to express itself in moral and material support to the Greek people's struggle.

THE DUTIES OF THE AMERICAN PROGRESSIVES TOWARD THE STRUGGLE IN GREECE

Although the American progressive forces and especially the C.P.U.S.A. have correctly assessed the importance of the Greek struggle and have striven to reveal to the American people the real imperialist meaning of the Truman Doctrine, nevertheless, it must be stated frankly that the *active* help which the Greek people are entitled to expect has not been extended. There is a widespread underestimation of the subject, even among American Communists, which reflects itself in the fact that during the first year of the Truman Doctrine the organized movement in support of Greece reached a virtual standstill, and the situation today appears not much better.

The main step which should be taken to overcome this serious weakness is a vigorous campaign led by our Party, not only among the membership broadly, but also among our cadres, in order to impress on them the importance of a wide movement in support of the Greek democrats. When the Communists understand this, when we take on ourselves the task of fostering such a campaign, then we shall be able to bring the issue to the wide American masses in the trade unions, in the Progressive Party, and, in general, in every mass organization.

The issue of peace in Greece should be presented to the American people as an integral part of the

whole struggle for peace. The danger that American or American-sponsored troops will be sent to that country, to create an intensified center of crisis, can be turned into a great lever to arouse the American people in support of a democratic Greece and peace. The pivot of this campaign will of course be the demand for an end to Wall Street's intervention and the Truman Doctrine policies, in order to safeguard peace and put an end to civil strife. When the Greek question comes up for discussion at the U.N. General Assembly, the issue of peace must have decisive support from American progressive forces.

There are a series of other issues which must be supported by American progressives. A petition to the International Red Cross, with Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann, and other prominent leaders as sponsors, has been launched by the American Council for a Democratic Greece. It demands the application of the Geneva convention to prisoners of war, civilians in exile, and other victims of the war and terror in Greece.

The trade unionists have a special responsibility in the struggle for the reestablishment of a free Greek trade-union movement, in demanding abolishing of the death penalty for strikers and saving the lives of working class leaders, particularly that of Demetrius Papparigas, the general secretary of the Greek General Confederation of Labor, who is threatened with execution.

American trade unions and all

progressive organizations must demand cessation of the mass executions, arrest, imprisonment and exile of hundreds of thousands of Greek patriots; they must see to it that the monarcho-fascist murderers of George Polk, CBS correspondent killed in Greece earlier this year, do not succeed in their effort to terrorize foreign correspondents in Greece and other Marshall Plan countries by the example of his unpunished murder. They must engage in a vigorous campaign for material aid to the victims of fascism in Greece—clothing, food, medicines, funds. They must strive through the press, forums, the trade unions and mass organizations to bring the truth of what is happening in Greece to the American people, and to mobilize their support.

The key issue of such a broad campaign must, of course, be the demand for peace, an end to the Truman-Marshall Doctrine, an end to shipment of armaments and munitions, an end to military assistance in any form to the Greek monarcho-fascist government.

The peoples' forces in Europe — France, Belgium, Britain, Bulgaria, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries—are already extending moral assistance. Can the American people, whose government bears the main responsibility for the present situation in Greece, do less? There is no doubt that provided the Communists become the driving force of the campaign, the American people will fulfill their historic obligations.

ON IMPROVING THE PARTY'S WORK AMONG WOMEN*

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

ONE OF THE GRAVEST weaknesses of the Communist movement in the various capitalist countries, including our own, is its relative failure to win the active support of decisive masses of women. It is a fact which we dare not ignore that the forces of reaction still have a strong hold on womankind, including proletarian women. This was again graphically demonstrated during the recent crucial elections in France and Italy, when an undue preponderance of women voted with the reactionary parties, especially those dominated by the Roman Catholic Church.

This shortcoming of the Communist parties becomes even more manifest today in view of the huge and increasing part that women are taking in all walks of life. This shortcoming must be quickly overcome inasmuch as the parties and organizations spearheading the drive to fascism and war hold the affiliation of very large masses of women. Ob-

viously, therefore, a drastic improvement in their work among women is very much on the order of business for the Communist parties of the capitalist world, especially our Party here in the United States.

The basic cause of the more or less general weakness of the Communist parties' work among women in capitalist countries is due to an underestimation and general neglect of this vital work. Clearly, for Marxists, inadequacy in practical work implies inadequate grasp of theory. It is to this aspect of the question, the theoretical side, that this article especially addresses itself.

There has been a woeful theoretical neglect on the woman question, which, in turn, greatly hampers all practical educational and organizational work. This neglect is illustrated by the fact that we have had no detailed presentation of this most important matter since Engels wrote his fundamental work, *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, 65 years ago and Bebel his *Woman and Socialism*, a generation later. This paucity of theoretical work is all the more deplorable because the role of woman is one of the most complex theoretical problems we have to deal with, and also because her position on a world scale has changed vastly since these famous books were written.

Only under Socialism can woman become truly free. Naturally, therefore, in the Soviet Union a revolutionary advance has been made in

the whole status of women, economically, politically, socially, culturally. But the trouble is that, so far, little of the underlying scientific conclusions that have been drawn from all this advance of woman in the U.S.S.R. has reached the Communist Parties in the capitalist world. We have no contemporary work on the question of women, whether under Socialism or under capitalism, anywhere nearly satisfactory in scope. The Communist Parties are, therefore, literally starved theoretically on this vital matter. This dearth of theoretical material constitutes a challenge which should not go unanswered from Marxist-Leninist theoreticians. It is in order to make whatever contribution we can in this vital field that our Party has set up a theoretical sub-commission on the woman question.

THEORIES OF MALE SUPERIORITY

One of the many aspects of the woman question where theoretical work is very necessary has to do with the "master idea," the widely current theories alleging the superiority of man over woman. These false notions, assiduously cultivated by all the forces of reaction, are widespread among the masses of the people. Obviously, our Party also is not free from the infection of these widely prevalent male superiority ideas. Such prejudices are extremely complex in character; they have roots

dating back thousands of years, and they constitute serious obstacles to woman in her age-long fight for equality as a worker, a citizen, a home-builder, and in her marital relations. In this article, it will be observed, I am only indicating the theoretical tasks involved in combating male superiority prejudices, rather than working out solutions.

It is a favorite trick, and a very effective one, for reactionary propagandists to base their anti-social arguments of all kinds upon pseudo-scientific assumptions, particularly in the field of biology. To uninformed people this gives the so-called theories an air of finality. In the same way, reactionary propagandists argue that "Socialism is contrary to human nature"; that war is caused by "man's naturally combative character." They rationalize capitalist exploitation as an inevitable result of "man's acquisitive nature," and the like. Fascists especially go in for reactionary "biological" arguments on a big scale. Their theories of the "master-race," of the "elite" among the "Aryans," of the "inferiority" of Jews, Negroes, etc., are all clothed with false and preposterous biological conceptions. It is not surprising, therefore, that reactionaries throughout the ages have sought to justify the subjugation of woman with the aid of similar fake biological "theories." Such theories, alleging the biological inferiority of woman, have, of course, greatly facilitated the economic exploitation and political op-

* A report to the Party Commission on Theoretical Aspects of Work among Women, August 9, 1948.

pression of women under systems of society that have succeeded each other, from chattel slavery to capitalism.

For one thing, the male supremacists boldly claim that woman is, by her very make-up, intellectually inferior to man. Her brain is said to average somewhat less in weight than the man's and, therefore, the reactionaries argue that she cannot think as well as he does. They put woman's thinking capacity somewhere between the animal's and man's. That is, the animal is guided by its instincts, the woman thinks "intuitively," while the man reasons objectively. Such false arguments, contrary to science and experience, but widely current, have done and continue to do grave damage not only to woman's fight for equality, but to society as a whole.

There are, of course, physical differences between men and women. As Engels states, the first division of labor is that of men and women in procreation.

From these functional differences, bourgeois ideologists develop false conceptions. They seize upon the apparent greater muscular strength of man as the basis for the pseudo-scientific theory that woman is generally physically inferior to man. They equate sameness with strength and difference with weakness. Thus they brush aside her greater ability to resist pain, her greater immunity to certain diseases, her greater longev-

ity, etc. Such notions of woman's physical inferiority, cultivated by reactionaries for centuries, make for great handicaps to women, especially in industry.

The advocates of male superiority also claim that because of the far greater role played by the woman in child bearing and rearing, she is thereby constitutionally unfitted to enter into the hurly-burly competition of intellectual, economic, political, and social life. They claim that by her very nature her inevitable place is in the home. Not only is woman physically and mentally unfit for an active "career" and for participation in the social struggle, they argue, but it would also destroy her femininity and charm. All such contentions place high barriers in the way of women in many walks of life.

Then these reactionaries contend, by inference if not frankly, that since man plays the more positive and aggressive role sexually, he also should dominate the woman in her social life. They assert, in substance, that nature has made man the master and woman his slave. This reactionary notion, which is far more prevalent than most of us realize, hangs like a millstone about woman's neck in her fight for freedom; it flourishes and does immeasurable damage to women in innumerable respects. We must show that this whole conception is belied both by the findings of science and by the great struggle of woman for equality with the man.

Finally, to mention only one more aspect of the hydra-headed notion of male superiority, there is the reactionary contention that "nature has made man essentially polygamous and woman monogamous." This is the theory of the double standard of bourgeois morals, which seeks to justify the sexual exploitation of woman. We must show both from science and experience how such standards wrought incalculable harm (and continue to do so) to woman's happiness and to her position in society.

Equally insidious is the new twist being given to these reactionary male superiority notions by the bourgeois, pro-fascist, and Social-Democratic ideologists, who provide "scientific" garb for the myth of woman's inferiority by proclaiming that she is psychologically inferior. Thus, we witness a steady stream of such reactionary works as *Modern Woman—A Lost Sex*, by Dr. Marynia F. Fernham and Ferdinand Lundberg, which attempt to justify every anti-woman prejudice by psychological claptrap, in order to divert woman from progressive struggle and to reduce her to the fascist *Kinder-Küche-Kirche* level.

On the other hand, bourgeois feminism, which places the blame on men and not on the social system, for the oppression of women, can exert its influence in the absence of a sound theoretical position on the woman question. The bourgeois feminist

would counterpose to the male superiority "theory" the equally unscientific notion of female superiority, which leads only into the blind alley of the "battle of the sexes."

The capitalists, in order to exploit the woman more effectively, make wide use of the male superiority theories in all their complexities and subtle ramifications. In this the capitalists are aided by reactionary church dogma. The general result is that harmful male supremacy notions have penetrated widely in all classes. Men especially readily absorb male superiority "theories"—little understanding that such noxious ideas injure them as well as they do women. Many women also accept the general notion that the man is the superior of the two sexes. Woman's painful struggle upward through the centuries, reaching heroic heights with the advent of the revolutionary struggle against feudalism and ever since, has been carried on in the face of the most savage interpretations and applications of male superiority theories.

IDEOLOGICAL SHORTCOMINGS IN OUR WORK AMONG WOMEN

From an ideological standpoint (particularly in relation to the male superiority notions) there are at least three major shortcomings in our Party's work among women, and also, it may be added, of the Communist

Parties of many other capitalist countries. The first of these weaknesses is a deep-seated underestimation of the need for a persistent struggle ideologically against all manifestations of masculine superiority. Of course, all the Communist Parties in the capitalist world have elaborate programs of economic, political, and social demands for women, and they back up this program with mass struggle. But such demands and struggles, vital as they may be, are in themselves not enough. They must be reinforced by an energetic ideological struggle against all conceptions of male superiority. But this is just what is lacking. Obviously our Party could not make any serious headway on the Negro question if it limited itself simply to economic, political and social demands and failed to carry on an ideological struggle against white chauvinism. And so it is in the case of the Party's work among women. An ideological attack must be made against the whole system of male-superiority ideas which continue to play such an important part in woman's subjugation. And such an ideological campaign must be based on sound theoretical work.

The second weakness is to be found in a pronounced reticence in dealing with questions of sex. Indeed, in our propaganda and agitational material we hardly deal with the subject at all. Some comrades try to justify such a hands-off attitude by reference to the famous interview between Lenin and

Clara Zetkin on the woman question, in which Lenin discouraged the idea of "poking around" in matters of sex. But in these remarks Lenin was stressing the need for concentrating the main attention, at that historic moment of revolutionary crisis, upon the question of winning political power. He was also polemizing against certain loose tendencies that had developed among the youth in the early days of the Russian revolution. Lenin was a great scientist and no subject was beyond analysis for him, especially one playing such a vital role in social life as that of sex. In that same interview with Zetkin Lenin, therefore, strongly favored making analyses of "questions of sex and marriage from the standpoint of a mature, living, historical materialism," but, he added, "deep and many-sided knowledge is necessary for that, the clearest Marxist mastery of a great amount of material." In such a spirit of scientific investigation, therefore, it is our Party's task to include this aspect in furthering its theoretical work on the women's question. Without this it is impossible for us to combat the male supremacy "theory" and to discuss fundamentally the relationship of woman to man and to society.

The third weakness in our work among women is a certain narrowness in treating this question from a scientific standpoint. That is, we tend in analyses to reduce women's status in society simply to a question of eco-

nomics and politics and we largely ignore its many other aspects, anthropological, biological, etc. (This is a narrowness which we also exhibit in other aspects of our Party's theoretical work.) It is not in the tradition of the great Communist thinkers. Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, recognizing the unity of all scientific truth, fared forth boldly into all the sciences. Theirs was a revolutionary approach to the sciences as a whole. In developing a better theoretical grasp of the complexities of the woman question, accordingly, a wide use of the sciences generally is especially necessary. This is particularly true of the science of biology. The facts of biology will support our economic, political and social programs for women and enhance our ideological struggle against bourgeois male superiority conceptions based on pseudo-scientific arguments. In pushing forward theoretical work on this whole question, therefore, comrades with a sound Marxian training in biology will have a large share of the responsibility.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The basic purpose of all our theoretical studies is to clarify, deepen, and strengthen our practical programs of struggle and work. This is true in the question of women's work, as well as in other branches of our Party's activities. Hence, a

sharpening up of our theoretical analysis of, and ideological struggle against, male supremacy will help all our day-to-day work among women. I have barely indicated the outlines of the subject in this article. Besides the question of male superiority, necessary also are theoretical studies of other phases of this generally complex aspect of Party work, including articles on the potentialities of women in modern industry, the record of women as political and intellectual leaders, the role of housewives in the class struggle, the disintegration of family life under capitalism, the many problems of family and marital relations, and many other subjects.

The Party theoretical sub-commission on women's work has a number of projects in mind to work on. First, it wants to secure a number of well-thought-out articles along the foregoing lines from competent comrades, to serve as a basis for a deeper consideration of the whole question of women's work by our Party. Second, it plans to issue, in the not too distant future, a pamphlet outlining the Party's program on work among women in the light of the theoretical discussions on the question that are now beginning. And third, the sub-commission hopes eventually to produce a book by a well-qualified writer that will state the Party's position and program on every phase of the question of women in all its scientific aspects.

The foregoing program of theoretical work, planned by the sub-commission, is an ambitious one. But it is achievable. Our Party has competent, trained forces to perform the proposed task. As this work goes ahead, it should never be forgotten that the progress we make in improv-

ing our theoretical analysis and in sharpening the ideological struggle will register itself in the general improvement of our practical work to win a stronger Party base and a wider mass following among the strategically situated masses of toiling women.

“So few men—even among the proletariat—realize how much effort and trouble they could save women, even quite do away with, if they were to lend a hand in ‘woman’s work.’ But no, that is contrary to the ‘right and dignity of man.’ They want their peace and comfort. The home life of the woman is a daily sacrifice to a thousand unimportant trivialities. The old master right of the man still lives in secret. His slave takes her revenge, also secretly. The backwardness of women, their lack of understanding for the revolutionary ideals of the man decrease his joy and determination in fighting. They are like little worms which, unseen, slowly but surely rot and corrode. I know the life of the worker, and not only from books. Our Communist work among the women, our political work, embraces a great deal of educational work among men. We must root out the old ‘master’ idea to its last and smallest root, in the Party and among the masses. That is one of our political tasks, just as is the urgently necessary task of forming a staff of men and women comrades, well trained in theory and practice, to carry on Party activity among working women.”

V. I. Lenin, as quoted in Clara Zetkin, *Lenin on the Woman Question*, p. 19.

FOR AN END TO THE NATIONALIST DEVIATION IN THE POLISH WORKERS’ PARTY*

By BOLESLAW BIERUT

General Secretary, Polish Workers’ Party

... IT OFTEN happens in a revolutionary party that vacillations and ideological mistakes which are not rectified in time, or are either concealed from the Party or stubbornly upheld, inevitably develop into a deviation from the main line of the Party and the working class. They are used by the class enemy and in his hands become a weapon against the Party in order to weaken it and, if possible, deflect it from the path along which it had been advancing. That is why the Political Bureau and the recent Plenum of the Central Committee considered it imperative to raise before the Party, fully and unreservedly, the question of the Right-nationalist deviation in the leadership so that it could be completely eradicated by the effort of the Party as a whole.

Even a year ago, at the time of the first conference of delegates from the nine Communist and Workers’ Parties, at which the Information Bureau of the nine Parties was formed, Comrade Weslaw displayed certain vacillations arising from his under-

estimation of the international situation at the time.

Comrade Weslaw [Gomulka] conceded his viewpoint only after pressure by the comrades and Political Bureau, but he maintained doubts and reservations. Criticizing its attitude to the vacillations at that time, the Political Bureau stated at the last Plenum of the Central Committee that it had not taken a sufficiently clear and firm attitude toward these vacillations, that the differences had been glossed over and not fully thrashed out.

Consequently, when the serious crisis arose in the Yugoslav Party, thrusting this Party on to a false path, Weslaw’s ideological vacillations became even more apparent.

The developments in Yugoslavia unquestionably encouraged Comrade Weslaw in his views stated at the June Plenum of the Central Committee.

LENINIST EVALUATION OF POLISH WORKERS’ MOVEMENT

The history of our labor movement—the anti-Marxist and incorrect estimation of which, given

* From a speech delivered at the September Plenum of the Central Committee, P.W.P., as published in *For a Lasting Peace, For a People’s Democracy!* September 15, 1948. This is a condensed text.—Editor.

in Comrade Weslaw's report, caught our Party leadership unawares and came upon them like a thunderbolt—developed in direct and continual contact with the theory and practice of the Bolshevik Party, led by Lenin.

Lenin, with his profound intellect, followed the development of the Polish revolutionary movement, drew conclusions and lessons from the experience of our movement—from both its achievements and mistakes—which he exhaustively analyzed, drawing general conclusions from it in his theoretical works.

He gave critical estimations of various trends in the Polish labor movement, estimations which are unequalled for their insight and Marxist analysis. He exposed the ideological roots of the sectarian theories of Rosa Luxemburg, theories which distorted the activity of the revolutionary Marxist political party, such as the Social-Democratic Party of Poland and Lithuania was then (even though it was not consistently Marxist). He mercilessly denounced the chauvinist and bourgeois-nationalist essence of the Right wing in the Polish Socialist Party as bourgeois agents within the working class. In all probability, not a single section of the revolutionary movement was subjected to such a thorough examination in Lenin's articles and theoretical works as the Polish revolutionary movement. There is nothing surprising in this. Lenin knew the leaders of our movement, met them time and again at Party congresses and conferences, heard their speeches and

followed their statements over a number of years. Thus, until now, there has been no more penetrating analysis of our movement and its traditions, an analysis based on the methods of historical materialism, than that given in the works of Lenin.

There is no doubt that Comrade Weslaw's June report was a conscious revision of the Leninist estimation of the history of our movement, a revision based on the complete rift of the national liberation struggle from the class struggle. In reply to the arguments stated by all members of the Political Bureau without exception, Comrade Weslaw announced his resignation from the post of General Secretary of the Party, without discussing the fundamentals of the matter. It was only after sharp criticism that Comrade Weslaw at the recent Plenum of the Central Committee delivered a lengthy speech which the Plenum regarded as an attempt to reconsider the position he had held until now, a position which was fundamentally dangerous.

Comrade Weslaw's estimation of the historical traditions of the labor movement in Poland is one-sided and incorrect. He presents the main problem of Poland's independence without linking it up with the class struggle of the proletariat. But the revolutionary labor movement of Poland, battling for national emancipation, set itself far-reaching aims. It strove to overthrow the bourgeois power and capitalist order and to

win political power. And in this struggle it encountered not only the frenzied resistance of the bourgeoisie, but also the equally strong resistance of bourgeois agents who were active in the labor movement. The Right wing of the Polish Socialist Party occupied first place among these agents.

The leaders of the Right wing in the Polish Socialist Party who were closely associated with the Pilsudskites, took an attitude to the Party's slogan of independence which was completely different from the views of the workers of the Party and its Left-wing section.

To the Right leadership, this slogan was the main weapon for splitting the labor movement, a weapon directed against its revolutionary class aims in the political interests of the bourgeoisie.

The Polish bourgeoisie regarded the national state, even though restricted and dependent on the countries which had dismembered Poland, as essential to them from the point of view of entrenching their own political power. In accordance with this aim of the bourgeoisie, the Right trend of the Polish Socialist Party tried to restrict the development of the revolutionary movement to the mere winning of independence, as a basis for a bourgeois state within the framework of which the working class could at most develop its economic and political slogans through parliamentary tactics.

Such was the difference in principle between the aims and tasks of

the two opposite trends in the labor movement in Poland.

Comrade Weslaw was prepared to take this non-Leninist conception of the Polish Socialist Party in the struggle for independence as "the ideological basis for a united Party."

* * *

The absence of a revolutionary and class orientation in Comrade Weslaw's reasoning on the question of independence and his stubbornness in defending a position that was clearly wrong resulted in his overlooking how decisive was the victory of the 1917 Revolution in Russia to Poland's independence. In answer to the draft resolution of the Political Bureau, Comrade Weslaw declared: "I cannot agree with the thesis that the Polish Socialist Party conception of independence has become bankrupt, for the question then arises, whose conception has been victorious?" And this is how Comrade Weslaw replied to this question: "The Polish Socialist Party conception of independence was a bourgeois-nationalist conception and as such was not bankrupt but victorious in 1918. This does not at all alter the fact that Poland received her independence as a result of the Russian revolution and the revolutionary movement in Europe."

This kind of scholasticism predominated in Comrade Weslaw's views, thus showing that he had drifted to a very dangerous platform, clearly alien to Marxism. . . .

P.W.P. IN STRUGGLE FOR
PEOPLE'S POLAND

It stands to reason that during the period when Hitler was preparing to attack Europe, an attack which threatened Poland also, the Communist Party had to advance the slogan of the defense of Poland's independence, which it did. At such moments the very problem of the class struggle changes in principle. A common national front is formed in the struggle against the imperialist robbers endeavoring to impose their will on weaker nations. The war then becomes a national, just war against the more dangerous enemy—in the given situation—the imperialist plunderers. This was precisely the position taken by the Polish Workers' Party at the time of its inception.

Taking up its position in the vanguard of the national-liberation struggle, the Polish Workers' Party linked the struggle for the country's liberation with the struggle for the conquest of power by the working people, headed by the working class. The formation of the Kraiowa Rada Narodowa [National People's Council], to represent the people, was an expression of this.

During the period of struggle for political power through the Kraiowa Rada Narodowa, and its local bodies, we achieved most successful co-operation of the internal forces of the Polish working people of town and countryside with the revolutionary forces of the Soviet State which de-

veloped as an armed force on the basis of the Socialist order, that is, the order which grew out of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is precisely because of this co-operation of the international revolutionary forces that there could develop this specific form of political power which we have called the people's democracy in Poland and other countries.

There is no question about the class character of these forces and the class character of the political power in the countries of people's democracy, a power which relies on the hegemony of the working class, moving at the head of the wide front of the working people, and above all, the poor and middle peasantry.

At the time when the Kraiowa Rada Narodowa was formed, certain comrades in our Party underestimated the actual relation of class forces, and especially the significance in the struggle for political power of the co-operation of these forces with the armed might of the Soviet Union, as a revolutionary and liberating force, not merely as a military ally, but as a class ally.

The incorrect estimation of the particular relation of class forces resulted in these vacillations, a reflection of which was the attempt to distort the conception of the Kraiowa Rada Narodowa. This is noted in Point 5 of the Plenum resolution.

The nature of these vacillations is best seen from the article by Comrade Benkowski, "Our Position," printed in the central organ of our Party, *Tribuna Wolnosti*, on July 1,

1944, with the consent of Weslaw.

This article determined the Party's position on the principal question, namely that of political power on the eve of the liberation of Poland. But it carried no conception at all of the Kraiowa Rada Narodowa. On the eve of the liberation of Poland, at a decisive moment in the struggle for state power, we see that the author of this article based his position on the political groups which were in fact the support of the reactionary camp—on the Right wing of the Stronnictwo Ludowa [People's Party] headed by Mikolajczyk and on the Centralni Comitet Ludowa [People's Central Committee], which was a subversive creation of the London Poles, formed to undermine the Kraiowa Rada Narodowa. This can only be qualified as an opportunist rejection of the slogan of the working people's struggle for power under the leadership of the working class, as an attempt, at this decisive moment, to desert the front of struggle which was organized and headed by our Party, the pivot and leader of the Armia Ludowa [People's Army], the leading force of the Kraiowa Rada Narodowa. . . .

And so, the reorganization of the reactionary London Government by a reshuffle of the posts of president and commander-in-chief in order to secure the positions of Mikolajczyk, Kwapiński and other leaders of the Stronnictwo Ludowa and the W.R.N.,* such was the opportunist program advanced by the Right-wing group in our Party at the time of

the struggle for state power, a program which Comrade Weslaw did not oppose.

I must say that this so-called "our position" was not the position of the Party, but of the Right group in the Party. During that period the Party formed local bodies of the Rada Narodowa throughout the country as well as new detachments of the Armia Ludowa. It consolidated the successful workers' and peasants' alliance not by "top" combinations but through the mass struggle and organizational work in the lower bodies. Our Party confidently prepared for the struggle for state power. There was no indication that anybody in the lower organizations doubted the victorious outcome of this struggle. Why then did the opportunist group in our Party leadership at the time—the group covered by Comrade Weslaw—seek other ways and means? I think I can briefly point out two main reasons for this disbelief.

Firstly, it was the result of the underestimation of the forces of the working class, an underestimation of the alliance of workers and peasants, which, under the leadership of our Party, grew and strengthened in the struggle against the occupation forces.

Secondly, it was the result of failure to understand the essence of the Soviet Union's aims of social liberation, arising from the ideological

* *Wolnosc, Rownosc, Niepodleglosc* (Freedom, Equality, Independence) — the designation assumed by the old reactionary leaders of the Polish Socialist Party.—*Editor*.

principles of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) and from the role of the Soviet Communist Party in the international front of struggle of all peoples, of all democratic forces against imperialism. We consider this failure to understand the ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism by which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always been guided, and which today, too, determine its leading role in the international front against imperialism, as one of the chief sources of Comrade Weslaw's ideological vacillations. Hence, our open Party criticism in order to help Comrade Weslaw and all those who, like him, failed to understand matters to overcome their vacillations.

In this critical analysis, one cannot fail to point out other mistaken views mentioned in the Central Committee Plenum resolution, views which gradually led Comrade Weslaw to a Right, and nationalist, deviation from our main Party line. What was behind Comrade Weslaw's vacillations, behind his opposition to the section of the Information Bureau Resolution which outlines the ideological platform of Marxist parties on the socialist reorganization of agriculture and the liberation of the poor and middle peasant from the exploitation of speculators and capitalist elements?

His position reflected the undoubted opportunist tendency of avoiding the class struggle with the capitalist elements in the countryside—a struggle without which the

victorious advance toward Socialism is impossible.

The same opportunist tendency is glaringly apparent in Comrade Weslaw's recent statements, on the question of the fusion of the Polish Workers' Party and Polish Socialist Party, and the methods by which the two workers' parties can be united. His statements reveal the mistaken conception that the two parties can be united without first eliminating the ideologically consolidated Right elements existing among a section of the old cadres of the Polish Socialist Party who, in the not too distant past, were connected with the W.R.N., or without a sharp struggle against the influence of alien ideology.

One cannot fail to see in this a relapse to the opportunist Social-Democratic conceptions which have not been completely eradicated and are again showing themselves, and against which our Party waged and must continue to wage an irreconcilable struggle.

THE SOURCES OF COMRADE GOMULKA'S MISTAKES

We characterized Comrade Weslaw's mistakes which, as pointed out in the Plenum resolution, are not isolated or accidental mistakes but a definite point of view of a Right-wing and nationalist character, despite internal contradictions.

Every one of us must ask ourselves the question: what are the sources of these mistakes? What are their

roots and why have they fully come to the surface precisely during the past few months?

In his reasoning, Comrade Weslaw is influenced by national narrow-mindedness, nationalist provincialism which restrict his political horizon, prevent him from seeing the close connection today between national aspirations and internationalism and lead to erroneous and extremely harmful political conclusions in practice.

Hence the tendency, in his estimation, of the Polish working-class movement, to separate the struggle for independence from the class struggle of the proletariat; hence the incorrect conception of the essence of people's democracy and the changes taking place in it; hence the position to strike a kind of "happy medium" between liberal-bourgeois democracy and socialist democracy.

Hence, as the resolution points out, the inclination to pass over in silence or soft-pedal the truth that the Polish path to Socialism, despite certain specific features, is not something qualitatively different from the general path of development toward Socialism, that it differs only in form from the general path of development, a difference that arose precisely because of the preliminary victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, a difference that is based on the experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, taking into account the possibilities afforded by the new historical period and the specific conditions of the historical

development of Poland.

Hence, the failure to understand the essence of the relations uniting the countries of the new democracy with the land of victorious Socialism, and the deep-going solidarity of their interests — relations which differ fundamentally from those existing between the new democracies and the capitalist countries.

Hence, the failure to understand the essence of the struggle for sovereignty, which is threatened by expansion on the part of American imperialism and its German agency.

These mistakes are the outcome of the fundamentally incorrect, anti-Leninist position in relation to the national question, the outcome of the fundamentally incorrect opportunist position on the peasant question. These mistakes have much in common with similar developments which found no rebuff and consequently, led to complete degeneration in Yugoslavia.

There is nothing fortuitous about the similarity of these developments, for they spring from the same roots.

What is the explanation for the fact that these mistakes became apparent only quite recently?

While our Party was battling against the reactionary fascist forces who frequently openly endeavored to restore landlord-capitalist rule, the ideological opportunism of Comrade Weslaw's views was not apparent. During that period Comrade Weslaw undoubtedly rendered great service to the Party. However, with the smashing of the main reactionary

fascist forces, people's democracy in Poland entered upon another phase of its development.

At the time when the capitalist-profiteering elements, taking advantage of the difficulties of the postwar period and exploiting the rural poor, began to enhance their positions, a new, cardinal contradiction came to the fore: one between the popular forces — consistently democratic forces, namely the workers and toiling peasantry on the one hand, and the capitalist elements in town and countryside on the other.

The question of the sharpening class struggle against the capitalist elements, especially in the countryside, became the order of the day. It was then that cracks appeared in Comrade Weslaw's militant position and his ideological weakness became apparent. Without doubt, the contradictions between the capitalist and anti-capitalist forces in the people's democratic order, as pointed out by the resolution, are becoming ever more obvious not only in Poland but also in the other countries of the people's democracy (as is eloquently borne out by the alarming Yugoslav signal).

The capitalist forces are endeavoring to "freeze" the present relationship of class forces (in the hope of gaining a more favorable position for themselves); they want "stabilization" while preserving the people's democratic order even with its existing scope of possibilities for capitalist elements, calculating on their flexibility, on the birth of capitalist

forces out of small economy and finally on possible support from abroad.

The working class, on the other hand, is striving to secure the further development of the socialist elements by dislodging and abolishing the capitalist elements. As for the poor and middle peasantry, they want to throw off the yoke of kulak exploitation and the overwhelming superiority of the rich peasant in the countryside. This helps to put the alliance of workers and peasants on a firmer basis.

It was in this situation that the concealed opportunist germ of the Right group in our Party became apparent and also the tendency to tone down the class struggle to create a suitable climate for the kulak and his natural striving for economic expansion and its inevitable corollary, political expansion.

As long experience of the working-class movement teaches us, opportunism as a rule goes hand in hand with nationalism, and mainly in the form of "social-nationalism." This is exactly how matters stand with us. I would say that here more than anywhere else opportunism is interwoven with nationalism, utilizing for this purpose the, as yet, unburied residue of nationalistic prejudices and also the anti-Russian and anti-Soviet sentiments assiduously fanned by the class enemy.

In view of the growing polarization of forces on a world scale between the imperialist and anti-imperialist camps, now more than ever

before, the attitude toward the U.S.S.R. becomes the touchstone of genuine internationalism, of loyalty to the cause of Socialism and, at the same time, the firm and sole bulwark of our independence and sovereignty.

The class content alike of opportunism and nationalism is one or another form of agreement or rapprochement with the bourgeoisie.

In 1915, Lenin, polemizing with the Menshevik, Potresov, wrote:

There is no doubt whatsoever about the ideo-political kinship, bonds and even identity between opportunism and social-nationalism. . . . Social-nationalism is an outgrowth of opportunism and it was the latter that gave it strength. . . . It may be that individuals of this type regard themselves as "internationalists," but people are judged not by what they think of themselves, but by their political conduct, and the political conduct of such "internationalists" who are not consistent and resolute opponents of opportunism, will always be either help or support for the nationalist trend.*

What brilliant foresight! How appropriate for our conditions are these words!

Does it not make one think that this Leninist analysis should be applied to the arrogant, empty and false "internationalist" phrasemongering of Tito?

Should not an understanding of the essence of this question sound the alarm for the whole Party?

* For the cited polemic against Potresov, see Lenin, "Under a Stolen Flag," *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 118-136.—*Editor*.

Should not this understanding mobilize for decisive struggle all Party members loyal to the fine traditions of our movement?

There is no doubt whatsoever that it is in precisely this way, that our whole Party, which has time and again proved its loyalty to the interests and ideals of the working class, will react to this danger.

Unquestionably, the Party will be helped in this by the self-critical attitude taken by Comrade Weslaw on the third day of the Plenum. Comrade Weslaw's self-criticism shows that in response to the criticism of the Plenum, which, though sharp, was candid and sincere, he has realized that it is essential for him to reconsider his hitherto fundamentally incorrect position.

CRITICISM AND SELF-CRITICISM STRENGTHEN THE PARTY

In spite of the opportunist and nationalistic vacillations of Comrade Weslaw which were particularly pronounced after the first conference of the Information Bureau, the Central Committee and the Party worked out a correct political line, guarded the ideological Marxist principles of the Polish Workers' Party and strengthened the Party's ties with the working class.

As a result of this correct line, our Party considerably enhanced its prestige among the masses, and above all, among the working class. This was reflected during the campaign for elections to trade union and fac-

tory committees. This was reflected among the mass of the peasantry by the co-operative elections. Also the rapid growth of our ranks is an indication of the masses' growing confidence in our Party.

However, it would be an abandonment of the principles of Marxism if we, who are here considering the question of the Right nationalist deviation in our Party, failed to criticize the serious shortcomings and mistakes in all leading branches of our Party, starting with the Political Bureau.

Here it should be stated that the opportunist and Right tendencies of Comrade Weslaw were not always rebuffed with sufficient energy by the Party leadership before they became a deviation.

The experience of our Party fully bears out the correctness of the thesis advanced ten months ago in the Declaration of the Information Bureau to the effect that "the principal danger for the working class today lies in underestimating its own forces and overestimating the forces of the imperialist camp."

The Central Committee of the Party did not analyze the relationship between the growth of forces of the socialist, small-scale production and capitalist elements in the economy of the countryside which accounted for an absence of clarity in the Party's policy. The Central Committee, likewise, was not sufficiently vigorous in repelling the opportunist conceptions about the harmonious co-existence and develop-

ment of "three sectors" in our economy, which were voiced in different Party branches. This gave rise to a tolerant attitude on the part of the Party leadership to certain instances of neglect of the sharpening class struggle in the countryside and to the growth of capitalist elements in the countryside. All this could only result in Party organizations overlooking the revolutionary perspectives, in the weakening of their class militancy in certain sections, in the theory about the dying down of the class struggle.

A glaring example of subordination to the Right and opportunist tendency of overlooking class contradictions in the countryside was the introduction of a fixed price for all peasants for the services of agricultural equipment from the machine-stations. This could only result in a distortion of the very idea that machine-stations are a weapon to protect the poor peasant, who has no implements, from exploitation by the village rich.

A similar absence of class differentiation was also reflected in the matter of the appeal to the peasants to give each other neighborly assistance.

Finally, the Party leadership failed to criticize its rural policy regarding settlement of the liberated territories. Consequently, the rich peasants gained a privileged position during the re-settlement campaign.

The tolerant attitude of the Party leadership to Comrade Weslaw's Right-nationalistic mistakes, espe-

cially to his tendencies to fence off the path of the people's democracy from the path of the Soviet Union and, arising from this, the opportunist glossing over of the sharpness of the class struggle in the development of people's democracy, could only have a negative effect on the practical activities of the Party and on the education of its membership.

Work to acquaint the Party with the experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union was poor and insufficient. During the entire period since the People's Poland came into being, we have done nothing concrete to acquaint the Party with life in the socialist countryside, to bring to it the truth about collective farm-building and so equip it to counter the inventions of reaction which endeavors to present conditions in the Soviet countryside in a distorted form.

We have done very little to bring the achievements of Marxist-Leninist thought to the Party, and our publishing work in this sphere has been very poor. We are particularly backward in studying the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), its leading role in the international working-class movement.

The poor Marxist-Leninist propaganda in the Party went hand in hand with the tolerant attitude toward ideological confusion among the Party intelligentsia and with an insufficiently Marxist study of questions of literature, art, and science, which, incidentally, was reflected in

the position of the literary journal *Kuznitsi*. This held up the Party's work on the cultural front and is affecting the work of our universities, where non-Marxist, pseudo-scientific ideological premises hold sway, especially in the humanist sciences.

The tolerant attitude toward opportunist and nationalist mistakes also resulted in a retreat from the principles of Marxism-Leninism on the question of the role of the Party. The Party leadership did not wage a sufficiently energetic struggle against the tendency to recruit members into the Party without discrimination. This signified a disregard for the principles of Leninism which state that the Party is the organized detachment of the best elements of the working class, the vanguard detachment of the working class and the highest form of class organization of the proletariat.

The disregard for these principles and the absence of vigilance when new members were accepted into the Party, resulted in the Party being loaded with socially-alien elements and with careerists who looked upon their Party card as a stepping stone to promotion or as a means of obtaining other advantages.

These shortcomings are mainly due to the underestimation of the leading role of the Party in all its sections in introducing the political, economic and cultural reforms in Poland. . . .

Bold criticism and self-criticism will not cause harm to the Party. On the contrary, it strengthens it

ideologically. The concealment or overlooking of mistakes can weaken the Party. Then again, the stubborn defense of wrong positions creates a grave danger which, if not countered, can result in an acute crisis causing vast and irreparable damage not only to the Party but to the whole country.

The anti-Marxist position of the leaders of the Yugoslav Party is an example of such a grave crisis, a crisis which is causing irreparable damage to the peoples of Yugoslavia, is breaking the ideological and organizational ties with the Soviet Union and the new democracies and is encouraging the aggression of the imperialists. The leaders of the Yugoslav Party denied the Parties of the Information Bureau the right to criticize their mistakes, thus avoiding ideological control by the international organization and placing themselves outside this organization.

After discussing the situation in the Yugoslav Party, the July Plenum of the Central Committee characterized the mistakes of this Party and denounced its leadership who did not even hesitate to split the united front of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism at a time when imperialism is intensifying its aggressive attacks. Since then, the Yugoslav leaders held a Party Congress which was entirely devoted to attacking the new democracies and the Soviet Union. Yugoslav figures who oppose this disastrous policy pursued by the Party leadership are forced into silence by ter-

ror, reprisal and assassination.

What is there Communist or democratic about a Party whose leaders arrogantly declare that it is the best and most revolutionary Party, that it will build Socialism quicker and better than the other countries, that it has no mistakes and never had, that it will tolerate no criticism whatsoever? Nothing. All that is left is a hostile attitude to the Parties in the Information Bureau instead of solidarity and ideological contact. Such are the consequences of the denial of the Leninist method of criticism and self-criticism within the framework of an ideological international organization.

On the other hand, we can see for ourselves from the example of the recent Central Committee Plenum of our Party the beneficial effects open and frank criticism and self-criticism have on the development of the ideological forces of the Party. As a result of this open and frank criticism and self-criticism, the Party was victorious in the battle against ideological vacillations in the Party leadership. The weapon of such criticism and self-criticism helped the Party leadership to raise considerably the political, theoretical and ideological level of the Party, strengthened and enriched the Party leadership and will, unquestionably, enrich the whole Party with the great experience of struggle against the danger of deviations from the main line of the Party. This weapon helped to raise the militancy of the Party and its vigilance, to increase

the activity of Party cadres and to speed up the struggle against alien ideological influences. It still further consolidated the Party and enhanced its prestige.

We are faced with the important task of overcoming this ideological deviation. We shall mobilize the whole Party to do this. But we shall not allow the struggle against the Right, nationalist deviation, which threatened to destroy our achievements, to be accompanied by the revival of pernicious, sectarian and Leftist practices.

We shall treasure, like the apple of our eye, the valuable ideological achievements of the Polish Workers' Party, its splendid and glorious traditions of struggle against the invaders, its creative work in laying the foundations of the People's Poland to attain which thousands of members of our Party sacrificed their lives or gave unstintingly of their labor.

Our Party holds its leaders in high esteem, appreciates their contribution to the work and struggle of the Party and has confidence in them. But it regards them solely as executors of the idea which guides the Party and the working class. The Party places loyalty to the idea of revolution and vigilance toward any attempt to smuggle in alien influences, higher than personal attachment to Party individuals. Therein lies the strength of our Party which will base its work not on the leader principle, but above all, on the collective efforts of the activists and the

entire membership.

We are struggling against the Right and nationalist deviations under the difficult conditions of the onslaught of petty-bourgeois spontaneity and rabid baiting on the part of our class enemies who are bringing up against us their entire arsenal of demagogy, chauvinism and anti-Semitism. But despite the difficulties, we are confident that the Party will emerge from this struggle stronger and more consolidated than ever before, better equipped ideologically, steeled against opportunist influences and matured politically for the unification of the working class—the creation of a united working-class party.

FOR BUILDING A SOCIALIST POLAND

The Plenum defined concrete paths of struggle for the working class and the poor and middle peasants, aimed at restricting the exploitation by the capitalist elements of the working strata in the countryside, at helping the vast majority of the rural population, and at depriving the kulaks of their privileged positions.

The Plenum defined the concrete ways and means of realizing these aims in all spheres of rural life: in the matter of maintaining a sufficiently profitable price for grain; a correct tax policy; a correct class policy in relation to agricultural credits; extending and reorganizing the network of machinery depots, enabling them to serve first of all those in the greatest need of help, that is, the

peasant household lacking adequate agricultural implements; large-scale development and the democratization and more efficient working of the *volost** co-operatives of the Peasant Mutual Assistance Union and, finally, the purging and renovation of the entire economic and administrative apparatus in the countryside.

There can be no doubt that the carrying out of these decisions of the Plenum will lead to a big increase in the activity of the masses of peasants, will enable them to improve their position and to counteract the rural rich in the struggle to restrict capitalist exploitation in the countryside, and will raise their material and cultural level.

In developing the July decisions, the Plenum clarified the position of the Party in relation to the producer co-operatives in the countryside, and gave concrete answers to a number of doubts expressed by the peasants on this matter.

While strongly emphasizing that the process of switching over from individual to collective farming would require a long time, the Party is of the opinion that this is the only way to secure a rapid improvement in rural welfare, to abolish poverty and capitalist exploitation. At the same time the Plenum warned against any harmful haste in the matter—for haste in this respect would be equivalent to adventurism.

The Plenum laid down as a principle the absolutely voluntary char-

* Small administrative division including several villages.

acter of the producer co-operatives and declared that extreme measures would be applied against any attempt to violate this principle. There can be no doubt that this decision of the Plenum will clear up the matter of developing the producer co-operatives in the rural areas and to a considerable degree will nip in the bud any attempt by the class enemy to cause confusion in this matter.

An important place in the decisions of the Plenum was taken by the big farms in the hands of the state; ways and means for the rapid development of their husbandry were outlined and measures for increasing aid to the peasant households by the state-owned farms.

During the four days in which it was in session, the Plenum of the Central Committee reviewed the path along which the Party is leading the working masses of Poland, on the basis of the unity of action of the entire democratic bloc. Our guiding idea on this path is the idea of a People's Poland, developing in the direction of a new, social system. And this new system is Socialism.

STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CONTACTS OF THE WORKING CLASS

The daily pulsating life of the working masses nourishes man's creative power, and his great ability to bring about social change. The greatest representatives of progressive social thought drew their revolutionary inspiration from the springs of this creative power. And from the

springs of this creative force, there emerged the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat, transformed by the brilliant minds of Marx and Lenin into a great social program, and which is now headed and enriched by the great and brilliant leader of the world proletariat and Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), Generalissimo Stalin.

In the course of the long years of revolutionary struggle against czarism, foreign and native fascism, against the barbarous Hitler invasion, the Polish working-class movement, headed by our Party, acquired a strength and maturity that has enabled it to lead the broad social movement of the working masses of town and countryside, the political expression of which is the bloc of the democratic parties.

In the heroic life-and-death struggle against the invader, the working masses received selfless, fraternal aid from the liberating army of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. Thanks to this aid, our country which had been devastated by the Hitlerite invaders, acquired freedom, and the masses of the people, working tirelessly, are building the new Poland. The plan of this construction will be prepared by the united workers' parties, the faithful and steadfast guardians of the great revolutionary ideology of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism, on the basis of political alliance and aid by all the parties in the democratic bloc.

Utilizing the eighty years' experience of the Polish working-class

movement, the experience of the hundred years' struggle of the international working class, the experience of the victorious Russian Revolution, the thirty years' successful Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., and basing ourselves on the ideological foundations of Marxism-Leninism, we are carrying out the great historical act of uniting the Polish Workers' Party and the Polish Socialist Party, the act of political unification of the Polish working class.

The united workers' party is taking upon itself the historical responsibility for the future of the Polish people, and will guarantee its well being. It will firmly unite the forces of the democratic bloc, and will be able to secure that political and cultural eminence which Poland can and shall attain among the progressive nations of the world. This Party alone, on the basis of the alliance of workers, peasants and intelligentsia, the political expression of which is the democratic bloc, can provide the working people of Poland with an ever increasing prosperity.

Not for a single moment can we rest on our achievements, because what we have accomplished so far in the way of building the new Poland, is merely a beginning toward realizing the great aims and tasks that confront our people.

Marching boldly forward under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, at the head of the working masses of Poland, our Party, as the leading element of the future united party, will successfully fulfill its historic tasks.

APPROACHING THE 30th ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

(STATEMENT OF THE 14TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE C.P.U.S.A., ADOPTED
AUGUST 6, 1948)

IN THE COMING YEAR, on September 1, 1949, the Communist Party of the United States of America will be thirty years old.

It was born on September 1, 1919. A child of the present epoch, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. arose at a crucial turn in the history of our nation and of the world. The First World Imperialist War had marked the opening stage of the general crisis of the world capitalist system. In the United States, Wall Street faced the approach of an economic crisis in the wake of the war. It became alarmed by the world-shaking victorious October Socialist Revolution in Russia and by its profound, radicalizing impact upon labor and the people's movements in our country. Through its two parties and its government, Wall Street unleashed its infamous open-shop and Red-baiting offensive of 1919-1921 which proved so costly to the American people and its working class.

On the other hand, this was also a moment in the history of our nation when the utter bankruptcy of pure-and-simple trade unionism, the Gompers political policy of drag-

nopolies, was beginning to be evident to wide circles of labor. Left trade-union and Socialist currents were growing and spreading in the American labor movement. Large sections of the working class were waging sharp defensive battles to meet Wall Street's open shop offensive. In Seattle, Washington, the historic general strike was taking place. Throughout the land, a people's movement was rising for the recognition of, and friendship with, the new Soviet state. And the more advanced sections of labor were moving fast to a total break, organizational as well as political, with the reformist and Centrist leadership of the Socialist Party (Berger, Hillquit, and Co.), and to the formation of a new working-class party.

It was a time in the history of our nation when American capitalism was beginning to feel the first effects of the general crisis of the world system of capitalism, and when the American labor movement was entering a new and higher stage of development. It was the development of these new conditions which hastened the birth of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

It was inevitable that an American working-class party of a new type—a Marxist-Leninist party—should come into existence in the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism and the growth of a new, Socialist world. Had the advanced detachments of American labor acquired a more intimate knowledge of the experiences and lessons of the world labor movement as estimated by Marxism-Leninism, it would have come sooner. On the other hand, had these same forces failed to assert themselves during the first world imperialist war, it would have come later. But whether sooner or later, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. had to come into existence in this epoch. It had to help organize and develop the new labor movement. It has to formulate and present new answers to the fundamental problems of struggle against the intensified exploitation and political reaction of the monopolies. It had to promote labor's leadership in the people's democratic movements and to build itself as the acknowledged vanguard party of the American working class in the struggle toward Socialism.

* * *

The Communist Party of the U. S. A. was organized by the Left Wing (formed during the first imperialist world war) of the Socialist Party of America. But the historical roots of the Communist Party reach far and deep into the past of the American working class. They are to be found in the very origin of our

working class and in its magnificent struggles against capitalist exploitation.

Communism in the United States has its beginnings in the very first efforts—the first glimmerings of class consciousness—of the more advanced American workers to connect up the daily struggle for the betterment of labor's conditions under capitalism with the historic aspirations and mission of the working class to lead the people to the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

Communism in the United States has its historic roots and traditions in every advance of American labor to class consciousness, to trade-union organization, to independent political action, to collaboration with other democratic forces in the struggle against reaction. The Party has its roots in the contributions of the American working class to the historic battles of the American people for democratic liberties under the leadership of Jefferson, for the Bill of Rights, for saving the nation and abolishing slavery under the leadership of Lincoln, for the defense and extension of the people's democratic liberties against the attacks of the monopolies in the past fifty years.

More directly and immediately, our Party stems from the first Marxist groups and Socialist movements in the United States. We stem from Weydemeyer and Sylvius, Debs and Haywood, Ruthenberg and Foster. We stem from the Left currents in the American labor movement —

trade-union and Socialist—organized and built by these heroic leaders. It is from these Left sections of the American labor movement that the direct organizers of the Communist Party come — the elements that formed the Left Wing of the Socialist Party during the first imperialist world war.

* * *

Taking a bird's-eye view of the history of our Party as we approach and prepare for its 30th anniversary, one is immediately impressed by the fact that it has stood through the years in the forefront of struggle for the needs and interests of the working class, the exploited farmers, the Negro people and all those oppressed and persecuted by the capitalist monopolies. American Communists have presented shining examples of working-class courage, devotion, self-sacrifice, and discipline in the fight against all enemies of the American people.

The Communist Party was the first political party in the United States to initiate a consistent fight against Wall Street imperialism in Latin America, China, Africa, and other areas, calling upon the American people to support the liberation struggles of the nations oppressed by American imperialism. Indeed, the very origin of the Party lies in the struggles of the Left Wing of the Socialist Party of America against the imperialist war of 1914-1918.

In the historic struggles for industrial unionism and for independent

working-class political action—struggles which make up much of American history in the last thirty years—the Communist Party of the U. S. A. played the part of pioneer builder and fighter. The entire American trade-union movement — C.I.O., A. F. of L., R.R. Brotherhoods—is indebted to the Communist Party's fight to organize the unorganized. The courageous, self-sacrificing struggles of its members helped build unions where the task was most difficult and dangerous. Through these unflagging struggles of the Communists grew the present strength of the trade unions, which the reformist and bureaucratic leadership of the Greens, Wolls, Dubinskys, Lewises, Murrays, Reuthers, etc., is undermining by its sell-out to the imperialists and monopolies, by its Red-baiting and labor-splitting treacherous policies. By its consistent fight for working-class political independence, the Communist Party played a major part in the rise of Labor and Farmer-Labor parties. During certain phases of the Roosevelt period the Communist Party, despite rising revisionist tendencies within it, was striving to prepare the working class and its closest allies for collaboration with other progressive forces on the political field and for participating in the present struggle for the building of the new party on a higher level.

Of particular historic significance is the pioneering role played by the Communist Party in the Negro people's struggle for equal rights and

for developing the movement toward realizing Negro national aspirations in the Black Belt of the South. The epic Scottsboro case symbolizes this great contribution. The Party has helped the Negro people to bring forth a growing national liberation movement and to become a major factor in American political life. As a result, the American working class and the progressive forces generally have gained a major ally in the fight against the monopolies and reaction.

In later years, it was again the Communist Party that raised in all its profound implications the slogan of struggle for the equal rights of the masses of the national groups, for their free development as organic parts of the American nation. It raised this slogan as essential to the struggle against the whole system of national oppression and discrimination practiced by American monopoly capitalists on the basis of their so-called superior white Anglo-Saxon ruling class ideology. This imperialist chauvinism is particularly directed against the Jewish, Italian and Slav masses, and the Mexican and Puerto Rican national minorities in the United States.

During the disastrous economic crisis of 1929-1932, in the struggle against unemployment and for relief, jobs, and security, it was the Communist Party which was the organizer of the mass struggles and the only true guide of the American people. Without the struggles of that period and the leadership of the Communist

Party, in the teeth of opposition from the reformist leadership, the great upsurge of labor and democratic forces during the years of the Roosevelt - Labor - Progressive coalition would have been impossible. The concrete gains achieved by the American masses, notably unemployment insurance and social security, would not have materialized without Communist leadership and agitation.

The pioneering role of the Communist Party in the fight against fascism and war during the 1930's played a major role in resisting the reactionaries and Munichites in the United States and in preparing American labor to play its important part in bringing about the military destruction of German and Japanese fascism.

Thus, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. has throughout its history championed the cause of labor and the people, fought the enemies of the people.

As in all Communist Parties, the internal life and development of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. was moved and determined by struggle against the constant pressure of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influences, against Right opportunism and Leftist sectarianism, for the theory of Marxism-Leninism and for policies based upon it. During a number of years, a factional situation of an acute character developed which made difficult and more painful the inevitable and necessary internal struggle against all ideological and

political tendencies hostile to Marxism-Leninism and against all anti-Party tendencies.

Roughly between 1923 and 1929, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. underwent a serious internal struggle against Lovestoneism and Trotskyism. Complicated by the factional situation, the fight became a prolonged one, at times threatening the existence of the Party. But the loyal, devoted, and healthy Marxist and working-class forces of our Party succeeded in defeating and eliminating both Right-opportunist, reformist Lovestoneism and the counter-revolutionary agent and ally of fascism—Trotskyism.

Again, in 1945, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. was confronted with the menace of Browder revisionism and liquidationism. The Party's Marxist-Leninist theory was being replaced with non-Marxist and anti-Marxist ideas and theories, and the Party itself was in fact being liquidated. And once more, the loyal and devoted Party forces, the healthy Marxist and working-class elements, rose to the defense of the Party and its Marxist-Leninist theory. Browderism was condemned and rejected and a broad ideological struggle against it initiated. The fight against the theoretical and political sources of Browderism must continue. It must become intensified in the light of the historic ideological and political struggle, initiated by the Communist Information Bureau and waged by all Communists, against

the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, bourgeois nationalist positions of the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party.

From the same Marxist-Leninist positions we must now wage the struggle against Right opportunism and Leftist sectarianism, as outlined in the main political resolution of this, the Fourteenth National Convention of our Party.

The history of the American working class is a history of brilliant class battles, of rapid and powerful advances, of magnificent contributions to the struggles of the American people for social progress and democracy.

But it is also a history of costly defeats, of serious setbacks, of prolonged periods of retreat and painful defensive struggles that do not pass over into counter-offensive and offensive battles.

It is true that the history of all movements for emancipation is in general a history of advances and retreats, of victories and setbacks, of offensive and defensive battles. No great liberation movement proceeds in a straight line of uninterrupted victories. But in the history of the American working class this feature is so accentuated and dominant as to form an important characteristic. It is a characteristic that stems from the great historical lag in the rise and consolidation of a mass Marxist party of the American working class. Without a recognized, powerful Marxist party to give the working-class move-

ment guidance, stability, persistence, and perspective, the American working class proved unable in most instances to turn defeats and retreats into starting points for new advances on a higher historical level or to follow such paths of struggle as would result in victory instead of defeat.

The delayed rise of a mass Marxist party in the United States, was, as Engels explained, caused in part by the traditional sectarianism of the more advanced detachments of the American working class and the prevailing bourgeois-fostered contempt for revolutionary theory. The retarded emergence of a mass Marxist party was the chief reason for the fact that the democratic and anti-monopoly movements of the American people in this country, while supported by labor, lacked the leadership and consolidating influence of the working class.

The formation of the Communist Party in the United States opened a new period in the history of American labor. It is a period in which the conditions are being created for working-class leadership in the democratic movements of the American people and for Communist Party leadership of the working class itself. Thus, the way is opened for the advance of America's oppressed masses headed by the working class to preserve and extend democracy against the menace of fascism, for the further advance to a new, people's democracy, and through it—to the direct struggle for Socialism.

Since the Emergency Convention of the Communist Party in 1945, which condemned and rejected Browderism and restored the Party, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. has undertaken a historic task of major importance to our nation and to the world. It is the task of arousing and mobilizing the American working class and its allies (farmers, Negro people, middle classes, national groups, etc.) against the imperialist war-making offensive of Wall Street, to checkmate its reactionary, pro-fascist attack upon the living standards and democratic liberties of the American people.

In the fulfillment of this task, the Communist Party of the United States has made its contribution to the rise and development of the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist peace coalition of the American people which gave rise to the new Progressive Party and its Presidential ticket.

Learning from the history of the American working class, illuminated by the theory of Marxism-Leninism, we say that the permanence of the coming new advances by labor and its allies hinges primarily upon the ability of the American working class to assume leadership of the people's coalition; and we say further that the ability of the working class to assume this position hinges primarily upon the ability of the Communist Party to give vanguard leadership to the working class.

The 14th National Convention of the Communist Party of the U. S. A.

calls upon the Party to begin preparations for the mass celebration of its 30th anniversary in September, 1949. The Convention decides that the incoming National Committee shall organize the preparation and publication of a volume on the History of the Communist Party of the United States of America. It shall also prepare varied forms of study and educational material on the Party's history, program, and immediate tasks, in relation to the decisions of this Convention. It shall also make the necessary preparations for the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the *Daily Worker* in January, 1949.

Approaching the 30th Anniversary, the Convention calls upon all Party members and organizations to inten-

sify the study of Marxism-Leninism; particularly the study of the classic of our time, the *History of the C.P.S.U.*; the struggle for the propagation and mastery of our theory; the fight for the ideological and political strengthening of our Party and its mass work. The Convention calls upon the Party to wage on incessant battle to build the Party in the course of our mass work, to study the Party's history, and to build among the masses of the American working class and its allies the authority and influence of the vanguard Communist Party.

LONG LIVE THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA!

FROM THE BRIEFS ON THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE SMITH ACT

SUBMITTED BY DEFENSE ATTORNEYS FOR THE INDICTED TWELVE COMMUNIST PARTY NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

I

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS INDICTMENTS ON CONSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS

THE PROSECUTIONS initiated by the indictments in these cases are of far-reaching historic importance. Any prosecution under the statutes here involved would be of vital importance since they concern the basic constitutional right of advocacy and by their enforcement threaten to undermine democratic government as we have known it in this country. But the cases at bar have a very special significance because these statutes are being used for the purpose of attempting to outlaw a political party—the Communist Party.

For this is no ordinary criminal prosecution. It is openly and avowedly a political case—one in which the government frankly seeks a judicial declaration that the Communist Party of the United States should be outlawed, that membership in that Party is illegal and may be punished as a crime, that the political program espoused by that Party may not lawfully be heard by the people of the United States.

The twelve defendants are all the members of the National Committee of the Communist Party, the leading body of that organization. Each of them is charged in a separate indictment with having violated the laws of the United States by being a member of the Communist Party. All of them are charged in a single indictment with having violated the laws of the United States by conspiring to form the Communist Party. The aim and purpose of the prosecutions is therefore to make the existence of and membership in the Communist Party unlawful and thus prevent the dissemination of its doctrines and the propagation of its platform and program.

But the significance of this case extends far beyond the fate of the individual defendants involved — it reaches to the very core of American constitutional democracy. For this is no ordinary criminal prosecution. Openly and avowedly, in the language of the indictment ten times repeated, it is a case in which no act is charged as being consummated or as having a purpose of individual or concerted action, other than the act of speaking, publishing by press, or peaceable assembly.

In violence to our historic American democratic tradition, political parties of protest and of fundamental reforms and revolutionary proposals would be forbidden to exist and to present their programs to the electorate. The Attorney General asks the court for a decision that political programs and candidacies for public office be hereafter subject to police screening; that such programs of public policy offered by political parties cannot be made known to the American public by speech or press, or by peaceable assembly—cannot be “advocated” to the public or “taught” through books or newspapers or classes, unless first they are passed upon by police power and found to be in accord with the supposed interest of the state as interpreted by officials for the moment in political power.

The indictments with which we are here concerned allege no criminal acts on the part of the defendants. There is no charge that any of them engaged in a single act of force or violence. There is no charge that they have attempted or conspired to commit such acts or indeed that they even intended to bring them about. The Government finds an alleged illegality only in what is its own estimate of the content of the speech and press of the defendants, although squarely denied by the defendants and sharply contradicted by the record of their speech and press.

The only issue raised by the indictments thus relates directly to

thought and its expression, and to the open choice among political doctrines in the public life of America. It is therefore an issue which can never be determined by the executive, the judiciary, or legislative bodies, but which is always and perpetually before the electorate alone.

Instead of following the familiar pattern of other cases of political persecution—the old pattern of assertion that certain ideas are evil because the men who espouse them are criminals—the government here asserts that certain men are criminals because their ideas are bad; to convict twelve men, the ideas of millions are to be branded as criminal.

In many cases where an indictment is politically motivated and is designed to interfere with the free expression of ideas, the invalidity of the indictment can be shown only at the trial itself, in a process of demonstrating that the charge of criminal conduct is false.

But in this case it is otherwise. There is no concealment, but open assertion of the political motivation; the “advocating and teaching” of ideas is made the sole ground of the prosecution, the declared object of the attack; the indictment itself reveals and virtually announces its constitutional infirmity. In such a situation, due process requires that the prosecution be halted at the very outset, that the court refuse to proceed with it. A trial cannot constitutionally be permitted to proceed.

If any doubts existed as to the pur-

pose of these indictments, the activities of the Democratic and Republican Parties during the current election campaign in which each party is seeking to outdo the other in vilifying the Communist Party and in attempting to destroy it by whatever governmental agencies each party happens to control, must have dispelled them. Even the President of the United States has made a public declaration of the purpose of these prosecutions. In a speech at Oklahoma City on September 28, 1948, reported in the *New York Times* on the 29th, page 25, he said:

The truth is, the Democratic Party has been leading the fight to make democracy effective and to wipe out communism in the United States. Long before these Republicans started their Communist talk for political purposes, my Administration was engaged in a direct attack on subversive organizations and persons in the United States.

We have been concerned not merely with Communists in the Government but with Communists in the United States of America wherever they are. . . .

My administration has been steadily and successfully fighting Communism. We have acted instead of just talking about it. . . .

On the basis of evidence collected by the F.B.I. and submitted to the grand jury, twelve top Communist leaders will go to trial in New York on October 15.

The Republican leaders have been trying to make communism an issue in this election. They are trying to make you think that the Republican party

has a monopoly on patriotism.

It is thus made abundantly clear that a government is attempting by the use of the law and courts to eliminate political opposition. This strikes at the vitals of our whole democratic process.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the means used to accomplish this purpose, should be a law which in itself strikes at the root of democratic liberty and government and violates constitutional rights and prohibitions.

* * *

[The defense brief then quotes sections of the Smith Act, under which the indictments were returned, and contends that Section 10 of that Act, headed “Advocating overthrow of government by force”:]

does not deal with acts or even with attempts at action, but is confined solely to the right of advocacy. It is our contention that the right of advocacy, the realm of ideas, is outside the pale of government intervention and that these sections of the statute were wholly outside the power of the Congress to enact, the Executive to enforce or the Judiciary to uphold.

* * *

CONGRESS IS WITHOUT POWER
TO ENACT LEGISLATION
SUCH AS THE ADVOCACY
SECTIONS OF THE SMITH ACT

It is the most elementary yet basic postulate of Federal law, that the Federal government, and that includes the Congress, is a govern-

ment of enumerated powers. Whether or not it has a specified power can be determined only by reference to the United States Constitution and its amendments, which alone chart, as well as limit, Federal power. If power does not appear there, it does not exist.

The government, then, of the United States, can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given, or given by necessary implication. . . .*

It therefore follows that to sustain the legality of Section 10, some powers in Congress to enact such legislation must be found in the Constitution. But no express power to enact such a law as the Smith Act, punishing solely advocacy, can be found therein.

There is sound reason for withholding from government any power over advocacy. The essence of democracy lies in the sovereignty of the people over their government; a belief in its principles is based upon a reliance on the reason and judgment of the entire people, a confidence in the superiority of such collective reason and judgment over the wisdom of any particular individual or group. In order to realize democracy then it is essential that the minds of the people remain wholly independent of the government itself. For if the government can direct or control or, by coercive methods, influence the popular judgment, ulti-

* *Dorr v. U.S.*, 195 U.S. 138, 149 (1904).

mate political power has in essence, been transferred from the people themselves to the government which was to be subject to their direction, and the essential basis of democracy has thus been lost.

It was for this reason, that the Constitution excluded government entirely from the exercise of power in the domain of ideas. The very foundation upon which the Constitution rests requires that the government be forbidden to interfere in any way with what people might believe, hear, discuss and read, be prohibited from cutting off any phase of the nourishment for the processes of human thought. Since what people discuss or hear or read, depends upon their access to what others have to say or write, the government's exclusion from the domain of the mind requires the removal of speech, press and assembly from the area of its control. And it is precisely speech, press and assembly which the Smith Act seeks to control and punish.

THE IMPLIED POWERS OF CONGRESS

But if it be not expressed, is such a power properly an incident to an express power, and necessary to its execution? For it will probably be conceded even by the government that this statute and this indictment are not based on any expressed power to pass such a law.

All our history and traditions, all sound legal authority answer in the negative. The most dangerous con-

cept affecting constitutional government is the notion that the legislature possesses unlimited means to carry into execution its limited powers. Thus, the argument that belief and opinion may be abridged out of sheer "necessity" and in order "to preserve the government" has been uniformly condemned. In *Ex Parte Milligan*, 4 Wall (U.S.) 2 (1866), the Supreme Court stated:

The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection, all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism; but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false. . . .

The attempt to point to some particular power contained in the Constitution as furnishing implied power to Congress to enact Section 10 are futile. If it is "necessary and proper" to prohibit speech and association in order to "provide for the common defense" or for "the public welfare" or "to guarantee the states a Republican form of government," then it follows that the government is not one of particular and definite powers only, but one which is vested with general, unlimited powers authorized to legislate on all subjects including the press, religion, and

every form of belief or opinion. . . . The Supreme Court has warned against legislative usurpation of power.

The first article, treating of legislative powers, does not make a general grant of legislative power. It reads: "Article 1, Section 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress," etc.; and then, in Article 8, mentions and declares the legislative powers that are granted. By reason of the fact that there is no general grant of legislative power it has become an accepted constitutional rule that this is a government of enumerated powers. . . .*

But if advocacy statutes such as the Smith Act are upheld, then it follows that the government, under the guise of carrying out some expressed power, can suppress all forms of speech, press, assembly and religion. Thus under the guise of regulating commerce, it could prohibit publication of newspapers; under the taxing power, it could oppress religious institutions; under the war power, it could proscribe public meetings and under the general welfare clause, all speech could be prohibited.

* * *

THE FIRST AMENDMENT EXPRESSLY FORBIDS GOVERNMENT TO LEGISLATE OR OTHERWISE INTERFERE WITH SPEECH, PRESS, ASSEMBLY AND RELIGION

The argument of lack of power al-

* *Kansas v. Colorado*, 206 U.S. 46, 81, 89 (1907).

ready made is further fortified when it is remembered that the power of Congress over speech, press, assembly and religion is specifically forbidden by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

When the Constitution was first proposed, the exemption of this area of expression from the sphere of governmental authority was not made explicit in its terms. The people who were then asked to ratify it refused to leave so vital a matter to implication. They would not accept the assurances of those who had written it that the exemption was intended. They insisted upon and they secured as a condition for ratification the inclusion of a specific guarantee of the indestructible dichotomy between speech and action in relation to governmental power. It is that guarantee which appears in the Constitution in the unequivocal language of the First Amendment, which reads:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

There is no equivocation in this language, it boldly and forthrightly declares, that Congress shall make *no law* abridging the freedom of speech, *no law* prohibiting the free exercise of religion, *no law* limiting the freedom of press, of peaceable

assembly and petition. It is as absolute as the Constitution's proscription of Bills of Attainder, it allows of no exception, provides no shred of excuse for invasion of the forbidden spheres. And in the light of the purpose for which it was adopted, it could not have been otherwise.

It is in that light that Justice Cardozo could write:

Of that freedom [of thought and speech] one may say that it is the matrix, the indispensable condition, of nearly every other form of freedom.*

that Justice Rutledge could refer to the preferred place given in our scheme to the great, the indispensable democratic freedoms secured by the First Amendment.**

For the slightest limitation would, in effect, destroy the guarantee. If such a limitation existed, government acting through its legislature, its executive, its courts—would necessarily be empowered to determine its scope. By expanding or restricting the limitation, government could then expand or restrict the freedom itself. The independence of the people's will from government control would thus be placed at the mercy of government itself; popular sovereignty over government would be effectively replaced by government dominion over the minds of man.

Seen in this light, the Smith Act is a patent violation of the Consti-

* *Palko v. Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319, 327 (1937).

** *Thomas v. Collins*, 323 U.S. 516, 530 (1945).

tion, which constitutes a usurpation of power by the Congress which enacted it. It gives the government the power to punish advocacy whenever it sees fit to do so. It gives the government the power to enter the market place of ideas, from which the Constitution excluded it, and to silence those who advocate changes in our society.

In effect, the Act is tantamount to a constitutional amendment. For if Congress had the power to enact this law, making one kind of advocacy unlawful, it may pass kindred laws making other advocacy unlawful. The upholding of such a law therefore as a constitutional exercise of Congressional power would be equivalent to rewriting the First Amendment so that it read that Congress may pass no law infringing advocacy except *such as Congress may deem necessary or desirable*. The utter absurdity of such a conclusion is manifested by the mere statement. . . .

* * *

THE ADVOCACY SECTIONS OF THE SMITH ACT AS CONSTRUED AND APPLIED TO THESE INDICTMENTS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The evil inherent in the statute before us, is exemplified to the full when seen how it has been applied in the indictment in these cases.

At the outset, we emphasize sharply that the indictments do not charge the defendants with any criminal acts. They do not charge that the

defendants committed a single act directed to the overthrow of the government; or that they attempted in any manner to overthrow the government or that they even conspired to overthrow the government.

To indicate how far removed are these indictments from the ordinary conceptions of criminal charges, it should be noted that the defendants are not even charged with advocacy of any kind. They are accused of a crime punishable by 10 years imprisonment, for "conspiring" to "advocate and teach." The government charges that this conspiracy to advocate and teach has been going on uninterruptedly since July, 1945. Yet not a single instance is alleged of the advocacy or the teaching of force and violence during these three years. And of course, not a single act or attempt of force and violence.

Nonetheless on such indictments the government asserts the power to send 12 men to jail for 10 years, to outlaw the political party which they head and to threaten with similar penalty every man and woman who is or may become a member of that party.

We are therefore confronted in bold and naked form with the claim of government that it has the power under the statute to penalize advocacy and teaching—that and that alone; that it can make criminal not only actions and conduct, but speech, opinions and ideas—not speech connected with criminal acts, nor speech inciting to criminal acts, but speech

alone. This in essence is what the conspiracy indictment charges. Yet, that is precisely what the government may not do as we have heretofore discussed.

But not only is the offense charged in the indictment—conspiring “to advocate and teach”—not unlawful, and not within the province of government to curtail or forbid. After the first paragraph charges this, the remaining 9 paragraphs set forth in detail what the government considers to be the full plan and scope of the conspiracy and not one of these alleges a single unlawful act. Neither the end purpose set out in the indictment nor the means alleged to have been planned to bring it about consists of a single unlawful or even questionable act. On the contrary, *each of the acts alleged as part of the plan falls within the constitutionally protected area of speech, press and assembly.* Let us examine them *seriatim.*

First paragraph. This charges what is alleged to be the violation of law, that the defendants

did conspire . . . to organize the Communist Party of the United States of America, a society, group and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow . . . (and) knowingly and wilfully to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing. . . .

Not only do the defendants categorically deny the advocacy or teaching of the overthrow of the govern-

ment by force and violence as alleged in the First paragraph but the government itself actually makes no such contention relying as revealed in the remaining paragraphs of the indictment solely upon its arbitrary characterization of the science of Marxism-Leninism in a manner to fit the language of the statute.

As demonstrated by the remainder of the indictment, the above charges deal exclusively with the right to advocate and to teach a political science. Nothing else is alleged.

Second paragraph. The Second of the paragraphs of the indictment relates to the commencement of the alleged conspiracy. Stripped of its gratuitous terms, the fact alleged therein is that it was part of the conspiracy that the defendants would

(a) convene a meeting of the National Board . . . to adopt a draft resolution for the purpose of bringing about the dissolution of the Communist Political Association.

(b) for the purpose of organizing as the Communist Party of the United States of America a society, group, and assembly of persons dedicated to the Marxist-Leninist principles of the overthrow. . . .

and here follows the estimate of the sponsors of the indictments as to the character of Marxist-Leninist principles.

The indictment aptly defines a political party as an “assembly of persons” dedicated to certain principles

—as though the indictment were intended to cover, point by point, the three pillars of the First Amendment’s: speech, press and peaceable assembly, in order to destroy them all.

What does this allege other than an agreement to meet—to *assemble*—for the drafting of a resolution concerning a perfectly lawful purpose—the dissolution of one organization and the organizing of another—*speech and assembly!*

Third paragraph. The Third paragraph of the indictment alleges as a part of the so-called conspiracy that the defendants

would . . . convene . . . a meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Political Association . . . to amend and adopt said draft resolution.

The draft resolution referred to is the one alleged in the Second paragraph of the indictment as having the purpose of bringing about the dissolution of the Communist Party. Again there is no allegation that an unlawful act was performed, nor a lawful act for an unlawful purpose. There is no federal law forbidding the dissolution of a Communist Political Association. The organization of the Communist Party of the United States of America is as lawful in the United States of America as the organization of a Republican Party, and cannot be made unlawful as long as the Constitution stands. Just as in the Second para-

graph, all that is involved is *speech and assembly.*

Fourth paragraph. The Fourth paragraph of the indictment avers nothing germane except that the defendants

would . . . cause to be convened . . . a special National Convention of the Communist Political Association . . . for the purpose of considering and acting upon said resolution as amended.

Nothing unlawful in itself or leading to an unlawful end is alleged. *The right to assemble!*

Fifth paragraph. The Fifth paragraph of the indictment alleges nothing germane except that the defendants

would induce the delegates to said National Convention to dissolve the Communist Political Association.

Certainly this was not unlawful. Again all that is projected by this part of the plan is *speech*, the fundamental right to meet in an organization and advocate a proposal.

Sixth paragraph. The Sixth paragraph of the indictment alleges that the defendants

(1) Would bring about the organization of the Communist Party of the United States of America as a society, group, and assembly of persons to teach and advocate the overthrow . . .

(2) Would cause said Convention to adopt a Constitution basing said party upon the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The act planned as set forth in this paragraph was the setting up of a political party. If the right to organize and *assemble* that is protected by the First Amendment means anything, it most certainly means the right to assemble as a political party without which under our form of government, the people would have no way of expressing themselves.

Common decency would require, that where the adoption of a *constitution* by a political party convention is alleged in a criminal indictment seeking to imprison persons who adopted it on the ground that the party was an assembly of persons to teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the United States Government by force and violence—that the indictment would state that the constitution provides and declares that the party defends the United States Constitution and all its democratic institutions and is opposed to and forbids membership in its ranks to persons who hold the views and doctrines which the indictment attributes to the party. Neither fairness nor the due process required by law is to be found in an indictment which seeks to lead a court to believe that the accused adopted a constitution as a part of a conspiracy to “teach and advocate” the desirability, duty, etc., of violent overthrow of the Government of the United States, by concealment of the fact that the constitution, the adoption of which is alleged to be a part of the conspiracy,

negatives such a conclusion in its very opening and in its pertinent parts:

PREAMBLE

The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism. It champions the immediate and fundamental interests of the workers, farmers, and all who labor by hand and brain, against capitalist exploitation and oppression. As the advanced party of the working class, it stands in the forefront of this struggle.

The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and popular liberties. It uncompromisingly fights against imperialism and colonial oppression, against racial, national and religious discrimination, against Jim Crowism, anti-Semitism and all forms of chauvinism.

The Communist Party struggles for the complete destruction of fascism and for a durable peace. It seeks to safeguard the welfare of the people and the nation, recognizing that the working class, through its trade unions and by its independent political action, is the most consistent fighter for democracy, national freedom and social progress.

The Communist Party holds as a basic principle that there is an identity of interest which serves as a common bond uniting the workers of all lands. It recognizes further that the true national interests of our country and the cause of peace and progress require the solidarity of all freedom-loving peoples

and the continued and ever closer cooperation of the United Nations.

The Communist Party recognizes that the final abolition of exploitation and oppression, of economic crises and unemployment, of reaction and war, will be achieved only by socialist reorganization of society—by the common ownership and operation of the national economy under a government of the people led by the working class.

The Communist Party, therefore, educates the working class, in the course of its day-to-day struggles, for its historic mission, the establishment of Socialism. Socialism, the highest form of democracy, will guarantee the full realization of the right to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” and will turn the achievements of labor, science and culture to the use and enjoyment of all men and women. . . .

In the struggle for democracy, peace and social progress, the Communist Party carries forward the democratic traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, and the great working class traditions of Sylvis, Debs and Ruthenberg. It fights side by side with all who join in this cause.

ARTICLE I

The name of the organization shall be Communist Party of the United States of America.

ARTICLE II

Purposes: The purposes of this organization are to promote the best interests and welfare of the working class and the people of the United States, to defend and extend the democracy of our country, to prevent the rise of fascism, and to advance the cause of progress and peace with the ultimate aim of

ridding our country of the scourge of economic crises, unemployment, insecurity, poverty and war, through the realization of the historic aim of the working class—the establishment of Socialism by the free choice of the majority of the American people.

The *Seventh paragraph* of the indictment alleges that the defendants

(a) would bring about the election of officers and the election of a National Committee of said Party (and)

(b) would become members of said Party (and)

(c) be elected as officers and as members of said National Committee and the National Board of said Committee (and)

(d) in such capacities said defendants would assume leadership of such Party and responsibility for its policies and activities (and)

(e) would meet from time to time to formulate, supervise, and carry out the policies and activities of said Party.

This has exactly the same character in the eyes of the law under the Constitution of the United States as the same words would have if spoken about the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, even if embellished with the insult to the court which is contained in the allegation that such regular, normal and lawful functioning of a political party is “a conspiracy.” The enormity and un-American character of such a fraudulent characterization is apparent when we know that the election, organization and regular functioning of national committees of all politi-

cal parties as well as the existence of all such parties, including the Communist Party, is a part of the recognized legal system of government of the United States.

Again, all that is involved in the acts set out is the basic right of organization, of *assembly*.

Eighth paragraph. The Eighth numbered paragraph of the indictment says nothing germane beyond the words that

defendants would cause to be organized Clubs, and District and State units of said Party, and would recruit and encourage the recruitment of members of said Party.

Here, too, all that is implied is the exercise of the right of *speech* and *press* to persuade and recruit and the right to *assemble* in clubs.

Thus, the statute is so interpreted as to give the government power, when it sees fit, to interfere with the right of political parties to assemble and meet in clubs and other local bodies.

Ninth paragraph. The Ninth paragraph of the indictment adds redundancy to the proof that the charge against the defendants contains nothing whatever but irresponsible allegations in respect to the use of speech and press, saying:

It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would publish and circulate, and cause to be published and circulated, books, articles, magazines, and newspapers advocating the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

This brings in freedom of the *press* to the hilt. It refers to books and periodicals sold and circulated on newsstands, in book-shops, libraries, schools and colleges.

Tenth paragraph. The Tenth paragraph of the indictment reveals beyond dispute that the advocacy sections of the Smith Act are intended to be used by government to establish a police censorship over thought, ideas, doctrine and the free discussion thereof even in schools of learning. The revealing substance of this paragraph is the allegation

that said defendants would conduct, and cause to be conducted, schools and classes for the study of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, in which would be taught and advocated the duty and necessity of overthrowing and destroying the government of the United States by force and violence.

The defendants assert that the indictment on its face reveals that the government construes the law as giving it power at will to prosecute advocacy, to penalize the propagation of ideas, to suppress the views and opinions which it disapproves by imprisoning the advocates and outlawing their organization.

The barren, naked charge of merely conspiring to advocate alleged in this indictment makes this case unique among the cases involving infringement of free speech, which the Supreme Court has passed upon. In all previous cases, the defendants were charged with some specific

words which were described as violative of the statute: a pamphlet, a speech, a leaflet, a book.

When convictions were upheld, the Court attempted to justify the abridgement of the First Amendment in one of two ways: either as in the Gitlow case by asserting that the pamphlet, for the writing of which the defendant was indicted, was found by a jury to contain forbidden views, *i.e.*, views which the legislature proscribed; or as in the Schenck case that the leaflets there considered presented a "clear and present danger."

Even in the Dunne case, as appears from the footnotes to the report, the indictment charged in 13 paragraphs alleged illegal acts as part of the conspiracy such as "to bring about an armed revolution against the government," "to create dissension . . . and insubordination in the armed forces," etc.

Unsound as the indictments in these cases surely were, the government here abandons even the pretenses of alleging specific acts. It points to no pamphlet, speech, leaflet or book as violative of the statute. What the government deems a crime, as set forth in the 10 paragraphs of the indictment, is everything which the Communist Party has done, does or may ever do. The court is asked to find the defendants guilty not for commission of any criminal act; not even for the "advocating" or "writing" or "publishing" of evil words, but for just being Communists; for

believing in Marxism-Leninism, for holding conventions of the Communist Party; for electing officers of the Communist Party; for setting up schools and teaching its views.

Nor is this indictment so drawn because the Attorney General was careless or inept. Only such an indictment could express and accomplish what the government seeks to do in this case: to wholly outlaw the Communist Party; to deny American citizens the right to belong to it; to stifle its efforts to bring its political views before the people so as to compete with the programs of other political parties.

For if the government were to draw an indictment in the language of all legal precedent, and allege the acts or books or words which are criminal, it would defeat its main purpose. True, some innocent men would go to jail, true, the United States Constitution would be circumvented, but the Communist Party would still exist. Americans would still hear their views on political issues of the day, and the battle to exterminate the ideas of Communism would have to be fought again and again.

The method of law enforcement, the only one consistent with our system of law based on the principle that man can only be punished for the crime he himself has committed, is clearly too tedious and troublesome for the government. This indictment is the shortcut by which all proof of specific acts and crimes is made

superfluous. Prove that the defendants "believe in Marxism-Leninism" and one will have accomplished in one sweep, by a single trial, what the enemies of the Communist Party have sought to do for 30 years without success: to deny to Communists the right to advocate and to non-Communists the right to hear the doctrine of Socialism, "advocated" for 100 years by millions throughout the world.

As construed and applied to these indictments, therefore, the Smith Act infringes the basic rights of the defendants to speech, press and assembly, destroys their right to organize and assemble with others as a political party, suppresses their right to expound and advocate a social science—and is therefore unconstitutional.

* * *

[There follows a study of pertinent decisions of the Supreme Court which establish that under the Constitution advocacy may not be abridged. This section concludes as follows:]

The Smith Act, and the indictments hereunder, are a reincarnation of the Sedition Act and the prosecutions of 1798. The Smith Act and these indictments represent once again the attempts of officials of government to transgress the provisions of the Constitution, to abridge and punish mere advocacy, to outlaw a political party and suppress its program and principles in the market place of ideas. Again the attempt

is made to justify such statute and prosecutions under the guise of "implied powers" under the Constitution or under the alleged power of Government to punish words which have a "dangerous tendency" or present a "clear and present danger" to Government. Our review of the historical precedents establishes that such an attempt by Government to prescribe advocacy is unlawful and contrary to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The Government will undoubtedly rely on the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals in the Sixth Circuit, *Dunne v. U.S.*, 138 F. (2) 137 (1944) upholding convictions under Sections 9, 10, and 11 of the Smith Act. Aside from the fact that the indictment in the Dunne case recited specific overt acts (while this indictment contains none); aside from the fact that its emphasis was upon the violations of Section 9 of the Act involving intent to interfere with the morale of the Armed Forces, and not the stark attempt to punish advocacy (as in this case); aside from the fact that the fundamental propositions presented here were not advanced in that case—we assert basically that the theory of the Circuit Court opinion cannot be defended. The decision in *Dunne v. United States* was grounded solely upon the majority decision in *Gitlow v. New York*. The Circuit Court adopts in toto the "dangerous tendency" test of 1920. It represents an abandonment of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and a disregard of the de-

isions of the Supreme Court in the last two decades. The Smith Act is an unconstitutional measure, a lawless attempt by officials of government to proscribe speech. History and legal precedent are to the contrary.

* * *

[After establishing a number of other legal points, the defense brief closes as follows:]

It is in the arena of public opinion that this case belongs, not in the courtroom. It is to that forum that this case should be transferred.

II

REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS INDICTMENTS UPON GROUNDS OF UNCONSTITU- TIONALITY

STATEMENT

The Government states:

The defendants argue broadly that the Constitution does not permit the federal government to interfere with advocacy of ideas or political programs.

That is correct.

The Government states further:

In support of the argument they liken themselves to the major political parties in the country, and urge that they are equally entitled to advocate their program and ideas.

That too is correct. The Communist Party is a political party and is entitled, like any other political par-

ty, to advocate its program and ideas.

The Government states, however, that "Whether the government may interfere with the advocacy of ideas in general" is an "abstract question." Its concern is solely with one idea—"the advocacy of revolution against the government."

The Government, while conceding on the one hand that the advocacy of ideas in general is free, contends on the other hand that ideas may be classified by Government as "good" or "bad." If "bad," then the expression of the idea may be suppressed. We are not furnished with a category of the ideas which Government considers evil. Assumedly, they will vary from time to time as the Government determines. Probably, as history indicates, some of the "bad" ideas may later turn out to be "good"—and vice versa. Sufficient, for the Government's purposes, is its present determination to characterize the ideas advocated by the Communist Party of the United States as "bad," ideas which, says the Government, shall never leave the lips of men. Whoever expresses those ideas—the content and nature of the expressions to be dissected by the judicial arm of government—commits a crime. (Cf., *United States v. Ballard*, 322 U.S. 78, 1944.)

For the support of this proposition, the Government does not, of course, cite the Constitution of the United States. It points solely to three cases—*Gitlow*, *Whitney* and *Dunne*. We shall show that these three cases are

futile reeds to support such an ominous proposition. What remains in the Government's brief is the boldest attempt ever made by Government to abrogate the First Amendment and to assert absolute power to censor, prosecute and penalize what Americans may say, write and advocate. . . .

* * *

[The defense reply to the Government's brief analyzes at length the decisions in the *Gitlow* and *Whitney* cases—which also involved violations of the First Amendment—and demonstrates that not only were their circumstances quite different from those in question here, but also that the majority decisions in those cases have since been, in effect, reversed. Due to limitations of space, it is not possible to reproduce these sections here.]

THE SCOPE OF SECTION 10

The Government maintains that the Smith Act "so far as here involved" is not void for uncertainty. It asserts that "no extended argument is required to demonstrate that men of common intelligence need not guess at the meaning of the Smith Act" (Government Brief, pp. 17-19). There is this difficulty with the Government's position—by these indictments it has construed this statute as meaning that any utterance of "force and violence," regardless of whether it constitutes a criminal attempt or incitation, whether the advocacy is ad-

vocacy of action or advocacy of doctrine—no matter what its form, and no matter how, or when, or where it is made—the Smith Act applies. The Government will probably urge in reply that it has no intention of punishing every advocacy, but since its sole reliance is upon Judge Sanford in the *Gitlow* case, it is clear that its position is that Government *has the power* to interdict the advocacy of this idea without any interference by the judiciary—and prosecutions will be dependent upon the sole determination of officials of government. As so construed, we maintain that the statute violates the provisions of the First Amendment and deprives defendants of their liberties without due process of law in violation of the Fifth Amendment.

The Government's position is that advocacy of the views contained in the Declaration of Independence may be punished under Section 10.

If a citizen of New Hampshire should state at a public meeting that:

Government being instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security, of the whole community, and not for the private interest or emolument of any one man, family, or class of men; therefore, whenever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may and of right ought, to reform the old, or establish a new government. The doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power, and oppression,

is absurd, slavish and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind. (Constitution, New Hampshire, 1784, Article 10th.)

it would appear, if the Government's position is correct, that he would be amenable to the terms of the Smith Act. . . .

[There follows at this point a list of thirty additional states whose constitutions have contained similar provisions.]

What would the Government's position be concerning any person who read or published the views of Jefferson, "I hold a little rebellion now and then is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical."* Would a President of the United States be permitted to say in an inaugural address as Lincoln did: "This country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it"?

What is the Government's position on the following statement delivered by a distinguished jurist rendering an opinion as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania:

The words "in such manner as they may think proper," in the declaration of rights, embraces but three known recognized modes by which the whole

people, the state, can give their consent to an alteration of an existing lawful frame of government, viz:

1. The mode provided in the existing constitution;

2. A law, as the instrumental process of raising the body for revision and conveying it to the powers of the people;

3. A revolution.

The first two are peaceful means through which the consent of the people to alteration is obtained, and by which the existing government consents to be displaced without revolution. The government gives its consent, either by pursuing the mode provided in the constitution, or by passing a law to call a convention. If consent be not so given by the existing government the remedy of the people is in the third mode—revolution. . . .*

As the Supreme Court stated in *Herndon v. Lowry, supra* (p. 263):

The statute, as construed and applied, amounts merely to a dragnet which may enmesh anyone who agitates for a change of government if a jury can be persuaded that he ought to have foreseen his words would have some effect on the future conduct of others. . . .

* * *

[This section, from which a preliminary portion is omitted, argues the duty and necessity of the court, without trial, to declare the government's action unconstitutional.]

We submit that the court's power to pass upon the constitutionality of the statute and/or indictments is highlighted by the very nature of this case. When the effects of a case go

* *Writings of Jefferson* (Ford edition), IV, p. 362.

* *Agnes, C. J., Wells v. Bain*, 75 Pa. 39, 47 (1874).

beyond the fate of the defendants, and determine also the rights of an entire political party and all its members, a Court can not lightly pass over the issue of constitutionality and rely upon its disposition by an Appellate Court. To determine constitutionality at this stage of the case would injure no one; to the contrary it would save from injury tens of thousands of men and women. For even a reversal on appeal will not make whole a political party outlawed by the action of a jury in the case of 12 men.

We need not speculate on the measure of harm which would flow from the contention that a District Judge lacked power to pass on the constitutionality of an advocacy statute. Proof is already at hand. Even while the Department of Justice is prosecuting the defendants in the Southern District of New York for being members of the Communist Party it is hailing men and women before Grand Juries in the Federal Courts in Colorado and Ohio—up to the very day this brief is submitted—and seeking to compel them to testify against themselves on the precise question of membership in the Communist Party, citing for contempt and even jailing men and women who assert their constitutional rights against incrimination. Were the Government sincere in urging constitutionality of act or indictment in this case, it assuredly would not be insisting before Federal Judges in other districts that men

and women must testify against themselves in matters relating to the Communist Party.

* * *

CONCLUSION

The Government's answering brief fails to meet the issue. We are considering here a particular statute, Title 18, United States Code, Sections 10 and 11, and particular indictments thereunder. The issue is—Is this specific statute on its face, and as construed by the Government in the indictments, constitutional? The issue is—Has Government the power to proscribe and punish the advocacy of ideas, and, as construed by the Government, the power to punish these particular defendants for organizing and belonging to a political party, the Communist Party of the United States of America? The Government contends that it has the power under our constitutional system to characterize "the principles of Marxism-Leninism" as evil, and to proscribe them. It contends that the formation of a political party with views and policies which the Government characterizes as unwise, or unpalatable, or wicked, is a crime. Whether these contentions find support in history or legal precedent is the real issue here.

The contention of the Government is not new. Governments have tried to usurp such power from time immemorial. One has only to recall the early struggles in England for liberty of opinion and association

when doctrines were proscribed by despotic Kings and venal proponents as "revolutionary" because they espoused electoral reforms or separation of Church and State. Suppression was the method adopted by Government to cope with the people's protests. . . .

With many of these forms of political and religious persecution the founding fathers were, of course, familiar. They created a government, and a charter for government, to make certain that these persecutions would never recur. The only attempt made in that early era to restore the absolutism of government and nullify the fruits of the Revolution (Sedition Act of 1798, 1 Stat. 596) met with speedy and decisive failure. A century and a half later the same attempt is being renewed.

It is argued that the statute here is different, that it is conceived solely, as the Government puts it, with "the advocacy of revolution against the government" (Government's Brief, p. 2). Indeed, the Government disavows any purpose to interfere with "the great, the indispensable democratic freedoms secured by the First Amendment" (Government's Brief, p. 3). That is the constant position of officials of government who seek the suppression of ideas. As Prof. Chafee puts it:

One of the striking features of a sedition law is that it always is said to be different—its proponents are sure to contend that they are not repeating the mistakes of last time. Thus Black-

stone defended the seditious libel prosecutions of his day because they were not the same as the censorship; and the Six Acts of 1819 were not the same as those libel prosecutions; and the Defense of the Realm Act under which Bertrand Russell went to prison was not the same as the Six Acts.

There are fashions in sedition laws as in everything else. . . . Aside from greater severity of sentences, the only big change during the intervening hundred odd years is in phraseology. Instead of saying "to excite against the government the hatred of the good people of the United States," sedition laws now say, "to advocate the overthrow of the government by force or violence." Yet the new words work out in much the same way as the old words. . . .

The truth is that the precise language of a sedition law is like the inscription on a sword. What matters is the existence of the weapon. Once the sword is placed in the hands of the people in power, then, whatever it says, they will be able to reach and slash at almost any unpopular person who is speaking or writing anything that they consider objectionable criticism of their policies.*

We do not retrace here the discussion contained in Points I and II of our main brief. We merely reaffirm that governmental power in our constitutional system is strictly limited, limited by the Constitution ordained by the people. Freedom of thought and expression of thought are a domain wholly immune from governmental infringement. There is no power in government, express or im-

* Z. Chafee, *Free Speech in the United States* (1941), p. 466.

plied, to abridge the advocacy of ideas. The First Amendment declares this unmistakably, "Congress shall make *no law*. . . ." The Government of the United States is a representative government. It exists by consent of the governed. Consent means free consent, freely given after choice freely made. For a people to make a free choice, every idea which men believe, they may express. In the free exchange of ideas—ideas of little moment and ideas which touch the

heart of things—there is distilled the final determination by the people which constitutes "the consent of the governed." For Government, the representative of the people, to interdict any body of ideas, or persons expressing such ideas, is to undermine the very foundation of constitutional government and endanger "the security of the Republic" (*De Jonge v. Oregon*, 299 U.S. 353, 365, 1937).

The indictments should be dismissed.

"The times of that superstition which attributed revolutions to the ill will of a few agitators have long passed away. Everyone knows nowadays that wherever there is a revolutionary convulsion, there must be some social want in the background, which is prevented, by outworn institutions, from satisfying itself. The want may not yet be felt as strongly, as generally, as might ensure immediate success; but every attempt at forcible repression will only bring it forth stronger and stronger, until it bursts its fetters."

Frederick Engels, *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, p. 9.

MANIFESTO OF THE WROCLAW CONGRESS*

The World Congress of Intellectuals in Defense of Peace, with nearly 500 delegates from 45 different countries, met in Wroclaw, Poland, August 25 to 28, and issued a Manifesto. Out of 42 British delegates, 35 voted for the Manifesto, 4 against, and 3 abstained. Out of 32 U.S.A. delegates, 23 voted for, 7 against and 2 abstained. One delegate from Brazil abstained. Other delegations were unanimously for the Manifesto.

WE, WORKERS IN CULTURE, science and the arts, who have gathered in the Polish town of Wroclaw from 45 countries, address the intellectuals of the world. We remind you of the mortal danger which only recently confronted the culture of mankind. We have witnessed fascist barbarity—the destruction of historical and cultural values, the persecution and death of brain workers, the utter disregard for all spiritual values—which endangered the very concepts of conscience, reason and progress.

EUROPEAN CULTURE IN DANGER

Human culture was saved by the supreme exertion of all the democratic forces—the Soviet Union, the peoples of Great Britain and the United States, by the heroic popular resistance in countries seized by fascism—at the cost of unparalleled sacrifices and privations. And yet, contrary to the will and aspirations of the peoples of all countries, a handful of selfish men in America and Europe,

who inherited from fascism its ideas of racial superiority and the negation of progress, who took over its tendency to settle all problems by force of arms, are again making an attempt against the spiritual wealth of the nations of the world.

The culture of the European countries, which have made an enormous contribution to the treasury of humanity, stands in danger of loss of its national features. In a number of countries—Spain, Greece, Latin-America—forces hostile to progress not only preserve, but create, new hotbeds of fascism.

Contrary to reason and conscience, oppression of human beings and of whole nations which the oppressors style as colored continues and even increases. The people who borrowed the methods of fascism practice racial discrimination within their countries and persecute progressive workers in science and the arts. Scientific discoveries which might benefit humanity are used for secret production of means of destruction, which tends to discredit and distort the lofty mission of science.

* Text and preface reprinted from the British *Labour Monthly*, October, 1948.

Under the rule of these people, the human word and art are not used for purposes of educating and bringing peoples together, but for fanning base man-hating passions and for preparing war. Firmly believing in the need for free development and dissemination of the achievements of progressive culture in the name of peace, progress and the future of mankind, we protest against any restriction of this freedom and stress the need for mutual understanding among cultures and peoples in the interests of world civilization.

PROTEST AGAINST USING SCIENCE FOR DESTRUCTION

Realizing that modern science has released great new forces, which will inevitably be used by humanity either for its good or to its detriment, the Congress protests against the utilization of science for the purpose of destruction and calls on the peoples to bend all their efforts toward disseminating knowledge widely throughout the world, toward the application of science in order to reduce, as swiftly as possible, the poverty, ignorance, disease and want af-

fecting the majority of mankind, and also to assist in relaxing restrictions on the free movement of those who serve the cause of peace and progress, on the free publication and circulation of books, on the publication of the results of scientific research as well as of all scientific and cultural achievements which serve the same aims.

The nations of the world do not wish war and possess sufficient strength to defend peace and culture against the attempts of the new fascism. Intellectuals of the world! You are facing a great responsibility to your nations, to humanity and history. We raise our voices for peace, for the free cultural progress of the nations, for their national independence and close cooperation. We call upon all brain workers in every country to discuss our proposals. We call for national Congresses of intellectuals in defense of peace to be held in all countries. We call for national committees in defense of peace to be set up everywhere. We call for international connections of intellectuals of all countries to be strengthened in the interests of peace.

FROM THE TREASURY OF MARXISM

"A HIDEOUS BLASPHEMY AGAINST NATURE AND MAN"

By FREDERICK ENGELS

[Exactly 150 years after the appearance of Thomas R. Malthus' *Essay on Population* (1798), we witness, in 1948, as part of the general ideological offensive of Wall Street imperialism, a new and significant disinterment and dissemination of Malthus' reactionary doctrines. During recent months the American people have been made the objective of a barrage of neo-Malthusian propaganda which links up an unscientific and reactionary population "theory," with pseudo-scientific notions on "man's" supposed inability to produce enough food. These books, forums, scientists' conferences, radio speeches, etc., seek to conceal the responsibility of capitalism for mass impoverishment and starvation, economic crises and recurrent wars, and are designed to prepare the people to accept, as results of "natural laws," the coming economic crisis and a third world war which U. S. imperialism is plotting.*

[The following letter by Engels to F. A. Lange (March 29, 1865)

*deals with Malthus and his "eternal laws of nature" (Engels).** The above-given title has been taken from a passage dealing with Malthus in one of the earliest writings by Engels on political economy, "Umrisse zur Kritik der Nationalökonomie," which was published in 1844 in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*.]

... I too was struck, the very first time I read Darwin, with the remarkable likeness between his account of plant and animal life and the Malthusian theory. Only I came to a different conclusion from yours: namely, that nothing discredits modern bourgeois development so much as the fact that it has not yet succeeded in getting beyond the economic forms of the animal world. To us so-called "economic laws" are not eternal laws of nature but historic laws which arise and disappear; and the code of modern political economy, in so far as it has been drawn up with proper objectivity by the economists, is to us simply a summary of the laws and conditions under which alone modern bourgeois society can exist—in short the conditions of its production and exchange expressed in an abstract and

* A forthcoming issue of *Political Affairs* will include an article analyzing this current ideological campaign.

* *The Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, International Publishers, New York, 1936, pp. 198-200. The text here reproduced is slightly abridged.

summary way. To us also, therefore, none of these laws, in so far as it expresses *purely bourgeois conditions*, is older than modern bourgeois society; those which have hitherto been more or less valid throughout all history only express just those relations which are common to the conditions of all society based on class rule and class exploitation. To the former belongs the so-called law of Ricardo, which is valid neither for feudal serfdom nor ancient slavery; to the latter belongs what is tenable in the so-called Malthusian theory.

Like all his other ideas, Parson Malthus had stolen this theory direct from his predecessors; all that belongs to him is the purely arbitrary application of the two progressions.* In England the theory itself has long ago been reduced to a rational scale by the economists; the pressure of population is not upon the means of subsistence but upon the means of *employment*; mankind is capable of increasing more rapidly than modern bourgeois society can stand. To us a further reason for declaring this bourgeois society a barrier to development which must fall.

You yourself ask how increase of population and increase in the means of subsistence are to be brought into harmony; but except for one sentence in the preface I find no at-

tempt to solve the question. We start from the premise that the same forces which have created modern bourgeois society—the steam-engine, modern machinery, mass colonization, railways, steamships, world trade—and which are now already, through the permanent trade crises, working towards its ruin and ultimate destruction—these same means of production and exchange will also suffice to reverse the relation in a short time, and to raise the productive power of each individual so much that he can produce enough for the consumption of two, three, four, five or six individuals. Then town industry as it is today will be able to spare people enough to give agriculture quite other forces than it has had up to now; science also will then at last be applied in agriculture on a large scale and with the same consistency as in industry; the exploitation of the inexhaustible regions fertilized by nature herself in South-Eastern Europe and Western America will be carried out on an enormous scale hitherto quite unknown. If all these regions have been ploughed up and after that a shortage sets in, then will be the time to say *caveant consules* [to sound the alarm].

Too little is produced, that is the cause of the whole thing. But *why* is too little produced? Not because the limits of production—even to-day and with present-day means—are exhausted. No, but because the limits of production are determined not by the number of hungry bellies but by

the number of *purses* able to buy and to pay. Bourgeois society does not and cannot wish to produce any more. The moneyless bellies, the labor which cannot be utilized *for profit* and therefore cannot buy, is left to the death-rate. Let a sudden industrial boom, such as is constantly occurring, make it possible for this labor to be employed

with profit, then it will get money to spend, and the means of subsistence have never hitherto been lacking. This is the endless vicious circle in which the whole economic system revolves. One presupposes bourgeois conditions as a whole, and then proves that every part of them is a necessary part—and therefore an "eternal law. . . ."

CORRECTION

The Editors wish to correct the error appearing in the second sentence following the subtitle on page 900 of the September issue, caused by a mistake in the stenographic transcription of John Gates' report to the recent convention of the Communist Party. The sentence should read:

"The answer is that Roosevelt failed to strike at the root of Southern backwardness and bring about a fundamental change."

* Malthus developed the idea that population increases in geometrical progression and therefore outstrips the means of subsistence, whose production increases only in arithmetical progression.—*Editor.*

BOOK REVIEW

FAMILY FARM FANTASY

By ERIK BERT

The publication of *Family Farm Policy** offers an opportunity for examining the theory of the "family farm."

Family farm tenure is viewed by the editors of the volume, Joseph Ackerman, of the Farm Foundation, and Marshall Harris, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as "compatible with the best way of life of Western civilization" (p. 10). They feel that the family farm facilitates "the establishment and maintenance of institutions and processes necessary to a smoothly functioning social order" and is a superior "means toward the attainment and maintenance of political democracy" (p. 17).

THE TERM "FAMILY FARM"

The conference participants adopted a definition of the family farm which was allegedly "realistic and permanent, that is, which defines something that actually can exist in practice" (p. 387).

* "Family Farm Policy: Proceedings of a conference on Family Farm Policy, attended by participants from the British Commonwealth, Northern Europe, Central Europe, Latin America, and the United States. Held at the University of Chicago, February 15-20, 1946." Edited by Joseph Ackerman and Marshall Harris. The University of Chicago Press, 1947. All page references are to this volume.

Other recent books with a pattern similar to that outlined in *Family Farm Policy* are: Wilcox, Walter W., *The Farmer in the Second World War*, the Iowa State College Press, 1947; Griswold, A. Whitney, *Farming and Democracy*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1948.

Such a definition includes (pp. 387-389):

1. "The entrepreneurial function resides in the farm family." This, they held, is the "first and most essential characteristic" of a family farm.

2. "The farm should possess sufficient land and capital to absorb efficiently the labor of such members of the farm family as may depend upon it for a livelihood. . . . However, it should possess no more land and capital than can be operated regularly by the farm family."

3. The family farm includes those farms which employ hired labor during peak seasons.

Excluded from the family farm group by this definition are (pp. 8, 389):

1. "Practically all . . . sharecropper units."

2. "Certain tenants and some farms operating under contract agreements which impair the essentials of entrepreneurship of the farm family."

3. "Plantations and other types of farm organizations dependent almost wholly upon hired labor or 'croppers.'"

4. "Many part-time and rural-resident farms which have become fairly numerous."

5. Many other farms which "have to be classified as quasi-family farms."

The volume gives no net figure on the number of family farms, since the number excluded under certain categories is unknown. But the conferees did reach the conclusion that "only a fraction of the farms in the United States meet fully" the specifications

laid down by the conference (p. 390).

Neither the conference as a whole, nor the editors of the volume, estimated this fraction. But some of the conferees, dismayed by the conclusions, hazarded a guess.

J. F. Booth, of the Canadian Department of Agriculture, put the figure of family farms in the United States at under 30 per cent (p. 404). Henry C. Taylor, of the Farm Foundation, and Anne Taylor were more specific: "The definition in the committee's report would include only about one-fourth of the farms of the United States as family farms" (p. 402).

Whatever the fraction may be, the family farm, as defined, includes those farms in the United States which have (at 1939 prices) a gross product between \$1,500 and \$10,000, and on which the labor is supplied either exclusively by the farm family, or by the farm family plus hired labor not to exceed fifty per cent of the total labor power expended. (Excluded also are sharecroppers and plantations.)

The family farms as defined are, thus, middle-sized farms. They constitute a minority of all farms, and embrace an even smaller minority of the farm population.

The family farm as defined is not a homogeneous entity. In addition to the employment of or non-employment of hired labor, the following criteria still remain:

1. Who owns the land?
2. Who owns the capital invested?
3. How much is produced for the market?

The theme song of the conference, repeated dozens of times in mild variation, was: "The family farm has long

been a basic part of our national land policy."

Leonard A. Salter, of the University of Wisconsin, presented a different version of the family-farm-policy theme. "Throughout the history of the United States," he said, "the idea of free *operator-ownership* of farms has been held as an end to be sought." (P. 123, my emphasis—E.B. See also John B. Bennett's contribution, p. 116.)

In so far as ideals are concerned, the ideal of farm tenure in American history has not been the family farm in general, but a farm *owned* by the farm family.

The conferees disposed of the owner-operator ideal—because it was so obviously contradicted by the facts of life—by recognizing tenancy as a permanent feature of American agriculture.

"It was recognized that tenancy has a part to play," they explained (p. 36). They did not admit that they had compromised the family-owned-farm ideal. They just changed the definition to include tenancy.

The family farm, as thus defined to include both fully-owned and rented farms, is still not a simple concept, if we apply the criterion either of who owns the capital or of how much is produced for the market.

The conference resolved this problem be exorcizing the contradictions inherent in the family farm as they had defined it.

They saw no "convincing reasons for suggesting that all or even any part of the capital required to operate the farm should be furnished by the family." It is not "necessary for a family farm to stay out of the capital market. It may borrow and it may lend funds to others. It may rent property from or to others.

How capital resources are obtained does not determine whether the operating unit is a family farm" (p. 388).

The questions of who owns the land, who owns the equipment, how much equity the family farmer has in the land (if he owns it), or in the equipment (if it is mortgaged) were, by agreement, eliminated from the factors which determine the character of the family farm.

In place of these factors, which are decisive in the development of agriculture, they substituted the euphonious theory that what counts is whether "the family maintains the essentials of entrepreneurship" (p. 388).

The question of production for the market was excluded by a flank attack. "It is not necessary that a family farm be self-sufficient in the goods and services consumed in the household or even in most of the food, fuel, and fiber that the family uses. Some dependency upon markets is presumably necessary. . . . But our definition does not specify the extent of this dependency" (p. 388).

Such definition excludes the criterion of production for the market and, specifically, the growing concentration in the largest farm enterprises of an increasing proportion of the produce marketed.

TENANCY AND LANDLORDISM IN THE U. S.

The main characteristics of American agriculture which bear on the conference's family farm are, as admitted in the conference:

1. Tenancy and landlordism are a permanent feature of American agriculture, including the middle-sized farms.

Under family farm policy "it is held

that every farmer should have a reasonable opportunity to own his farm and home," the editors say (p. 45). But in the United States only a minority of farmers "have a reasonable opportunity" to own their own farms and homes, mortgage-free. And, if croppers and farm workers are included, the fraction who have this opportunity is even smaller.

2. The conference's family farm group is being eroded by economic forces inherent in capitalist agriculture. The weakest family farms are being driven into the group of small farms, or are being enveloped by the largest farms. The strongest family farms are moving toward the big farm group by engrossing the land of their neighbors.

"The facts are simple," Robert W. Hudgens told the conference. "We have large farms, and we have small farms; we have owner-operator farms, and we have tenant-operated farms; and we have a great discouraged group of sharecroppers and agricultural laborers. Among these groups the family farm seems to be the one that is losing ground" (p. 107).

"There has been an increase in both land concentration and parcellation. . . . Both of these movements have been observed during the last fifteen years" (p. 19).

During the conference every recommendation that has ever been made (either in the United States or anywhere else in the capitalist world) for the improvement of farm tenure, was echoed. These include proposals which can serve as the immediate demands of small and middle farmers, croppers and farm laborers.

We are concerned here, however, not

with these or any other proposals, but with the context in which the conference proposals were stated. They were put forward as an evasion of, and a substitute for, an analysis of the historic course of American agricultural development.

In philosophic terms, the whole train of thought of the conferees was idealistic, both with regard to the future, and to the past.

The editors declare, for example, that in the United States "our system of farm tenure" was "largely shaped" by "our theory, ideals, and objectives of democracy" (p. 42). "No other single concept has so profound an effect upon our tenure pattern" as the family farm, "and undoubtedly no other concept will exert so powerful an influence in the immediate future" (p. 45). "The idea of the family farm has shaped the structure of most of American agriculture" (p. 386).

Actually the family farm ideal was conceived by men who opened up and tilled free land. For a time the ideal corresponded in a rough way with reality. Today it no longer corresponds. Today most of the land belongs to a landlord, or is mortgaged and/or cannot provide a decent living to the family that tills it. The family farm ideal had a material basis in free land.

The conferees admit that the family farm ideal has not been fulfilled. But they describe this failure in idealistic terms also. They conceive the world to be one where conflicting ideas are the cause, not the result, of material conflict.

"Conflicting concepts have been at work," they say (p. 45). These are: the family farm ideal and the "laissez faire ideal," the right to grab as much land

as one can hold, as Salter puts it (p. 126). Present-day tenure problems arise, in large part, the editors say, from the "conflicting ideologies" of the family farm and unrestricted acquisition of land (p. 42).

"Tenure problems" have their real origin in the persistent advance in the technique of production. This raises the level of production, the amount of capital and acreage required for most efficient operation, and reduces the amount of living labor required for a given volume of output. Every such advance widens the gap between the level of production and the tenure structure. An accumulation of such advances creates a contradiction between the level of production and the tenure structure which is resolved by changes in tenure.

"Tenure problems" represent the impact of changes in technique (toward a higher level of production) on the existing tenure relations.

In discussing the future the conferees and the editors indulged in pleasantries about education, research, the golden rule, better landlord-tenant and creditor-debtor relations, and the like. But the facts of life cannot be thus resolved.

TECHNOLOGY AND THE FAMILY FARM

The conferees moved on to more basic questions:

"Can the family farm acquire and employ new technology that requires much additional capital and the movement of many people out of farming?" (p. 391).

Howard R. Tolley, chairman of the conference planning committee, asked: "How can the best that science will produce be applied to family farms so

that farmers may participate fully in the march of technology? How can all the newer and better machines and improved production techniques and processes be made to minister to the well-being of family farmers?" (p. 110).

This is possible, the conference held. How? The secret lies in "adequate-sized" farms.

The conferees held that the key to survival for the family farm lies in *bigger* farms, that those which expand will survive, and those which do not will succumb.

"One of the serious shortcomings of the present farm tenure situation, for both owners and tenants, is inadequate sized units. Either the operators lack sufficient capital . . . or the farms contain too few acres." "Wise social planning," to their mind, "aims toward *consolidation* needed to assure farms which are really adequate for the occupying families" (p. 435—my emphasis—E.B.).

"The present situation clearly demonstrates the need for land settlement and land tenure policies leading to an *increase in the size* of farms to ensure adequate farm incomes" (p. 436. My emphasis—E.B.).

The inevitable complement of the development of "adequate-sized" units—that is, bigger units—is, as the conference recognized, the elimination of "inadequate-sized" units, and of the "surplus" farm population. "Adequate-sized" farms on the one hand mean too-many-people on the other hand.

"It was fully agreed that agriculture cannot provide full on-farm employment for all the present farm population. Neither can it provide work opportunities for the comparatively large annual increase in population" (p. 30; also

p. 448). "Increased labor efficiency is due to mechanization and technological improvements in farming, such as greater use of tractor power, the combine, and possibly the cotton picker. . . . The decrease in manual labor due to increased efficiency displaces large numbers of farm people, especially farm laborers and sharecroppers" (p. 449).

"When the possibilities of continued improvement in agricultural efficiency are considered, it may well be that the desirable policy . . . will be to reduce the proportion of the population engaged in agriculture and to take measures to encourage the transfer to other occupations" (p. 428).

The monopoly rulers of America also think that there are "too many" farmers. The U. S. Chamber of Commerce published a report in March, 1945, titled "Variations in Farm Incomes," which blithely proposes to eliminate from one-fourth to two-thirds of the farms in this country. This report was signed not only by the "farm" representatives of the Chamber of Commerce but also by the N.A.M., Armour & Co., Pillsbury Flour Mills, General Electric, Carnation Milk, and other business interests. It was also signed by officials of the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange, whose top officers can usually be found testifying for every piece of reactionary legislation put forward by the N.A.M. and the Chamber of Commerce. To ballyhoo this reductionist philosophy, Henry Luce's *Life Magazine*, in its issue of May 5, 1947, ran a sensational editorial demanding that 3,800,000 farm families be eliminated from commercial agriculture, and characterizing the family-type farms as breeding grounds for the "Dillingers" and "Pretty Boy Floyds." It is plain that

their proposals for eliminating the family-type farms are also aimed at the small farms as well.

The existence of six million "farms" is an obstacle to the increase in the size of agricultural operations. The big farmers and their monopolist allies would like to carry through an enclosure movement in the classical British style. The existence of millions of farms—however uncertain the tenure under which they are operated—permits the enlargement of operations on a minority of the biggest farms too gradually to suit the bigger-farm proponents.

They fear that there will be serious social consequences among the mass of the farm population as the technical level of production is raised and the bite of competition becomes sharper. The "too many farmers" record is being played over and over again by the monopolists' disc jockeys to condition the mass of the farm population to accept lowered living standards and expulsion from the land without complaint.

The family farm siren song is intended to help obscure the path that the development of American agriculture is taking.

The use of the term "family farm" as defined by the conference is unscientific on two counts.

1. The conference used the blanket term "family farm" to describe what is admittedly a small minority of all farms and an even smaller proportion of the farm population. There is nothing wrong about analyzing a section of the farm population, however small. It is unscientific to describe middle-sized farms by the term "family farm," which can, and does, mean all things to all men.

2. By combining ownership and tenancy, fully-owned and mortgaged farms, farms with a high volume of production for the market and those with a small volume, the conferees embraced under one label the most contradictory developments.

The conferees believe that by suitable measures some kind of stability can be found for the ideal they have described as a "family farm." For the farm population living below the "family farm" level the conferees offered only the hope of finding "some other occupation."

HOW TO ANALYZE

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

American agriculture can be analyzed scientifically only by searching out the main forces making for change—development of technology, reduction in the cost of production, infiltration of capital from outside agriculture through mortgage and other debt (both private and government).

American agriculture can be analyzed scientifically only by determining the impact—of the main forces making for change—on the ownership of the land (tenancy, mortgages), on the size of enterprise, on production for the market among farms of various size, and by ascertaining the resultant changes in real tenure status among the farm population.

Only on such a basis can a progressive agricultural policy be established—one which seeks to improve the living conditions of the great majority of the farm population, beginning with the poorest sections, and not one which goes after the will-o'-the-wisp of stability for one section of the farmers.

The main trend in the agriculture of

the United States is toward increased size of operations on a minority of farms, utilizing a greater amount of capital per farm.

The consequences, in so far as the total number of agricultural wage workers is concerned, are not clear. The possibilities exist for great increases in the amount of capital invested in machinery and equipment, with no increase in the number of wage workers. As far as the South is concerned, a rapid increase in mechanization would mean a rapid reduction in the number of sharecroppers.

The main trend in the agriculture of the United States is toward concentrating production for the market in a small minority of farms, and toward making millions of farms "superfluous."

The family farm will not escape the impact of these developments. Either become a bigger farmer—or else. This is the alternative for the family farm. For most of them there is no choice.

CONCLUSION

The theory of the family farm serves to obscure the laws of development of American agriculture. This theory is dangerous because it appears to answer the desire of the mass of farmers to own, or at least operate, their "own" farms.

This theory seeks to bind the farmer to the system of "free enterprise" by picturing an island of security which

he can win if he works diligently and scientifically.

The laws of motion of capitalist agriculture are such that the great mass of farmers face increasing insecurity—with the end goal either elimination from farming altogether, or subsistence farming if they survive.

The only security that can protect the great mass of farmers within the confines of capitalism, and which only struggle can achieve, is the right to the land, and social security measures which will offset the competitive advantages that accrue to the minority of big farms. These competitive advantages are the hammer blows that threaten the mass of farmers.

The right to the land means the struggle against evictions, against having the land sold or leased from under them, and for the division of large holdings. In the South this means the expropriation of the plantation landlords and the division of the land among the croppers.

Playing the game according to the rules of capitalism—which is what the "family farm" advocates propose—means ruination for the mass of farmers, more immediately for some than for others.

The only rule that counts for results is mass struggle for right to the land and for social security measures that will provide a foundation of higher living standards for the poorest farm families.

SOME RECENT PAMPHLETS

What Next in France?	<i>Maurice Thorez</i> \$.05
Murder Inc. in Greece	<i>Olive Sutton</i> .05
Spotlight on Germany	<i>Paul Richards</i> .15
"Dangerous Thoughts"	<i>Eugene Dennis</i> .02
Jewish Culture in America	<i>Nathan Ausubel</i> .15
The Crime of El Fanguito	<i>William Z. Foster</i> .03
People's Victory in Czechoslovakia	<i>Walter Storm</i> .25
The "Save the Country" Racket	<i>John L. Spivak</i> .25
The Twelve and You	<i>Elizabeth G. Flynn</i> .05
Turning Point in China	<i>Mao Tse-tung</i> .10
Crisis in Germany	<i>Joseph Clark</i> .05

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

READY IN DECEMBER

TOMORROW'S CHINA

By ANNA LOUISE STRONG

Anna Louise Strong is the only foreign correspondent to have penetrated the Liberated Areas of China, including Manchuria, shortly after it fell under Communist control. *Tomorrow's China* is based on a year's stay, from July, 1947, to July, 1948, in these newly liberated areas, and her first-hand description of how the economic, administrative, and cultural life of these constantly expanding territories is developing and flourishing under the dynamic leadership of the Communist Party, makes enthralling reading.

By jeep, donkey and airplane, this indomitable reporter has visited places hardly to be found on maps. She has interviewed not only leaders like Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, but spoken to workers, peasants, factory managers, doctors, intellectuals, and hundreds of others. Her on-the-spot description of the agrarian reform, how Mao Tse-tung's military principles are applied in the fighting against Chiang Kai-shek's armies, Chinese attitudes to the Marshall Plan and U.S. intervention, and the developments leading to the establishment of a new democratic all-China government, throws a brilliant searchlight on the China of today and tomorrow.

Anna Louise Strong has become a fabulous figure in modern literary reportage, and in this book she carries forward brilliantly the rich journalistic traditions of John Reed, Egon Irwin Kisch, and Lincoln Steffens.

Price: \$65

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.