

Political Affairs

25c

DECEMBER

1947

THE SPECIAL SESSION

ARNOLD JOHNSON

FOR THE REPUBLIC, FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

MAURICE THOREZ

THE A. F. OF L. AND C. I. O. CONVENTIONS

JOHN WILLIAMSON

REPORT TO THE 9-PARTY CONFERENCE

A. A. ZHDANOV

AMERICAN TRADE UNIONISM

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- selected writings by a veteran Communist Party and labor leader on the past 35 years of trade union activity.
- first compilation of the tactics, policies, and role of the Left Wing in American trade unions.
- selections include: the Great Steel Strike; Trade Union Educational League; the Question of the Unorganized; Trade Union Unity League; Organization of Negro Workers; Industrial Unionism; Communists and the Trade Unions; New World Federation of Labor; the Trade Unions and Socialism.

Price: \$2.85

HISTORY of the LABOR MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

By PHILIP S. FONER

- a detailed study of the struggles of the working class to win an improved status in American society.
- a history of the rise of trade unions and their influence on the development of American capitalism.
- an authoritative work based on new and previously unpublished material.

Price: \$3.75

LABOR FACT BOOK 8

Prepared by Labor Research Association

- production and consumption figures, trends toward industrial concentration and monopoly, social and economic status of the Negro people, wages in relation to productivity, strikes, the organizations behind the drive for anti-union legislation.

Price: \$2.00

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

MAX WEISS, *Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Associate Editor*

ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, JACK STACHEL

VOLUME XXVI, NO. 12

Contents

DECEMBER, 1947

The Special Session	<i>Arnold Johnson</i>	1059
"Secure These Rights"	<i>From the Eugene Dennis Brief in the U.S. Appellate Court</i>	1066
The A. F. of L. and C.I.O. Conventions	<i>John Williamson</i>	1077
On the International Situation	<i>A. A. Zhdanov</i>	1090
The Chicago Elections	<i>Gil Green</i>	1112
For the Republic, For National Independence!	<i>Maurice Thorez</i>	1120
Statement on the Question of Affiliation to the Information Bureau of the Nine Communist Parties	<i>National Board, C.P.U.S.A.</i>	1141
BOOK REVIEW: Pioneer of American Socialism	<i>Hy Gordon</i>	1143
Index, Volume XXVI, 1947		1146

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.

SCIENCE AND IDEALISM

By Maurice Cornforth

A clear, objective exposition of the views of philosophers from Francis Bacon and Thomas Hobbes, through British empiricism, to the schools of "modern logic" and the logical analysis of science" as represented by Bertrand Russell, Wiggstein, and the logical positivists.

PRICE \$2.50

STUDIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM

By Maurice Dobb

An examination of the main factors which have determined economic development in modern capitalism: the decline of feudalism, the beginnings of the bourgeoisie, the rise of capital and investment, forms of capital accumulation and growth of monopoly, the formation of the proletariat, and the influence of the labor market on economic and political policies.

PRICE \$3.50

NOTES FROM THE GALLOWS

By Julius Fuchik

The final testament of a Communist leader of the anti-Nazi underground movement in Czechoslovakia, describing his Golgotha, his mental and physical tortures until the last moments before his death on the gallows. It is permeated with the spirit of struggle and confidence in the ultimate triumph of the people over fascism.

PRICE \$.60

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

By ARNOLD JOHNSON

IMMEDIATELY PRIOR to the opening of the special session of Congress, the Communist Party addressed a letter to the members of the House and Senate. The document of November 8, signed by William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, outlined briefly the present situation, charged Congress and the Administration with responsibility for high prices at home and suffering in Europe, and offered a program for legislative action. The approach and the program of that letter provide the basis for activity for the legislative period opening November 17.

The Eightieth Congress has a record. In the *New Republic* of August 4, Henry Wallace declared: "The 80th Congress of the United States was a sell-out. The Congress sold out the millions who cast the votes, to the few who put up the cash." The *C.I.O. News* declared: "The 80th Congress was an N.A.M. Congress," and proceeded to show by the record that "Big Business was in the saddle." At the last meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, the report of John Gates declared: "The 80th Congress is N.A.M.-ism and Bilboism in action." The proof is not only in the voting record, but also in what the Congress failed or

refused to consider, and in the action of its infamous committees. Thus, for example, ever greater sections of the population have expressed revulsion and alarm at the practices and policy of the Thomas-Rankin Un-American Committee. The people are also becoming more and more acquainted with the Wall Street connections of the men who hold high office in the Truman Administration, such as: W. Averell Harriman, James V. Forrestal, John Snyder, Robert A. Lovett, Charles Saltzman, Lewis Douglas, John J. McCloy, and William McChesney Martin, Jr. Among the policy makers of the Truman Administration are also such leaders of monopoly capitalism as Herbert Hoover and John Foster Dulles.

Thus, in the minds of the people, the important thing in characterizing this Congress is that in conjunction with the Truman Administration it is doing the bidding of Big Business, of the N.A.M., the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—in short, of Wall Street.

DANGERS TO OVERCOME

When we consider the record to date of this Congress and the Administration, it is clear that the present situation is fraught with many serious dangers. One set of dangers is to be found in the rapid drive on a reactionary course and the intensification of the danger of war and fascism. This is evidenced by the mobilization for the imperialist Marshall Plan, the rapid application of the provisions of the slave-labor Taft-

Hartley law, the profiteering orgy by Big Business with cheers from Congress, the brazen demand for U.S. domination in the U.N. through such moves as the Little Assembly, the contemptuous disregard for the Bill of Rights by the Un-American Committee, and the speculation on grains and foods. These and many other actions indicate that this Congress may act like a reckless adventurer, who would ruin with atom bombs all that he cannot rule with dollars.

Another set of dangers is tied up with the 1948 elections. This special session of Congress—as well as the regular session, which will start after the Christmas holidays—will set the tone on all campaign issues. Presidential candidates such as Truman and Taft will use every form of demagoguery and trickery to advance their own personal candidacies. There will most likely be growing concessions to the people in words and sharpening attacks in deeds. There will be more strenuous efforts to divide and rule. There will be threats and promises. The fact that both Truman and Taft, that the high command of the Republican and Democratic parties, are doing the bidding of Wall Street, does not mean that they will not fight for narrow partisan advantages. They will do this more vigorously than ever before, because they see big partisan stakes at issue in the advancement of Wall Street's program for world domination. The danger is that il-

lusions will develop among the masses because of the heat of campaigning in the Congress. It should be remembered, for example, that Truman gained strength with his veto of the Taft-Hartley bill, despite his own responsibility for its passage with the smashing of the railway and mine strikes and inaction against the bill.

During the fight against the Taft-Hartley bill, our Party warned against the danger of the development of illusions about Truman. Our warnings did not prove sufficient. We must be much more vigorous and convincing today in exposing the hypocrisy, trickery, and demagogic propaganda of Truman and Taft and their political colleagues. While doing this, we must also strengthen the struggle for legislation that will improve the people's living conditions.

The exposure of the demagoguery of the Trumans and the Tafts, with a vigorous struggle against them, is not only essential for the 1948 elections; it is also the tactic that can bring the greatest immediate benefit to the people. The smashing of the false propaganda and maneuvers of the Republican and Democratic high command on concrete issues with facts and figures, dates and places, is part of the work of building a people's movement that can get results. Thus, when Henry Wallace exposed the Wall Street connections of the Truman Administration, the entire people's movement was potentially

strengthened. Vigorous exposure of the basic character of the Republican and Democratic Party leadership does not mean that advantage is not to be taken of any differences that exist among them. On the other hand, precisely such exposure will permit the people to take fuller advantage of such differences without becoming a victim of either of the two parties and without becoming a stooge for Wall Street. Campaigns on all vital issues during this session of Congress will further the development of a new political alignment and will improve the possibilities of a third ticket for the 1948 elections. The growth of that new movement—a third-party coalition of all progressive forces—will be a potent force in dispelling illusions that “lesser evils” will stop the danger of fascism and war.

Still another set of dangers is one that is being fostered in the ranks of labor and the people by bourgeois writers. It is expressed in various forms. Progressives are called “crackpots.” Whenever the people conduct a militant action that dramatizes the needs of the people, they are denounced for being “unreasonable” and “foolish.” Editorials try to make it appear that unions and strikes have brought lower living standards and that the road to plenty is through speed-up and class collaboration to increase profits. The National Association of Manufacturers has issued a pamphlet, *Who Profits from Profits?*, to prove that corporations, bankers,

and big trusts are merely servants of the public. The pamphlet “proves” that 97 cents of the “income dollar” goes to all the people, and that the final 3 per cent of profit goes to 14,000,000 stockholders! And these are “workmen, teachers, grocers, bus drivers.” The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has issued its special pamphlets on the “infiltration” of Communism in the trade unions and in the government. This whole propaganda campaign is directed toward demobilizing the people.

Together with this patently false reactionary propaganda we have the deliberate defeatism and capitulation tendencies of some forces in the ranks of labor who say: “We got nothing good from the 79th Congress in spite of campaigns, and our campaigns did not stop reaction in the first session of the 80th Congress, so let's not waste time and energy on the present Congress. Let's wait until the election in 1948.” Such an approach permits Congress to proceed with a reactionary program without opposition and creates confusion among the people. Such an approach denies any leading role to labor in the struggles of the people. Nor is it merely a matter of pessimism or cynicism. It is part of the “economism” of the American labor movement, of the subordination of the working class to the parties of monopoly capitalism. It is also an expression of anti-parliamentary attitudes, of a sectarian approach that declares that since Congress is reac-

tionary all forms of pressure upon Congress are futile. These defeatist moods must be overcome.

Labor must advance on the whole political arena. The situation demands intensified labor activity in the field of legislation, and a rejection of attitudes that legislative struggles should be carried on only when the going is easy. By participating fully in struggles around this session of Congress, labor and the people as a whole can also fashion the instruments and develop forms and methods for effectively fighting reaction in Congress.

A PROGRAM FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

The Communist Party letter to the Congress cuts right through these dangers. It establishes the approach that can mobilize the people. The content and form of the letter is expressive of a people's program in direct opposition to the program of Wall Street and its Congressional lackeys, Republican and Democratic. The letter is a call for mass struggles.

The letter states in part:

Along with millions of progressive and peace-loving Americans, the Communist Party urges that the special session of Congress act immediately on the following concrete proposals:

1. Congress should restore rationing and price control of essential foods, steel, fuel, and all building materials, and roll prices back to the level of June,

1946. It should prohibit speculation in grains and livestock. It should adopt tax reforms that will exempt low income groups, restore the excess profits tax, and abolish all withholding and sales taxes.

2. Congress should declare its support for the restoration of the United Nations administration of economic relief to foreign nations. For this specific purpose Congress should now appropriate an adequate fund—not less than \$10 billion—and place it at the exclusive disposal of the appropriate United Nations agencies for use in 1948. Administration of this economic aid should give priority to those nations which made the greatest contribution to victory and suffered the worst devastation in the anti-Axis war. The aid should be non-military and administered by the United Nations under conditions that will fully protect the national sovereignty of all the recipient countries and speed their rehabilitation.

Congress should defeat all proposed measures for implementing any aspect of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan—no matter in what guise this reactionary imperialist program is presented by the Administration or the Republican-dominated Congressional Committees.

Undoubtedly the American people will demand that this special session also act on other equally urgent questions. Therefore the Communist Party, together with labor and other democratic Americans, Negro and white, proposes that the House in this session vote down all requests for contempt citations from the Un-American Activities Committee and adopt the Sabath Resolution (H. Res. 46) to abolish it; that a federal Fair Employment Prac-

tices Act, a federal anti-lynch and anti-poll tax law be adopted; that the Taft-Hartley Act be repealed, and legislation enacted to raise minimum wage standards to 75 cents an hour. We also call on Congress to adopt long over-due measures for expanding social security and providing adequate housing.

Moreover, in the interests of the American people and the cause of world peace, this special session of Congress should help to restore American-Soviet cooperation and the unity of the United Nations. It should declare its support for maintaining the unanimity principle in the U.N.; for prohibiting war propaganda; for promoting universal disarmament; for adopting immediately a U.N. covenant to destroy existing stockpiles of atom bombs and to outlaw their manufacture and use.

The letter does not attempt to elaborate or even indicate every phase of the program which the Communist Party has put forward. It provides the basic elements for a coalition of Communists and non-Communists for struggle on issues before this Congress. It helps clear the air. The poisonous Wall Street propaganda as to what is needed is completely challenged. The role of the Communists in fighting for the people's interests is established.

TOWARD THE 1948 ELECTIONS

This letter may simply remain in Congressional desks. However, the actions of different sections of the people in the strongholds of democ-

racy in the U.S. will serve to remind Congressmen about it. The people may not refer to the letter, but they will express similar proposals in regard to aid to Europe. Indeed, many will do this because they know the Communists and have respect for Communist proposals.

The peace of the world is at stake. People are bound to speak out on this issue. Wall Street has been mobilizing all its forces for the Marshall Plan, which advocates the rebuilding of Germany at the expense of, and as a menace to, the rest of Europe and the peace of the world. The voices of the mass of people have not been heard. Only now, the people are trying to discuss an alternative in opposition to the Marshall Plan. When that alternative takes final shape, it will be the center of a mass struggle because it is in the interests of the people. Linked with this will be the growing movement against Universal Military Training. This movement already includes labor, the vast majority of educators and religious leaders, student and youth organizations, and forces from all sections of the population. The American Legion, the military forces, the Truman Administration, and the newspaper spokesmen for big capital are among those who are determined to push through a program of U.M.T. for the purpose of world domination and without any relation to the needs of this nation. The struggle against U.M.T. will be part of the battle for universal

disarmament. While making this defensive fight, it is necessary to keep building the movement in support of the other concrete proposals that must become planks in the peace platform of the 1948 electoral struggle.

The battle for civil rights, which is taking place in every community, must also be made on the floor of Congress. The marked growth of the people's resistance to the Un-American Committee has placed this struggle on a new plane. The indictment which the N.A.A.C.P. placed before the United Nations has exposed a crude characteristic of American democracy. In an effort to behead a mass movement of the people against discrimination, the President's Committee on Civil Rights makes a report, which also has the objective of splitting the alliance of the Negro people and the Communists. While the report contains much that could be helpful in the fight against discrimination, yet that is made ineffective by its slanders and attacks against the Communists—the staunchest fighters against discrimination, by sugar-coating the loyalty oath, by its failure to call for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and by its failure to condemn the Thomas-Rankin Committee. To advocate action against Communists is to destroy the Bill of Rights. This is true whether the action is direct and fascist-like as by the Thomas-Rankin Committee or when it is piece-meal as advocated by the President's Committee. Progressives may use parts

of the report while rejecting and fighting that which is false and dangerous. However, the report cannot be the basis for a program of action. The people, in the struggle to strengthen civil rights, should campaign on specific bills such as for passage of the anti-lynching bill, the anti-poll tax bill, for an F.E.P.C. bill with teeth in it, for a bill to outlaw anti-Semitism, for other bills against discrimination, and for abolition of the Un-American Committee.

Progressive forces must be vigilant and must act against each and every move that is destructive of the rights of people. Developing mass movements on concrete issues is an essential part of the fight for specific pieces of legislation. Thus, an intensified campaign for the freedom of Eugene Dennis is obviously part of the fight to abolish the Un-American Committee. It is more than that. This fight is the battle to preserve political rights, to preserve the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. The fight for the freedom of Eugene Dennis, Gerhart Eisler, Leon Josephson, Howard Fast, Dr. Edward Barsky, and all the victims of the Un-American Committee is a fight for those who champion the cause of civil rights in behalf of all America.

Further, the vigorous protests of the people must be directed to President Truman and Attorney-General Clark against the action of a Federal jury in Brunswick, Georgia, which gave freedom on November 4 to prison warden H. D. Worthy and

four of his guards who murdered eight Negro prisoners at Anguilla Camp on July 18. A campaign on this concrete case will strengthen the entire legislative fight. There are many concrete cases that can become the points of struggle. This fight of the people for the advancement of civil rights directed at Congress represents the writing of another plank in the platform for 1948.

Every issue involving the cost of living must be brought before this Congress, not because the Administration and the Congressional leaders want to face these issues. The people must not be satisfied with hand-outs and crumbs from the table of plenty. The entire program of Congress and the Administration has been—profits and more profits for Wall Street, and flagrant disregard of the people's needs. The scandalous crisis as regards housing and living standards is with us now; it will be even sharper in the future.

The Republican and Democratic leaders are demonstrating a callous indifference to the plight of the people in a period of approaching economic crisis. Every part of a program relative to the defense of the living standards of the people assumes ever greater significance in the face of the fears that the oncoming economic crisis holds for the masses.

Shall jobs and relief in the U.S. during a period of crisis be given on the basis of political affiliation?

Shall we have a revival of the Hoover idea of money for the bank-

ers and apple selling for the unemployed? Are we in for a period of evictions?

These are some of the questions people ask as they watch the course of Congress and the Administration. These are some of the questions they want answered in this special session. That is why every Representative and Senator, the respective political parties, and Congress as a whole, are under a searching scrutiny.

As the bankruptcy of present officeholders becomes ever more apparent, the people look to new forces and new alliances for their security, for freedom from fear and want. The failure of Congress and the Administration to prepare against the disasters of an economic crisis impels the people to make their own preparations. That is why the struggles on issues before the Congress will determine this phase of the election struggle.

Thus, because of the ultra-reactionary character of Congress and the Administration, because of the present world and domestic situation, and because of the impending 1948 election with its developing new alignments and third-party prospects—because of these factors, this session of Congress assumes ever greater importance. The Republican and Democratic leaders will try demagoguery and bribery and every trick. Decisive, however, will be actions of the people. The extent of the mobilization of the forces of the people today will be decisive in determining the future.

"SECURE THESE RIGHTS"

From the Eugene Dennis Brief
in the U.S. Appellate Court

[Much has happened in these United States since Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party, was cited for contempt of the House Un-American Committee last April. Now there are literally millions of Americans who understand that, as Henry David Thoreau put it, "only those are guiltless who commit the crime of contempt" for such a committee.

Of these democratic millions, growing thousands are also beginning to grasp the cardinal political fact of our time—that anti-Communism is the weapon of those who plot a fascist America and that therefore democracy, like peace, is indivisible.

It was wholly consistent with the logic of pro-fascist reaction that it singled out the Communist Party as the first objective in an attack of much wider strategic aims. It was equally consistent with the record of the Communist Party that its leader should reply with a fundamental challenge to the very existence of the Thomas-Rankin Committee and, in defending himself, take on the defense of the Bill of Rights and the constitutional liberties of the whole American people.

Eugene Dennis bases his case before the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, on two major contentions.

He argues that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is empowered solely to investigate into the propagation of ideas, and that the House of Representatives is without power to authorize such investigation because personal beliefs of citizens are protected from inquiry by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

This argument is also being pursued by the more than thirty other anti-fascists who have either been convicted of contempt for the Committee or are threatened by such action.

But, as befits a leader of the Communist Party, Dennis has done more. He has seized upon the injury done himself by the Thomas-Rankin Committee and utilized it to provide a means for making the first major court test of continued disfranchisement of the Negro people since the days of Reconstruction. He has charged that the Committee is not in fact a lawful Committee of Congress, but is tainted with the illegality of one of its members—John Rankin, who sits in Congress in violation of the second section of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Negro people have been quick to respond to this important blow struck in their interest. Remembering Scottsboro and the manifold other battles waged in their behalf by

the Communist Party, the Negro people, through their press and mass organizations, have rallied to the support of Dennis undeterred by anti-Communist hysteria and with full confidence that he will plead their cause with his own.

The noted Negro attorney and president of the National Bar Association, Earl Dickerson of Chicago, will argue this section of the Dennis case when it comes before the Appeals Court early this winter.

We are privileged to print below excerpts from the brief on which this historic argument will be based. [THE EDITORS.]

POINT

The so-called Committee on Un-American Activities by which the defendant was allegedly summoned was not in fact a Committee of the House of Representatives in that it did not consist exclusively of members of that House, but included one John E. Rankin, who, although purporting to act as a representative from the State of Mississippi, was not, under section two of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted pursuant thereto, authorized so to act or to exercise any of the powers or prerogatives of a member of the House of Representatives. The alleged refusal of the defendant to obey the subpoena issued by that body, therefore, did not constitute a violation of Section 192.

INTRODUCTION

The gravamen of the offense charged by the indictment is an alleged wilful failure on the part of the defendant to obey a summons of a Committee of the House of Representatives. An essential part of the offense charged then is the existence of a duly constituted Committee of the House of Representatives whose summons defendant allegedly failed to obey; one which fulfils at least the primary prerequisite for the constitution of such a Committee and consists exclusively of members of Congress.

Defendant was under no obligation to appear before a group composed of a mixture of members and non-members of Congress. It is unthinkable that such a conglomeration of individuals could possess the enormous authority of a Congressional Committee. For it is axiomatic that the powers granted to Congress under the Constitution can be exercised only by members of Congress, chosen in accordance with the provisions of that document (United States Constitution, Article I, Section 2). And the entire theory behind the creation of Congressional Committees is that certain functions of each House may properly be devolved upon "a Committee of its members" who act in behalf of and are bound by the limitations of the chamber to which they belong (*Barry v. U. S. ex rel. Cunningham*, 279 U. S. 597, 613, 73 Law Ed. 867 [1929]). . . .

In determining the basis upon which political power in the House of Representatives would be apportioned among the several states, in determining the elements to be considered in estimating the relative strength of the states, the founding fathers were faced with a difficult problem. They could have provided for representation upon the basis of physical population, upon the basis of the number of persons within each state who enjoyed full political liberty, upon the basis of wealth, or upon the basis of relative contribution to the national welfare as a whole. This issue, so crucial to the organization of the legislative branch of the government, was complicated by the institution of slavery, around which intense controversy raged. The problem was finally resolved by Article I, Section 2, Clause 3, which provided:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons.

Thus a compromise was effected among several of the factors considered. Although total population was the starting point for determining the number of Representatives to be apportioned to any State, it was not the complete determinant

of that apportionment. At least to a certain extent, the denial of political rights to a portion of the population was made to result in a reduction of representation. A State which had a total population of 1,000,000 of which 500,000 were disfranchised and politically voiceless slaves would have its total number computed for apportionment purposes as 800,000 rather than 1,000,000.

THE PROBLEM OF APPORTIONMENT AFTER THE CIVIL WAR

The Thirteenth Amendment, adopted after the Civil War, accomplished the abolition of slavery and eliminated the significance of the three-fifths clause. There were no longer any persons who were not "free" in contemplation of the law. If the Constitution had remained further unamended, then total population (with the exception of un-taxed Indians) would have been the *sole and exclusive* basis for the apportionment of Representatives. The result would have been that those States which had theretofore countenanced the institution of slavery would have been allotted an increased representation in the House.

But it was widely recognized that the elimination of slavery would not of itself bring political equality to those who had thus become free. Anyone who nurtured a contrary theory was quickly disillusioned by the ferocity by which the late rebels pursued their oppression of the liberated slaves. Far from being

granted the right to vote or to participate fully in political life, the Negro people in the Southern States were made the victims of every conceivable mechanism for the preservation and enforcement of the same tyranny and degradation which had existed under the institution of slavery. The notorious "Black Codes" were adopted in many States. Negroes were subjected to arrest and imprisonment upon the slightest pretext and were compelled to labor without return for private plantation owners. Southern law enforcement authorities blandly shut their eyes to the most unspeakable outrages perpetrated against the Negro population.

The repression was implemented by individual terror and mob violence. In the Spring of 1866, a riot took place in Memphis which, in the language of an official report of the House of Representatives, was "actuated by feelings of the most deadly hatred to the colored race." The Report concluded that the actions of the mob against the Negro people inspired "the most profound emotions of horror" (House Reports, 39th Congress, 1st Session, No. 101). A few months later another massacre took place in New Orleans which was characterized by another House Report as the most inhuman and fiend-like in American history (House Reports, 39th Congress, 2nd Session, No. 16, p. 1). Scores of Negroes were murdered with what a military board declared was "a

cowardly ferocity unsurpassed in the annals of crime." (House Ex. Doc., 39 Congress, 2nd Session, No. 68, p. 40).

Under these circumstances, it was to be anticipated that in the absence of Federal action, the former slave holders would retain political power within their various States for some time. If the Third clause of Article I of section 2 of the Constitution remained intact, such slave holders would thus secure a greater voice in the Government than they had had before their defeat in the Civil War. That voice, indeed, would be so great that together with their Northern adherents in Congress, they could defeat any reconstruction measure designed to relieve the oppression of the Negro people. In other words, unless the basis of apportionment were changed, the hegemony of the white slave masters over the Negro people might be indefinitely extended and the whole fruit of the Union victory in the Civil War be forever lost.

This prospect was not viewed with equanimity by those who had engaged in a costly struggle to preserve the Union against the rebellious slave holders. Powerful voices were raised demanding that action be taken to prevent the victors from becoming in fact the vanquished, to prevent the triumph of liberty from being turned into the triumph of oppression. . . .

Discussion throughout the nation

and in the Halls of Congress centered about proposals for amending the Constitution to change the basis for apportionment. It was that problem which received the primary attention of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, popularly known as the Committee of Fifteen, and formed the subject of their first report. Following that report, the Congressional debate revolved around two essential positions. On the one hand, it was urged that Representatives should be apportioned on the basis of the number of voters in each State. On the other, many argued for an Amendment which would eliminate from the total population all persons of any race or color when the right to vote of any individual of that race or color was denied or abridged within any State.

The purpose of these proposals was two-fold: firstly, to relate the political power of any State to the degree to which political liberty was extended to its inhabitants and secondly, to encourage the extension of the franchise to the Negro people in the South. . . .

And Representative Conkling, a member of the Committee of Fifteen, speaking for the Committee's original proposal to eliminate from the basis of representation all persons of any race or color when a State denied the right to vote to any citizen of that race or color, declared:

My sole purpose is to get rid of the present injustice and inequality of representation between different sections

of the country, arising from the fact that four million people who have now no political rights are, in the present condition of things, to be represented in Congress whenever Southern Representatives shall be admitted to seats. The entire object is to devise such a mode of adjusting representation that if race or color is made a ground for withholding political or civil rights the consequence shall be to deduct the whole of that race from the enumeration upon which political power is based. Its excellence, if it has any, consists in the fact that it prevents evasion, and insures the nation against votes to be cast in Congress in future on account of those who in truth have no political *status* in the country.

. . . At length the debate was resolved by the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, the second section of which provides:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male

citizens twenty-one years of age in such State. . . .

THE OBJECTIVE OF THE SECOND SECTION OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

The purpose of this section was essentially the same as that behind the earlier proposals. It was designed to make certain that:

. . . the measure of political power of any State shall be determined by that portion of its citizens which could speak and act at the polls, and shall not be enlarged because of the residence within the State of portions of its citizens denied the right of franchise. (Representative Elliott, speaking in the House of Representatives as reported in the Congressional Globe, May 9, 1866, p. 2511.)

In the language of the report of the Committee of Fifteen, recommending the adoption of this section:

. . . Slavery had been abolished by Constitutional amendment. A large proportion of the population had become, in spite of some objections, free men and citizens. Through all the past struggle, these had remained true and loyal, and had, in large numbers, fought on the side of the Union. It was impossible to abandon them without securing them their rights as free men and citizens. The whole civilized world would have cried out against such base ingratitude and the bare idea is offensive to all right thinking men. Hence it became important to inquire what could be done to secure their rights, civil and political.

The increase of representation necessarily resulting from the abolition of

slavery was considered the most important element in the questions arising out of the changed condition of affairs, and the necessity for some fundamental action in this regard seemed imperative.

It appeared to the Committee that the rights of those persons by whom the basis of representation had thus been increased would be recognized by the general Government. While slaves, they were not considered as having any rights, civil or political. It did not seem just or proper that all the political advantages derived from their becoming free should be confined to their former masters, who had fought against the Union, and withheld from themselves, who had always been loyal. . . .

. . . As the best, if not the only, method of surmounting the difficulty and as eminently just and proper in itself, your Committee came to the conclusion that political power should be possessed in all the states exactly in the proportion as the right of suffrage should be granted without distinction of color or race. (Emphasis added.)

The amendment thus adopted retains the essence of both earlier proposals while largely eliminating the objections advanced against them. Thus where the right to vote is generally denied within any State on the grounds of race or color, the persons of that race or color would, in effect, be eliminated from the basis of representation. On the other hand, if the denial is not general but merely occurs in isolated instances and in contravention of the policy of the State, the reduction in representation reflects only the extent to which

the denial actually takes place. At the same time, the probability of evasion is minimized by virtue of the fact that the denial of the right to vote results in a reduction in representation regardless of the grounds upon which the denial is based. Thus the effect of the amendment cannot be circumvented by creating qualifications ostensibly designed to establish property, literacy or educational standards for voting, but actually calculated to eliminate the Negro population from the ranks of the electors in a State.

Actually, the Amendment approximates the relation of representation to the number of male citizen electors. In this connection, it is noteworthy that for purposes of the Second Section of the Fourteenth Amendment, the manner in which the right to vote of citizens is denied or abridged is wholly immaterial. Whereas the Fifteenth Amendment refers to the abridgement of the right to vote because of race, color or previous condition of servitude "by any state" and the First Section of the Fourteenth Amendment similarly proscribes action *by a state*, the Second Section, that with which we are here concerned, is not so limited. It provides generally for applicability ". . . when the right to vote . . . is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State . . . or in any way abridged. . . ." The fact that the denial or abridgement may not have occurred by the official action

of the state through its legislative, executive or judicial officers is of no consequence at all.

The purpose of this section, as we have seen, required such a formulation. It was designed to deny to political oppression within a state the effect of increased political power in the National Government. And state authority was not required in order to enforce political oppression by former slaveholders against former slaves. State authority was required affirmatively to eliminate oppression. It was the purpose of the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment to make certain that unless and until the state fulfilled its responsibility, unless and until a state established and safeguarded political equality for the Negro people, the oppressors of those people would not be given an enlarged voice in the determination of national policy.

This section stands today as the only guide to the Constitutional composition of the House of Representatives. It is the only lodestone in our basic law for determining whether individuals from any state are entitled to sit in the House of Representatives.

It is against that guide, that lodestone, that the right of persons purporting to exercise the authority of members of Congress must first be tested, for no one can even reach the stage of qualifying as a member of the House unless a seat is provided for him under this Section. It is in

the light of that guide, of that lodestone, that we must examine the status of John E. Rankin who, presuming to act as a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, was a member of the so-called Committee which issued the summons to the defendant in this case.

THE STATUS OF MISSISSIPPI'S REPRESENTATIVES IN THE LIGHT OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

Congress has purported to grant to the State of Mississippi seven seats out of a total of 435 in the House of Representatives (World Almanac, 1947, p. 182). This allocation was based upon a consideration only of the total population of that state undiminished to any extent by the proportion which the number of adult male citizens whose right to vote was denied or abridged bore to the total number of adult male citizens in that state.

Yet the irrefutable fact is that a wholesale abridgement of the right to vote has consistently occurred in Mississippi. At the time of the apportionment of seven representatives to that state, as well as at the time of the election of John E. Rankin to the Eightieth Congress, the Negro people of Mississippi were uniformly denied the right to vote.

Of course, it is no longer open to question that the denial of the right to vote in primary elections in any state, such as Mississippi, in which

the primary is the determinant of the final election, falls within Constitutional provisions pertaining to the right of suffrage (*U. S. v. Classic*, 313 U. S. 299 [1941]; *Smith v. Allwright*, 321 U. S. 649 [1944]). And as the Report of the Senate Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1946, which inquired into the campaign, nomination and election of Theodore Bilbo, points out, the responsible officials of the State of Mississippi recognized the applicability of these decisions to the primaries in that state.

The lengths to which private individuals and public officials in that State went to maintain the exclusion of the Negro people from the right to vote were vividly portrayed in the evidence presented at the hearings held by that Committee as well as in the report itself. They indicate how state laws governing qualifications for voting were discriminatorily applied so as to eliminate Negroes from the exercise of voting rights, how officials have so applied literacy and educational requirements as to bring about disqualification of Negroes, how insurance against any effort on the part of the Negro people to exercise their right to vote was brought about by a campaign of terror and threats of violence on the part of prominent citizens of the state.

Indeed, the majority of the Committee, which consisted of Senator Ellender of Louisiana, the chairman, Senator Maybank of South Caro-

lina, and Senator Thomas of Oklahoma quoted with approval the following testimony, first of a Negro witness and second, of an election official who admitted that obstacles were placed in the way of Negroes who attempted to register:

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is it not true that it is common knowledge in the South, particularly in Mississippi, that the white people have been trying to keep the colored people from voting in their primaries?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is common knowledge, is it not?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir. (Report, p. 7.)

* * *

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't it a fact that it is common knowledge throughout the State of Mississippi—that the white people have been striving to keep the primary elections to themselves without interference by the colored people?

MR. FIELD: I think so, yes, sir. I think it is common knowledge, and I just believe it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, isn't it that which prompted you to take the steps you did?

MR. FIELD: I expect that is right. (Report, p. 8.)

There was no disagreement between the minority and the majority of the Committee as to the denial of the right of the Negro people to vote in Mississippi. The conclusion of the former that "Under custom long maintained in Mississippi . . . admittedly . . . the Democratic primary therein was white" was

matched by the majority's unequivocal declaration that:

. . . it is apparent from the record that previous to the July 2 primary, Negroes have not participated in Democratic primaries in Mississippi for 56 years for the reason that the Democratic primary in Mississippi had been accepted under the law as the white man's primary by Negroes and whites.

The issue between the minority and the majority was only as to the effect of Senator Bilbo's activities upon the abridgement of the right of the Negro people to participate in Mississippi's elections. The majority insisted, in opposition to the minority, that Senator Bilbo was not responsible for that abridgement. Their primary argument for his exoneration was precisely their conclusion that the Negro people would have been disfranchised regardless of Senator Bilbo's statements. Thus they declared:

A majority of the committee are of the opinion that the record clearly shows that irrespective of what Senator Bilbo actually said in his campaign oratory, the disqualification of and prevention of the Negro from registering or voting would have been the same, since that is uniformly the attitude of the native white Mississippi citizenry.

And, again:

We find that the law in Mississippi, as administratively and traditionally interpreted by the local election officials, constituted a white primary and that Senator Bilbo, in realization and under-

standing of this fact, did nothing further than earnestly and sincerely seek to uphold Mississippi law, custom, and tradition.

This abridgement of the right of the Negro people to vote has an important effect upon the number of representatives to which Mississippi is entitled under the Fourteenth Amendment. For the total number of white males in that state is 556,157. The total number of Negro males is 528,335. The number of aliens is negligible and there is no indication that there is any appreciable difference between the proportions of Negro and white males who are over the age of twenty-one years. It follows that for purposes of apportionment under the Fourteenth Amendment the figures as to total population of Mississippi should have been reduced by approximately forty-eight percent, the proportion of Negro males to the total male population of Mississippi. The number of seats in the House of Representatives to which Mississippi is entitled must, therefore, be reduced in a similar proportion. Mississippi was thus not entitled to more than four seats in that House (population figures taken from World Almanac, 1947, pp. 214-217, and reflect information secured by the census of 1940).

What Congress did was to consider only the total physical population of each state in apportioning representatives to the State of Mississippi. But this, as we have seen, is precisely what it would have done if the Sec-

ond Section of the Fourteenth Amendment had never been adopted at all. That section was designed precisely to avoid such a basis for apportionment, to make it impossible for Congress to do exactly what it has now done. In essence, therefore, what Congress has done is to repeal a Constitutional amendment.

Given a total of 435 seats in the House of Representatives, Congress could not constitutionally award seven of them to the State of Mississippi. The seven persons who were sent to Congress purportedly as representatives of the State of Mississippi are, therefore, in reality without seats in that body. It is impossible to say that any four of those individuals are authorized to occupy the four seats to which Mississippi is actually entitled. In view of the fact that each of these seven representatives was elected from a separate geographic district, to determine that any four of them are properly seated would be to deprive almost half of the state of any representation at all. In the light of the provisions of Title 2, U. S. C., Section 2, which, in order to insure representation to all portions of a state require the election at large of all Congressmen where the total number to be elected is less than the number of Congressional districts within a state, none of the purported representatives from the State of Mississippi can be considered to have been Constitutionally selected to serve in the House.

It is obviously impossible to say

that each of the persons purportedly elected as representatives from the State of Mississippi occupies four-sevenths of a seat in the House; there is no authority for creating fractional parts of Congressional seats. Congress has not presumed to designate any of the four individuals authorized to represent the State of Mississippi in the House of Representatives. Indeed, under the Constitution no one except the qualified voters of the State of Mississippi is endowed with the authority to fill the authorized seats within that House (Constitution, Article I, Section 2, Clause 1). Certainly this Court is nowhere expressly or by implication given that authority. Until the choice is made by the people of Mississippi none of the present would-be Congressmen is entitled to act in that capacity.

Thus John E. Rankin, one of the individuals purporting to act as a representative from the State of Mississippi, cannot be considered by this Court to be entitled so to act under the terms of the Constitution. He cannot be regarded as a representative from the State of Mississippi and he cannot hold a seat in Congress otherwise than as a representative from that state. And since Mr. Rankin purported to serve as one of the members of the so-called House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Committee did not consist exclusively of duly elected members of the House and was not author-

ized to exercise the prerogatives of a Congressional Committee at the time defendant was allegedly summoned to appear before it. . . .

It is realized that the violation of the Fourteenth Amendment by the State of Mississippi and by other states in our Union has been countenanced for a long time. But "general acquiescence cannot justify departure from the law" (*Smiley v. Holm, supra*). To justify a refusal to apply the Fourteenth Amendment because for many years its violation has been tolerated is to write into our law a doctrine that constitutional limitations can be repealed by ignoring them. To refuse to apply the Second Section of the Fourteenth Amendment because Congress has chosen to forget about its existence is to destroy the fundamental idea that this is a government of laws and not of men.

Congress has chosen to ask this Court to put the defendant in prison because he allegedly ignored the summons of a group of wilful men purporting to act as a Committee of Congress. But this defendant was never under a legal obligation to obey the orders of such a group of men unless they constituted in fact a committee composed of members of Congress. And it is the solemn duty of this Court to protect the liberty of the defendant against invasion by a group which had no constitutional authority to summon him.

THE A. F. OF L. AND C. I. O. CONVENTIONS

By JOHN WILLIAMSON

AS FIFTEEN MILLION organized workers began to live in the shadow of the Taft-Hartley Act, harassed by skyrocketing prices and hounded by the fear of an oncoming crisis and the threat of new atomic wars, their two main labor federations met simultaneously in national convention at San Francisco and Boston. Just as these cities have certain characteristics in common, so there were certain similar features in both conventions. Nevertheless, the physical distance between them was also symbolic of the difference between the two organizations themselves, and the fact stood out clearly that, despite its weaknesses, the C.I.O. is still the most progressive sector of the organized labor movement.

Although there was confusion in C.I.O. ranks on foreign policy and Philip Murray endorsed the Marshall Plan, the decisions of the C.I.O. convention were otherwise generally progressive. On the other hand, the A. F. of L. convention literally grovelled in the dirt of American imperialism and pleaded for consideration because, in the words of William

Green, it is "the one great labor agency which defends our free enterprise system. . . ."

Both conventions condemned the Taft-Hartley Act, but the A. F. of L.—except for the opposition of John L. Lewis—meekly submitted to the Taft-Hartley ultimatum to sign affidavits and file financial and other information. True, there were the counterparts of Dubinsky, Meany and Woll in the C.I.O. who took advantage of the autonomy rights of each International union to sign the Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavits. Thereby they spat on the otherwise excellent resolution which declared:

In defiance of the overwhelming protest of millions of Americans, the reactionary 80th Congress has passed the Taft-Hartley Act. . . .

The act represents a triumph of repression. It is a direct step toward fascism. Free men can only marvel at the cynical contempt for human liberty which the act reflects. No right was too fundamental, no activity of workers too basic to escape the act's hatchet. The Wagner Act created the legal machinery for the protection of fundamental democratic rights and needs of American workers. The Taft-Hartley Act destroys this machinery and converts the act and the Board into instruments of repression. . . .

The liberty of workers, like the liberty of all our people, was won only after bitter struggle. Untold numbers of common people have starved and suffered, have been beaten and blacklisted, have been exploited and hunted so that labor organizations might have a right

to exist and flourish as a fundamental part of a democratic society. . . .

We would betray the heritage created as a result of struggles in Homestead, Cripple Creek, River Rouge, South Chicago, Gadsden, and other places throughout the length and breadth of our land, where American workers have spilt their blood so that our movement might be free. We would not merit the name of free Americans if we acquiesced in a law which robbed American workers of the right to strike, to picket, and to engage in those concerted activities which are the life blood of our movement. . . .

We cannot and will not acquiesce in a law which makes it a crime to exercise rights of freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly. . . .

. . . Nor will we permit the black-mail, the threats and the smears of legislative hatchet-men operating through the House Labor and Un-American Committees to divide or deter us.

From this day forward we dedicate ourselves to the mission of obtaining a repudiation and forthright repeal of this infamous Act and of the reactionary program of which it is a part. . . .

The capitulation of Rieve, Reuther, Green, Rosenbloom, Joseph Fisher, and Moran, who did not have the courage to defend their position on the convention floor, reflects the inherent weakness of the C.I.O., since this Right Wing weakens the overall strength of the C.I.O. and its six million members.

Both conventions planned maximum political activity in 1948, with the A. F. of L. deciding to establish

its new Educational and Political League, and the C.I.O. reinforcing its P.A.C. with a pledge of one million block workers. How "serious" the A. F. of L. really is with regard to 1948 was reflected in its offhand rejection of the C.I.O. convention proposal that:

While our conventions are still in session . . . concrete steps be taken looking towards a meeting of representatives of all branches of the labor movement . . . to formulate an immediate joint program for effective political action on a local, state and national level to assure the election of candidates to public office who will be responsive to the needs of the American people.

Further, it should be noted that neither convention was ready to give leadership to the feelings of labor and progressive forces for an alternative to the two-party system and its reactionary bipartisan bloc in Congress. Not only did the two gatherings of labor not fulfill their historic responsibility in promoting a third party; they both studiously avoided any mention of Henry Wallace and his independent crusade, except in speeches from the floor at the C.I.O. convention. The dominant labor statesmen of the C.I.O. did not rise to the occasion to offer a militant progressive program against Wall Street's efforts to dominate the world, in favor of independent political action in the 1948 elections, and for a new wage policy as the present contracts expire.

The C.I.O. resolutions, if the pro-

Marshall Plan interpretation is rejected, can serve as the starting point for involving millions of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. members in constructive activities and mass struggles against the forces of reaction and fascism in our country. It was only the United Electrical Workers' convention (meeting prior to the C.I.O.) which adopted an integrated program, from defense of the job interests, through new wage struggles and political action, to a rejection of the Truman Doctrine as representative of the same forces that have adopted the Taft-Hartley Act at home.

THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION

A summary of the work and the decisions of the A. F. of L. convention leaves no doubt that it reached a new low in its support of American imperialism and consequently in its neglect of policies needed to advance the interests of its members.

William Green's report sounded the keynote of the convention by its denunciation of Communism and an appeal to the employers to unite and work with the A. F. of L. in order to save free enterprise at home and abroad. This same pro-imperialist, anti-Communist, and anti-Soviet hysteria was blared forth daily, especially with the aid of such guest speakers as General Clark, American Legion Commander O'Neil, Social-Democrat Schumacher of Germany, and Secretary of Labor Schwollenbach who advised the convention that

"Communists should be picked up by the seat of the pants and the nape of the neck and thrown out bodily."

Against this background, the convention determined its position on foreign policy, which might easily be that of the National Association of Manufacturers, in that it included:

a. Full support to the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan;

b. Support to the U.S. Government (read: Wall Street imperialism) in Europe with a view to bringing back there the lost prestige of "free enterprise," as well as "free" trade unions;

c. Support to the government's "waste less" program for economic war against the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies;

d. Pressure to abolish the veto in the U.N.;

e. Advocacy of a Western European mutual assistance pact (*i.e.*, an anti-Soviet Western Bloc);

f. Rejection of disarmament now, but acceptance of abolition of peacetime conscription when all occupation forces are jointly withdrawn;

g. War on the World Federation of Trade Unions and the C.T.A.L.;

h. Support to the establishment of a new labor center in South America, and preparation of the machinery to establish a new world labor organization as soon as the British and Scandinavian trade unions withdraw from the W.F.T.U. (an eventuality hoped for by the A. F. of L. leadership).

i. Increase in the per capita to

create a one-million-dollar fund for so-called education and public relations—a large part of it for Europe.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Although the convention formally went on record to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, it was no surprise that its leaders fought for the right to sign all Taft-Hartley affidavits and to file all financial statements. The single major battle of the convention took place on this issue with Lewis declaring:

The Taft-Hartley statute is the first ugly, savage thrust of fascism in America. It came into being through an alliance between industrialists and the Republican majority in Congress, aided and abetted by those Democratic legislators who still believe in the institution of human slavery. . . .

It symbolizes and parallels historically what happened in Italy before the coming of fascism, and it symbolizes and it parallels historically what happened in Germany before the coming of nazism. . . .

In continuing to argue against the contradiction of the Executive Council calling for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act while proposing that the convention comply with it, Lewis continued:

What a paradox! How much heart do you think that will give the members of our organizations out in the industrial centers of this country when they see their great leaders, with all the pomp and ceremonials of a great con-

vention kneeling in obeisance before this detestable and tyrannical Statute? . . .

. . . the leaders of our movement are to be the first of our mighty hosts of 8,000,000 members to put their tails between their legs and run like cravens before the threat of the Taft-Hartley Bill?

I am reminded of the Biblical parable, "Lions led by asses."

After Lewis was defeated, the convention majority proceeded to amend its Constitution for the purpose of removing him as an A. F. of L. officer in order to comply with the Taft-Hartley Act.

In fear of rank-and-file joint action with the C.I.O. in the 1948 election campaign—foreshadowed in various local joint action committees, including that of San Francisco where the convention met—the gathering established the Labor's Educational and Political League. The League was specifically limited in its purpose to activity aimed at defeating all Congressmen who voted for the Taft-Hartley law and is not supposed to participate in the presidential campaign.

As the League is built in the localities, it is to be expected that the local leadership and membership will refuse to be bound by these restrictions and will find the ways and means—inside or outside the L.E.P.L.—to establish joint action of all labor in support of policies and candidates that represent the interests of labor and the people.

The series of reactionary decisions—on foreign policy, anti-Sovietism, Taft-Hartley compliance, Red-baiting, rejection of joint action with the C.I.O., endorsement of the Rankin-Thomas Committee and the Loyalty Order of the President, and rejection of price-control legislation as incompatible with the "free enterprise" system—revealed the extent of the A. F. of L. Convention's open support of American imperialism. The formal endorsement given to some progressive measures on the domestic field in the closing hours of the convention—such as a Federal anti-lynch law, F.E.P.C., the Wagner housing act, the Murray-Dingell health bill and veterans' aid—in no way altered the essentially reactionary character of this convention.

The ousting of Lewis from leadership brought forward as top leaders Meany, Tobin and Dubinsky, with Meany as the candidate to replace Green as President in the near future. The fight of Lewis against the Taft-Hartley Act and A. F. of L. compliance with it was important as a rallying center within the A. F. of L. against this phase of its reactionary decisions. It is to be noted, however, that Lewis did not take issue with the other policies of the reactionary hierarchy, particularly on foreign policy, nor did he clarify his position on the candidacy of Dewey in 1948. Nevertheless, a continued struggle by Lewis on the issue of the Taft-Hartley Act could bring about a new relationship of forces, which

would necessitate a re-evaluation of the situation.

THE A. F. OF L. RANK AND FILE

From this convention came no program which reflected the feelings of the seven million A. F. of L. members in favor of a new wage program to meet inflation prices. Neither was there reflected the growth of joint action with the C.I.O. on a local scale or the steps forward taken in a number of A. F. of L. state conventions on political action, or the joint struggles with the C.I.O., or the advances in a number of local A. F. of L. bodies to promote Negroes to leadership. The militancy of the rank and file and local union officials, expressed in the fight against the Taft-Hartley Bill, never broke through the front of well-heeled bureaucrats that constituted the bulk of the convention.

The rank and file, together with local union officials, can bring about a change in this situation only by making its organized strength felt, in the locals and councils of the affiliated international unions. The greater activation of A. F. of L. members, in whatever organizational form they think best, around the issues of the moment, can not only make itself felt, but could then lead to certain new relationship for forces among some sections of the leadership. To bring this about, it is necessary that all progressive workers in the A. F. of L.—and they are the great majority of its membership—

attend the local union meetings, become active on the job and in the local union, win support for a fighting program through which the members can assert their majority will.

THE C.I.O. CONVENTION

In contrast to the convention decisions of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O. remains the progressive wing of the American labor movement. Nevertheless, this C.I.O. convention did not completely fulfill its established progressive role. While the resolutions adopted were generally progressive, the convention did not effectively mobilize the members for a new wage program in the spring of 1948 and for a united policy of all-out struggle against the entire Taft-Hartley Act, inclusive of affidavit signing. Above all, the visit of Secretary of State Marshall was taken as the occasion for the Right and Murray forces to put a reactionary construction on the vague formulations in the foreign policy resolution. In addition, the Murray leadership undertook to consolidate further its organizational position, at the expense of such a timid Left force as R. J. Thomas. This was an advantage that Walter Reuther readily grasped in the bitter internal struggle within the U.A.W.A. In many minds the question was raised as to the future Murray-Reuther relations, involving Reuther's known ambitions to be Murray's successor.

That such shortcomings could still

continue in the convention within the framework of a set of progressive resolutions, reflects the general weakness of the working class, namely, great concern and considerable alertness with regard to the attacks of reaction on the home front, but great confusion on foreign policy, with no identification of these same forces of capitalism whose government conducts the American reactionary foreign policy. This in turn points up the inadequate development and growth of the Party of the working class—the Communist Party—among workers in the decisive industries of the nation.

THE C.I.O. AND THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The policies of the convention were officially stated in the 40 resolutions adopted. Among the most important were:

1. *Condemnation of the Taft-Hartley Act.* This excellent resolution, previously referred to, was weakened by the failure of the convention, upon Murray's prompting, to speak out boldly against signing the "yellow dog" compliance affidavits. It was not enough for Philip Murray to state he "was unwilling to file an affidavit that I am not a Communist" as president of the U.S.W.-C.I.O., but in the next breath, as President of the C.I.O., to state, "some of the organizations attached to the C.I.O., for reasons which might seem to be good and substantial, may file and qualify with this Board," and "there

certainly is nothing in the policy (of C.I.O.) . . . which either inhibits or prevents those organizations from exercising that right. . . ." This statement in a situation where it is known that Right leaders of international unions have already signed, and where pressure exists in his own Steel Union, merely gave indirect encouragement to those wanting to sign Taft-Hartley affidavits. Without violating the principle of autonomy, what was needed was aggressive leadership to convince the C.I.O. to remain united in its fight against *every phase* of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Those unions which mistakenly sign the Taft-Hartley "yellow dog" affidavits, are not "buying" anything for themselves, as they mistakenly believe. They are merely putting their necks voluntarily into the Taft-Hartley noose. Their signing creates illusions and weakens the fighting spirit and morale of the workers. James Matles of the U.E. put it most aptly in his convention speech when he said:

We don't believe that you can start out today and lead men into submission step by step; that you can lead them to a feeling of subversion; that you can lead them to submit to their employers day by day—and that on November 6 of 1948 they will spring to their feet and replace the Congress. . . . To the extent that they can protect their unions today and tomorrow and prevent contracts that impose on their conditions . . . when comes November . . . they will be in the kind of a mood to fight.

For a full mobilization of labor to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, the following considerations are important:

a. The issue of the Taft-Hartley Act should not be narrowed down to the question of Section 9-H alone. It must be understood that the over-all purpose of the Act is to weaken and destroy the trade union movement. The convention resolution very correctly stated:

In the brief period in which this infamous law has operated it has been used exclusively against workers for the purpose of forcing down their living standards, requiring them to work against their will through slave labor injunctions . . . and has encouraged employers to seek to set aside established contract conditions.

b. The struggle to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act is not merely a 1948 campaign issue or a legal fight. The fight will have meaning only if it is started now. In the very center of this struggle will be the demand for increased wage rates and renewal of contracts in the spring months ahead.

c. The trade unions must overcome the present tendency to underestimate their own strength and to rely on government boards. The present N.L.R.B. carries the old name, but it has branded itself with the trademark "Taft-Hartley." Unions such as electrical, steel, coal, Ford's and others, have shown that they can live without signing affidavits, despite the difficulties involved. In the long

run, every union will have to rely only on its own strength to secure its demands and protect its members.

d. The great danger lies in the possibility of division within the ranks. The over-all fight against the Taft-Hartley Act demands new unity of all trade unions, those which sign affidavits and those which do not sign.

FOREIGN POLICY

2. *Foreign Policy.* This was a compromise resolution, which pleased neither the reactionary nor the progressive forces. As a result of the insistence of the progressives and Murray's desire for unanimity in the committee, it did not endorse the Truman Doctrine or the Marshall Plan. It called for "a fulfillment of the basic policy of our late President Roosevelt for unity of purpose and action among the three great wartime allies—the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union—within the United Nations," and emphasized that "failure to accomplish this necessarily means dissension and strife in the world." It further called for "universal disarmament," for "fulfillment of the agreement among the great powers for the complete demilitarization and utter destruction of all vestiges of fascism in Germany and Japan, and complete elimination of the cartels" in Germany. Then it went on record for "discontinuance of production of atomic bombs [and] outlawing of atomic weapons," and, lastly, emphasized that "the people de-

mand peace." In a separate resolution the convention opposed "peacetime military conscription."

The invitation to Secretary of State Marshall to speak to the convention, the setting of his address and its reception, as well as the personal endorsement of the Marshall Plan by Philip Murray, all negated the resolution and lent credence to the newspaper claims of convention endorsement to the Marshall Plan. While this was not factually true, it is obvious that great confusion was created by the Marshall speech in and out of the convention.

The visit of Marshall was deliberately planned by the administration. He came to the C.I.O., and not to the A. F. of L., convention with the two-fold purpose of (a) winning C.I.O. support to his plan and thus remove a major barrier to this latest aspect of the American drive to dominate the world, and (b) to use the C.I.O. convention as a forum for speaking to the labor and democratic forces of Europe, in the hope of confusing them, since many look to the C.I.O. as a Left trade union federation.

The discussion on the foreign policy resolution after Marshall's visit expressed the sharpest debate in C.I.O. convention history. The Right Wing, through its Social-Democratic spokesmen Reuther, Baldanzi and Altman, joined by Murray and Van Bittner, used this as an occasion to support the entire reactionary foreign policy of American imperialism

and to engage in anti-Soviet and anti-Communist attacks. Typically Social-Democrat was Reuther's offer of himself to the Truman Administration to help them sell Wall Street's brand of democracy to Europe. Reuther stated:

... the thing that is weak about American foreign policy is not its idealism, is not its motives—those motives cannot be challenged and they need no defense from me—the weakness is in how it is being sold to the people of Europe. . . . My plea is that they have to bring labor into this, give us our place around the councils in Washington . . . so it can be "hands across the sea" from the American people to the people of Europe.

While delegates Potash and Kehoe, in supporting the resolution and refuting the Reuther-Baldanzi slanders, both boldly challenged the entire reactionary concept of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan it was a decisive weakness that dozens of progressive—especially Left-wing—delegates did not fight for the floor to expose the lies of the Social-Democrats and to take issue with President Murray. This was the appropriate occasion to expose Truman as betraying the policies of F.D.R. and to bring forward boldly the role and policies of Henry Wallace. The majority of delegates allowed themselves to be momentarily intimidated and did not present the thinking of their own trade unions on this question.

The convention resolution on foreign policy can be utilized in a posi-

tive way to the extent that it is interpreted correctly. This means a rejection of the concept expressed in the *C.I.O. News* editorial of November 3rd that:

Russia is trying to extend its influence westward across Europe and establish communistic forms of government in some 16 countries. The U.S. government is opposing this move and it figures the most effective way to do the job is to help Western European nations get back on their feet.

It also means that the trip of Secretary Carey calculated to sell the Marshall Plan to the trade union movements of Europe, and especially to those in the new people's democracies, must be branded as not in accord with this convention resolution. At best, the resolution was a compromise. It certainly is not a starting point for the thinking of progressive trade unions on this vital question. The workers must reach an understanding that the reactionary forces who attack them at home, through a Taft-Hartley Act, are precisely the same forces in government who are carrying on a reactionary policy abroad. The Achilles heel of the Truman-Hoover-Marshall Plan will be its domestic counterpart of still greater attacks on the economic conditions of the workers—all intensified as the maturing economic crisis breaks out.

OTHER MAJOR RESOLUTIONS

Other major resolutions dealt with trade union unity, support to the

W.F.T.U., preparations for the 1948 elections, protection of American democracy, and farmer-labor unity. In the discussion of the 1948 elections, many important speeches were made. Most significant was the indictment that Delegate Quill made of the Republican and Democratic parties, emphasizing "they are both responsible for what is happening in this country today," and warning against illusions about President Truman, who "was the President . . . when there occurred the first strike of railroad workers . . ." as well as "when they wiped out the last vestige of the F.D.R. program—price control." He alone emphasized that "today there is one independent voice calling for peace and security, and that voice is Henry Wallace."

Significant also was the dropping by the Right Wing of its intention to obtain reaffirmation of the Communist-slurring "resent and object" resolution adopted last year at the Atlantic City convention of the C.I.O. The Murray administration also found it necessary to refrain from presenting the prior recommendations of a sub-committee concerning the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union. These recommendations—which included attacks against alleged Communists in leadership, calling for the resignation of duly elected international union officers and for the appointment of a C.I.O. administrator over the M.M.S.W.U.—were dropped and it was pledged that they would not be

considered a precedent. This was an important victory for democratic trade unionism and the established autonomous rights of each C.I.O. affiliate. It was achieved only through vigorous struggle by the progressive forces in the C.I.O. Executive, and especially by the members and officers of the M.M.S.W.U. itself.

TRENDS IN THE C.I.O.

The contradictory character of the convention needs to be seen in the light of the existing political situation, which exerts its pressures on the union. Thus, on the one hand, unanimous resolutions, and, on the other, the most bitter struggle of interpretation on foreign policy and overtones of differences on other issues—particularly on the 1948 election policy, the attitude to Truman, and the struggle against the Taft-Hartley Act. Within the convention, Murray tried to play the role of "Center" in order to present a united C.I.O. to the outside world.

Murray himself is a bundle of contradictions. At heart a bourgeois-reformist believing in free enterprise, his ties with capitalist ideology and the pressure of the reactionary Catholic hierarchy lead him in the direction of collaboration with the entire Right forces. He has certain skepticism concerning the practices of some of these forces. He desires, as long as he remains C.I.O. president, to have a united organization. Present in his mind is the ghost of Lewis. The over-all effect

of all these contradictions is what influenced him over the last period to occupy a so-called Center position. While continuing to be organizationally distinct from the Right bloc, his position becomes more difficult, since he has definitely moved to the Right on foreign policy and, irrespective of his desires, the logic of that position will be to move in the same direction on domestic issues also. This is already seen in the post-convention editorial of the *C.I.O. News*, which states, "The foreign and domestic problems are tied so closely together they will have to be considered almost as one," and in Murray's blanket endorsement of Walter Reuther at the U.A.W. convention.

This trend follows naturally the Right-wing factional use of the "resent and reject" resolution of a year ago and the dangerous growth of the American Catholic Trade Union activities with resulting hooliganism and strong-arm attacks in some subdivisions of C.I.O. On the other hand, the Left-progressive forces in some industries have not only held their own but have consolidated and extended their position.

To one who recalls the past conventions of the C.I.O., a significant new development was the greater participation of progressive and Left forces in the debates and determination of such forces to develop their own progressive understanding of issues and policies, while still maintaining unity with the Murray forces on a minimum and principled program.

The progressive and Left forces must still understand the urgent need of fighting for a united C.I.O. in which joint action in support of common demands and policies that represent the interests of the workers and trade unions is more urgent than ever before. Side by side with this goes the responsibility of the Left-progressive forces to pursue a fighting policy and independent line, in order to muster maximum support from the workers in the shops and the local unions themselves. The future of the C.I.O. demands alertness and struggle against the growing influence of Social-Democratic representatives, like Reuther, Rieve, Mazey, etc., among the workers. The present relationship of forces on top must be changed to lessen the influence of the Right. This is not in contradiction to the maximum application of joint action on the basis of issues and activities in the interests of all the workers. In fact, only to the extent that the Left and progressive forces increase and extend their strength among the workers in the shops and key local unions, will they have the power to repel the offensive that will be made against them inside and outside the trade union movement.

URGENT ISSUES

The year ahead will be a difficult one for the entire trade union movement. The forces of Big Business will pretend to be interested only in at-

tacking the unions with Left leadership, and some trade union leaders, falling prey to this will accommodate themselves to the policy of Big Business and the Truman Administration.

The Left and progressive forces wherever they are—in leadership or as rank-and-filers—must take the initiative in uniting their unions, as well as establishing joint C.I.O.-A. F. of L. action to struggle effectively against these growing attacks of reaction. Among the issues most urgent for the entire trade union movement to understand and struggle around are:

a. United struggle on a day-to-day basis against the Taft-Hartley Act—helping to prove to the workers on the basis of their experiences the anti-union character of the act.

b. An aggressive wage policy for the coming year and preparation for the wage reopens on expirations of contracts in the spring.

c. Alertness in combating every specific move of speed-up in the mills and shops—with a further strengthening and extension of the shop steward system.

d. Labor's active collaboration with all other progressive forces in fighting for the abolition of the Rankin-Thomas Un-American Committee and against all other anti-democratic forces which reflect the "creeping fascism" that is prevalent in the country.

e. A foreign policy in the interest of labor and the people instead of

the present Truman - Hoover - Marshall plans.

f. A program for educating and organizing labor for active participation in the 1948 elections—to secure a new Congress representing the people and not subservient to party bosses or administration and, above all, the development of an independent presidential ticket.

To advance the interest of their members and unions, the Left-progressive forces in C.I.O. leadership must be alert to the systematic offensive of the A.C.T.U. and Social-Democratic forces, and must establish bridgeheads and influence their members to repel these forces. The members of such unions as auto, rubber, marine, packing, chemical and woodworkers, are basically sound militant workers, who built their unions in the democratic traditions. If they are given perspective, without being tied into factional straight-jackets, they can, and will, assert themselves as part of the over-all progressive camp.

In the case of U.A.W., a combination of Reuther-Mazey Socialists, A.C.T.U. leaders, and reactionary anti-Negro boss-collaborating Gossers, have momentarily taken over, as this article goes to press. Although the newspapers talk of a "bandwagon sweep," the majority this combination holds among the membership is a very slim one and is the result of the factionalism which has permeated the top leadership of this union and has resulted in the Ades-

Thomas-Leonard leadership's not being identified clearly with a progressive program or with mass struggles by the membership. A realignment of forces—not squeezed into the old straightjacket of caucus lines—with its base in the decisive shops and locals, fighting militantly against the offensive of the auto barons, will bring to the top again the forces within this union which built it through struggle and still believe in struggle, rather than in fancy radical talk that covers up collaboration with the employers.

In such unions as steel, textile, telephone and oil, where the emphasis is on leading the union from the top down, systematic work is essential to win the membership to a full understanding of the C.I.O. convention decisions in the course of day-to-day struggles in the shops and communities.

The C.I.O. convention decisions can be an important instrument in the defense of the workers and their trade unions, if used as a starting point in the struggle. Because of the growing offensive of the Right-wing forces of Socialist and A.C.T.U. persuasion and the capitulation of Murray to those forces in foreign policy,

complete understanding of the C.I.O. convention decisions can be reached only through constant explanation to the members and through winning their support in the course of struggle, which includes continuing to organize the unorganized.

Some Left and progressive forces think the year ahead is going to be rough only for them. While these forces will be tested and must rise to their responsibilities, it is necessary to see that the entire working class and trade union movement is facing a rough year ahead, and these Left-progressive forces will be surrounded by millions of workers who are ready to fight if they understand the issues and are given leadership.

Communist trade unionists, as always, will be fighting shoulder to shoulder in every union with their fellow-unionists and will stand ready to collaborate with all forces in leadership who are ready to fight against the employers and the forces of reaction within and outside the government.

The trade union movement, as the backbone of the democratic forces of America, must lead the drive against fascism. United action and struggle will bring victory.

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

By A. A. ZHDANOV

(Report at the Informational Conference of representatives of the Communist Parties of nine European countries, held in Poland at the end of September, 1947.*)

I. THE POST WAR SITUATION

THE ENDING OF THE Second World War led to substantial changes in the entire international situation. The military rout of the bloc of fascist countries, the anti-fascist liberation character of the war, and the decisive role of the Soviet Union in the victory over the fascist aggressors, have sharply changed the relation of forces between the two systems—the Socialist and capitalist systems—in favor of Socialism.

What is the essence of these changes? The main result of the Second World War was the military defeat of Germany and Japan, the two most militaristic and aggressive countries of capitalism. The reactionary, imperialist elements throughout the world, especially in Britain, the

United States and France, placed special hopes on Germany and Japan, and primarily on Hitler Germany, first as a force most capable of dealing a blow to the Soviet Union in order, if not to wipe her out, at any rate to weaken her and to undermine her influence, and secondly as a force capable of smashing the revolutionary working-class and democratic movement inside Germany and in the countries that became victims of Hitlerite aggression and thereby of strengthening the general position of capitalism.

This was one of the main reasons for the prewar so-called Munich policy of appeasement and encouragement of fascist aggression, the policy which was consistently pursued by the ruling imperialist circles of Britain, France, and the U.S.A. But the hopes placed by the Anglo-Franco-American imperialists on the Hitlerites proved unfounded. The Hitlerites proved to be weaker, and the Soviet Union and the freedom-loving peoples stronger, than the Munichites thought. As a result of the Second World War, the main forces of militant international fascist reaction were defeated and put out of action for a long time to come.

Moreover, the world capitalist system as a whole suffered yet another serious loss. If the most important result of the First World War was the breach in the united imperialist front and the removal of Russia from the world system of capitalism, if as a result of the victory of the Socialist system in the U.S.S.R. capitalism

ceased to be the only and all-embracing system of world economy, the Second World War and the defeat of fascism, the weakening of the world positions of capitalism and the strengthening of the anti-fascist movement led to the removal from the imperialist system of a number of countries of Central and South-eastern Europe. In these countries new, popular democratic regimes arose.

The great example of the patriotic war of the Soviet Union and the liberating role of the Soviet army merged with the ascendant struggle of the freedom-loving peoples for national liberation against the fascist invaders and their collaborators. This struggle exposed as traitors to the national interest the pro-fascist elements which cooperated with Hitler and the collaborationists—the most influential big capitalists and landowners, the top bureaucracy and the monarchist military officers. Liberation from the German fascist enslavement was accompanied in the Danube countries both by the removal from power of top circle bourgeoisie and landowners, who had been compromised through their collaboration with the German fascists and by the coming to power of new forces from the ranks of the people which had emerged in the struggle against the Hitlerite enslavers.

In these countries representatives of workers and peasants and representatives of the progressive intelligentsia have come to power. Since the working class everywhere dis-

played the greatest heroism, the greatest consistency and irreconcilability in the anti-fascist war, its authority and influence among the people grew immeasurably. The new democratic power in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Albania, supported by the popular masses, was able to carry through in the shortest possible time such progressive, democratic transformations as the bourgeois democracies are incapable of achieving.

The agrarian reform has given land to the peasants and has brought about the liquidation of the class of the landed gentry. The nationalization of large-scale industry and of the banks, as well as confiscation of the property of traitors who collaborated with the Germans, have radically undermined the positions of monopoly capital in these countries and have freed the masses from imperialist enslavement.

The basis was laid for State, national, ownership, and a new type of State was created—the people's Republic—where power belongs to the people, where big industry, transport, and the banks belong to the State, and where the leading force is the bloc of the laboring classes of the population headed by the working class. As a result, the peoples of these countries not only rid themselves of the grip of imperialism; they laid the basis for the transition to the road of Socialist development.

As a result of the war, the international importance and authority of the U.S.S.R. grew immeasurably.

* A translation of the text which appeared in *Pravda*, October 22, 1947.

The U.S.S.R. was the leading force and spirit in the military defeat of Germany and Japan. The democratic, progressive forces of the entire world rallied around the Soviet Union. The Socialist State withstood the dire trials of the war and emerged victorious out of the life-and-death struggle against its most powerful enemy. Instead of becoming weaker the U.S.S.R. became stronger.

Important changes have also occurred in the capitalist world. Of the six so-called great imperialist powers (Germany, Japan, Britain, the U.S.A., France, and Italy), three were shattered by military defeat (Germany, Italy, Japan). France was weakened and lost its former importance as a great power. Thus, only two "great" world imperialist powers remain, the United States and Britain. But the positions of one of them, Britain, have been undermined.

During the war British imperialism proved to be weakened both in the military and political respects. In Europe, Britain was helpless in the face of German aggression. In Asia, Britain—although the largest imperialist power—was unable to hold on to its colonial possessions by its own efforts. Having temporarily lost its connection with the colonies, which supplied the home country with food products and raw materials and which absorbed a great part of her industrial production, Britain became dependent militarily and economically on supplies of American foodstuffs and industrial goods. Since the war the financial and economic de-

pendence of Britain on the U.S.A. has increased.

Although after the war Britain managed to recover its colonies, it met there the increased influence of American imperialism, which during the war developed its activity in all those regions which before the war were considered spheres of influence of British capital—the Arabian East and South-east Asia. American influence has also grown in the Dominions of the British Empire and in South America, where Britain's former role to a considerable and increasing extent is passing to the U.S.A. The sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system as a result of the Second World War is seen in the mighty surge of the national liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries, which threatens the rear of the capitalist system. The colonial peoples refuse to live any longer in the old way, and the ruling classes of the metropolitan countries cannot rule any longer in the old way. Attempts to suppress the national liberation movement by military force now encounter ever increasing armed resistance from the colonial peoples and lead to prolonged colonial wars, such as that of Holland in Indonesia and of France in Viet-Nam.

As a result of the uneven development of capitalism in various countries, the war led to a further sharpening of this unevenness. Only one of all the capitalist powers—the U.S.A.—emerged from the war, not weaker, but considerably stronger both in economic and military respects.

American capitalists made great fortunes out of the war. The American people did not, as a result of the war, experience either privations or oppressive foreign occupation or air bombing, while the human losses of the U.S.A. which, in fact, entered the war at the last stage when the outcome had already been decided, were relatively small. In the U.S.A., the war gave an impetus to extensive development of industrial production and a decisive increase in exports, mainly to Europe.

The ending of the war faced the U.S.A. with a number of problems. The capitalist monopolies are aiming at preserving their profits at the former high level. With this aim in view, they are trying to maintain the wartime volume of contracts. But this requires the preservation by the U.S.A. of all the foreign markets which absorbed its products during the war and the conquest of new markets, since the purchasing capacity of most nations has fallen as a result of the war.

The financial and economic dependence of these nations on the U.S.A. has also increased. The U.S.A. has invested abroad credits to the value of 19 billion dollars, without taking into account the investments in the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The main competitors of the U.S.A.—Germany and Japan—have disappeared from the world market and this has created new, very great possibilities for the U.S.A.

Before the Second World War, the

most influential reactionary circles of American imperialism followed the policy of isolationism and refrained from active intervention in European and Asiatic affairs. Under the new postwar conditions, however, the masters of Wall Street have adopted a new policy. They put forward a program of using the whole of American military and economic might, not only to preserve and consolidate foreign positions won during the war, but also to enlarge them to the maximum, replacing Germany, Japan, and Italy on the world markets.

The sharp decline in the economic might of other capitalist States gave rise to the possibility of a strategic exploitation of their postwar economic difficulties, which facilitate subordination of these countries to American control, and, in particular, the utilization of Great Britain's postwar economic difficulties. The U.S.A. has proclaimed a new, openly predatory, expansionist orientation.

The new, openly expansionist orientation of the U.S.A. has as its aim the establishment of the world domination of U.S. imperialism.

In order to consolidate the U.S. monopoly of markets, which arose from the elimination of the two largest competitors of the U.S.A.—Germany and Japan—and the weakening of the capitalist partners of the U.S.A.—Britain and France—the new orientation of U.S. policy involves a broad program of a military, economic and political character. This program aims at the establishment, in all the countries that are the object

of U.S. expansion, of the political and economic domination of the U.S.A., thus reducing these countries to the position of satellites of the U.S.A., and establishing in these countries such regimes as would eliminate any resistance by the working class and democratic movements to the exploitation of these countries by American capital. The U.S.A. is attempting to impose this new political course, not only on its military enemies of yesterday, or on neutral States, but to an even greater degree on its war allies.

Special attention is being paid to exploiting the economic difficulties of Britain, the U.S.A.'s ally and at the same time its age-old capitalist rival and competitor. The American expansionist orientation is based on the assumption that it is desirable, not only to keep Britain in the grip of the economic dependence on the U.S.A. established during the war, but further to increase the pressure on Britain in order gradually to deprive it of control over its colonies, to displace it from its spheres of influence, and to reduce it to the status of a vassal power.

Thus, the new U.S. policy is directed toward the strengthening of its monopolistic position and envisages the placing of its capitalist partners in a subordinate, dependent position. But athwart the path of the U.S. striving for world domination stands the U.S.S.R.—this bulwark of anti-imperialist and anti-fascist policy, with its growing international influence—as well as the countries of

new democracy, which have freed themselves from control by Anglo-American imperialism, and the workers of all countries—including those of the U.S.A. itself—who do not want new wars for establishing the domination of their oppressors. That is why the new expansionist and reactionary course of U.S. policy is designed for struggle against the U.S.S.R., against the countries of new democracy, against the working-class movement in every country, against the working-class movement of the U.S.A. itself, and against the anti-imperialist liberation forces of all countries throughout the world.

American reactionaries, perturbed by the successes of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., the successes of the countries of new democracy, and the growth of the working-class and democratic movement in all countries of the world in the postwar period, have modestly decided to assume the role of saviors of the capitalist system from Communism.

Thus, the openly expansionist program of the U.S.A. is very reminiscent of the fascist aggressors' adventurist program which suffered such an inglorious fiasco. These aggressors also were but recently claiming world domination.

Just as the Hitlerites masked their preparations for predatory aggression by their anti-Communism, in order to ensure the possibility of oppressing and enslaving all the people and, in the first place, their own people, so the present-day U.S. ruling circles mask their expansionist policy and

even their offensive against the vital interests of the U.S.A.'s weaker imperialist competitor—Britain—by alleged defensive anti-Communist aims. The feverish arms race, construction of new military bases, the establishment of *places d'armes* for American armed forces in every part of the world, are false and hypocritically justified by the plea of defense against the imaginary military threat of the U.S.S.R.

By means of threats, bribery, and blackmail, American diplomacy is snatching from other capitalist countries, and in the first place from Britain, consent to the legalization of the advantageous American positions in Europe and Asia—in the Western zones of Germany and Austria, in Italy, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Iran, Afghanistan, China, Japan, etc.

American imperialists, regarding themselves as the main force opposed to the U.S.S.R., the countries of the new democracy and the working-class and democratic movements in all countries, and as the bulwark of the reactionary, anti-democratic forces in the entire world, literally on the very day after the end of the Second World War started to restore a front hostile to the U.S.S.R. and world democracy. They encouraged the anti-popular, reactionary forces of collaborators and former capitalist stooges in the European countries liberated from the Hitlerite yoke, which had begun to organize their life according to their own choice.

Following Churchill's lead, the most venomous imperialist politi-

cians, who had lost all sense of proportion, began to advocate plans for the speedy realization of a preventive war against the U.S.S.R., openly demanding that the temporary monopoly of the atom bomb should be used against the Soviet people.

The instigators of a new war are attempting to frighten and blackmail not only the U.S.S.R., but other countries as well and, in particular, China and India. They represent the U.S.S.R. as the aggressor and themselves as friends of China and India and as saviors from the Communist danger, called upon to help the weaker countries. Thus the aim of preserving China and India under imperialist domination, and preparing their further political and economic enslavement, is being achieved.

II. THE NEW ALIGNMENT OF POLITICAL FORCES

The radical changes in the international situation and in the situation of various countries which took place as a result of the war have changed the political aspect of the world. A new alignment of political forces came into being. The further we become removed from the end of the war the clearer become the two basic orientations in international politics, corresponding to the division of the political forces active in the world arena into two main camps—the imperialist and anti-democratic on the one hand and the anti-imperialist and democratic on the other.

The main, leading force of the imperialist camp is the U.S.A. Britain and France are in alliance with the U.S.A. The existence of the Attlee-Bevin Labor Government in Britain and the Socialist Government of Ramadier in France does not prevent either Britain or France, as U.S. satellites, from steering a parallel course with the imperialist policy of the U.S.A. in all basic questions.

The imperialist camp is also being supported by such colonial powers as Belgium and Holland, countries with reactionary, anti-democratic regimes, such as Turkey and Greece, and countries dependent both politically and economically on the U.S.A., like those of the Near East, South America and China.

The basic aim of the imperialist camp is the strengthening of imperialism, the preparation of a new imperialist war, the struggle against Socialism and democracy and all-round support for reactionary, pro-fascist regimes and movements. For the solution of these tasks, the imperialist camp is prepared to rely on reactionary and anti-democratic forces everywhere and to support former war enemies against its own war allies.

The anti-imperialist and anti-fascist forces constitute the other camp. The U.S.S.R. and countries of the new democracy constitute the mainstay of that camp. It also includes countries which have broken with imperialism and which have firmly adopted the path of democratic development, such as Romania, Hungary, and Finland. Indonesia and

Viet-Nam belong to the anti-imperialist camp: India, Egypt and Syria sympathize with it. The anti-imperialist camp relies on the support of the workers and the democratic movement in all countries, on the fraternal Communist Parties of all countries, on the fighters of the national liberation movements of the colonial and dependent countries and on the support of all the democratic and progressive forces in every country of the world.

The aim of this camp is the struggle against the threat of new wars and imperialist expansion, the consolidation of democracy and the elimination of the remnants of fascism.

The ending of the Second World War confronted all the freedom-loving peoples with the most important task of ensuring a stable, democratic peace that would consolidate the victory over fascism. The leading part in the solution of this basic task of the post-war period belongs to the Soviet Union and its foreign policy. This follows from the very nature of the Soviet Socialist State, which is completely alien to any aggressive, exploiting aims and is interested in the establishment of the most favorable conditions for the construction of Communist society.

One of these conditions is external peace. As the bearer of a new, higher social system the Soviet Union reflects in its foreign policy the aspirations of all advanced mankind, which is striving for a durable peace and cannot be interested in a new war, the product of capitalism.

The Soviet Union is the faithful champion of freedom and independence for all peoples, the enemy of national and racial oppression and of colonial exploitation of any kind. The general alignment of forces between the world of capitalism and that of Socialism, which has changed as the result of the Second World War, has increased still more the importance of Soviet foreign policy and increased the scale of its foreign political activity.

All the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist camp have rallied around the task of ensuring a just and democratic peace. This was the ground on which the friendly collaboration of the U.S.S.R. with the democratic countries in all questions of foreign policy has grown and strengthened. These countries—and in the first place the countries of new democracy, such as Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Albania, which played an important role in the war of liberation against fascism, as well as Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary and partly Finland, which have joined the anti-fascist front—have become, in the postwar period, staunch fighters for peace, democracy and their own freedom and independence against all the attempts of the U.S.A. and Britain to reverse their development and drag them again under the imperialist yoke.

The successes and the growth of the international prestige of the democratic camp were not to the liking of the imperialists. Even during the war the activity of reactionary forces

in Britain and the U.S.A. grew constantly, calculated to disrupt the cooperation of the allied countries, drag out the war, bleed the U.S.S.R. white and save the fascist aggressors from a complete rout. The sabotage of the Second Front by the Anglo-Saxon imperialists with Churchill at their head clearly reflected this tendency, which in essence was the continuation of the Munich policy under the new, changed conditions. But while the war was on, the reactionary circles of Britain and the U.S.A. dared not act openly against the Soviet Union and the democratic countries, understanding full well that the sympathies of the masses of the peoples throughout the world were unreservedly on the latter's side.

In the last months before the end of the war, however, the situation began to change. During the negotiations at the Berlin three-Power Conference, in July, 1945, the Anglo-American imperialists had already shown their unwillingness to take into account the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries in the last two years has been a policy of struggle for the consistent implementation of the democratic principles in the postwar world. The States of the anti-imperialist camp became faithful and consistent champions of the application of these principles, without deviating from their stand by a single inch. This is why the main task of the democratic States'

foreign policy since the war has been the struggle for a democratic peace, for the liquidation of the remnants of fascism and the prevention of the rebirth of fascist, imperialist aggression, for the consolidation of the principles of equality of rights among nations and respect for their sovereignty, for a universal reduction of armaments in general and the prohibition of the most destructive arms designed for the mass extermination of the civilian population.

In solving all these tasks, Soviet diplomacy and the diplomacy of the democratic States came up against the resistance of Anglo-American diplomacy, which since the war has steadily and consistently pursued the course of rejecting the general principles for the building of the post-war world proclaimed by the allies during the war and of replacing this policy of peace and strengthening of democracy by a new policy of disrupting universal peace, of the defense of fascist elements, of the persecution of democracy in all countries.

The joint action of the diplomacy of the U.S.S.R. and the democratic countries has a tremendous significance. It aims at solving the problem of armament reduction and prohibition of that particularly destructive weapon—the atom bomb.

On the initiative of the Soviet Union a proposal was made in the U.N. on the universal reduction of armaments and on recognition as a task of first priority the prohibition of production and use of atomic energy for military purposes. This

proposal of the Soviet Government encountered sharp resistance on the part of the U.S.A. and Great Britain. All the efforts of imperialist circles were directed toward sabotaging this proposal, which was expressed in the incessant and sterile raising of all sorts of obstacles and barriers in order to prevent any effective practical measures from being taken.

The activity of the delegates of the U.S.S.R. and the democratic countries in the bodies of the U.N. has the character of a systematic, persistent, day-to-day struggle for the democratic bases of international cooperation, for the exposure of the intrigues of the imperialist conspirators against the peace and security of the peoples. This, for instance, is shown particularly clearly in the discussion of the situation on the northern frontiers of Greece. The Soviet Union, together with Poland, came out resolutely against the utilization of the Security Council for discrediting Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania, who were falsely accused of aggressive acts against Greece.

Soviet foreign policy proceeds from the premise of the co-existence, over a lengthy period, of two systems—capitalism and Socialism. From this flows the possibility of cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the countries with other systems, given the observation of the principle of reciprocity in the fulfillment of pledges made.

It is well-known that the U.S.S.R. has always been and is loyal to the pledges it has made. The Soviet

Union has shown its will and desire for cooperation.

An absolutely opposite policy is pursued in the U.N. by Britain and the U.S.A., who do everything to break the pledges they entered into previously and to untie their hands for the pursuit of a new policy based, not on the cooperation of peoples, but on setting them against one another, on the violation of the rights and interests of the democratic peoples, on the isolation of the U.S.S.R.

Soviet policy maintains the course of maintaining loyal, good-neighborly relations with all States which show a desire for cooperation. In its relations with countries which are genuine friends and allies of the Soviet Union, the latter has always conducted itself, and will continue conducting itself, as a loyal friend and ally. Soviet foreign policy is aimed at the further extension of the friendly assistance of the Soviet Union to these countries.

Defending the cause of peace, Soviet foreign policy rejects the principle of revenge against defeated peoples. As is well known, the U.S.S.R. favors the constitution of a unified, peaceable, demilitarized, democratic Germany. In outlining the Soviet policy toward Germany, Comrade Stalin pointed out that "stated briefly, the policy of the Soviet Union on the German question demands, in essence, the demilitarization and democratization of Germany. . . . The demilitarization and democratization of Germany constitutes one of the most important con-

ditions for the establishment of a secure, lasting peace."

However, this policy of the Soviet State with regard to Germany is coming up against the resistance of the imperialist circles of the U.S.A. and Britain. The session of the Foreign Ministers' Council in Moscow in March-April, 1947, showed that the U.S.A., Britain and France were prepared, not only to work for disrupting the democratization and demilitarization of Germany, but even for the liquidation of Germany as a unified State, for its dismemberment and for a separate decision of the question of peace.

The pursuit of this policy now takes place in a new situation, in which the United States has departed from the old course of Roosevelt and is going over to a new policy, the policy of preparing for new military adventures.

III. THE U.S. PLAN FOR THE ENSLAVEMENT OF EUROPE

The transition of American imperialism since the end of the Second World War to an aggressive, openly expansionist course found expression both in the foreign and home policy of the U.S.A. Active support for reactionary, anti-democratic forces throughout the world, the undermining of the Potsdam decisions to demilitarize and democratize Germany, the patronage of Japanese reactionaries, the extension of war preparations, the accumulation of stocks of atom bombs—all this is accompanied by an

offensive against the elementary democratic rights of the working people inside the United States.

Although the U.S. was comparatively little affected by the war, the overwhelming majority of Americans do not desire a repetition of the sacrifices and restrictions connected with it. This forces monopoly capital and its henchmen in the ruling circles in the United States to search for extraordinary means in order to overcome the opposition within the country to the aggressive expansionist line and to free its hands for the further carrying out of this dangerous policy.

The campaign against Communism enunciated by the American ruling circles which base themselves on the capitalist-monopolies, inevitably leads to an attack on the vital rights and interests of the American toilers, to internal fascization of the political life of the United States, to the propagation of the most vicious, hate-sowing "theories" and conceptions. Dreaming of preparing a new, third world war, American expansionist circles are vitally interested in suppressing within the country every possibility of resistance to external adventures, in poisoning with chauvinism and militarism the politically backward and undeveloped masses of the rank-and-file Americans, in "doping" the average American by means of every kind of anti-Soviet, anti-Communist propaganda in the movies, radio, press, and pulpit. The expansionist foreign policy inspired and carried out by American

reactionaries involves simultaneous activity in all directions:

1. Military strategic measures.
2. Economic expansion.
3. Ideological struggle.

The realization of the military-strategic plans for future aggression is connected with the desire to utilize to the fullest extent the military-industrial apparatus of the U.S., which expanded extraordinarily toward the end of the Second World War. American imperialism is carrying on a consistent policy of militarization of the country. The expenditures of the U.S. for the Army and Navy exceed 11 billion dollars a year. For 1947-48, 35 per cent of the budget has been appropriated for the maintenance of the armed forces of the United States, *i.e.*, eleven-fold as compared with 1937-38.

Whereas at the beginning of the Second World War the army of the U.S.A. occupied the 17th place among the armies of the capitalist countries, it now occupies first place among them. While accumulating atom bombs, American strategists do not hesitate to speak of preparations for bacteriological warfare being made in the U.S.A. The military-strategic plan of the U.S.A. provides for the creation, in peacetime, of numerous bases and *places d'armes* at a considerable distance from the American continent and destined for use for aggressive purposes against the U.S.S.R. and the countries of the new democracy. American military air and naval bases have been, or are being, established in Alaska, Ja-

pan, Italy, Southern Korea, China, Egypt, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Austria, and Western Germany. An American military mission is operating in Afghanistan and even in Nepal. Feverish preparations are taking place to utilize the Arctic for purposes of military aggression.

Despite the fact that the war has long ended, the military alliance between Britain and the U.S.A. continues, and even the joint Anglo-American Staff of their armed forces continues to function. Under the cover of agreements on the standardization of arms the United States has extended its control over the armed forces and military plans of other countries, in the first place of Britain and Canada. Under the cover of joint defense of the Western Hemisphere the countries of Latin America are being drawn into the orbit of the military expansionist plans of the U.S.A.

The Government of the United States has declared it as its special task to assist in the modernization of the Turkish Army; the army of the reactionary Kuomintang is trained by American instructors and equipped with American materials. The military clique is becoming an active political force in the U.S.A., providing on a large scale statesmen and diplomats who are following an aggressive militarist course in the entire policy of the country.

The economic expansion of the U.S.A. is an important supplement to the realization of its strategic plan. American imperialism strives, like a

usurer, to utilize the postwar difficulties of European countries—in particular the shortages of raw materials, fuels, and food in those allied countries that have suffered most from the war—in order to dictate to them enslaving conditions of assistance. Foreseeing the forthcoming economic crisis, the U.S.A. is anxious to find new monopoly spheres for capital investment and surplus goods. The economic aid of the U.S.A. pursues the broad aim of the enslavement of Europe by American capital. The more difficult the economic position of one country or another, the harsher the conditions which the American monopolies are trying to dictate to it. But economic control also leads to political subordination to American imperialism. Hence, the extension of the monopoly spheres for the sale of American surplus goods is combined by the U.S.A. with the acquisition of new *places d'armes* for the struggle against the new democratic forces in Europe. American monopolies, in "saving" a country from hunger and ruin, strive to deprive it of all independence. American "aid" almost automatically leads to the change of the political line of the country on which that "aid" is bestowed. Parties and persons come to power who are prepared to carry out a program of home and foreign policy to the liking of the U.S.A. and on instructions from Washington (France, Italy, etc.).

Finally, in striving for world domination and an anti-democratic line, the U.S.A. is also conducting an

ideological struggle. The basic task of the ideological part of the American strategic plan consists in black-mailing public opinion, spreading slanders about the imaginary aggressiveness of the Soviet Union and the countries of the new democracy, and in this way to represent the Anglo-American bloc in the role of countries defending themselves, thus absolving it from the responsibility for preparing a new war.

During the years of the Second World War the popularity abroad of the Soviet Union increased tremendously. By its self-sacrificing, heroic struggle against imperialism, the Soviet Union gained the love and respect of the working people of all countries. Before the eyes of the whole world, the military and economic might of the Socialist State, the invincible power of the moral-political unity of Soviet society, has been clearly demonstrated.

The reactionary circles of the U.S.A. and Britain are anxious to expunge this indelible impression which the Socialist system is making on the workers and toilers of the whole world. The warmongers are well aware that in order to make it possible to send their soldiers to fight against the Soviet Union a long ideological preparation is necessary.

In the ideological struggle against the U.S.S.R. the American imperialists, lacking understanding of political questions and demonstrating their ignorance, are fostering above all the conception which represents the So-

viet Union as an allegedly anti-democratic, totalitarian force, and the U.S.A., Britain and the whole capitalist world as a democratic force. This platform of the ideological struggle, of the defense of bourgeois pseudo-democracy and of the charge of totalitarianism leveled against Communism, unites all enemies of the working class without exception, beginning with the capitalist magnates and ending with the leaders of the Right-wing Socialists, who with extreme readiness seize on any slander against the U.S.S.R. which their imperialist masters suggest to them.

The pivot of this fraudulent propaganda is the assertion that a system of many parties and the existence of an organized opposition of the minority are symptoms of genuine democracy. On this basis the British Laborites, who spare no efforts in the fight against Communism, would like to discover antagonistic classes and a corresponding struggle of parties in the U.S.S.R. Ignoramuses in politics, they cannot understand that for a long time there have not been any landlords and capitalists in the U.S.S.R., no antagonistic classes and, therefore, no multiplicity of parties. They would like to find in the U.S.S.R. bourgeois parties dear to their hearts, including pseudo-Socialist parties, acting as imperialist agencies; but to their regret history has doomed these exploiting bourgeois parties to disappearance.

Not sparing words in uttering slanders against the Soviet regime, the Laborites and other advocates of

bourgeois democracy at the same time regard as perfectly normal the bloody dictatorship of a fascist minority over the peoples of Greece and Turkey, close their eyes to many crying violations of the norms even of formal democracy in the bourgeois countries, and pass over in silence national and racial oppression, corruption, and unceremonious violation of democratic rights in the U.S.A.

One of the trends of the ideological "campaign" attendant upon the plans for the enslavement of Europe is the attack on the principle of national sovereignty, the call for the renunciation of the sovereign rights of nations, and the contraposition of the idea of a "world government." The significance of this campaign is to disguise the unrestrained expansion of American imperialism, which unceremoniously violates the sovereign rights of nations, to represent the U.S. in the role of a champion of humanitarian laws, and those opposed to American penetration as supporters of an obsolete "egotistic" nationalism. The idea of a "world government," seized on by the bourgeois intellectuals from among the day-dreamers and pacifists, is taken advantage of not only as a means of pressure for the ideological disarmament of peoples who are defending their independence from attacks on the part of American imperialism, but also as a slogan especially directed against the Soviet Union, which is consistently and untiringly defending the principles of genuine equality and of safeguarding

the sovereign rights of all peoples, great and small.

Under present conditions imperialist countries like the U.S.A., Britain and the states close to them, are becoming dangerous enemies of the national independence and self-determination of peoples, and the Soviet Union and the countries of the new democracy, reliable bastions of the defense of the equality and national self-determination of peoples.

It is highly symptomatic that in the realization of the ideological plan put forward by American imperialism, we find closely cooperating American military-political intelligence men of the type of Bullitt, yellow trade union leaders of the type of Green, French Socialists headed by the obdurate apologist of capitalism Blum, the German Social-Democrat Schumacher and Laborite leaders of Bevin's type.

The "Truman Doctrine" and the "Marshall Plan" are a concrete expression of the expansionist aspirations of the U.S.A. in the present situation. In essence both these documents are an expression of a single policy, although they differ in the form of presentation. Both documents contain one and the same American claim to the enslavement of Europe.

The essential features of the "Truman Doctrine" with relation to Europe are the following:

1. The creation of American bases in the eastern part of the Mediterranean basin, with the purpose of

consolidating American domination in this zone.

2. Demonstrative support of reactionary regimes in Greece and Turkey, as bastions of American imperialism, against the new democracy in the Balkans (the rendering of military and technical assistance to Greece and Turkey, the granting of loans).

3. Uninterrupted pressure upon the states of the new democracy, expressing itself in false charges of totalitarianism and expansionist aims; in attacks on the principles of the new democratic regimes; in constant interference in the internal affairs of these states; in the support of all anti-national, anti-democratic elements within these countries; in the demonstrative breaking off of economic ties with these countries, designed to create economic difficulties for them, to handicap their economic development, to disrupt their industrialization, etc.

The "Truman Doctrine," which reckons on granting American aid to all reactionary regimes which are coming out actively against the democratic peoples, is frankly aggressive. Its publication caused a certain amount of indignation even among the circles of American capitalists which are used to anything.

Progressive social elements in the U.S.A. and other countries have made resolute protests against the provocative, openly imperialist speech of Truman. The unfavorable reception accorded the "Truman Doctrine" made the "Marshall Plan"

necessary as a more veiled attempt to carry out the self-same expansionist policy.

The essence of the nebulous, deliberately veiled formulations of the "Marshall Plan" is to knock together a bloc of states bound by obligations to the United States and to grant American credits as payment for the renunciation by European states of their economic and, subsequently, also their political independence. At the same time the basis of the "Marshall Plan" consists in the restoration of the industrial areas of Western Germany under the control of American monopolies.

The "Marshall Plan," as became clear from subsequent conferences and speeches of American public figures, consists in rendering help, in the first instance, not to the impoverished victorious countries, allies of the U.S.A. in the war against Germany, but to German capitalists, and, having gained control of the basic sources of coal and metal needed by France and Germany, to make the nations that need coal and metal dependent upon the restored economic might of Germany.

Despite the fact that the "Marshall Plan" provides for the final reduction of Britain as well as France to the position of secondary Powers, the Labor Government of Attlee in Britain and the Socialist Government of Ramadier in France have seized hold of the "Marshall Plan" as an anchor of salvation. It is known that Britain has already spent, in the main, the American loan of 3,750 million dol-

lars granted her in 1946. It is likewise known that the enslaving conditions of this loan have bound her hand and foot. Having already got caught in the noose of financial dependence on the U.S.A., the Labor Government of Britain could see its only way out in another loan. Therefore it saw in the "Marshall Plan" a way out of an economic *cul de sac*, a chance to obtain new credits.

British politicians, moreover, counted on taking advantage of the creation of a bloc of West European countries—debtors of the United States—in order to play within that bloc the role of chief American bailiff who might possibly succeed in enriching himself at the expense of weaker countries. The British bourgeoisie hoped, by taking advantage of the "Marshall Plan," by serving American monopolies, and by subjecting themselves to their control, to recover their lost positions in a number of countries and, in particular, to restore their positions in the Balkan-Danube region.

In order to invest the American proposals with greater external objectivity it was decided to draw France into the number of initiators of preparations for the implementation of the "Marshall Plan"—France, which had already half-sacrificed her sovereignty in favor of the U.S.A., inasmuch as the credit granted to her by the U.S.A. in May, 1947, was conditioned upon the elimination of the Communists from the French Government.

On instructions from Washington,

the Governments of Britain and France invited the Soviet Union to take part in the discussion of the "Marshall Plan." This step was to mask the anti-Soviet character of the proposals. It was thought that, inasmuch as it was well known in advance that the U.S.S.R. would decline to discuss the proposals of American aid on Marshall's conditions, it would be possible to lay at its door the blame for not wishing to promote the economic restoration of Europe and thereby to set against the U.S.S.R. the countries which need real assistance. If, however, the Soviet Union did take part in the negotiations, then it would be easier to catch the countries of Eastern and South-eastern Europe in the trap of "European economic restoration with American aid." Whereas the Truman plan puts its stake on terroristic intimidation of these countries, the "Marshall Plan" was calculated to feel out their economic steadfastness, to try to tempt these countries, and then to shackle them, with dollar help.

The "Marshall Plan" was calculated (in the given country) to assist in the realization of one of the most important tasks of the general American program: that of restoring the power of imperialism in the countries of the new democracy and to force them to renounce close economic and political cooperation with the Soviet Union.

The representatives of the U.S.S.R. in agreeing to discuss the Marshall proposals with the Governments of

Britain and France in Paris, exposed at the Paris conference the unsound nature of the task of evolving an economic program for the whole of Europe and exposed the creation of a new European organization under the aegis of France and England as a danger of interference in the internal affairs of European countries and a threat to their sovereignty. The representatives of the U.S.S.R. showed that the "Marshall Plan" contradicted normal principles of international cooperation and harbored in it the splitting of Europe and the threat of subordinating a number of European countries to the interests of American capitalism; that it was calculated to give help to the German monopoly concerns in preference to the allies, since the "Plan" clearly attributed a special role in Europe to the restoration of these concerns. This clear position of the Soviet Union tore the mask off the plan of the American imperialists and their Anglo-French bailiffs.

The all-European conference failed scandalously. Nine European states refused to take part in it. And even among the countries which agreed to take part in the "Marshall Plan" discussions and the working out of concrete measures for its realization, this "Plan" was received without particular enthusiasm, the more so since it very soon became clear that the Soviet Union's suggestion that this plan was still remote for real, effective aid was fully confirmed.

It turned out that the government of the U.S.A. was not at all in a

hurry to realize Marshall's promises. American members of Congress admitted that Congress would examine the question of new appropriations for credits to individual European countries not earlier than 1948.

Thus, it became evident that England, France, and the other Western European countries that had accepted the Paris "project of realization" of the "Marshall Plan," had themselves fallen victim to American blackmail.

However, the attempts to knock together a Western Bloc under the aegis of America continue. It is necessary to note that the American variant of the Western Bloc cannot but encounter serious resistance even in countries already so dependent on the United States as Britain and France. The perspective of the restoration of German imperialism as a real force capable of opposing democracy and Communism in Europe cannot tempt either Britain or France. This is one of the main contradictions inside the Anglo-American-French bloc.

The American monopolies, like the whole of international reaction, apparently do not count on France or the Greek fascists as any kind of reliable bulwark of the U.S.A. against the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies in Europe. They therefore place particular hopes in the restoration of capitalist Germany, as a most important guarantee of success in the struggle against the democratic forces in Europe. They do not trust either the Laborites in Britain or the Socialists in France, deeming them, despite all

their servility, to be insufficiently trustworthy "quasi-Communists."

That is why the question of Germany, and in particular of the Ruhr basin, as a potential war industry base of the anti-Soviet bloc is a most important subject of international politics and a question of dispute between the U.S.A., Britain and France.

The appetites of the American imperialists cannot but arouse serious anxiety in Britain and France. The U.S. unambiguously made it understood that it wants to take away the Ruhr from the British. The American monopolists likewise demand the merging of the three occupied zones and the open formulation of the political separation of Western Germany under American control. The U.S.A. insists on an increase in the level of the production of steel in the Ruhr Basin on the basis of the preservation of capitalistic enterprises under the aegis of the U.S.A. The credits promised by Marshall for European rehabilitation are understood in Washington as preferential aid to German capitalists.

Thus the Western Bloc is knocked together by America not on the model of the Churchill plan of the United States of Europe, which was conceived as a guide for British policy, but as an American protectorate in which sovereign European states, not excluding Britain herself, are assigned a role not very different from that of the notorious "49th State of America."

American imperialism is treating Britain and France ever more inso-

lently and unceremoniously. The bi- and tri-partite conferences on the fixing of the level of industrial production for Western Germany (G.B.-U.S., U.S. and France), are a deliberate violation of the Potsdam decisions and at the same time demonstrate how completely the United States ignores the vital interests of its partners in negotiation.

Britain and, particularly, France, are compelled to obey American dictation and to accept it meekly. The conduct of American diplomacy in London and Paris recalls, in many ways, its conduct in Greece, where the American representatives no longer deem it at all necessary to observe any decencies, appointing and replacing Greek Ministers at will and behaving like conquerors.

Thus, the new plan for the Dawesification of Europe is, in effect, directed against the vital interests of the peoples of Europe and represents a plan for the enslavement and subjugation of Europe to the United States. The "Marshall Plan" is directed against the industrialization of the democratic countries of Europe and, consequently, against the basis of their independence. And if the plan for the Dawesification of Europe was doomed to failure at a time when the forces of resistance to the Dawes plan were incomparably weaker than now, today there are quite sufficient forces in Europe, even without the Soviet Union, which, given the will and the resolution, can disrupt this plan of enslavement.

It is a matter of the will and readi-

ness for resistance on the part of peoples of Europe. As for the U.S.S.R., it will make every effort to prevent this plan from being realized.

The estimate given of the "Marshall Plan" by the nations in the anti-imperialist camp, has been fully confirmed by events. With respect to the "Marshall Plan," the camp of the democratic countries has shown itself to be a mighty force that stands on guard for the independence and sovereignty of all European nations, that does not yield to blackmail and intimidation, just as it does not allow itself to be deceived by the intrigues and maneuvers of dollar diplomacy.

The Soviet Government has never objected to taking advantage of foreign, and even American credits, as a means of speeding up the process of economic restoration. However, the Soviet Union always insisted that the conditions of the credit should not be of an enslaving nature and should not lead to the economic and political subjugation of the debtor to the creditor states.

Guided by this political conception, the Soviet Union has always adhered to the position that foreign credits should not become the main means of restoring the economy of a country. The basic and decisive condition of economic restoration should be the utilization of the internal forces and resources of any country and the creation of its own industry.

Only on that basis can the independence of a country be safeguarded from the encroachments of foreign capital, which constantly displays a

tendency to take advantage of credits as an instrument of political and economic enslavement. Precisely such a plan is the "Marshall Plan," which is directed against the industrialization of the European countries and is, consequently, calculated to undermine their independence.

The Soviet Union tirelessly defends the position that the political and economic relations between various states must be built exclusively on the basis of the equality of the partners, on mutual respect for their sovereign rights. Soviet foreign policy, in particular Soviet economic relations with foreign states, is based on the principle of equality, the safeguarding of mutual advantages from the agreements to be concluded. The agreements with the U.S.S.R. are agreements to the mutual advantage of their partners and never contain any encroachment on the state independence or the national sovereignty of the contracting parties.

This is a basic distinction in the agreements between the U.S.S.R. and other states, which stands out particularly clearly now in the light of the unjust, unequal treaties concluded and in course of preparation by the United States.

Soviet foreign trade policy does not know unequal agreements. Moreover, the development of the economic relations of the U.S.S.R. with interested states shows on what bases the normal relations between states should be built. Suffice it to recall the recently concluded agreements of the U.S.S.R. with Poland, Yugo-

slavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Finland. In this way the U.S.S.R. shows clearly by what paths Europe can find a way out of its difficult economic situation. Britain could also have had such an agreement, if the Labor Government had not, under external pressure, destroyed the already formulated agreement with the U.S.S.R.

The exposure of the American plan for the economic enslavement of the European countries is an undoubted merit of the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. and the countries of the new democracy. At the same time it is necessary to bear in mind that the U.S. herself is threatened with an economic crisis. Marshall's official generosity has its solid reasons: if the European countries do not receive American credits, the demand of these countries for American goods will shrink, and that will hasten and intensify the approaching economic crisis in the U.S.A.

Therefore, if the European countries are sufficiently steadfast and prepared to resist the enslaving credit conditions, the U.S. can be forced to retreat.

IV. THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

The dissolution of the Comintern, in accordance with the requirements of the development of the labor movement under the conditions of the new historical situation, has played a positive role. The dissolution of the Comintern has forever

put an end to the slanders of the enemies of Communism and the labor movement to the effect that Moscow allegedly interferes in the internal life of other states, that the Communist Parties of the various countries allegedly act not in the interests of their peoples but on orders from abroad.

The Comintern was formed after the First World War, when the Communist Parties were still weak, when ties between the working classes of various countries were almost nonexistent, and when the Communist Parties had no generally acknowledged leaders of the working-class movement. The merit of the Comintern lies in the fact that it restored and strengthened the ties between the toilers of different lands, worked out theoretical questions of the working-class movement in new, postwar conditions of development, established general norms of propaganda and agitation of the ideas of Communism, and facilitated the work of the leaders of the working-class movement. In this way conditions were created for the transformation of young Communist Parties into mass workers' parties. However, with the transformation of young Communist Parties into mass workers' parties, direction of these parties from one center became impossible and inexpedient. As a result, the Comintern, instead of being a factor contributing to the growth of Communist Parties, began to be transformed into a factor hindering this growth. The new stage in the devel-

opment of Communist Parties required new forms of liaison between parties. These circumstances determined the necessity of dissolving the Comintern and organizing new forms of liaison between parties.

In the four years since the dissolution of the Comintern a considerable strengthening of the Communist Parties, a strengthening of their influence, has taken place in almost all the countries of Europe and Asia. The influence of the Communist Parties has increased not only in Eastern Europe but also in almost all the countries of Europe where fascism ruled, as well as in those countries that were under German occupation—in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Finland, and so on.

The influence of the Communists has particularly increased in the countries of the new democracy, where the Communist Parties are the most influential parties in the state.

However, the present situation of Communist Parties also has its shortcomings. Some comrades have come to believe that the dissolution of the Comintern meant the liquidation of all liaison, of all contact between fraternal Communist Parties. Yet experience has shown that such dissociation among parties is incorrect, harmful, and, in essence, unnatural. The Communist movement develops within a national framework but, at the same time, has general problems and interests for parties of various countries. A rather strange picture results: the Socialists, who outdid

themselves in order to prove that the Comintern dictated directives from Moscow to Communists of all lands, re-established their International; whereas Communists refrain even from meeting among themselves, not to speak of consulting with each other on questions of mutual interest, fearful of the slander of enemies with respect to the "hand of Moscow." Representatives of the most varied kinds of activity—scientists, cooperators, trade-unionists, youth, students—consider it possible to maintain international contacts, to exchange experiences and to consult with each other on problems of their work, to arrange international conferences, but Communists even of allied countries hesitate to establish friendly contacts among themselves. There is no doubt that such a situation, if it were prolonged, would be pregnant with extremely harmful consequences for the development of the work of fraternal parties. This need of consultation and voluntary coordination of the activities of the separate parties is ripe, especially now when continued isolation may lead to the weakening of mutual understanding and, at times, even to serious errors.

Since the majority of the leadership of the Socialist parties, especially the British Laborites and the French Socialists, are acting as an agency of the imperialist circles of the U.S.A., the Communists are called upon to play a special historical role: to head the resistance to the American plan for the enslavement of Europe, ably

to expose all internal accomplices of American imperialism.

At the same time the Communists should support all truly patriotic elements who do not want to see their country dishonored, who want to fight against the enslavement of their country by foreign capital and for its national sovereignty. Communists should be the leading force in the cause of drawing all anti-fascist, freedom-loving elements into the struggle against the new American expansionist plans for the enslavement of Europe.

It is necessary to bear in mind that between the desire of the imperialists to unleash a new war and the possibilities of organizing such a war there is an enormous gap. The peoples of the world do not want war. The forces that work for peace are so considerable, so large, that if these forces are steadfast and resolute in the defense of peace, if they display stamina and firmness, the plans of the aggressors will be completely defeated.

One must not forget that the clamor of the imperialist elements about the war danger is intended to frighten the nervous and unstable and to bring about concessions to the aggressor through blackmail. The main danger now for the working class is in the underestimation of its own forces and the overestimation of the forces of the enemy.

Just as the Munich policy in the past gave a free hand to Hitlerite aggression, so concessions to the new course of policy of the U.S.A. and the imperialist camp can make its inspirers even more insolent and aggressive. Therefore the Communist Parties must head the resistance to the plans of imperialist expansion and aggression along all lines—state, economic and ideological; they must rally and unite their efforts on the basis of a common anti-imperialist and democratic platform and gather around themselves all the democratic and patriotic forces of the people.

A special task devolves upon the fraternal Communist Parties of France, Italy, England, and other countries. They must take into their hands the banner of defense of the national independence and sovereignty of their countries. If the Communist Parties will stand firmly on their positions, if they will not allow themselves to be intimidated and blackmailed, if they will stand courageously on guard for a stable peace and popular democracy, on guard for the national sovereignty, freedom, and independence of their countries; if they will succeed in their struggle against the economic and political enslavement of their countries, in heading all forces ready to defend the cause of honor and national independence, then no plans for the enslavement of Europe can be realized.

THE CHICAGO ELECTIONS

By GIL GREEN

THE WIND THAT SWEEPED Chicago on November 4, was a political one, leaving in its wake two badly jarred political machines, and a new political party that is here to stay.

On that day the unprecedented happened in Chicago politics. The Democratic and Republican machines were challenged by a full slate of 21 candidates, running under the designation of a newly formed party.

The Progressive Party, without professional leadership or organization and making its first appearance on the ballot, stunned old-time leaders by winning more than 113,000 straight votes for its ticket, more than 16 per cent of the vote cast. (*Chicago Sun*, November 6.)

The high vote on the Progressive Party ticket was 313,000 for Homer F. Carey, Northwestern University law professor. The low vote was 138,000. Thus, while 16 per cent of the electorate gave the new party a straight vote, 59 per cent cast their ballot for one or more of the Progressive Party candidates.

What are some of the special circumstances that led to this "uprising of the independent voters," as

the *Chicago Daily News* characterized it?

In the first place, it should be borne in mind that this was a judicial election. The only candidates on the ballot were those running for the 21 seats on the Superior Court bench of Cook County (Chicago and suburbs).

Normally, a judicial election is a rather dull affair, arousing little general interest. But there were a number of special and unique circumstances that helped transform the Chicago affair into a battle royal.

Over the years, the Chicago judiciary has been notoriously corrupt and reactionary, a venal and pliable tool of the spoils system. This was particularly true of the Superior Court. Nor were the protests of liberal, progressive, and good-government forces of any avail. Through a system of bipartisan coalition, the two old party machines came together and nominated a single slate of candidates supported by both parties. In this fashion they could ignore all protests and foist upon the community hand-picked political hacks dressed in judicial garb.

A second issue of prime importance was the Jim-Crow character of the Superior Court bench. For many years, the Negro people of the county, and particularly the Cook County Bar Association—the organization of all Negro attorneys—had demanded the nomination of at least one qualified Negro candidate for this court. Over 25,000 signatures of Negro vot-

ers, requesting a place on the ticket, had been presented to the Democratic and Republican political bosses. But this year, as in the past, the Negro people were rudely rebuffed.

There are two special reasons for the arrogant dismissal of this rightful demand of the Negro people. First, the political bosses felt that so long as both parties were united in the campaign, they had nothing to fear from the Negro electorate. How wrong they were in this estimate is now a matter of record. Secondly, the Superior Court of Cook County handles all cases relating to restrictive covenants. The placing of a Negro on that bench would therefore constitute a threat to the very legal structure which keeps the Negro people walled into overcrowded, slum, high-rental ghettos. Both political machines preferred to serve the vested real estate interests and the racial bigots as against the justified demands of the Negro people and of democracy.

A third key issue in the election was that of anti-labor injunctions. Chicago labor has many times winced from the lash of court injunctions. With the passage of the Taft-Hartley Law, the menace of strike-breaking by injunction judges has increased a thousand-fold. At this issue, too, the old party machines shrugged their shoulders, refusing to replace reactionary, company-bribed judges with progressive-minded friends of labor.

It was around these three major is-

ssues that a people's coalition began to take shape in battle with the corrupt bipartisan coalition. This progressive coalition brought together a number of diverse class and social groupings: a large section of the middle class, which was moved in the main by the issues of clean courts and clean government; the most important organizations and forces of the Negro people, who responded in the first place to the Jim-Crow issue; and a considerable section of the labor movement, which, while reacting to all other issues, felt most keenly the issue of anti-labor injunctions.

But if these three streams finally joined into the swiftly running Niagara of a new party, this did not take place automatically or spontaneously. Certainly, the issues were there, and the need for an alliance was apparent. But what was absent was the instrumentality for forging the unity and waging the fight. Only the formation of a third-party ticket could effectively challenge the corrupt coalition. But many shied away from this conclusion, thinking it radical or impractical.

HOW THE PROGRESSIVE VOTE WAS RALLIED

Where could 21 qualified attorneys be found who would be ready to risk the ire of the machines on so frail a vessel as that of a new party? How could the imposing figure of 103,000 signatures of registered voters be gathered in the few weeks be-

fore the final filing date? It had never been done before. Most observers believed it could not be done this time.

And yet both tasks were accomplished. Twenty-one progressive attorneys were found, and within three weeks time, 121,000 valid signatures were filed with the Board of Elections.

A great deal of credit is due the relatively small handful of persons—leaders of labor, community and Negro people's organizations—who, together with the 21 candidates, had the courage of their convictions and the confidence that when the issues were made clear the people would respond.

Surprised at the ability of the independent voters to win a place on the ballot, the machines, however, still continued to underestimate the movement. Jack Arvey, County Chairman of the Democratic Party, rushed to press with a Red-baiting blast, charging that the Progressive Party was Communist inspired, a "plot" by which the Communists hoped to win a place on the ballot behind the subterfuge of the Progressive Party name. But so transparent was this trick, so ridiculous the accusation, so deep-going the resentment of decent-minded people, that Mr. Arvey hastily reversed his strategy.

The machines decided on another course of action. They were not going to be provoked into any debate over issues. They were not going to give the Progressive Party any recog-

inition or publicity. They were going to keep mum, act as if it did not exist. And this is exactly what they did.

Not a speech, poster, or meeting emanated from the side of the bipartisan coalition. The Democratic and Republican leaders depended exclusively on the power of their machines. They rounded up their precinct captains, ordered them to bring out only the sure machine vote, and threatened the loss of jobs and political plums if they failed to deliver their precincts.

So certain were the machines that only the controlled vote would come out, that on the eve of the elections, "Bunny" East, Republican County Chairman, estimated that some 300,000 voters would turn out at the polls, while Mr. Arvey's guess was 400,000. The turn out exceeded 700,000.

The strategy of silence on the part of the Democratic and Republican parties placed a heavier burden on the newly formed, poorly organized, and finance-less Progressive Party. It had to transform a walk-away into a race, to force the issues, to arouse the electorate, to bring out the independent voters, and to guarantee that, once they came out, their votes would be counted.

Of course, the strategy of the machines, clever as it seemed, had one serious defect. It gave the Progressive Party the much coveted initiative and kept it on the offensive. It helped to prove to those who were reached with the issues that the old parties

had something to hide and were afraid to face the people.

How the fledgling Progressive Party was able to reach the people and organize the vote is a story in itself. But the underlying political fact that made it possible was the receptiveness of the people. Once it became clear that an effective alternative to the Republican and Democratic coalition had been placed on the ballot, things began to happen, and a qualitative change occurred in the relationship of political forces. The people had something to rally around, some way of expressing their discontent with the old parties and the movement for the Progressive Party ticket began to mushroom and grow into something bigger and broader than originally anticipated.

The mere existence of an effective alternative on the ballot not only focused attention on the major issues; it also brought to light new ones. Cracks and fissures began to appear in the old machines. In the industrial suburbs of Cicero, Berwyn, and Maywood, the voters, many of whom were traditionally Republican, saw in the new party an opportunity to register their dissatisfaction with the domination of the big city machines over the smaller towns in the county. On election day a small-town revolt took place, the Progressive Party sweeping a number of the small townships.

On Chicago's great South Side, many Democratic and Republican precinct captains, sensing the mood

of the voters, refused to deliver their precincts. In other cases, individual precinct captains expressed their resentment with the policies and leadership of their parties by lying down on the job, or by going out to do a job for the Progressives.

Nor was it any longer possible for non-partisan critics of the bipartisan deal to continue their criticism without taking a stand for or against the candidates of the Progressive Party. Thus, the conservative, austere Chicago Bar Association, which could not for the good of its own reputation go along with the bipartisan coalition slate, had to endorse three of the Progressive candidates. The Cook County Bar Association (of Negro attorneys), not only endorsed the three outstanding and qualified Negro candidates on the Progressive ticket, but called upon the Negro people to give a straight vote to the Progressive Party, making its offices available as the South Side headquarters for the campaign.

While the militant *Chicago Star* was the only paper to support the Progressive Party ticket as a whole, and did a yeoman job in that respect, the daily newspapers could not remain silent. Having previously attacked corruption in the courts and the method of coalition, although for varied and sundry reasons, they were compelled before the end of the campaign to endorse one or more candidates on the Progressive line. This did not stop them, however, from issuing dire warnings against a third

party and from belittling the Progressive Party ticket as a whole.

Support for at least one Progressive candidate became incumbent upon the press, when it was revealed that a leading bipartisan candidate, Wilbur F. Crowley, Assistant State Attorney, was a bosom pal of the mouth-piece of Jack Guzik, notorious Chicago mobster. It was to defeat Crowley that all Chicago newspapers endorsed Homer F. Carey, the best known of the Progressive candidates. This undoubtedly explains the 313,000 votes received by Carey, who missed election by the narrow margin of 20,000 votes. That Carey was actually elected is a widely held view in Chicago for the machines voted the cemeteries on election day and stole bushels of votes wherever they could get away with it.

But the high vote for Carey is not the most important outcome of the election. As Milburn P. Akers, political editor of the *Chicago Sun*, noted a day after the election:

The significance of Tuesday's election is not the spectacular vote received by Homer F. Carey, Progressive candidate. . . . But the 120,000 to 130,000 votes received by the low candidates have significance.*

Undoubtedly they constitute the base of a left-wing movement in Chicago politics. And a left-wing movement, that can garner 120,000 to 130,000, or more, votes in Cook County can be, at times, a balance of power.

Sponsors of the Progressive slate may

* The final tabulation shows that the lowest vote on the Progressive ticket was 138,000.

be unable to hold the base vote together. It consists of a number of elements. They may be difficult to put together into a real third party. . . .

Be that as it may, this fact remains. They did so for the judicial election. They may do so again. So the shadow of Henry Wallace still hangs ominously over the Democratic Party.

Mr. Akers is undoubtedly correct when he says that the Progressive Party vote "consists of a number of elements." But this is true of every broad movement, particularly those of a mixed class character.

The building of the third-party movement, both locally and nationally, consists precisely in the art of bringing together all forces and elements who can be united around a common progressive program and party. To look for "pure" movements, made up of single class or social groupings, is to close one's eyes to the only way in which the broadest base for a third-party movement can be established.

The people of Chicago were not asked to vote for the abstract idea of a third party. Had they been, it is doubtful whether the same results would have been obtained. They were asked to vote on issues, and where one or more of these became clear to them, where they felt deeply about them, they did not hesitate to leave the old party columns for that of a new party. This is one of the most important lessons to be learned from the Chicago elections, one of great importance for 1948.

NATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROGRESSIVE VOTE

It goes without saying that it was not only the local issues that brought out the progressive vote. In the period of the Roosevelt New Deal, too, there had been considerable progressive and clean government opposition to the shenanigans of the corrupt Kelly machine. But in those years people were ready to forgive the crimes of the machine politicians, for were they not supporting the Roosevelt Administration nationally? Under such circumstances "uprisings" and third-party movements could not be organized around such "small" matters as a judicial election.

Ample proof exists that the people who voted for the Progressive Party were not oblivious to its national significance. First, the press tried to make much of the fact that if the new party received 5 per cent of the total vote it would become a legal party, capable of running a third ticket in 1948. In the gathering of the signatures, and on election day itself, many were those who asked whether the Progressive Party was associated with Henry Wallace.

The day after election the *Chicago Tribune* carried the story that, in certain Republican precincts, voters "associated the Progressive ticket with the party of the same name in the 1912 Bull Moose movement led by Theodore Roosevelt." Which proves that there are more than a few Republicans who are thinking of a third party.

Likewise, the *Chicago Defender* reported that Negro voters, when asked why they were voting Progressive, responded that they were voting for their race and that since the death of Roosevelt they saw no difference between the Republican and Democratic parties. Certainly this had something to do with the ability of the Progressive Party to sweep a number of wards highly populated with Negro people, and why Earl B. Dickerson and Sidney Jones, two Negro candidates, polled 216,000 and 182,000 votes respectively.

It is important to note the role that the women voters played in the election. They sparked much of the campaign in the precincts. On election day, reports from all over the city showed that the women were among the most responsive to the issues and least tied to the machines. The women rallied around the candidacy of Pearl M. Hart, a progressive, who has made a brilliant record for herself, especially in the field of juvenile delinquency. Miss Hart polled over 181,000 votes. The performance of the women in this campaign leads this writer to conclude that the progressive movement generally underestimates the role of women, gives leading women too little recognition, and hence fails to tap this great reservoir for progress.

PROBLEMS AHEAD

While emphasizing the positive aspects of the Chicago election, and showing its intimate relationship to

the developing third-party movement nationally, it would be highly dangerous to exaggerate what took place, or to underestimate the big and difficult problems that still confront the third-party movement in Chicago. This election did contain certain peculiarities that will not repeat themselves again in the same way or form. For example, the Democrats and Republicans will certainly not coalesce around one slate of candidates in 1948. There may be no vital issues that separate them, but there certainly will be two different slates of candidates. This will lend itself to greater demagoguery and greater confusion. The machines will also try to bribe or buy off some of those who participated in the "uprising."

Furthermore, one must not underestimate the power still displayed by the machines, which, after all, did win the election. Especially in the white working-class wards, the Democratic Party polled an exceedingly high straight vote. This does not mean that the workers who marked their cross in the Democratic circle are indifferent to the issues, or are in basic agreement with the policies of Truman and his local henchmen. It does mean however, that a great many workers still think of the Democratic Party as the party of Roosevelt and continue to have a fatal attraction to the Democratic column.

In this election, a great job was done by a number of important trade unions, which reached their members in the shops and which con-

tributed to the man-power in the precincts and at the polls. But the failure of the official city C.I.O. and A. F. of L. leadership to join hands with other progressive forces in this campaign did much to create confusion in the minds of workers. The net result of the election is, however, a sharp rebuke to those trade union leaders who prefer to wallow in the pigsty of party patronage, as against giving courageous and honest political leadership to their rank and file.

The way to overcome this division in the ranks of the trade union leadership and to win the great mass of the workers away from the old parties is to reach and clarify the rank and file on the issues. Where this cannot be done through the trade unions, it must be done in the precincts, and in as many places as possible on both levels. This means, in the first place, better and more permanent organization on a precinct level.

It also requires better knowledge of the "know-how" of clarifying issues. The experience in this campaign proves that the issues must be simple and understandable. This is particularly important for 1948, when the country will be deluged with demagoguery, and when every politician and candidate will be ready to promise the most beautiful legislative program to the people. The advantage that the Progressive Party had in this campaign is that it stuck to facts, to deeds. For example, no matter how desperately certain Negro political

leaders tried to squirm out of their predicament by pointing to this or that stand of their party on the Negro question, they could not explain away the stark fact that both parties had denied Negroes a place on this high court. And it was this and other such simple facts which advanced the cause of the Progressive Party.

There must also be more indictment of the two-party system as such and the corrupt machines of the two major parties. Both major parties in this country have become electoral corporations in the service of monopoly capital. The struggle for a political realignment, for a third party, must also be the struggle against corruption in politics. Too long have the progressive forces ignored this issue. And yet, when this issue is tied-up with a general progressive program for peace and well-being, it can help create the moral fervor of a crusade.

In the Chicago election, for the first time, an important section of the labor movement joined forces with many good-government, reform forces, and, as a result of this, the local third party was able to attract to its fold considerable middle class support. These middle-class groupings are opposed to corrupt politics because it has meant higher taxes,

dirty alleys and streets, and a school system of which the less said the better. The future of the Progressive Party in Chicago will depend in great part upon its ability to maintain the triple alliance of the progressive trade unions, the Negro people and the good government, reform elements of the middle class.

The third party movement must grow out of every phase of American life. Its appeal and program must be as all-sided as life itself, for monopoly capital and its parties are not responsible for war preparations and Taft-Hartley anti-labor laws alone. They are just as responsible for the shameful wave of teen-age crime, for the rat infested slums of our cities, for Negro discrimination and anti-Semitism, for corrupt courts, and for everything that is foul and debased.

* * *

These are only a few of the many lessons that can be drawn from the Chicago elections. But neither time nor space will permit of further treatment of them in this article.

The progressive forces of Chicago have made an important beginning in the building of a third party in that city. Only time will tell whether they can maintain the necessary clarity and unity to forge ahead.

FOR THE REPUBLIC, FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE!

By MAURICE THOREZ

(Report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France, October 29, 1947*)

I

SINCE THE LAST MEETING of our Central Committee, two events have occurred, the effects of which are still being felt on our national life and on the evolution of the international situation. I refer to the municipal elections and the Conference of the Nine Communist Parties held in Poland at the end of September.

The results of the municipal elections allow us to make two fundamental observations:

1. The consolidation of the working-class and advanced-democratic forces around our Party;

2. The regrouping and disturbing progress of the reactionary forces around the Reunion of the French People (R.P.F.).

A third observation flows from the first two: that is, the further weakening of the Socialist Party and the collapse of the Popular Republican Movement (M.R.P.), three-quarters of whose voters deserted it for the Reunion of the French People.

* Translated from the text which appeared in *L'Humanité*, October 30, 1947.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY IS STILL THE FIRST PARTY

Our Party has every reason to be proud, and it can look confidently to the future, when a third of the voters, Frenchmen and Frenchwomen, showed their unshakeable attachment to it, despite a violent anti-Communist campaign for which General de Gaulle set the tone and which all the other parties, from the Socialists to the worst reactionaries, adopted as their platform; moreover, despite an arbitrary election law which was aimed against us and which gave rise to shocking collaboration between the Socialists and the de Gaullists in naming mayors.

After trying as always to give a distorted picture of the balloting and, of course, one that favored the reactionaries, the official statistics have finally been forced to acknowledge that we are still the first party in France.

In cities with more than 9,000 inhabitants, a breakdown of the candidates elected shows the following:

Communists	3,993	30.64%
Socialists	2,107	21.12%
Radical-Socialists	531
M.R.P.	1,682	12.91%

FOR THE REPUBLIC, FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE! 1121

P.R.L. (Rightist group) 257
R.P.F. (de Gaullist)..... 3,762 28.86%

In these cities the proportion of our vote reached 30 per cent. It was not any less in the smaller communities where, in general, we made progress.

Since the liberation our vote has risen consistently: 26 per cent in October, 1945; 26.2 per cent in June, 1946; 28.6 per cent in October, 1946; 29.2 per cent in November, 1946.

The official statistics also gave us first place in the number of candidates elected in the first round of balloting in communities of more than 4,000 inhabitants: we had 5,152 councilmen, or 22 per cent of the total. And the run-off elections, the final results of which are not yet definitely known, increased the number of our candidates elected and improved our percentage.

General de Gaulle thought that he would deliver a telling blow against our Communist Party. The would-be dictator considers us—and rightly so—the main obstacle to the establishment of his personal power. The results of the municipal elections show that the efforts of all our opponents have not been able to weaken the solid position of our Communist Party, which is deeply rooted in the very heart of the nation. There were setbacks in some localities: we will analyze the causes for them. But in many places we have gained, and, on the whole, we have more than held our own.

Once again the working class and an important section of the peasants

and "little people" have shown their confidence in the Party that has been, and that remains, the vigilant defender of their daily interests, their rights, and their freedoms; the Party that, before and during the war, took the lead in the struggle against fascism; the Party that effectively organized and led the Resistance in armed struggle against the invaders and the traitors of Vichy; the Party of French Rebirth through work and unity of the people. The working class, the common people, have recognized in our Communist Party a solid bulwark of the Republic, the resolute champion of national independence and sovereignty.

THE R.P.F. IS FASCISM

Nevertheless, General de Gaulle has been able to profit from the ruinous policies of the Ramadier Government, policies that arouse general discontent, discourage the workers, and sow confusion and bewilderment among all republicans. General de Gaulle has exploited, for the sake of his own policy of adventurism, the various difficulties of all kinds that he himself, during all the time he was in power, proved incapable of overcoming, and some of which he even aggravated. Under these conditions, he has succeeded in regrouping around himself all the forces of social and political reaction. For a long time now the wealthy caste—who fear for their profits and who, until the battle of Stalingrad, the turning-point in the war against Nazi Germany, backed Pétain and Hitler—

have been betting on de Gaulle and his American supporters.

In de Gaulle's Reunion of the French People, one finds Munich-men and Vichyites, notorious collaborators, hardened criminals, gangsters and killers, such as the hoodlum who seriously wounded our young friend Vergnole, at Nîmes. It is the coalition of all the selfish and the lusts for profit—but, of course, under the mask of virtue and devotion to the public welfare. It is fascism.

An important English newspaper, the *London Observer*, has very correctly written:

In General de Gaulle's attitude there are many symptoms of régimes which are usually called fascist: the concentration of the whole movement around a single man, with a mystic exaltation of his personality and imperious commands to entrust power to him; an avowed impatience regarding the parliamentary process, chauvinist nationalism and militant anti-Communism; and the promise of national unity and political stability by means of a blank check given to the Savior of the Country. (Re-translated from the French—Tr.)

The fact that in Paris and the other large cities the R.P.F., the party of the bankers and the Vichyites, has succeeded in attracting to itself important sections of the dissatisfied and unstable petty bourgeoisie, underlines the gravity of the danger threatening the Republic and the working class. It would be wrong to underestimate this danger.

THE "GAINS" OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY ARE THE GAINS OF REACTION

The Socialist Party has emerged from the recent electoral struggle still further weakened. The Socialist leaders, taking advantage of a few "successes" gained at our expense, try to keep up the illusion that their party has won. That is an indication of the reactionary frame of mind of the Socialist leaders who see no other enemies to fight except the Communist Party. In reality, the Socialist "gains" are gains of the reactionaries, who supported the Socialist ticket or coalition tickets including Socialists and pro-fascists of the R.P.F., in most of the municipalities we formerly held—as in the Pas-de-Calais and other *départments*. The same thing was true of the new "Socialist" municipalities in the suburbs of Paris: there, the Socialist Party received on an average 10 per cent of the votes as against 45 per cent for our Party. And the Socialists were elected, in every case, by the de Gaullists.

But the Socialist leaders are silent about the fact that their biggest cities have fallen into the hands of the R.P.F.: Lille, which had been governed for half a century by the Socialists; Mulhouse, Bordeaux, Nice, Chartres, and Nancy, where the ticket of the retiring Socialist mayor did not even get the 5 per cent of the votes required by the Depreux Law. At Lyons, the Socialist ticket did not elect a single candidate. That

is the truth they are trying to make the Socialist workers forget by harping brazenly on the few towns "re-taken" from the Communists—with the open support of reaction.

THE BISHOPS OF PETAÏN TOLD THE PEOPLE TO VOTE FOR DE GAULLE

The M.R.P. was the chief victim of General de Gaulle. On many occasions we have emphasized that the M.R.P. was nothing but a screen behind which were "re-gathered the social forces that had formed the base of Vichyism and Pétainism." That is what explains "the support given the M.R.P. by the Catholic Church, the chief reactionary force on the ideological and political level." (Report to the Central Committee at Saint-Denis, June, 1946.)

It seems that this time the Catholic hierarchy did not give its support to the M.R.P. The cardinals and bishops, who not so long ago were ardently pro-Pétain, have had the people vote for General de Gaulle, their new man of destiny. That fits in perfectly with the orientation of the Vatican, whose close relations with the American Government are well known. The Pope himself spoke out on September 8: "The time for reflection has passed; the moment for action has come." And on October 9, receiving in audience American Congressmen who are members of the Military Affairs Committee, the Pope asserted: "Force must be used for the defense of law and order." Capitalist law and order, of course.

Long ago, did not the founder of Christianity once say: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword"? The Pope prefers to give his blessing to the assassins of democrats and patriots—in Greece, in Spain, and elsewhere. He prefers to justify in advance the good apostles of the atom bomb.

To sum up, the results of the municipal elections are a reflection of the contradictions in which our country finds itself. They express the deepening and sharpening of the class struggle in France and in the world. For the new relation of class forces in France is not unrelated to the evolution of the international situation.

[Section II is omitted because of lack of space. This section dealt with the Conference of Nine European Communist Parties held in Poland in September and with the report by A. A. Zhdanov made to that conference. That report is reprinted in full in this issue.—The Editors.]

III

A former United States Ambassador to France, Mr. William C. Bullitt, recently wrote that it was necessary to intensify what he called "the battle for France." Thus, the American multi-millionaires seek to enslave our country; they would like to put an end to our economic and political independence, to our national sovereignty. They would like to turn our country into a semi-colony like Portugal or Chile. And

against whom is their battle? Against the people of France, against the democrats, against the workers led by our Communist Party. For these French democrats and Communists mean to preserve the economic and political independence of their country; they are against driving France into the imperialist and anti-democratic camp led by the United States; they denounce the surrender by the Ramadier-Bidault Government of the French policy of security and reparations.

THE COAL OF THE RUHR

American plans for giving priority to the revival of German industry are directly contrary to the interests of France. The Brown Report* would entirely deprive us of the coal of the Ruhr. That is what the policy of surrender followed by Leon Blum, and then by Bidault, leads to in the question of reparations and coal. Our Communist Party was the only one, in the Government and in the country, to protest against the London and Moscow agreements, which "did not give us a single ounce of fuel more," to quote the reactionary weekly *Carrefour*.

It is now clear that by refusing us the German coal to which we had a claim as reparations, the British and American Governments were only trying to make us subservient to them. They have hampered our re-

covery. They did not want, they do not want, a strong and prosperous France, capable of resisting their pressure. They do not want a strongly industrialized France, producing a great deal of iron and steel, which are the material basis and guarantee of our economic and political independence.

It is Germany, more specifically the Krupps and the Thyssens, that the Americans have chosen as the industrial power with "a predominant role in Europe," in the words of Senator Tom Connally.

Moreover, by refusing us German coal, the British and American Governments have knowingly worsened our financial situation, increased our foreign trade deficit, and reduced to nothing the currency we could use. The Americans have killed two birds with one stone:

1. They sell us their coal, and we pay for it in dollars, as we pay in dollars for the coal of the Ruhr and the Saar.
2. Having aggravated our economic and financial difficulties, they speculate on France's distress in order to subject her to their policy of imperialist aggression.

WHO IS MAKING TRADE BETWEEN OUR COUNTRY AND THE U.S.S.R. DIFFICULT?

An important fact has just enlightened public opinion concerning the attempt to colonize France, which is being made with the connivance of those who govern us. The country needs bread. The Soviet

Union, despite vicious campaigns against her, despite the flagrant pro-American orientation of French policy, has made it known that she has 15,000,000 quintals (approximately 1,650,000 tons) of grain at the disposal of France. Since the Soviet Union knows our financial difficulties, she has not demanded payment in dollars. In exchange for wheat, the U.S.S.R. has asked our country to furnish industrial products, equipment, and machinery. Thus the Soviet Union has offered us both food and work.

Immediately, the press, taking its cue from America, asserted that France could not export anything to the Soviet Union; and that, anyhow, Soviet wheat would lessen the amount we would get from America. Hence there was no reason to accept the proposals made by the Soviet Government in reply to requests made of it in Paris. The French Government, in a statement it has issued through the press, seems ready to accept the point of view of the pro-American party. Products capable of being exchanged for Soviet wheat would not be able to be delivered until 1948-1949 and, for the most part, until 1950. If that is true, is it not an act of accusation against those who have renounced the coal of the Ruhr and yielded to the well-known desire of the Americans to forbid France an adequate production of iron and steel and not to allow our machine industries to satisfy both the needs of the country and the demands of our foreign trade?

Here we have definite proof that, in order to tie us to their imperialist chariot, the Americans have behaved in such a way as to make difficult the trade ties between France and the Soviet Union and our other allies in Eastern Europe.

Moreover, we are told that a precondition of more extensive trade relations between France and the new democracies is the payment of a completely unjustified compensation to the French capitalists, who had sold to the Germans factories in Poland or Yugoslavia that are today nationalized. Thus, Schneider and the *Union Parisienne* Bank, with Pierre de Gaulle as its assistant director, would be paid twice for the mining and metal industries they formerly owned in Poland.

THE ECONOMIC COLONIZATION OF FRANCE

The Americans want either to liquidate certain of our industrial undertakings or to control them and get the profits from them. Thus, Ford has established himself in Poissy and, together with General Motors, would like to get his hand on our entire automotive production. The American trust of Thompson-Houston-Alsthom dominates our electro-mechanical and telephone equipment industry with a tie-up with International Telephone and Telegraph, another American trust. American banks have important interests in a number of French enterprises. The same situation exists in our overseas territories, where the

*An official report prepared for General Lucius D. Clay, Military Governor of the American zone in Germany, by Lewis H. Brown, Chairman of Johns-Manville Corporation. (Lewis H. Brown, *A Report on Germany*, Farrar, Strauss, New York, 1947.)—Ed.

Americans control various firms, in Guinea and Togoland, in French Guiana as well as Madagascar. The French aviation industry has been sacrificed. Contrary to slanderous and biased statements by the reactionaries, every nationalized firm in the aircraft industry, except one, shows a profit on its balance-sheet. It is the Government which has created difficulties for them by not paying them the nine billion francs owed them.

In a pamphlet published in New York, the National Foreign Trade Council, a powerful organization of many American financial and industrial groups, complains bitterly of the slowness of American colonization in France. It demands more assistance for American capital to be invested in French private industries. It demands that all measures of tariff protection and the like, which harm American trade, be abolished. It even reminds us arrogantly that France has not yet fulfilled all the agreements made by Leon Blum in April, 1946.

The American bankers are also quite solicitous about French overseas territories. They demand access to these sources of raw materials; they would like to open the markets of North Africa and Indochina to their export trade. The booklet mentioned above pays special attention to the phosphates of Morocco and Tunisia and to the other mineral resources of Morocco and all of North Africa. Madagascar and its

uranium supply is particularly attractive to the Americans.

At our 10th Congress [June, 1945] we drew up a plan for the proper exploitation of all our fuel resources, in coal and electric power. The Monnet Plan provided for the necessary investments to overhaul and modernize the equipment and machinery of our nationalized oil industry and to proceed with the building of large dams. The Americans, who propose to invest shortly an initial sum of 30 billion francs in the coal mines of the Ruhr, have liquidated the Monnet Plan. Our nationalized oil, gas, and electricity industries will have to depend on the American capitalists to continue functioning. The same is true of building reconstruction, at a time when so many homeless are waiting to be housed. The workshops are closed, unemployment is growing. In July, 1947, alone, 27 medium-sized building firms went out of business. And yet there are ruins all over France, from Dunkirk to Marseille, from Brest to Strasbourg.

"The French cinema is in a desperate position. Death is around the corner." This is the cry uttered by Marcel Pagnol, member of the French Academy. And that is the sad result of the Blum-Byrnes film agreement. *L'Humanité* has published the figures revealing the ruin of this, our second most important national industry, and the victory of its American competitors. In the first half of 1946, the following were released for exhibition: 38 American

films and 35 French films; in the second half of 1946, 145 American films, 46 French films; and in the first half of 1947, 338 American films, 55 French films.

But the question involved is not only the fabulous profits realized by the Americans, and the distress, unemployment, and ruin threatening actors, musicians, and workers in the French studios. It also involves the question of ideological penetration, which the Americans inflict on peoples they intend to enslave. It is an attempt to disintegrate the French nation, an effort to demoralize and pervert our young men and women, with these stupid films in which eroticism rubs shoulders with crime, in which the gangster is king; these movies which aim at bringing up, not a generation of Frenchmen conscious of their duties toward France and the Republic, but a band of slaves crushed under the "iron heel." Moreover, how can they produce good movies when the finest artists in the United States are persecuted on the pretext of their sympathy for the ideals of Communism?

American expansionism in economic affairs has, as its inevitable accompaniment, the creation of strategic and military bases in the countries subjected to dollar imperialism. The newspaper *Figaro* admitted on September 27, 1947, and without protesting, that "by its location at the edge of Western Europe opposite England, and by its extension into Africa, France is included in the zone of America security."

Just like Greece and Turkey, just like Iran, which *Le Monde* calls "an advanced bastion on the flank of the Soviet Union," our country is becoming a base of operations against the Soviet Union, a "bridgehead," to speak the language of the American militarists. They would like to give us the honor of choosing France as the theater of a future atom and germ war.

THE INTERVENTION OF THE UNITED STATES INTO OUR INTERNAL POLITICS

American intervention into French internal politics is flagrant. The American Government, American senators and representatives, and all the dealers and salesmen in corned beef and chewing gum no longer even take the trouble to hide it. They hand out their orders in arrogant fashion.

On July 9, 1947, the newspaper *Libération* wrote:

One must know all the conversations which leading French personalities have had during this last period with diplomatic representatives of certain powers to understand how heavily external events weigh on our internal life. One must know how for three months now, ever since the first contacts were made with regard to the plan for American aid to our country, every political crisis in France has been dictated by international considerations.

The American imperialists support every reactionary force in our country. An American paper, the *New York Post*, has written:

General de Gaulle is playing on our anti-Communist phobia, hoping that it will win for him our support just as it has won support for the Chinese and Greek reactionaries. We have reached a point where the only people who greet our intervention with satisfaction are those who are furthest removed from the interests of their people. (Re-translated from the French—Tr.)

The Americans are supporting with their dollars the efforts of the clerical reactionaries against our lay schools. The United States Ambassador appeared in person at the opening of so-called "free" schools in the Calvados *département*.

The Americans are spending millions and millions of dollars to deal a blow at the C.G.T.* At Paris they have opened a special office for carrying on the struggle against the C.G.T. Former Ambassador Bullitt wrote: "No task is more vital for the future of France." In this work the Americans utilize certain Socialist leaders who have attempted to split the trade union movement, among the postal workers, the Paris transport workers, and in several other unions.

The vain efforts of so-called autonomous unions to divide the workers and incite them against the C.G.T. by means of partial strike movements, such as the delayed strike of the postal workers, the disturbances in several departments of the Renault works, or the stoppage of the subway conductors, bear an American stamp. Bullitt recommended that the Catho-

lic unions be supported; the Government heeded his advice. The whole blackmailing press has been leading a furious offensive against the C.G.T. and its leadership. De Gaulle, who in his time refused to receive the executive committee of the C.G.T., has said that his plan to revise the Constitution includes a clause limiting trade-union liberties and the right to strike.

Everyone now knows that the Communists were dismissed from the Government at the orders of the Americans. That was one of the conditions for "aid" to France. On the eve of elections, the newspapers published a statement by Senator Styles Bridges, head of a Senate investigating committee in Europe: "I have told the French ministers," Senator Bridges asserted, "that we firmly hope that the next French Government will not be under the control of the Communists. We have received assurances that, thanks to reasonable collaboration, the Communists could certainly be prevented from winning." (Retranslated from the French—Tr.)

Nor was there any lack of cooperation between the Government parties and the de Gaullist R.P.F. in this election campaign, under the banner of anti-Communism, and in the naming of municipal administrations by the shameful coalition of Socialists and reactionaries.

It was also in order to keep the promises made to Senator Bridges that Ramadier "concentrated" his Government of failure and national

abdication. "What is essential," the American Ambassador is reported to have told Georges Bidault, "is to keep the Communists out of the Government."

Thus the Americans acknowledge that we are the best defenders of the interests of our country. Our presence in the Government would signify a completely independent French policy. Our expulsion, on the other hand, underlines the subservience of France and its present leaders to the United States.

THE RUNNING DOGS OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

It is to hide these sad realities, this shame inflicted on the France of 1789 and of 1944, it is to cloak with a thick fog the operations in which the American imperialists and their agents in France are indulging, that an abominable campaign of slanders is being led against the Soviet Union and against our Communist Party.

The Americans are becoming the masters in our house, they are making and unmaking governments, they are grabbing our national resources and condemning us to vegetate in misery, they are seeking to turn our country into a battlefield and to enlist Frenchmen in the new anti-Soviet crusade. And boldly attempting to turn the tables, the Americans and their agents falsely accuse the Soviet Union of imperialist aims. By conjuring up the specter of Bolshevism, certain people would like to make us forget that they have sacrificed the interests of

France, notably in the German question, and that they have servilely placed themselves at America's orders.

Once upon a time, General de Gaulle spoke of our "beautiful and good alliance" with the Soviet Union. Today he is vilely inciting against our Soviet allies those who refuse to pardon the latter for having crushed Hitlerism and, as a result, Vichyism and Pétainism.

The general secretary of the Radical Socialist Party has the audacity to assert: "The enemy is not Germany—it is Russia!" What infamy! Do they think, these running dogs of the American party, that true Frenchmen have such short memories? Do they think that the word *gratitude* has been erased from the French dictionary? No, the people of France have not forgotten the heroic feats and enormous sacrifices made by the Soviet peoples and their Red Army in the common cause. The workers of Paris understand this, as they showed last evening when they demonstrated against the fascist *provocateurs*.

The slanderers froth with rage against Dimitrov, the hero of the Reichstag Fire Trial at Leipzig, because the justice of the Bulgarian people has condemned a traitor. But Frenchmen have not forgotten the same campaigns, before the war, during the Moscow Trials! Already at that time, the same slanderers attempted to fool public opinion and to arouse the people against the sentencing of the Trotskyites and other

* General Confederation of Labor. Ed.

spies in the pay of German and Japanese imperialists. The people of France think that it would have been good if we had done as much against the Lavals and Déats, instead of allowing them to carry out their crime against the nation. The people of France think that it would be better to imitate the Bulgarian democrats, and strike at the traitors, the Nazi militiamen, and all the former collaborators, instead of letting them go free. Then there would be fewer plotters and gangsters, and also fewer members and voters for de Gaulle's Reunion of the French People.

LEON BLUM, ADVOCATE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

It is clear that American plans for the enslavement of our country would have no chance of success were it not for the support given them by the Socialist leaders—above all, Leon Blum and Ramadier. American imperialism—the “Marshall Plan”—has no better advocate in France than Leon Blum. Not only has he committed France to this deadly path, in his negotiations at Washington as well as at London, but, even worse, he has tried to give the brutal demands of American policy the appearance of generosity and disinterestedness. Leon Blum has been the only one in France to dare to maintain that the American capitalists have no need to export. But that did not prevent him from granting more licenses for American

films on our screens, or from importing at great expense American coal, to make up for the coal of the Ruhr that he renounced. At our 11th Congress,* we already stated that the attempt by Blum “to idealize the expansionist policy of the American monopolies can only disarm the working class and the people of France ideologically and politically, in their resistance to the encroachments of international finance which jeopardize our national independence.”

Leon Blum considers the expression *national sovereignty* “a nationalist phrase.” He considers that it is an old-fashioned archaic phrase. He opposes to it his theory of a “super-sovereignty of the international community.” He would like to trade on the workers’ faith in international solidarity, and cover over with a democratic and progressive veneer France’s renunciation of independence and national sovereignty for the sole benefit of American imperialism. But the workers will not confuse proletarian internationalism with the cosmopolitanism of the trusts.

Likewise, a “pacifist” Trotskyite publication asserts that it was a great mistake to proclaim in the Atlantic Charter that the signers “wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.” Naturally this publication supports the “Marshall Plan.”

* Held in June, 1947. Ed.

LEON BLUM AND GUY MOLLET AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION, AGAINST PEACE

Leon Blum and Guy Mollet* excel in sophisms designed to lull the working class and true friends of peace. To denounce the aggressive aims of the imperialist camp, to struggle against the war danger that is again weighing on the world, would mean—according to the Socialist leaders—to resign ourselves to the division of the world into two blocs; it would mean, they say, accepting conflict as fatal, admitting war.

We have already heard such phrases from the lips of Blum, when he took the initiative in the so-called “Non-Intervention” which proved fatal to the Spanish Republic. Or when Blum expressed his “cowardly relief” in the face of the Munich treason paving the way to catastrophe.

The obstinacy of the Socialist leaders in speaking of two blocs only tends to obscure in the eyes of the masses the exact notion of reality: to wit, that an imperialist camp has been formed under the leadership and for the benefit of the United States, and that Leon Blum, like General de Gaulle, wants to keep France in this imperialist camp. As for the opposing camp, it is not a bloc of States; it is the rallying throughout the world of all the working-class, democratic, and anti-

imperialist forces attached to freedom and peace, with the Soviet Union and the new democracies constituting the powerful base of this anti-imperialist camp.

Guy Mollet criticized us for having chosen among former allies. I replied:

1) It was the Americans who chose Germany in preference to France, by virtue of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan;

2) As for us, without having had to choose, by the very fact that we defend French positions, we have quite naturally remained in the camp in which the Soviet Union is found. Does not history show that it is in the interests of France to be the friend and ally of the Soviet Union?

No, we have not had to choose. From the very first day of its existence, *thirty* years ago, we have been the faithful and unshakable friends of the Soviet Union. We remained friends in difficult hours, and events have proved that we were right. We will remain friends forever, conscious in so doing of serving the inseparable cause of the working class, of the Republic, and of France.

We are not naive enough to be surprised that the repeat-offender, Leon Blum, has resumed his part in the anti-Soviet chorus. For a certain time, when the Soviet armies were deciding the fate of democracy in the world, the Socialist leaders had to soft-pedal their usual campaigns against the Soviet Union. At present, like the dog in the Bible, they are returning to their vomit. They think

* Secretary-general of the Socialist Party of France, and the leader of the pseudo-Left tendency in that party. Ed.

that the moment has arrived for them to cast off their mask of hypocrisy.

THE "THIRD FORCE" MEANS A SPLIT IN THE WORKING CLASS

We are forced to draw the same conclusions in the field of internal politics. On the pretext of maintaining an even balance between the Communist workers and the neofascists in the R.P.F., the Socialist leaders, with Leon Blum in the van, dare to assert that "the Communists would be a danger to our liberties." This is slander pure and simple, which tends to cover up the criminal actions of the plotters of the Blue Plan* and the other Cagouards, to disorient the masses, and to divide the working class whatever the cost, at a time when the reactionary threat is growing.

The Socialist leaders are trying to set themselves up as a "third force." But to check de Gaullism, is it not necessary to forge the unity of all workers and all republicans? Is it not necessary to rally them in a *united front* against reaction and imperialist war?

The "third force" means in reality a split in the working class and a help to the reactionaries. Is it not significant that the "Leftist" Guy Mollet and the "ultra-Leftist" Marcceau Pivert, that perfect type of

Trotskyite demagogue, took the lead in the Socialist-reactionary operations against the Communist municipalities? With amazing cynicism, the Socialist leaders have played the game of de Gaullism, whether they agreed to be elected by the reactionaries or made possible the election of reactionaries. At Choisy-le-Roi, where the Communists had 13 seats out of 27, a Socialist mayor was elected by 10 R.P.F., 2 M.R.P., and 2 Socialist councilmen. The same thing occurred in many other places.

The Socialist leaders have given a slap in the face to the workers and the republicans, who will not forgive them this betrayal of the cause of the working class and democracy. A striking example of this is the action of Julien Benda, who has just joined our Party. After that, the British Laborite Harold Laski can keep on giving us advice and asking us to support the Socialist leaders. He would do better to give advice to his friend Blum. How could the Communists now support the Socialist leaders who are handing over the City Halls of our working-class communities to the reactionaries? Perhaps by opposing the just demands of the workers, or by breaking strikes? In short, by paving the way for fascism?

But Laski is used to pronouncing Leftist phrases that cover up a Rightist policy, like Guy Mollet, who has forgotten his own resolution at the Socialist Congress of Lyons severely criticizing the Ramadier policy of failure, and who now reserves all his

ammunition for the Communists. The Central Committee was right, at its meeting in Aubervilliers last month, to direct its criticism against both the outspoken Right-wingers and the pseudo-Leftists in the Socialist Party. The link between them is apparent. They are united in their adulation of their American masters and their hatred of the Soviet Union. They are united in their policy of dividing the working-class and democratic forces, a policy of openly playing the game of reaction.

And the Socialist leaders dare to pose as victims! The phrase-maker Leon Blum speaks of the "Communist straitjacket," which "his innocence" refuses to wear. Does he think that he can make people forget that, at a time when so many active Communists fought and died in the struggle against Hitler, he was busy writing pages that are an outrage to their memory, a slander of their Party? He was forging new anti-Communist arms for the arsenal of reaction.

It is clear that we cannot rally all the workers, all republicans, for a victorious struggle against the imperialists and their agents without vigorously denouncing the Socialist leaders who have become accomplices and executors of a policy of enslavement of our country, a policy entirely directed against the working masses, for the sole benefit of international reaction.

IV

The sacred task of our French

Communist Party is to grasp in its strong hands, and more firmly than ever, the banner of struggle for the independence and national sovereignty of our country.

In this connection the Manifesto of the Nine Communist Parties declares:

If the Communist Parties stand strongly on their positions, if they do not permit themselves to be frightened or blackmailed, if they stand bravely on guard for the democracy, national sovereignty, freedom, and independence of their countries, if they know how to fight against attempts at the economic and political enslavement of their countries and place themselves at the head of all the forces ready to defend the cause of national honor and independence, then and then only no plans to subjugate the countries of Europe and Asia can succeed.

These past few weeks we have had a new insight into the clamor the reactionaries and Socialist leaders can make in their efforts to intimidate us. What a chorus they sang after the Conference of the Nine Communist Parties!

But we have also shown that, despite the violence of their general attack, we have held fast to our positions and rallied to our banner, which is the banner of France, a majority of the working class and important sections of the peasants, artisans, civil servants, the common people in town and country. One Frenchman in three has voted Communist.

We have shown that our Com-

* At the end of June, 1947, a fascist conspiracy was uncovered in France, organized by monarchists, Vichyites, and members of the prewar fascist Cagouard organization. The "Blue Plan"—master plan of the fascists—was to be put into operation at the end of July, 1947, with the objective of establishing a military-type dictatorship. Ed.

unist Party, the Party of France, is truly capable of uniting, organizing, and leading in struggle against the forces of oppression all the French forces determined to defend national honor and national independence.

OUR SHORTCOMINGS AND WEAKNESSES

Nevertheless, we do not close our eyes to our shortcomings and weaknesses. As disciples of Lenin and Stalin, we examine our own activity from a critical point of view.

"The attitude a political party adopts toward its own mistakes," Lenin wrote, "is one of the most important and surest criteria of the seriousness of the party and of how it fulfils *in practice* its obligations toward its *class* and the toiling *masses*. To admit a mistake openly, to disclose its reasons, to analyze the conditions which gave rise to it, to study attentively the means of correcting it—these are the signs of a serious party; this means the performance of its duties, this means its educating and training the *class*, and then the *masses*." ("*Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder*.)

The Central Committee, at its last meeting, pointed out some gaps and mistakes in the activity of the Party, its various sections, and its members who occupy various posts because the masses have confidence in them.

The root of these errors is to be found in the delay of the Central Committee itself to point out and

clearly define the character and scope of the changes that have occurred in the international situation—particularly the regrouping of the imperialist and anti-democratic forces under the leadership and for the benefit of the United States.

As a result, we did not stress from the very beginning and with the necessary vigor that we were driven out of the Government only at the express orders of the American reactionaries. And we laid ourselves open to the maneuver of Léon Blum and Ramadier, who wanted to make it appear as if the differences involved questions of wages and prices exclusively. We allowed them to put forward what had only been a pretext for getting us out of the Government.

On the other hand, if we were right in denouncing our dismissal from the Government as a violation of the laws of parliamentary democracy—as a new indication of the crisis in bourgeois democracy, which the capitalists throw overboard the minute it can be utilized by the working class—we left the impression that it was a question of a more or less routine cabinet crisis. But it really was a question of the naked intervention of American imperialists into French affairs.

As a result of this initial mistake, we did not from the outset relentlessly unmask the behavior of the Socialist leaders and of the various parties in the Cabinet as an infamous act, a shameful betrayal of national interests.

From this resulted the waverings and the indecision of our group in the National Assembly, criticized by the Central Committee at its last meeting: its abstention instead of its resolutely hostile vote on certain Government bills (measures worsening the lot of the peasants, the Algerian Statute); its insufficient denunciation of the Depreux-Barachin municipal election law, because of the illusions that were fostered with regard to one group or another, without taking into account the new situation in France and in the world.

For a certain time the Party seemed to hesitate in its opposition to a government that so seriously flouts the interests of the country. We appeared sensitive to the squeals of the Socialists and others, who reproached us for wanting to block the grant of American credits and thus "harm" our country—in short, for not acting as patriots. Yet we *alone*, on this problem as on all other questions, have an attitude in absolute conformity with the interests of France. *We alone* behave like patriots passionately devoted to our country.

The hesitations of the Central Committee and our Parliamentary Group harmed, to a certain extent, the rapid mobilization of the working class and democratic masses against the Ramadier Government and its fatal policies. They have fostered opportunist tendencies, condemned last month by the Central Committee, which find expression in

an underestimation of the forces of the working class and in fear of the mass movement. Yet the duty of Communists, in the words of our September resolution, "is to place themselves resolutely at the head of the people's movement, with boldness and a sense of responsibility." And it is the mission of the Communist Party to develop, educate, organize, and guide the movement of the working class and the toiling masses.

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

One may ask, in this connection, if we have been able to draw the lesson from all our past experiences, in order to enlighten the Party and the working class and to educate our cadres seriously. For example, did we sufficiently enlighten the Party and the masses about the defects of the People's Front and the causes of its final collapse, so that we could avoid similar disasters for the workers?

The principal defect of the People's Front, which we ourselves initiated and which did have very positive sides, was that it had become merely *an understanding from the top*. We had called for the democratic election of committees in the factories and neighborhoods. We had called for the holding of a National Congress, composed of delegates elected by people's gatherings from below. The Congress itself was to elect a National Committee charged with seeing to it that the program of the People's Front was

carried out. There were People's Front Committees set up in many factories and neighborhoods; but we did not succeed in overcoming the adamant opposition of the Socialists and of our other partners to these elected committees and to the calling of a National Congress. Little by little, the Socialists and the Radicals drained the People's Front of its content: the fight for bread, peace, and liberty.

Because of the exclusive formula of *understanding from above*, we tolerated in the People's Front the presence of individuals like Daladier and Paul Faure, who only thought of betraying the movement on the first occasion that presented itself. That is why the People's Front was powerless against "non-intervention" in Spain, and against the "breathing-spell"* for which Leon Blum and the Socialist Party took the initiative. That is why the People's Front was powerless against the Munich treason perpetrated by Daladier, with the approval of the Socialist leaders. That is why the People's Front gradually disintegrated and completely fell apart with the approach of war.

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE RESISTANCE MOVEMENT

We said these things and repeated them long before 1939. Did we take them into account when we organ-

* Early in 1937, at the height of the People's Front in France, and while the first Blum government was in office, Léon Blum called for a "breathing spell," a postponement of the enactment of the points of the People's Front program that had not been fulfilled, i.e. for a compromise with finance capital. Ed.

ized and led the Resistance movement? We must recognize that we did not.

We were the first, and for a long time the only one, in the Resistance. For us, the Resistance did not begin on June 18, 1940, but dates from the struggle led by the working class and the republican elements (together with the C.G.T. and the League for the Rights of Man), against "non-intervention," and later against Munich. We continued the French Resistance during the dark period of the "phony war," when Daladier and Bonnet, with the aid of the Socialist Party, struck at our Party, split the trade unions, and tracked down our Party members, in order to clear the path for the armies of Hitler. We were *the first* to engage in the struggle on our national soil for the independence and rebirth of France, at a moment when all the other parties floundered in shame and confusion.

From the first months of 1941, Frenchmen of all opinions and beliefs united in Committees of the National Front, with their flexible and many-sided forms of organization: factory and neighborhood groups, or on the level of professional activity, and then in groups of the *Francs-Tireurs et Partisans Français* (F.T.P.). Socialists, Catholics, and Communists were not in the Committees of the National Front or in groups of the F.T.P. as representatives of their parties or their beliefs; they were there as fighters, struggling effectively against the

German invaders and the Vichy traitors. That was the correct road. We may point out that, having rendered immense services to the cause of liberation, the National Front, by virtue of its roots among the people, has been the only one of the resistance movements that has managed to survive.

Unfortunately, we later agreed to the establishment of the National Council of Resistance on the basis of the direct representation of various parties and groups, as the People's Front had been organized, instead of building it on the basis of committees from below and their military organizations. Worse still, these parties, except for our own, bore a heavy responsibility for France's tragedy; and, besides, their resistance activity was almost non-existent. In fact, these parties and groups and their representatives in the National Council of Resistance thought less about organizing an effective struggle against the invaders than they did about the situation in France right after liberation. In agreement with, and under the leadership of, General de Gaulle, they set up their resistance forces, not against the Germans and the Vichyites, but against the demands that the people of France could not fail to make when liberation came.

General de Gaulle, who orates against political parties, did everything he could to revive certain ones among them in order to oppose them to our party, the Communist Party, the only one that really counted in

the Resistance. Likewise, de Gaulle did everything he could to liquidate the local and district committees of liberation. The Congress of Liberation Committees in the Southern zone, held at Avignon, had opened up such perspectives of national reconstruction and recovery that de Gaulle and the various groups belonging to the Liberation Committees hastened to stifle a movement that frightened them and threatened to sweep over them.

It must be considered as a serious mistake that in the organization and leadership of the Resistance we tolerated the same defects that had proved fatal to the People's Front, and that showed themselves just as pernicious to the movement for national liberation.

More or less camouflaged behind groups belonging to the National Council of Resistance, more or less "whitewashed" or "given clearance" by the Council, the men of reaction have regained their boldness. Again they are in the saddle, as was seen yesterday in the Chamber, during the André Mutter affair. Today, grouped behind de Gaulle, reaction is pursuing its offensive against the working class and against the Republic.

TURN MORE TOWARD THE MASSES!

Our conclusion must be that in order to unite all the workers, all republicans, with a view to defending their immediate interests and their liberties, with a view to resist-

ing new attacks by fascism and to preserving the independence of France, we must turn more toward the masses. We must remember that the united front means action. Conversations and eventual agreements between groups and organizations have no reason for being except insofar as they end in strengthening activity against the enemies of the people and of the Republic.

The positive experience of the National Front can help us in finding new forms for the units and action of the broad masses. Already, in several factories in the Paris area, workers have elected Committees for the Defense of the Republic. It is possible to build similar committees on a neighborhood basis, and to unite all republicans, Communists and Socialists, free-thinkers and Catholics, in order to resist the menace of fascism and to defend against the would-be dictator the Constitution ratified by the people. The workers, the republicans, will understand that "revision" means an assault on the liberties and the social laws favorable to the workers and all the disinherited. General de Gaulle would like to liquidate the nationalization of industries and the shop committees, suppress social insurance, dragoon the trade unions, cheat the working class of its rights, and, in general, rob the French people of the liberties for which so many died a hero's death.

Likewise, we may point out that some groups have made an excellent start in fighting against American

plans to enslave our country and liquidate our nationalized industries. The actors, musicians, and workers in the movie industry have set up a Union for the Defense of the French Cinema. It is possible to conceive of similar movements built up on broad-based committees; for the defense of the French auto industry, or for a serious reconstruction program, which will interest both the small builders and the building-trades workers, technicians and tenants, the homeless and newlyweds looking for a place to live in.

It is a question of uniting all Frenchmen who are conscious of the dangers threatening the Republic and the economic and political independence of France. Unity of the working class, unity between Communist and Socialist workers, must be the basis for this broad republican movement. But that does not mean subordinating the unity of all republicans and patriots to a prior agreement with the Socialist leaders and organizations. The latest events have opened the eyes of a good many workers to the divisive policies of the Socialist leaders. The shocking collaboration between de Gaullists and Socialists in electing mayors and municipal councilmen has enlightened the masses as to the relativity of such notions as *Rightist* and *Leftist* when applied to men who are openly paving the way to reaction.

THE GOVERNMENT THE COUNTRY NEEDS

The most recent declaration of the

pro-fascist General de Gaulle shows that the danger is great. Encouraged and emboldened by the support given him by the Socialist leaders, the would-be dictator demands and threatens. And this is the moment when Leon Blum and Ramadier are widening the gulf among the workers. This is the moment when they claim to be governing both against the de Gaullist plotters and against the honest workers who believe in Communism. In reality, the Ramadier Government, as it has up to now, will bring grist to the mill of de Gaullism and adventurism.

One government alone can force back those who are plotting a *coup d'état* and an imperialist war. That is a government relying boldly on the working people:

A democratic government in which the working class and its Communist Party will finally play a decisive part.

A government that will apply a program corresponding to the aspirations of the working people, that will make the rich pay by means of a genuine tax reform and by requisitioning all French holdings abroad.

A government that will put an end to the inflation, and balance the budget, above all by a large-scale reduction in military expenses—and that is possible by embarking finally on a democratic reorganization of the army and by stopping the criminal war against the people of the Viet-Nam Republic.

A government that will grant the legitimate demands of the workers,

by curtailing capitalist profits and by halting the disastrous rise in prices.

A government that will energetically defend the Constitution and the Republic against the fascist-minded in the R.P.F. and all the plotters grouped behind de Gaulle.

A government that will assure freedom and well-being through work and unity and that will safeguard national independence and sovereignty against the pressure of the American imperialists.

FOR THE FORCES OF THE WORKING CLASS AND OF DEMOCRACY TO WIN

I come to the end of my report. I have not spoken of organizational subjects, which will be the theme of a special report by Leon Mauvais. I will limit myself to insisting, once again, on the special importance of the problem of cadres and leadership at all levels in the Party. This is the moment to show boldness in the choice of cadres, by naming to various functions and to various posts of leadership men and women who know how to act with a spirit of initiative and responsibility, Party members who have given proof of their ability to convince, organize, and lead the masses, proof of their ideological firmness, of their fighting spirit, of their absolute devotion to the cause of the working class and the nation.

More than ever, the Party, its organizations in the factories and villages, and its members must take it upon themselves to defend the de-

mands of all the working people, of the women, and of the youth whom fascism seeks to enlist under its anti-democratic and anti-national standard.

The municipal elections have shown that the forces of domestic and international reaction think that the moment has come for them to launch an open attack on the working class and the Republic.

The imperialists and their agents would like to push forward in their attempt to enslave France and to drag our people along the road of a new imperialist war.

The forces of reaction, of fascism and imperialist war are great and active. But the forces of the working class, of democracy and of peace, in France and throughout the world, are still greater and more powerful. And victory will be theirs if they know how to unite and fight with firmness and tenacity.

"The main danger for the working

class at this moment," says the Manifesto of the Nine Communist Parties, "consists in the underestimation of its own forces and in overestimation of the forces of the imperialist camp."

The Central Committee, our entire Party, and the great number of Frenchmen and Frenchwomen who have just attested, in so stirring a fashion, to their unshakable confidence in us, agree completely with this evaluation. All of us are determined to close ranks and to rally around us, on the basis of our platform of anti-imperialist and democratic struggle, all the patriotic forces of our people.

Our cause is just. It will triumph.

Long live the unity of the workers and democrats in all countries, for the struggle against imperialism and for the triumph of democracy and peace.

Long live France!

Long live the Republic!

STATEMENT ON THE QUESTION OF AFFILIATION TO THE INFORMATION BUREAU OF THE NINE COMMUNIST PARTIES*

NATIONAL BOARD, C.P.U.S.A.*

THE ESTABLISHMENT of an Information Bureau by nine Communist Parties of Europe is of great significance. This provision for a medium through which these Parties can consult, and, if they deem it desirable, coordinate activity, has heartened anti-fascists, anti-imperialists and lovers of peace in every land.

These Communist Parties are the leaders of the working class and peoples of their countries. They are the champions of national freedom, social progress, economic reconstruction, democratic advance and world peace.

Confronted by the Marshall Plan—Wall Street's program for enslaving Europe and the world—it is natural that these Parties should again prove themselves the best champions of the national independence of their own countries, and of the welfare of all freedom-loving peoples.

It is already clear that their joint declaration of views and their forma-

tion of an Information Bureau has everywhere strengthened patriots defending national freedom and the cause of peace, making more effective their resistance to the program of imperialist expansion, intervention and war, of which Wall Street is the chief instigator.

Considering the question of whether or not to seek affiliation to the new Information Bureau, the National Board of the Communist Party has concluded that the present political situation in the United States is such that the Communist Party should not affiliate. The reactionary and pro-fascist forces now whipping up anti-Communist hysteria and war incitement in our country would undoubtedly seize upon such action by the American Communist Party as a pretext for new provocations and repressions against the Communists and all other sections of the American labor and progressive movement.

Since the abandonment of Roose-

* Statement issued on November 2, 1947.

velt's policies at the end of the war, the Communist Party has intensified its struggle against American monopoly's bipartisan preparations for World War III and its reactionary drive against the living standards and democratic rights of the American people. We Communists, together with millions of American workers and progressives, have enlisted for the duration in this struggle to check and defeat Wall Street's drive toward world domination, fascism and war.

In pursuit of its established policy of defending the interests of the American people against the American monopolies and all imperialists, the Communist Party of the United States will continue to promote the international solidarity of labor and all anti-fascists and anti-imperialists. It will continue to advance the cooperation of all peace-loving peoples, and especially the friendship of the American and Soviet peoples, as the main hope of international cooperation for peace among nations.

BOOK REVIEWS

PIONEER OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

By HY GORDON

JOSEPH WEYDEMEYER, by Karl Obermann. International Publishers, New York. 1947. \$1.85.

The book, *Joseph Weydemeyer*, by Karl Obermann, helps fulfill a long-felt need, shedding light on a little known period of Marxist thought and organization. It is an account of the life and activities of the pioneer Marxist organizer and propagandist in America, and it is particularly welcome now as a contribution to the 100th anniversary of Marxism, tracing its American origins.

The author has done a painstaking research job. The scattering of Weydemeyer's articles in short-lived papers and magazines, primarily German, the lack of continuity in Marxist organization, made the job all the more difficult.

The author shows by documentary evidence the struggle of the early Marxists in the United States to end their isolation from the native American workers and to make of theory a lever to set broad American masses in motion. Weydemeyer's fifteen years of activity in the U.S., beginning with his coming to this country in 1851 and ending in his untimely death in 1866

at the age of 48, place him at the head of this struggle.

Weydemeyer emerges as a highly important figure in the development of Marxism in the U.S. A Prussian officer who embraced Communism as a youth, he was associated with Marx and Engels in the Communist League which brought forth the historic *Communist Manifesto*. An old friend of Marx who called him "one of our best people," Weydemeyer published in New York the first edition printed anywhere of Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, and was known as the literary representative of Marx and Engels in America. A Communist and labor organizer; a tactician, student, and lecturer; a heroic soldier in the Civil War, rising to the rank of colonel and retiring as a brigadier general; a county auditor in St. Louis a few months before his death—Weydemeyer stands out as a powerful, integrated Marxist, a man of theory and action.

Unlike the majority of leading German exiles, Weydemeyer never fell victim to doctrinaire, conspiratorial, and sectarian methods of work; nor did he subordinate the interests of the young working class to that of the developing American bourgeoisie.

His was a positive approach to the historical development of capitalism in the United States. In 1852 he stated:

The accumulation of capital is not harmful to society, the harm lies

rather in the fact that capital serves the interests of a few. If the bourgeoisie has fulfilled the first task, it is the task of the proletariat to put an end to this state of affairs which has ended in chaos. (P. 50.)

Weydemeyer rejected the prevalent sectarian approach to bourgeois democracy. He declared:

... the proletariat is the only class in a position to carry forward the entire heritage of the bourgeoisie because its own prosperity is conditioned by the future development of this heritage. It is the last class which will exercise its rule. (P. 46.)

He fought the phrasemongers, the "revolution-makers," the German sects advocating conspiratorial groups and methods of work. He said that their "propaganda only serves publicly to expose the political immaturity of the parties which support them. . . ." And further:

... revolutions are not "made"; on the contrary, they are brought about by the appearance of circumstances over which the individuals have no control. (P. 48.)

He was tireless in the fight against the various petty-bourgeois socialist and anarchist ideologies that plagued the early, immature working-class movement.

At the same time, he fought all those who based all solutions on the growth of universal suffrage. He declared:

... this is indeed the universal panacea for healing all the wounds of the world. . . . But in bourgeois society the basis of universal suffrage

lies in the economic dependence of the voter. . . . (P. 47.)

Weydemeyer made many contributions to the labor movement. On the wave of a big strike movement in the early 1850's, he helped form the American Workers' League. Though composed mainly of German workers, it played a leading role, especially in the labor movement of New York. He emphasized the role of trade unions as unifying, fighting organizations of workers for the improvement of their conditions, and as bulwarks of democracy. He and other Marxists were active in the struggle for the ten-hour day, for limiting child labor, for free education, etc.

The first paragraph of the constitution of the American Workers' League declared that it "strives for the organization of the working class into a closely knit and independent political party in order to achieve and guarantee the rights of the workers" (p. 65). Thus, the independent political role of labor was already stressed in the United States almost a century ago.

The author deals with the role of Marxists in the struggle against slavery. The Communist Club organized by Weydemeyer proclaimed anti-slavery as a main task of the working class. He himself wrote and lectured on the economic basis of slavery. The Communists campaigned for the broadest anti-slavery coalition. They worked to incorporate the German-American labor groups into the general anti-slavery movement, fighting those who called it a betrayal of the special interests of the working class. The German-American labor movement, influenced by the Communists, helped place

an anti-nativism plank (nativism was the anti-foreign-born movement of that day) into the Republican Party platform of 1860. It helped win the nomination for Lincoln and campaigned actively for his election. And three days after the election the *New Yorker Demokrat*, a paper influenced by Weydemeyer, declared:

We have taken part in the campaign . . . because we consider its [the Republican Party] victory a guarantee that still greater victories . . . can be achieved in the future. It is therefore our special task to see to it that what has been achieved with our help is not again undone. . . . (P. 115.)

When the Civil War broke out, Weydemeyer chose Missouri, a border state and a pivotal point in the war, as the field of his activities. He began as an artillery captain. He was active in building fortifications in St. Louis as well as in warfare against Southern guerrillas, and he put to use his political as well as military experience. General Grant, speaking of this pivotal point, said:

There was some splendid work done in Missouri, and especially in St. Louis, in the earliest days of the

war. If St. Louis had been captured by the rebels it would have made a vast difference. (P. 118.)

Weydemeyer played an important part in this campaign, in which he rose to the rank of colonel.

He died in St. Louis, a victim of cholera, on August 20, 1866, the same day that the first National Labor Congress opened its sessions in Baltimore. It was this Congress that founded the National Labor Union—the forerunner of the Knights of Labor, the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O.—and its organization was, in part, the fruit of Weydemeyer's many years of labor.

This book is but a small payment on the great debt owed to Weydemeyer. His unwavering devotion to the cause of the working class, his Marxist understanding of the united front, his contributions to our national freedom in the Civil War, his holding aloft the banner of Socialism—give added courage and determination to all progressives in the great tasks that lie ahead.

It is well to note today that a Liberty Ship called the "Joseph Weydemeyer" was launched in 1944 during the war against fascism. It is a symbol of the century-long Marxist contributions to the true national interests of our country.

Index—Volume XXVI, 1947

AUTHOR INDEX

- Albertson, Albert—Labor Fights Back, September, 826-835.
- Allen, James S.—The Marshall Plan, July, 563-570; The Marshall Offensive for Imperializing the Ruhr, August, 739-750; German Policy of the Marshall Plan, September, 855-864.
- Bary Arthur—The Denver Elections, January, 47-53.
- Berry, Abner W.—The Fourth of July, 1947, July, 571-576.
- Bidien, Charles—Indonesia: Asian New Democracy, September, 813-825.
- Bittelman, Alexander—A Communist Wage Policy, March, 221-238; The Maturing Crisis and the People's Fight against the Monopolies, May, 418-428; Problems of Peace, Democracy, and National Independence (review of "War of Peace with Russia" by Earl Browder), June, 508-519; A Democratic Solution for Palestine, July, 576-585; The Struggle against the Approaching Economic Crisis, September, 836-854; Once More on Wall Street's "Progressive" Role, November, 981-995.
- Clark, Joseph—The Disarmament Question, February, 122-131; The German Problem and Big Three Unity, March, 204-215.
- Communist Party of the United States—Resolution on the Question of Negro Rights and Self-Determination, February, 155-158; United Labor Action Can Halt Reaction (May Day Appeal), May, 387-390.
- C.P.U.S.A., National Board—Statement on the Question of Affiliation to the Information Bureau of the Nine Communist Parties, December, 1947, 1141-1142.
- Davis, Benjamin J., Jr.—Summary Remarks on the Discussion of the Revolution on Negro Rights, January, 59-63; Build the United Negro People's Movement, November, 996-1006.
- Dennis, Eugene—Concluding Remarks on the Plenum Discussion, January, 8-13; The Progressives Can and Must Unite, March, 195-203; American Democracy Must Not Commit Suicide, April, 291-292; Cablegram to Secretary of State Marshall, April, 293-294; The "Foreign Agent" Lie, May, 391-394; Challenge to the Legality of the Thomas-Rankin Committee, May, 395-402; Concluding Remarks on the Plenum Discussion, August, 684-700; Secure These Rights, December, 1947, 1066-1076.
- Digby, Robert—The Second Chronic Crisis in Agriculture, January, 89-96; February, 182-192.
- Editorial—Lenin on the Struggle for Genuine Political Consciousness, January, 3-7; 28 Years: A Record of Service to Labor and the Nation, September, 771-779.
- Foster, William Z.—On the Question of Negro Self-Determination, January, 54-58; On Building a People's Party, February, 109-121; For a Stronger, More Active Communist Party, February, 152-154; The British Empire Communist Conference, April, 302-315; The National Question in Europe, June, 493-498; American Imperialism and the War Danger, August, 675-687; Marxism and American "Exceptionalism," September, 794-812; The Battle for the Youth, October, 867-871.
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley—International Women's Day, 1947, March, 216-220; Hitler's 3K's for Woman—An American Rehash (Review of "Modern Woman—the Lost Sex," by Marynia Farnham), April, 376-384; Sacco and Vanzetti—Twenty Years After, August, 751-757.
- Freeman, Donald—Toward a People's Tax Program, April, 326-358; May, 465-470.
- Gannett, Betty—On a Study of Marxism and Idealism, May, 441-453.
- Gates, John—The 80th Congress and Perspectives for 1948, August, 716-729.
- Gates, Lillian—The People Fight Back for Rent and Housing, April, 316-327.
- Gerson, S. W.—Electoral Coalition Problems in New York, October, 894-901.
- Gomulka, Wladyslaw—People's Democracy: The Way to the Peaceful Development of Poland, April, 328-335.
- Gordon, Hy—Pioneer of American Socialism (Review of "Joseph Weydemeyer," by Karl Obermann), December, 1947, 1143-1145.
- Gordon, Max—Truth and Trickery about High Prices, June, 499-507.
- Gottwald, Klement—The Mission of Czechoslovakia's Young Communists, November, 1947, 1060.
- Green, Gil—The Chicago Elections, December, 1947, 1112-1119.
- Hall, Rob F.—The International Trade Organization, November, 1018-1028.
- Harris, Louis—A Program for Agriculture, October, 910-922.
- Ivanov, S.—The Social-Democratic Parties and Labor Unity, October, 936-949.
- Jerome, V. J.—Restore American-Soviet Cooperation for Peace!, November, 963-971.
- Johnson, Arnold—Less Food—More Profits, November, 972-980; The Special Session, December, 1059-1065.
- Johnson, Howard—The Negro Veteran Fights for Freedom, May, 429-440.
- Kardelj, Edward—Notes on Some Questions of International Development, June, 531-554.
- Kish, Gabe—A Program for Coal, November, 1029-1039.
- Labor Research Association—Economic Review of 1946, January, 80-88; Current Economic Trends, April, 368-375; July, 624-631; October, 950-955.

- Lannon, Al—Lessons of the Recent Maritime Struggles, August, 758-768.
- Lohman, Lloyd—The Oakland General Strike, February, 173-181.
- Lowe, Al—Industrial Health and Safety, March, 278-287.
- Lu Ting-Yi—The Postwar International Situation, March, 239-251.
- Lypin, A. P.—On the Gradual Transition from Socialism to Communism, July, 632-649.
- Magil, A. B. and North, Joseph—The Struggle for the Urban Middle Class, June, 520-530.
- Martel, Harry—A Contribution to the Understanding of Dialectical Materialism (review of "Soviet Philosophy" by John Somerville), June, 555-560.
- Merker, Paul—The Development of the new German Trade Union Movement, April, 359-367.
- Minc, Hilary—Poland's Economy and Socialism, October, 902-909.
- Mindel, J.—Benjamin Franklin, May, 471-480.
- Morris, George—Spotlight on the A.C.T.U., March, 252-263.
- Nelson, Steve—Foster Reports on the New Europe (review of "The New Europe" by William Z. Foster), October, 956-960.
- North, Joseph, and Magil, A. B.—The Struggle for the Urban Middle Class, June, 520-530.
- Phillips, George—American Imperialism and the Colonial World, July, 596-611.
- Remes, Joel—Facts that Expose Fiction (review of "A Guide to the Soviet Union," by William Mandel), July, 650-653.
- Resolutions of the 9-Party Communist Conference, November, 1051-1056.
- Roberts, Joe—The Connecticut Story, April, 336-345.
- Roland, Joseph—An Indispensable Labor Handbook (review of "Labor Fact Book 8," prepared by Labor Research Association), July, 653-656.
- Ross, Nat—What's Happening in the South, July, 612-623; Two Years of the Reconstituted Communist Party in the South, October, 923-935.
- Rowland, Joseph—The Economic Basis of Current U. S. Imperialism Policy, February, 144-151.
- Shaw, Marvin—The Reawakening of the American Student Movement, February, 132-143; Student America Convenes, October, 872-886.
- Stachel, Jack—Foster's Contribution to Trade Union Theory and Practice, July, 586-595; The Third Party Movement in the 1948 Elections, September, 780-793.
- Stalin, Joseph—Stalin's Reply to Professor Razin, May, 416-417.
- Starobin, Joseph—The Brazilian National Elections, March, 269-277; The Truman Doctrine, May, 403-414; The Inter-American Conference, October, 887-893.
- Thompson, Robert—Conclusions from the N. Y. Elections, January, 37-46; Basic Aspects of the Negro People's Struggle, February, 159-172.
- Thorez, Maurice—For the Republic, For National Independence!, December, 1947, 1120-1140.
- Varga, Eugene—The Approach of an Economic Crisis in the Capitalist World, March, 264-268.
- Weinstone, William—Independent Self-Study of Marxism, November, 1040-1046.
- Welss, Max—The Nathan Report, February, 99-108.
- Williamson, John—The Situation in the Trade Unions, January, 20-36; Organic Unity: Next Point on Labor's Agenda, April, 295-301; The Recent Wage Settlements and Labor's Course, June, 483-492; The Taft-Hartley Law and Labor's Tasks, August, 701-715; The Trade Unions and the Negro Workers, November, 1007-1017; The A. F. of L. and C.I.O. Conventions, December, 1947, 1077-1089.
- Winston, Henry—Toward a Party of 100,000, January, 64-79; Not against But with the Stream, August, 730-738.
- Wortis, Rose—Crucial Issues Facing the I.L.G.W.U., May, 454-464.
- Zhdanov, A. A.—On the International Situation, December, 1947, 1090-1111.

SUBJECT INDEX

The following table shows the pages covered by each issue:

1-96, January	561-656, July
97-192, February	673-768, August
193-288, March	769-864, September
289-384, April	865-960, October
385-480, May	961-1056, November
481-560, June	1057-1152, December

Accidents, industrial, 278ff.
 Adhikari, G., 598ff, 606f.
 Agricultural workers, 920.
 Agriculture, Communist program for, 910ff; crisis in, 89ff, 182ff.
 "Amerasia" (periodical), 981ff.
 American "exceptionalism," 794ff.
 American Federation of Labor, and Oakland General strike, 175ff; and Negroes, 34ff;

and Sacco-Vanzetti case, 753f; trade union unity, 295ff; in southern states, 932f; situation in, 27ff; 1947 convention of, 1077ff.
 American imperialism. See U.S. imperialism.
 American Labor Party, 37ff, 894ff.
 American Legion, and Negroes, 433f.
 American Veterans Committee, and Negroes, 435f.
 American Youth for Democracy, 872ff.
 Americans for Democratic Action, 198ff, 882.
 Anglo-American relations. See Great Britain; United States.
 Anti-Sovietism, 243, 964ff, 1102f.
 Argentina, and U.S., 890.
 Armament production, and U.S. economy, 839.
 Arvey, Jack, 1114.

- Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, 252ff.
- Atomic bomb, and disarmament, 129f.
- Australia, and British empire, 306f.
- Automobile industry, Negroes in, 1010.
- Baltimore, elections in, 823.
- Barrows, Adhemar de, 276.
- Ben Gurion, David, 579ff.
- Bevin, Ernest, 739.
- Big Business. See U.S. imperialism.
- Blibo, Theodore, 169.
- Black Belt, defined, 163ff.
- Blum, Leon, 940, 1130f.
- Book reviews. "American Trade Unionism," by W. Z. Foster, 586ff; "A Guide to the Soviet Union," by William Mandel, 650ff; "Labor Fact Book 8," 653ff; "Modern Woman—the Lost Sex," by Ferdinand Lundberg and Marynla Farnham, 376ff; "The New Europe," by W. Z. Foster, 556ff; "Slave and Citizen—the Negro in the Americas," by Frank Tannenbaum, 281ff; "Soviet Philosophy," by John Somerville, 555ff; "Spotlight on Labor Unions," by William J. Smith, 252ff; "War or Peace with Russia," by Earl Browder, 508ff; "Joseph Weydemeyer" by Karl Obermann, 1143ff.
- Bourgeoisie. See Capitalists.
- Brazil, and U.S., 269ff, 892f.
- British empire, outlook for, 314f.
- British Empire Communist Party Conference, 302ff.
- British Labor Party. See Labor Party (Great Britain).
- Browder, Earl, 602ff, 508ff, 808f.
- Buck, Tim, on British empire, 306f.
- Building construction in U.S., 626f.
- Cadres, importance of, 1139.
- Canada, and British empire, 306f.
- Capital formation, rate of, 373f.
- Capitalism, conflicts within, 1092.
- Capitalism, uneven development of, 532f, 1092f. See also Economic crisis; Imperialism; Monopolies; State capitalism.
- Capitalists, divisions among in U.S., 631ff.
- Carey, Homer F., 1116.
- Carroll, John, 47ff.
- Catholic church, and trade unions, 252ff; and French elections, 1123.
- Catholic students, 138ff, 879ff.
- Cavleer, Jesse, 882.
- Chapultepec conference, 889.
- Chicago, elections in, 1112ff.
- Chicago Student Conference, 135f.
- "Chicago Sun," 199f.
- Churchill, Winston, and U.S.S.R., 968.
- Civil rights, battle for, 1064.
- Class collaboration, dangers of, 485.
- Class consciousness, 4f.
- Class conflict, and foreign policy, 685f.
- Clausewitz, Stalin on, 415f.
- Coal industry, program for, 1029ff.
- Coal strikes, 20.
- Colonial countries 511f; and International Trade Organization, 1025ff; Great Britain and, 305f; U.S. imperialism and, 247f, 596ff, 983ff. See also Indonesian republic; India; Philippine Islands; and other specific countries.
- Committee for Maritime Unity, 759f.
- Communism, transition from Socialism, 632ff.
- Communist Information Bureau, 1052ff, 1141f.
- Communist International, results of dissolution, 1109f.
- Communist Parties, tasks of, 1109ff.
- Communist Parties of the British Empire, conference of, 302ff.
- Communist Party of Brazil, 270ff.
- Communist Party of France, mistakes of, 1134ff; Thorez' report to, 1120ff.
- Communist Party of Indonesia, 824.
- Communist Party, U.S.A., and Conference for Progressive Political Action, 110ff; and democratic coalition, 199ff; and Denver election, 51ff; and "exceptionalist" theories, 806f; and fight against monopolies, 811f; and fight on Taft-Hartley Law, 703ff; and mass movement, 737f; and Negroes, 157f, 924f, 1017f; and New York state election, 39ff; and 1948 elections, 729; and Oakland general strike, 179; and Palestine, 583ff; and students, 143; and third party, 7f, 120f, 790f; and trade unions, 25f, 31f, 340f, 592ff, 831; and women, 217ff; anti-monopoly program, 977f; attacks on, 291f, 572ff, 697ff, 723ff, 730ff; Browder's attack on, 514f; building of, 64ff, 152ff, 699ff, 730ff; concentration policy, 69ff; criticism of 80th Congress, 1059ff; in southern states, 622f, 923ff; National Committee meeting (July), 688f; program for agriculture, 910ff; program for economic crisis, 852f; tasks in foreign affairs, 685ff; tasks in South, 933ff; 28th anniversary, 771f.
- Communist youth, in Czechoslovakia, 1047ff.
- Communists, in maritime struggles, 766f.
- Community clubs (in the Party), 73.
- Concentration policy (in Party building), 69ff.
- Conference for Progressive Political Action, 109f.
- Congress of Industrial Organizations, and foreign policy, 1084ff; and Negroes, 1012, 1016; and Oakland general strike, 178f; and trade union unity, 295ff; Association of Catholic Trade Unionists and, 258f; 1947 Convention of, 1077ff; political activity, 5ff; situation in, 693f, 712ff.
- Consumer expenditures, 628ff.
- "Containment" of U.S.S.R. See U.S.S.R.
- Cooperative societies, agricultural, 916f; in Poland, 907ff.
- Corporation profits, 23, 82f, 93, 369, 483f.
- Corporation taxes, 353ff.
- Cost of living, increase in, 84; struggle around, 977f; Congress and, 1065f.
- Crawford, Frederick, 974.
- Crises. See Economic crises.
- Crop insurance, 917.
- Crowley, Wilbur F., 1116.
- Curran, Joseph, 761.
- Cushing, Richard J., 881.
- Czech Social-Democratic Party, 947.
- Czechoslovakia, and Marshall Plan, 739f; national question in, 496f; young Communists in, 1047ff.
- "Daily Forward," 26.
- "Daily Worker," 12ff, 76f.
- Davis, Benjamin, 8f.

- de Gaulle, Charles, 1121ff.
- Democracy, in U.S.S.R., 651f; in U.S., 803f; Marshall's position on, criticized, 293f.
- Democratic coalition, and fight against Taft-Hartley Act, 725f; and Negroes, 17f, 1005; farmers and, 188f; growth of, 791f; in Chicago, 1113ff; in New York State, 894ff; in southern states, 619ff, 932f; must be organized, 811; urgent need for, 195ff; versus monopolies, 976f.
- Democratic coalition, in Chicago, 1113ff.
- Democratic Party, and Taft-Hartley Law, 705; and Denver election, 48f; and Wallace, 72f, 726f; in New York State, 899; record of, 707, 784ff; and Chicago elections, 1114ff.
- Dennis, Eugene, Excerpts from appeal brief, 1066ff.
- Denver, 1946 election in, 47ff.
- Depression. See Economic crises.
- Dialectical materialism, "Soviet Philosophy," by John Somerville, 555ff.
- Dialectics, Marxian and Hegelian, 44f.
- Dictatorship of the proletariat, conditions in which required, 333ff; not aim of Polish government, 328f, 332f.
- Dimitroff, Georgi, on fascist dictatorship, 639f.
- Disarmament, 122ff.
- Discrimination in education, 876f.
- Dubinsky, David, 455ff.
- Dulles, John Foster, 993.
- Dutt, R. Palme, on India, 606; on U.S.-British relations, 309.
- Economic conditions. See U.S., economic conditions.
- Economic crisis, approach of, 18ff, 264ff, 418ff, 1065; trade unions and, 711ff; underconsumption theories, 844ff; ways of fighting, 841ff.
- Education, discrimination in, 876f.
- Elections. See 1946 elections, etc.
- Ella, Roberto, 752.
- Employment, programs for, 852; trend in U.S., 954; see also Unemployment.
- Engels, Frederick, on American "exceptionalism," 805; on economic crises, 843.
- Epistemology, Marxism and, 448f.
- Estate taxes, 356f, 463f.
- Europe, national question in, 493ff.
- "Exceptionalism," American, 794ff.
- Excise taxes, 357f.
- Exports, place in U.S. economy, 628, 838f.
- Factionalism, in trade unions, 336ff.
- Factory councils, in Germany, 365f.
- Farm laborers, 920.
- Farmer-Labor relations, 188f.
- Farmers, and price control, 505f.
- Farmers cooperative societies, 916f; see also Agriculture.
- Farnham, Marynla, "Modern Woman—the Lost Sex" (review), 376ff.
- Fascism, and monopoly, 536ff; destruction not completed, 532; and women, 376ff; and youth, 867f; dangers of in U.S., 688ff.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation, 884.
- Federal-state relationships, and taxation, 369f.
- Finland, and U.S.S.R., 968.
- Food prices, 505.
- Food stamp plan, 920f.
- Food supply, 911f, 972ff.
- Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers, 615ff.
- "Foreign agent" slander, 391ff, 776f.
- Foreign trade, 421ff, 952f.
- Foster, William Z., contributions to trade union work, 586ff; "The New Europe" (review), 956ff.
- Fourth of July, 571ff.
- France, and Marshall Plan, 1107f; and U.S.S.R., 1124f; politics, 1120ff; relations with U.S., 534f; U.S. imperialism and, 1125ff.
- Franklin, Benjamin, 471ff.
- French Socialist Party, 939f.
- Garmatz, Edward A., 828.
- Gaulle, Charles de, 1121ff.
- General Electric Company, 338f.
- General strike, Oakland, California, 173ff.
- Germany, and Big Three unity, 204f; situation in, 860ff; trade unions in, 359ff; U.S. policies in, 745ff, 855ff; weakening of, 1092f.
- Gift taxes, 356ff.
- Googe, George L., 932.
- Grain speculation, 914.
- Great Britain, and Marshall Plan, 1107f; and Truman doctrine, 410f; economic difficulties, 303ff; relations with U.S., 308ff, 607ff, 677f, 858.
- Greece, U.S. policy in, 405f, 746f.
- Gromyko, A. A., and Palestine, 577ff.
- Hacker, Louis M., 805.
- Hartley-Taft law. See Taft-Hartley law.
- Healey, Denis, 338.
- Health conditions in industry, 278ff.
- Hegelian dialectics, 44f.
- Hoover, Herbert, and Truman doctrine, 993.
- Hoover, J. Edgar, 752.
- Holland. See Netherlands.
- Hours of labor, relation to accidents, 279f.
- Housing, and economic crisis, 848; fight for, 316ff, 978; for Negroes, 997f; see also Building construction.
- Idealism, and Marxism, 441ff.
- Imperialism, and colonial peoples, 511f; and national question, 494f; see also Monopolies; U.S. imperialism.
- Imports, and U.S. economy, 838f.
- Income taxes, 346ff.
- Independence Day. See Fourth of July.
- India, independence movement in, 598, 606f.
- Indonesian republic, 597, 600f, 813ff, 821ff.
- Industrial accidents, 278ff.
- Industrial clubs (in the Party), 70ff, 735.
- Intellectuals, role in U.S., 525f.
- Inter-American Conference, 887ff.
- International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 156f.
- International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 454ff.
- International relations, disarmament and, 122ff; Germany and, 204ff; in postwar period, 239ff; nine-party conference on, 1053ff; postwar situation in, 1090ff; recent developments in, 521ff; review of "War or Peace with Russia," by Earl Browder, 508ff; see also Marshall plan; Truman doctrine; U.S. imperialism.
- International Socialist Conference, sixth, 936ff.

- International trade, 421ff, 936.
 International Trade Organization, 1018ff.
 International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, 336ff.
 International Union of Students, 134f, 878f.
 International Women's Day, 216ff.
 Investments, private, 951f.
 Italian Socialist Party, 939, 942ff.
- Jaffe, Philip, 981ff.
 James, Daniel, 436.
 Japan, working-class activity in, 598.
 Junkers, role of, 206f.
- Kautsky, Benedikt, 941f.
 Knowledge, theory of, 448.
 Korea, independence movement in, 599.
- Labor's Educational and Political League, 1080.
 "Labor Fact Book 8" (review), 663ff.
 Labor-Management Relations Act. See Taft-Hartley Act.
 Labor movement, and youth, 868f; struggle for political consciousness, 3ff.
 Labor Party (Great Britain), 811f, 937f.
 Labor Party of Indonesia, 823f.
 Labor productivity, in coal industry, 1030; increase in, 5f, 22; in U.S.S.R., 639f.
 Labor's Non-Partisan League, 5f.
 Land question, in southern states, 620f.
 Laski, Harold, 1132
 Latin-America, and U.S. Imperialism, 887ff.
 Left opportunism, 235ff, 343f, 763.
 Lenin, V. I., and struggle for political consciousness, 3ff; and theory of knowledge, 444, 451f; on crises, 844ff; on imperialist control of small countries, 604ff; on monopolies, 987; on self-criticism, 1134; on Soviet relations with capitalist states, 964, 966, 970; opinion of Clausewitz, 415ff.
 Lewis, John (British philosopher), 441ff.
 Lewis, John L., 1938, 1081.
 Local taxes, 469.
 Lockout, in shipping industry, 759.
 Lovestone, Jay, 806.
 Loyalty oath order, 689.
 Lundberg, Ferdinand, "Modern Woman—the Lost Sex" (review), 376ff.
 Lynchings, 612ff, 937.
- McLaughlin, Martin, 881.
 Mandel, William, "A Guide to the Soviet Union" (review), 650ff.
 Mao Tse-tung, on international situation, 239f.
 Maritime industry, struggles in, 758ff.
 Marshall, George, position on democracy criticized, 293f.
 Marshall plan, 563ff; aims of, 679ff, 739ff, 969; and Germany, 865ff, 982f; main features of, 1104ff.
 Marx, Karl, on capitalist production, 237; on economic crises, 843.
 Marxism, and idealism, 441ff.
 Marxism-Leninism, and American "exceptionalism," 794ff; what to study on, 1040ff; see also Communism; Dictatorship of the proletariat; Imperialism; Socialism.
 Materialism, and idealism, 442ff.
 May Day, Appeal by Communist Party, 387ff.
 Middle classes, struggle for, 520ff; trade unions and, 488f.
- Militarism, in U.S., 717f.
 Military science, Stalin on, 415ff.
 Military training, 1063.
 Mississippi, suffrage limitations in, 1073ff.
 Missouri Valley Authority (proposed), 919.
 Mollet, Guy, 1131.
 Molotov, V. M., 743.
 Money, role in Socialist society, 645f.
 Monopolies, and agriculture, 184ff; and economic crisis, 418ff; and fascism, 536ff; and price control, 504f; attack Communist Party, 772f; distort rate of profit, 102f; growth of, 974f; ideological attack of, 526ff; in Germany, 207ff; program of, 425ff, 702ff; public ownership of, 852.
 Morgan banking group, and Truman doctrine, 992f.
 Murray, Philip, 693f, 979, 1013, 1086f.
- Nathan report, 22ff, 99ff, 101f, 223ff.
 National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 883.
 National Association of Real Estate Boards, 323f.
 National City Bank, 105ff.
 National income, changes in, 369f.
 National Intercollegiate Christian Council, 883.
 National Labor Relations Board, 828f.
 National Maritime Union, 758ff.
 National question, 9f, 54f, 166f; in Europe, 493ff; see also Negro question.
 National Student Association, 872ff.
 Nationalization of coal industry, 1032; of food industries, 916; of industry, 423f; of railroads, 914f.
 Negro question, Benjamin Davis on, 59ff; Dennis on, 8ff; National Committee resolution on, 155ff; results of correct understanding of, 928; Robert Thompson on, 159ff; Wm. Z. Foster on, 54ff.
 Negro veterans, 429ff.
 Negro women, 998.
 Negro youth, 998.
 Negroes, and Communist Party, 157f, 924f, 1017f; and Oakland general strike, 179; and third party, 1002; denial of voting right to, 1071f; distortion of history of, 381ff; in Chicago elections, 1117; in trade unions, 34ff, 615ff, 714, 1005, 1007ff; political activity, 723; special problems in South, 917f; unemployment among, 997, 1010; worsened condition of, 996ff; see also lynching.
 Neighborhood clubs (in the Party), 73.
 Nenni, Pietro, 942ff.
 Netherlands, drive against Indonesian republic, 814ff.
 New Committee for Publications, 235ff.
 New Deal, and capitalist crisis, 148ff.
 "New Masses," achievements of, 520ff.
 New York State Industrial Union Council, 898.
 New York State, 1946 elections in, 37ff; and 1948 elections, 894ff.
 Nine-Party Communist conference, resolutions of, 1051ff.
 1946 election, Communist Party and, 10; in Denver, 47ff; in New York state, 37ff; results of, 718.
 1948 elections, and third party, 113f, 316ff, 695ff, 780ff; and New York State, 894ff; Communist Party and, 1063ff; 80th Congress and, 716ff; Negroes and, 1005; Philip Jaffe's position criticized, 995.

- Oakland, California, election in, 722; general strike in, 173ff.
 Obermann, Karl, "Joseph Weydemeyer" (review), 1143ff.
 Occupational disease, 278ff.
 October revolution, 963ff; see also U.S.S.R.
 Opportunism, dangers of, 234ff, 342ff; see also Left sectarianism; Right opportunism.
- Palestine, democratic solution for, 576ff.
 Pan-American Union, 495.
 "Parity" prices, 913.
 People's Front (in France, 1936), weakness of, 1135ff.
 People's Party. See Third Party.
 Petropolis conference, 887ff.
 Philippine Islands, 602.
 Poland, democracy in, 328ff; economy of, 902ff.
 Polish Socialist Party, 946f.
 Political consciousness, Lenin and struggle for, 3ff.
 Political parties. See Democratic Party; Communist Party; Republican Party; Third Party.
 Pollitt, Harry, 307.
 Prestes, Luis Carlos, 274ff.
 Price control, 861f.
 Prices, trend in, 82ff; truth and trickery about, 499ff.
 Productivity of labor. See Labor productivity.
 Profit-sharing, 253f.
 Profits, relation to wages, 228f; see also Corporation profits.
 Progressive Party (Chicago), 1112ff.
 Progressives, can and must unite, 195ff.
 Public ownership, 852; see also Nationalization of industry.
 Pure Food and Drug act, 915.
- Race, concept of, 56f, 164f.
 Railroads, public ownership of, 914f.
 Rankin Committee. See Un-American Activities Committee.
 Rankin, John E., 1076.
 Rate of profit, effect of monopolies on, 102.
 Real estate taxes, 466f.
 Real wages, decline in, 371f, 978.
 Realism, Lenin on, 444ff.
 Red-baiting, and anti-Negro activities, 1001; and third party, 118f; "foreign agent" charge, 391ff; in trade unions, 339f; results of, 683f.
 Relativism, and theory of knowledge, 448f.
 Rent control, 316ff, 978.
 Republican Party, and Chicago elections, 1114ff; and price control, 500f; must be exposed, 728f; record of, 707, 783.
 Retail prices, 630.
 Retail trade, decline in, 371f.
 Reunion of the French People, 1121ff.
 Revisionism, 153f, 808f. See also American "exceptionalism."
 Revolutionary war, Benjamin Franklin and, 472f.
 Reynolds, R. J. Co., strike against, 615ff, 927.
 Right opportunism, 225ff.
 Rio de Janeiro conference, 887ff.
 Rocky Mountain Council, 48f.
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., foreign policy of, 985f.
- Roth, Almon E., 759.
 Ruhr valley, 745ff, 855ff, 1124.
 Romanian Social-Democratic Party, 947f.
- Sacco-Vanzetti case, 751ff.
 Sales taxes, 468.
 Salsedo, Andreo, 752.
 Saragat, Giuseppe, 939.
 School lunch program, 921.
 Sectarianism, struggle against, 692f, 736f.
 Segregation in education, 876f.
 Self-criticism, Lenin on, 1134.
 Self-determination of nations, 9f, 54ff, 166f, 493ff.
 Seniority, and coal miners, 1034; and Negro workers, 169f, 1011f.
 Share-cropping system, 155ff, 918.
 Shipping industry, struggles in, 758ff.
 Shop clubs (in the Party), 70ff, 735f, 738.
 Shop committees. See Factory councils.
 Slavery, Benjamin Franklin and, 473f.
 Smith, William J., "Spotlight on Labor Unions" (review), 252ff.
 Snow, Edgar, 205.
 Social-Democracy, and labor unity, 936ff; and Negroes, 1003f; and third party, 780ff; in France, 1128ff; nine-party conference on, 1054f.
 Social-Democratic Party of Czechoslovakia, 947.
 Social-Democratic Party of Romania, 947f.
 Social insurance taxes, 465f.
 Socialism, economic characteristics of, 902ff; transition to Communism, 632ff.
 Socialist Party of France, 939f.
 Socialist Party of Indonesia, 824.
 Socialist Party of Italy, 939, 942ff.
 Socialist Party of Poland, 946f.
 Socialist Unity Party (Germany), program of, 211f.
 Somerville, John, "Soviet Philosophy," (review), 555ff.
 Southern states, Communist Party in, 923ff; new developments in, 612ff, 932f.
 Speed-up, 279f, 484.
 Stalin, Joseph, on Capitalist-Socialist relations, 970; on economic crises, 848f.
 State capitalism, 903f.
 Steel industry, Negro employment in, 1011.
 Strikes, in tobacco industry, 615ff, 927; see also General strikes; Lockouts.
 Student League for Industrial Democracy, 882.
 Student movement, 132ff, 872ff.
 Students for Democratic Action, 882.
 Sulzberger, C. L., 964ff.
- Taft-Elliender-Wagner Housing Bill, 324f.
 Taft-Hartley Act, 691f, 701ff, 764, 826ff, 1077f, 1080f, 1082f.
 Taft, Robert A., and price control, 501f.
 Talmadge, Herman, 928.
 Tannenbaum, Frank, "Slave and Citizen—the Negro in the Americas" (review), 381ff.
 Taxation, people's program for, 346ff, 465ff.
 Third party, and Democratic Party, 726ff; and Marshall plan, 749f; and Negroes, 1002; and 1948 elections, 113f, 516f, 695f, 780ff, 898; and youth, 871; building of, 109ff; indispensability of, 7; initiation of, 11ff; trade union unity and, 117f, 707f, 789f.

- Thomas-Rankin Committee. See Un-American Activities Committee.
- Trade union unity, and democratic coalition, 198; and fight on Taft-Hartley law, 706ff, 829f; and third party, 117f, 707f, 733f; in 1948 elections, 694f; maritime unions and, 765f; next task for labor, 295ff; progress toward, 489ff; question of organic unity, 831f; urgency of, 32ff, 87f.
- Trade Union Unity League, 591.
- Trade unions, and 80th Congress, 1061f; and industrial safety, 281f; and Negroes, 34ff, 615ff, 714, 1005, 1007ff; Communist Party and, 26ff, 31ff, 340f, 592ff, 831; and struggle against Taft-Hartley Act, 691f, 701ff, 764, 826ff; and Truman doctrine, 725f; and youth, 871; Foster's contribution to, 586ff; factionalism in, 336ff; in Germany, 359ff; political activity, 4ff; recent wage settlements by, 483ff; situation in, 20ff. See also names of specific federations and unions.
- Truman administration, abandons Roosevelt policies, 782f; hostile to labor, 991f; record of, 784ff.
- Truman doctrine, 403ff; alternatives to, 989ff; and Marshall Plan, 563ff; essential features of, 1103f; implications of, 679; trade unions and, 725f; see also Marshall Plan; U.S. imperialism.
- Truman, Harry S., and price control, 499, 502f; and Taft-Hartley law, 705; Browder's opinion of criticized, 615f; illusions concerning, 1060f.
- Un-American Activities Committee, anti-Negro activities, 1000; Dennis brief on, 1066ff; Dennis challenge of, 305ff.
- Underconsumption theories, 844ff.
- Unemployment, among Negroes, 997; Census Bureau figures criticized, 372f; in U.S., 839, 955; trade unions and, 715.
- Unemployment insurance, Negroes and, 430ff; taxes, 465f.
- Uneven development of capitalism, 632f, 1092f.
- Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and disarmament, 126f; and France, 1124f; and Germany, 205ff, 213ff; and Marshall Plan, 565ff, 740ff, 1108f; "containment" of, 963ff; development contrasted with that of Poland, 329ff; foreign policy, 1053f, 1097f; growing prestige of, 1091ff; industrial development in, 859f; international position of, 249f; relations with U.S., 608ff, 963ff; review of "A Guide to the Soviet Union," by William Mandel, 650ff; transition from Socialism to Communism, 622ff; women in, 219f; see also Anti-Sovietism.
- United Automobile Workers of America, 1947 convention of, 1088f.
- United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, factionalism in Connecticut local, 336ff.
- United front, tactic of, 692ff; against U.S. imperialism, 248.
- United Harlem Consumers' and Tenants' League, 831f.
- United Mine Workers of America, 16f, 832ff, 1034.
- United Nations, Truman doctrine and, 406ff.
- United Negro and Allied Veterans of America, 434ff, 438ff.
- United States, American "exceptionalist" theories, 794ff; and Brazil, 892f; and Germany, 745ff, 857f; and Great Britain, 308ff, 677f, 607f, 858, 533ff; and Soviet Union, 608ff, 963ff; Congress, 716ff, 783; Department of Agriculture, 184f; economic conditions, 80ff, 99ff, 221ff, 265f, 368ff, 418ff, 624ff, 836ff, 950ff; foreign policy, 981ff; see also Democratic coalition; 1946 elections; 1948 elections; Marshall Plan; monopolies; Third Party.
- U.S. Congress, 1059ff.
- U.S. imperialism, aims of, 563ff, 608ff, 676, 866f, 982ff, 1054f, 1099ff; and agriculture, 185f; and colonial people, 247f, 596ff, 1025ff; and economic crisis, 810; and food problems, 972ff; and France, 1125ff; and International Trade Organization, 1018ff; and Latin America, 887ff; and war danger, 675ff; and youth, 869; anti-Negro activities, 998f; economic basis of, 144ff; historical development, 796ff; importance of fight against, 971; obstacles to, 678f, 688ff; role of, 241ff; problems of, 1093ff; special characteristics of, 512ff; Truman Doctrine and, 403ff.
- United States of Europe (proposed), 495.
- Vanzetti, Bartolomeo, 751ff.
- Vargas, Getulio, 270ff, 277.
- Veterans, housing problem of, 325f; in colleges, 133ff.
- Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Negroes, 433f.
- Wage labor, Benjamin Franklin on, 476f.
- Wages, and crises, 847f; Communist policy on, 221ff; decline in real, 371f; in U.S., 839f; Nathan report on, 103f; new demands, 21f; recent settlements, 483ff; relation to profits, 228f; see also real wages.
- Wagner-Blender-Taft housing bill, 321f.
- Wallace, Henry, on Democratic Party, 932; popular support for, 720f, 897ff.
- War danger, U.S. imperialism and, 675ff.
- Washington disarmament conference (1921-22), 122f.
- Wason, Robert, 975f.
- Weydemeyer, Joseph, 1143ff.
- White chauvinism, struggle against, 924.
- Wholesale prices, 82f, 630.
- Winston-Salem, N. C., 722.
- Women, in U.S.S.R., 219f; International Women's Day, 216ff; review of "Modern Woman—the Lost Sex," by Lundberg and Farnham, 376ff.
- "Worker," building of, 76f.
- Working class, main enemies of, 310f; political outlook in U.S., 801ff; role in U.S., 571ff, 733f; task in Germany, 210f.
- World Congress of Students, 134f.
- World Federation of Trade Unions, 33f.
- World politics, see international relations.
- Youth, battle for, 867ff; in Czechoslovakia, 1047ff; see also student movement.
- Yugoslavia, national question in, 497f.
- Zionists, and Palestine, 579ff.

LITERATURE AND ART

By KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS

The first collection in English of the writings of Marx and Engels on the foundations of a Marxist approach to art. Selections are included on such subjects as the origins and development of art, art in capitalist society, realism in art, and literary history.

Required reading for an understanding of Marxist esthetics.

Price: \$1.85

ART AND SOCIETY

By SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

A new kind of book about literature, music, and painting, a vigorous and original study of the social roots of art, the germinating power of folk art, form and content, the artist and his audience, main currents in the history of art, and the struggle for a living culture.

Price: \$2.75

A MARXIST APPROACH TO CULTURE IN A CHANGING WORLD

By V. J. JEROME

An incisive study of the ideological struggle in the cultural sphere, including a critical examination of reactionary ideas advanced by various exponents of bourgeois ideology, the people's counter-forces moving toward a democratic culture, and the special role of Marxist cultural workers.

Price: \$3.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York 3, N. Y.

HOW SHOULD MARXISTS TACKLE THE CHRISTMAS GIFT PROBLEM?

We don't pretend to know *all* the answers. But we do want to offer *one* solution—a combined annual subscription to POLITICAL AFFAIRS and MAINSTREAM. Think about it any way you like, examine the idea from every possible angle, and you are bound to conclude that *this is it!*

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is a monthly magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. Single copies are 25¢, subscription price \$2.50, a saving of half a dollar to subscribers. A year's issues give you 1152 pages of the best Marxist thought and opinion on world political events and issues as they develop.

MAINSTREAM is the new Marxist literary quarterly that made such a stir this year. Starting in 1948, single copies will be 60¢, subscription price remains \$2.00, a saving of 40¢ to subscribers. A year's issues give you 512 pages of stories, essays, poems, communications, by the foremost American and foreign writers and artists.

Talk about cultural values! For \$4.50 you can send these two magazines to someone you like for a whole year, and to our way of thinking this is the nicest way of telling that person that you know he or she is interested in things that really matter. It is a gift in supreme good taste and, withal, kind both to your friends and to your purse. Just think—1,664 pages of top-notch political and cultural articles for barely the price of a novel!

Act now. Send in your list of gift subs with check or money order to cover and we will do the rest. Incidentally, we will be glad to send the recipients of your gift a special card informing them that you are the donor.

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York 3, N. Y.