

Political Affairs

25¢

AUGUST

1948

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF AMERICAN IMPERIALIST EXPANSION

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE YUGOSLAV LEADERS ON THE PATH OF BETRAYAL

V. J. JEROME

THE NEW STATE OF ISRAEL

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

GIL GREEN • CLAUDIA JONES • FRED FINE
PETTIS PERRY • GEORGE MORRIS • MARVIN SHAW

PEOPLE'S VICTORY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

by Walter Storm

An eye-witness account of the February event in Czechoslovakia by the well known foreign correspondent.

A day-by-day account of the seven-day crisis with full reporting on the principal meetings, mass demonstrations, and speeches in Prague and throughout the country.

Storm had been living in Czechoslovakia for over a year before these stirring days and his account is full of his talks with workers, with housewives, youth, and with all the flavor of on-the-spot reporting.

The People's Victory in Czechoslovakia gives the truth about a most important event, a truth that American newspapers have tried desperately to conceal.

PRICE: \$.25

LINCOLN'S THIRD PARTY

by Elizabeth Lawson

Here is a historical study to fill an important gap in American history, and to provide pointed lessons for the third-party movement today.

Lincoln's Third Party describes the formation and building of the Republican Party, and the political and economic conditions which enabled its growth in six years from a handful of supporters to a party which succeeded in electing its candidate—Abraham Lincoln—to the presidency of the U.S.A.

PRICE: \$.20

THE PALMER RAIDS

Prepared by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Based on an exhaustive study of contemporary documents and reports, this book throws a searching light on the present reactionary drive spearheaded by the Un-American Committee against civil liberties. It includes an exposé of the sinister role of J. Edgar Hoover.

PRICE: \$.30

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

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

V. J. JEROME, *Editor*

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

VOLUME XXVII, NO. 8

Contents

AUGUST, 1948

Specific Features of American Imperialist Expansion	William Z Foster	675
Resolution of the Information Bureau Concerning the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia		690
Statement on the Information Bureau Resolution Concerning the Situation in the C.P. of Yugoslavia	William Z. Foster & Eugene Dennis	699
The Yugoslav Leaders on the Path of Betrayal	V. J. Jerome	701
The "Grand" Old Party	Max Gordon	711
The New State of Israel	Alexander Bittelman	720

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

A Few Thoughts on Our Perspectives	Gil Green	731
For New Approaches to Our Work Among Women	Claudia Jones	738
Against Opportunism in Practice	Fred Fine	743
National Group Work in California	Pettis Perry	749
The Menace of Social-Democracy and Our Fight Against Opportunism	George Morris	756
On the Party's Responsibility for Work Among the Youth	Marvin Shaw	763

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

205

RECENT PAMPHLETS

♦ ♦ ♦

WOMAN AGAINST MYTH <i>by Betty Millard</i>	\$.10
BEWARE OF THE WAR DANGER! STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN! <i>by William Z. Foster</i>	.03
THE MARSHALL PLAN — RECOVERY OR WAR? <i>by James S. Allen</i>	.15
MURDER, INC., IN GREECE <i>by Olive Sutton</i>	.05
THE CRIME OF EL FANGUITO, AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN ON PUERTO RICO <i>by William Z. Foster</i>	.03
THE THIRD PARTY AND THE 1948 ELECTIONS, <i>by Eugene Dennis</i>	.15
NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE'S 23 QUESTIONS ABOUT THE COMMUNIST PARTY ANSWERED <i>by William Z. Foster</i>	.10
JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION, CITIZENS AND BUILDERS <i>by Paul Novick and J. M. Budish</i>	.15

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York City 3

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF AMERICAN IMPERIALIST EXPANSION

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

I.

AMERICAN capitalism, contrary to widespread capitalist denials, is imperialist in the fullest sense. Lenin in his great work, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, made the classical analysis of imperialism, which fits American capitalism precisely. Thus, American imperialism is characterized by (a) concentration of industry and banking; (b) the dominance of finance capital; (c) a vast export of capital; (d) participation in the economic division of the world, and, (e) in the territorial division of the world. Besides these basic aspects, characteristic generally of imperialism, American imperialism also has its own special secondary features. These features are influenced by the relative strength and specific position of American capitalism, by the resistance of other peoples and countries to American penetration, by the general status of the world capitalist system, and by numerous other factors. The specific features of American imperialism are of great importance and they contribute significantly in determining the general perspective of the United States and the world. Let us, therefore, after outlining some of the broader characteristics of the present expansion of American capitalism, point out those special forces tending

either to facilitate or to defeat this American expansionist drive.

1) *The wide scope of American imperialist conquests:* Through military occupation during the latter phases of the war and through the broad extension of its general world influence since the end of armed hostilities, the United States has built up by far the biggest empire in the history of the world. The combined war conquests of Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito did not equal those of Wall Street. Thus, the United States holds Japan and Western Germany under its complete domination; it has reduced the weakened British Empire to the status of a minor partner in the Anglo-American imperialist combination; it holds the sixteen so-called Marshall Plan nations of Western Europe, including France and Italy, on its financial dole; it has greatly tightened its grip upon the countries of Latin America; it holds the Chiang Kai-shek Government of China in the position of a puppet; and it has greatly extended its influence in the British Dominions and in many colonial and semi-colonial countries. Never before has there been such a wide and rapid imperialist expansion as that of the United States during the past five years.

2) *The specific American forms of imperialist domination:* Because the United States, unlike Great Britain and France, has not developed an extensive system of outright colonies, especially after its victory in the war, capitalist apologists are loudly asserting that this country is not an imperialist power. Browder even uses this argument to "prove" that American capitalism is progressive. This is one of the Hitler Big Lies of the present period—the denial of the imperialist character of the United States. In reality, our country is the biggest and strongest imperialist country in world history.

The capitalist defenders of Wall Street's conquests, in denying that the United States is imperialist, limit the concept of imperialism to outright colonialism. But Lenin did not. He clearly and correctly saw various degrees of control over weaker countries by strong imperialist powers. In his work, *Imperialism*, he spoke of "transitional forms" of dependency:

Since we are speaking of colonial policy in the period of capitalist imperialism, it must be observed that finance capital and its corresponding foreign policy, which reduces itself to the struggle of the Great Powers for the economic and political division of the world, give rise to a number of *transitional* forms of national dependence. The division of the world into two principal groups—of colony-owning countries on the one hand and colonies on the other—is not the only typical feature of this period; there is

also a variety of forms of dependence; countries which, formally, are politically independent, but which are, in fact, enmeshed in the net of financial and political dependence. . . *

American imperialism, far more than the older imperialism of Great Britain, France, Holland, etc., makes use of these "transitional forms" which Lenin here deals with. Thus, throughout its farflung sphere of influence, American imperialism employs various means, short of actually establishing colonies, for consolidating its control and exploitation. In Latin America it intensifies its imperialist grip through military bases, economic privileges, standardization-of-arms agreements, semi-puppet governments, etc. In France and Italy it threatens the national independence of these countries, and dictates who shall or shall not be in the government (expulsion of the Communists). In Great Britain, it boldly halts the movement for the nationalization of the steel industry, and lays down conditions for the world trade of that country. In Greece, Turkey, and Kuomintang China it arrogantly orders the dependent governments about like lackeys. In Western Germany and Japan it acts as the sole master in the house. As fast and as far as American imperialism spreads its tentacles, its whole tendency is, in the basic spirit of colonialism, to force the subjugated peoples to subordinate their economies and their political independence to the will of the

* V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, International Publishers, p. 85.

United States, while at the same time it generally leaves them a thin pretext of political independence. But, as we shall see, this is meeting with powerful and effective resistance.

3) *American imperialism's boundless objectives:* German fascist imperialism did not possess the same seeming advantages for pressing its drive for world domination as does the United States. When the Hitlerites launched World War II there still was, in the capitalist sector of the world, a powerful Japan, Britain, and United States — major world powers. The Hitler ambition for world domination was thus faced with powerful obstacles—apart from the U.S.S.R.—that had to be overcome.

American imperialism, to the contrary, sees no such obstacles within the capitalist world. It therefore lacks all restraint in its wild dream of complete and sole world domination. It is determined to rule alone, with other leading capitalist states relegated to minor satellite roles, if not reduced practically to the position of colonial possessions of the U.S.

Indeed, the United States has already succeeded in establishing, in varying degrees, its domination over the countries making up the capitalist world. This, Hitler was never able to do. The United States, already largely dictating the course of capitalist world economic affairs and generally controlling a subservient majority of votes in the United Nations, is recognized universally as far and away the strongest capitalist

world power. What it is striving to accomplish now are the strategic aims of further consolidating its world capitalist leadership and of transforming the more or less subordinate capitalist countries into an active military alliance, under its leadership and directed against the Soviet Union. The central objective of American imperialism is to be the supreme world master, and in order to accomplish this end it is preparing to deluge the world in the blood of another great war. But as we shall see, it is, like Hitler, overreaching itself, for its grandiose objective is unrealizable.

4) *Special American imperialist ideological camouflage:* The United States is covering up its determined drive for imperialist world control with a blanket of hypocritically disarming pretenses, especially adapted to deceive the American and world democratic masses. Hitler, during the recent expansionist drive of German imperialism, boldly glorified war. He stated that he was out to shatter the Versailles Treaty and to conquer what he called *Lebensraum* for the German people at the expense of other nations. Although his program was very thinly veiled with slogans of defense and of his bastard National Socialism, it was transparently one of ruthless imperialist world conquest.

But the American imperialists are more discreet in proclaiming their aims. They speak in the name of democracy and of the defense of world peace. With industries far stronger than those of anyone else, they are

vociferous defenders of "free enterprise," "free trade," and "free competition." They also talk, tongue in cheek, of America's "moral world leadership." This leadership, allegedly forced upon their "unwilling" capitalist shoulders, they claim they are carrying out for the benefit of all the world (except, naturally, American Big Business). These democratic and pacifistic pretenses are, of course, merely a tipping of the hat to the deeply ingrained democratic and anti-militaristic sentiments of the American people. They are also calculated to allay the lively suspicions of the war-weary masses of the world, who have just had such bitter experiences with another set of would-be world conquerors. In our imperialist country, only the less skillful capitalist demagogues speak openly of American world domination. At the recent Republican Convention, Herbert Hoover characteristically expressed in the following words the self-righteous, sentimental slobber that is generally being used to obscure the expansionist program of American imperialism:

In these thirty years of wars we alone have taken no people's land; we have oppressed no race of man. We have faced all the world in friendship, with compassion, with a genuine love and helpfulness for our fellow men. In war, in peace, in disaster, we have aided those whom we believed to be in the right and to require our aid, foe as well as ally. . . . We have hated war; we have loved peace.

5) *The American path to fascism:* American reactionaries are also de-

veloping a different route to fascism than that followed by Hitler's imperialists; it is American imperialism's specific way. They are not organizing a fascist party and plumping for a one-party system; although there is less and less difference between their two big parties. Also, they do not definitely fulminate against democracy and parliamentary government, as Hitler and his protagonists did, but, instead, glibly defend it in words. Likewise, although advocates of Anglo-Saxon superiority and of "white supremacy," they do not as openly advocate the Hitlerian doctrine of the "master race." Also they do not (as yet) openly legislate "Nuremberg laws" against the Jews, nor do they propagate a vague "new order" to take the place of capitalism. In short, they have no elaborated body of fascist "theory."

Nevertheless, American imperialism, under pseudo-democratic slogans, is definitely pressing in the direction of fascism at home and abroad. All over the world the agents of the U.S. State Department have as their close allies (together with reactionary Social-Democrats and clericals) various fascist groupings and individuals. Wherever they can, they are establishing ultra-reactionary governments, of the type of Greece and Kuomintang China. And all this, they are doing in the name of a crusade against Communism and for world democracy.

In this country, under similar democratic slogans, they are building up a whole body of national

legislation and persecutions of a definitely fascist character. This internal fascist development expresses itself through such developments as the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Taft-Hartley Law, the Mundt Bill, the "loyalty" oath for government employees, the growing attacks upon the Negro people, the rising wave of anti-Semitism, the persecution of the Communists, the growth of militarization, etc., as well as a host of reactionary laws in individual states. To carry on its war-breeding imperialistic program abroad, American Big Business requires a reactionary, fascist-like regime in this country. It is building such a regime with specifically American methods and slogans.

II.

Factors Facilitating American Imperialist Expansion

Among the major factors favoring and motivating American imperialist expansion may be listed the following:

1) *The huge extent of American industry:* The highly monopolized industries of the United States, swollen and fattened by two world wars, far surpass in productivity those of Nazi Germany in its imperialist drive, and, indeed, of all the former Axis powers together. The present situation is an extreme example of the uneven development of capitalism. American industry is now turning out fully 60 per cent of the industrial production of the en-

tire capitalist world. This, in the crippled condition of world industry, gives the United States a highly favored economic position. Its vast industrial productivity is also supported by a monster merchant marine (now largely laid up) of some 35 million tons. During World War II, the gigantic industrial base of American imperialism doubled its production, adding new plants to the extent of 25 billion dollars, or an increase equal to about 1½ times the total prewar industrial system of Germany. This predominance in productive capacity is the most powerful weapon of Wall Street in its present drive for world supremacy. Nevertheless, this economic supremacy is but a temporary phenomenon. American capitalism lives, economically, on borrowed time, for its very economic strength is generating and sharpening its internal contradictions and driving it toward economic crisis and catastrophe.

2) *Vast financial resources:* The United States is also far and away the greatest creditor nation in the world. It has all the big capitalist powers deeply in its debt. Its total exports last year, amounting to nearly 20 billion dollars, something never before even remotely equalled by any country in peacetime, intensified the dollar famine and vastly increased the indebtedness of Western Europe and other countries to the U.S. Moreover, the United States has over half of the world's gold reserves cached away at Fort Knox. With its unprecedented mass of surplus capital pressing for investment,

American capitalism is under the most urgent need for imperialist investment and conquest all over the world. This imperialistic urge is all the greater because of the Keynesian consciousness among American big businessmen, who widely believe that only by developing huge capital exports, plus a war economy, can they avert, or at least delay, the almost instant outbreak of a devastating economic crisis of overproduction in the United States. Its present financial strength, based upon its tremendous industrial system, furnishes the United States with its most powerful weapon for the subjugation of other peoples. This fact is especially expressed in the Marshall Plan. Hitler, in his drive for world domination, had only a fraction of such financial resources at his disposal.

3) *Powerful military forces:* The United States now has a navy stronger than the navies of the rest of the world put together. With these vast naval forces it is, for the time being at least, able to dominate all the oceans of the world. The American Air Force, already very powerful, is also being rapidly strengthened under the 70-group plan, as well as through the development of air bases in scores of strategic places throughout the capitalist world. According to Hansen W. Baldwin, the *New York Times* military expert, present government plans call for 20,500 up-to-the-minute planes in the Army Air Force and 14,500 in the Navy.

The obvious aim of all this is to secure for the United States as com-

plete atom-bomb domination of the world's airways as it now holds over the world's oceans. American air strategy is developing through the creation of several great air salients, all pointed against the U.S.S.R.—through Canada and over the North Pole, through the Japanese Islands, through Kuomintang China, through the Mediterranean and the Middle East, and through Western Europe.

The Army is also being rapidly strengthened, to keep pace with the Navy and Air Force. The draft, just enacted into law, will bring the total number in all the highly-modernized national armed services, up to 2,160,200, a figure previously unheard of in peacetime in the United States. Moreover, there are about half a million more men in the National Guard and the reserve forces. The United States' national military budget now reaches the vast total of twenty billions yearly and it is being rapidly increased. The principal military strategic aim of the Marshall Plan, with its planned total expenditure of at least seventeen billion dollars, is militarily to arm Western Germany and Western Europe against the Soviet Union. The newly-formed Western European Union is also being built as the nucleus of an all-capitalist war alliance against the U.S.S.R. But all such Hitler-like dreams of world military supremacy do not reckon with the mighty U.S.S.R. and the peace-loving peoples, and are doomed to disaster.

4) *Imperialistic Labor Leaders:* An important factor favoring the drive of American imperialism,

which cannot be ignored, is the special role being played by the bulk of the decisive conservative labor leaders in the A. F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods, United Mine Workers, etc. These officials openly support the foreign policies of American imperialism, picking up and repeating to the masses all of Wall Street's demagogic slogans about democracy and national defense and aid to Europe. They are the principal means for weakening the anti-fascist, anti-militarist, anti-imperialist solidarity of the masses. They are acting openly as strike-breakers and union splitters. They are brazenly seeking to split the labor movements of France and Italy, to disrupt the Latin-American Confederation of Labor, and to break the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Hitler, of course, had the powerful objective support of the Social-Democrats who, with their persistent Soviet-baiting, refusal to join with the Communists in anti-fascist struggle, and support of increasingly reactionary political candidates under the slogan of "the lesser evil," were indispensable in preparing the ground for fascism in Germany. The American conservative union leaders, including such Social-Democrats as Reuther, Rieve, and Dubinsky, are open and direct defenders of American capitalism and its drive for world control. They are labor imperialists. Not only would they heartily support an anti-Soviet war, but also, no doubt, many of them would adapt themselves to the role of leaders of a fascist "labor front,"

as many Social-Democrats did in Germany and elsewhere. However, the mounting cost of living, Taft-Hartleyism, government strike-breaking, and the peace aspirations of the American workers, create favorable conditions for undermining the influence of these labor lieutenants of monopoly capital.

5) *Weakened capitalist competitors of the United States:* This is an undermining factor, peculiar to the present postwar situation and very important in influencing the drive of American imperialism. The fact that Great Britain, Germany, Japan, France, Italy, and other capitalist countries have been gravely weakened by the war, while the United States has grown fat on it, is a powerful indirect stimulant to the expansionism of American imperialism. Hitler never had such easy pickings with his capitalist rivals. It would be like counting on the wolf to protect the sheep to expect the powerful United States not to take full advantage of its own strength and of the war-weakened condition of its capitalist competitors. By seizing upon all possible controls over them, it is acting fully in accord with the dog-eat-dog nature of capitalism. It is in the same spirit of imperialist cannibalism that the United States is also attempting to subjugate the U.S.S.R., which suffered such gigantic losses in manpower and industry during the war while fighting to save the world from fascist enslavement.

6) *The capitalists' sense of im-*

pending doom: A powerful factor motivating the expansionist drive of American imperialism is the growing sense among capitalists of the inferiority and hopelessness of the capitalist system. They sense, even if they do not clearly understand, the fact that world capitalism is slipping deeper and deeper into general crisis. And small wonder that they should develop such ideas, considering the ruinous wars and devastating economic crises to which their system is increasingly a prey. The capitalists have a profound dread of socialism, whose forces they see developing in many parts of the world. This capitalist fear is manifested by an increasing awareness of the superiority of growing world socialism. It translates itself into action in the shape of a violent hatred of the U.S.S.R. and every other socialist force, and also into a desperate determination to crush by violence the new social system which is growing out of the ruins of the old. Never were such pessimistic moods of desperation so prevalent among capitalists as they are now, in this difficult postwar period, for capitalism. American imperialism, although itself deeply infected by these fears and feelings of inferiority, nevertheless knows how to make use of such moods among the world's capitalists. They are the basis for its present international campaign of Red-baiting and Soviet-hating, behind the screen of which American imperialism is not only fastening its grip upon many capitalist nations and preparing to launch a third world war, but also

systematically building fascism in the United States.

III.

Factors Impeding American Imperialist Expansion

Among the major obstacles that are hindering the advance of American imperialism in its efforts to conquer the world may be listed the following:

1) *The Soviet Union:* The U.S.S.R. is the major fortress of world democracy. By the same token, it is also the biggest obstacle in the path of American monopoly capital's drive for world domination. The Soviet Union, although heavily devastated in the war, has grown greatly in strength and prestige. It is sturdily and successfully resisting the tremendous pressures—ideological, economic, political, diplomatic, and military—now being brought to bear against it by the imperialists of Wall Street. The United States has been able to put Great Britain in a subordinate position with the help of the capitalist lickspittle Labor Government. But not the socialist U.S.S.R., led by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Wall Street's inability to break the democratic resistance of the U.S.S.R. is a fact that has created a panic of desperation in the ranks of American imperialists.

2) *The New European Democracies:* Another serious stumbling block for American imperialism is the group of new people's democracies in Eastern Europe, including Po-

land, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania, with the position of Yugoslavia in the course of being determined. During Hitler's drive for power, all these countries, except Czechoslovakia, had fascist governments. But today they are fortresses of democracy. They have defeated every effort of American imperialism to dominate them and they are a most disturbing problem indeed for the would-be world rulers in Wall Street.

3) *The colonial and semi-colonial countries:* The great national liberation movements at present surging in various colonial and semi-colonial countries throughout the world constitute another massive road-block along the route of American imperialism. China, India, Indonesia, Indo-China, Burma, North and South Africa, and other countries and areas formerly more or less completely dominated by the imperialist nations, are now in varying stages of anti-imperialist revolt. Half the world's population is systematically casting off the shackles of feudalism and imperialist oppression, and the insurgent peoples can never be re-enslaved by ambitious American imperialism. They present a staggering menace to those who are striving to make American Big Business master of the world.

4) *Resistance of the peoples in the capitalist countries:* Despite the fact that the capitalists and the Right Social-Democratic leaders are selling them down the river to American imperialism, the peoples in the capitalist countries are maintaining

a stubborn and powerful democratic resistance that is proving impossible to break. The peoples' deep hatred of fascism and growing opposition to capitalism, and their determination not to permit the launching of a third world war, are especially receiving powerful leadership from the big Communist Parties and from the greatly enlarged and solidified trade unions.

In the United States, although undoubtedly the current imperialist, war agitation has sunk deep roots among all classes of the people, there is nevertheless a powerful popular opposition that is proving to be a thorn in the side of American imperialism. This mass resistance was repeatedly shown in the long struggles against U.M.T. and the selective draft, against military control of the atom-bomb, against government by generals, and, in these recent weeks, by the successful fight against the police state Mundt Bill. But the most significant and most all-embracing of such developments is, of course, the growth of the anti-war, anti-fascist, new party movement under the leadership of Henry A. Wallace. This movement embraces Left and progressive trade unions, Negro organizations, and a whole host of other democratic movements. Many millions of workers and others are sympathetic to its democratic, anti-war slogans.

5) *Internal counteracting forces.* The special advantages of U.S. imperialism are offset not only by the world forces of peace and democracy, but also by its internal contra-

dictions, by the sharpening class struggle at home. The oncoming crisis threatens to upset thoroughly the overly-ambitious expansionist aims of Wall Street. The plethora of surplus capital influences and sharpens the contradictions of American capitalism and threatens to choke it in its own wealth. Mass resistance of the working class to Taft-Hartleyism and the increasingly rapid deterioration of its living standards is already gaining momentum. The Negro question remains, politically, the Achilles' heel of U.S. imperialism; and the liberation movement of the Negro people is reaching new heights of consciousness and unity, representing a mighty anti-imperialist force. The people's resistance to militarization and draining the wealth of the nation of the war budget, will assert itself—as demonstrated in the mass response to the peace program of the new people's party.

6) *Mutual capitalist antagonisms:* Further big obstacles that confront American imperialism are the many sharp economic and political antagonisms that are arraying various of the capitalist states against each other. At most, it is only a limited degree of control that the United States has been able to set up over other capitalist countries, and the present American hegemony over world capitalism is very shaky. Between the United States and Great Britain in particular, serious clashes in interest are constantly cropping out, some of the more recent ones being the disputes around the Pal-

estine question and the struggle over Near East oil. France and the United States are also in conflict over the latter's project of rebuilding a fascist, rearmed Western Germany. Growing sections of native capitalists, students, and professional elements in Kuomintang China are resentful at the American policy of recreating a strong Japan. And the peoples of Latin America are highly antagonized by the bare-faced efforts of American imperialism to reduce them almost to the status of colonies. Such inter-capitalist janglings naturally make it extremely difficult for American imperialism to create anything like a united capitalist front against the U.S.S.R.

7) *The weakened condition of the world capitalist system:* A further and most basic obstacle to the progress of American imperialism in its attempt to establish its all-world control is the present weakened condition of the very foundations of the whole world capitalist system. Among the multiplying signs of the developing general crisis of capitalism are the disrupted state of international financial relationships; the wrecked state of world markets; the war devastation of many industries and cities; the lop-sided development of world industry, with an overwhelming preponderance in the United States and with the result that while most of the capitalist world is suffering a grave crisis of underproduction the United States trembles in fear of a major crisis of overproduction; the surging class struggles in many countries; the

sharpening antagonism among the respective capitalist nations; the breakdown of the colonial system, which is so vital to the existence of imperialist capitalism; the ideological confusion in the ranks of the world bourgeoisie; and the tremendous loss of capitalist prestige and the growth of socialist sentiment among the world's toiling masses, etc., etc. Obviously all these capitalist weaknesses and confusions present very severe problems to American imperialism, hindering its efforts to breathe the breath of life into the whole ramshackle capitalist structure and to weld it together into a powerful and smoothly-working anti-Soviet military alliance under American leadership. Hitler, in his drive for world power, faced no such degree of chaos in international capitalism. The deepening crisis of the world capitalist system is the specific and also most fundamental factor conditioning the world drive of American imperialism.

IV.

The Failure of American Imperialist Policy

Although, as indicated at the outset of this article, American imperialism has scored some heavy victories and has widely expanded its world influence, nevertheless, by and large, its policy is failing. This is because it has not succeeded in achieving its major objective of defeating the Soviet Union and the other great world democratic forces. The factors hin-

dering American imperialism are manifestly much stronger than those promoting its progress. In this basic relation of forces lies a perspective of the ultimate disastrous defeat of American imperialism.

American imperialist policy has passed through several stages, or phases, overlapping and reinforcing each other. But ever and always the objective of this policy has remained the same—to break down the stubborn resistance of the U.S.S.R. and the other world democratic forces opposed to American expansionism.

1) *Atom-bomb diplomacy:* When the Russians decisively defeated Hitler at Stalingrad in the winter of 1942, the allies began definitely to develop a victory perspective. At the same time it became increasingly clear that American imperialism, after the war, was itself going to make a big bid for world supremacy, and also that in this endeavor it considered the U.S.S.R. to be its greatest obstacle. This explains why, already during the war, the main body of American reaction, combating the Roosevelt policy of wartime and postwar collaboration with the U.S.S.R., delayed the opening of the Western front in Europe for a full 18 months, thereby causing the Russians and the countries occupied by the Hitlerites to suffer millions of needless casualties and endless devastation of their industries and cities. These reactionaries tried, too, to put the chief burden of the war even more heavily upon the Russians by switching the American attack away

from Nazi Germany and against Japan. Their general purpose was to weaken the U.S.S.R. so basically that it could not offer serious resistance to American imperialism in the post-war period. President (then Senator) Truman cynically expressed this unspeakable treachery to our Soviet war ally as follows:

If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia and if we see that Russia is winning we ought to help Germany. . . .

Immediately upon the end of the war in 1945, with Roosevelt dead, the Wall Street reactionaries, finding a willing tool in President Truman, opened up in full blast their offensive of imperialist conquest. Their major effort was directed toward cowing the U.S.S.R. They believed that they had by their wartime betrayal so debilitated that country that it would be unable to resist the powerful American pressure. In this spirit they launched their get-tough-with-Russia policy. This was a combination of open threats of a "preventive" atom-bomb war against the U.S.S.R. and the ruthless use of an American-controlled majority of votes against that country in the United Nations. But the U.S.S.R. ignored all the atom-bomb threats and it protected itself in the United Nations by a resolute use of the veto. The general result was a serious defeat for Wall Street's atom-bomb diplomacy.

2) *The Truman Doctrine*: This infamous policy of American imperialism, rightly named after our

gingoistic President, was announced in the Spring of 1947. In connection with its cold-blooded armed intervention in Greece, which by-passed the U.N., the United States served notice on the world that in its efforts to intimidate the world democratic forces into submission it was prepared to provoke civil war in the respective countries. The Truman Doctrine was only a clearer statement and an accentuation of the already developing American policy of ruthlessly interfering in the internal affairs of other nations for the purpose of defeating democracy and strengthening Wall Street's imperialist front. Examples of such interference, both before and after the formal announcement of the Truman Doctrine, were the development of numerous armed fascist plots and uprisings against the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe; the sending of arms, money and men to the reactionary forces in the civil wars in China, Indonesia, and Indo-China; the ousting of the Communists from the French, Italian, Chilean, and Brazilian Governments; the cultivation of the De Gaulle movement and the so-called Center force in France; the systematic shielding of fascist elements in Germany and Japan; the recent wholesale interference on the side of reaction in the Italian elections, etc., etc.

But the Truman Doctrine, like its related policy of atom-bomb diplomacy, has not succeeded in defeating world democracy. The mass resistance to American imperialism in the

Western European countries has not been broken; the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, with the present exception of Yugoslavia, which is in an uncertain position, have definitely moved to the Left under this American intimidation; the civil wars in China and Greece, despite huge American assistance, continue to go badly for the reactionaries. And, of course, the attempts of the supporters of the Truman Doctrine to create a reactionary diversion within the Soviet Union itself, which was the expressed purpose of their anti-Russian radio broadcasts, collapsed miserably. So the Truman Doctrine, like atom-bomb diplomacy, has, in the main, failed in its major anti-democratic objectives.

3) *The Marshall Plan*: This policy, the chief aim of which is to re-arm Europe against democracy at home and also for eventual war against the U.S.S.R., was announced close upon the heels of the statement of the Truman Doctrine. It dovetails right in with that doctrine and also with atom-bomb diplomacy. Like the Truman Doctrine, the promulgation of the Marshall Plan was the culmination of a course that had already been developing for a considerable time. It is the American policy, raised to the *nth* degree, of granting loans and relief to subservient countries. The Marshall Plan, which also by-passed the United Nations and thereby rendered it impotent, is the full economic power of America being used to prepare Europe for an anti-Soviet war. During the year of its existence the

Marshall Plan, with its billions of dollars for profit-hungry European exploiters, has done much to establish American hegemony over the capitalist-ridden countries of Western Europe and it has also created illusions far and wide among the capitalist world's toiling masses. Nevertheless, it has not been able to crack the resistance of the new democracies in Europe, or to halt the progress of the national liberation movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and especially it has not succeeded in overcoming the resolute anti-imperialist, pro-peace stand of the U.S.S.R.

4) *Active preparation for war*: American imperialism, perceiving the obvious failure of its atom-bomb diplomacy and its Truman Doctrine, and realizing also that the Marshall Plan cannot succeed in smashing the world anti-imperialist resistance, now finds itself in a most difficult position. It simply must break the resistance of the peoples to American imperialism if it is to achieve the world domination for which its whole structure of monopoly capitalism inexorably compels it to strive. It cannot possibly tolerate the tremendous consolidation of the world forces of democracy and socialism that has taken place since the end of the war. Hence it reaches desperately for the only other weapon left to it after the failure of its previous policies, namely, an anti-Soviet, anti-peoples' war. The present intense war preparations in the United States and in the countries under American domination are the surest signs that

American imperialism considers its policies up until now to be essentially a failure. These developments indicate that Wall Street can see no other possible way to defeat the forces of democracy and socialism and to establish its own world rulership except through the frightful hazard of war.

From its inception, the drive of American imperialism has borne within it the danger of war. It is to the credit of the Communist Party of the United States that it has realized this fact all along. Behind the atom-bomb diplomacy, the Truman Doctrine, and the Marshall Plan, there has always been implicit the danger of the precipitation of another world war. But the war danger has grown more and more acute with the continuing failure of these policies to achieve their anti-democratic aims. This has been especially true since the collapse, last February, of the American-inspired attempt to overthrow the Communist-led government of Czechoslovakia, with the result that that country moved sharply to the Left. After this major political defeat, which doubly emphasized the failure of American imperialist foreign policy, the Wall Street reactionaries have turned more and more sharply toward using the weapon of war. They are greatly intensifying military preparations and are readying the people ideologically for an early plunge into war.

American Big Business has undoubtedly resolved upon throwing our country into war against the

U.S.S.R. Both of its two big political parties are saturated with this war spirit. Only strong mass democratic resistance can balk the bellicose determination of the warmongers. The great monopolists of this country cannot tolerate the perspective of capitalism and socialism living in the same world together, in peaceful rivalry. For they are sure, in their pessimism, that such a competition of the two systems could only result in the ultimate defeat of capitalism. They also do not believe that the Marshall Plan, even if supported by atom-bomb diplomacy and the Truman Doctrine, can of itself bring the whole shattered world economy under the iron-bound control of American monopoly capital. They believe that only by a war economy, and eventually war, can they prevent overdeveloped American industry from collapsing in crisis. They do not share the naive opinions of the "American exceptionalists" who, holding that the economic system in this country is not subject to the destructive influences that have so deeply undermined world capitalism, believe that American capitalism can not only itself survive, but can restore and reinvigorate capitalism in all other countries. Having no such illusions, American big capitalists want to smash democracy and socialism by war, since they are unable to do so by atom-bomb diplomacy, the Truman Doctrine, and the Marshall Plan. And it is not merely political expediency (as many capitalist apologists claim) that makes the agents of American Big Business line up

with fascists all over the world and also makes them move in the direction of fascism in this country. This reactionary course is inseparable from the main orientation of American monopoly capital toward fascism and war.

But the war for which the American imperialists are planning also could not succeed any better than have their other ill-omened imperialist policies. For the world forces of democracy and socialism are much too strong to be defeated militarily by American imperialism, with its impoverished and crisis-stricken foreign allies and its ideologically bankrupt trade-union and Social-Democratic stooges. Such a war, besides wreaking havoc on the American people, would be a lost war for American imperialism and would also have dire consequences for world capitalism. This grim reality is sensed by many of the more thoughtful of bourgeois military experts and political commentators. These people are telling us that an American-Soviet war would lead to an almost immediate occupation of Western Europe and most of Asia by the Red Army, whence it could be dislodged, if at all, only after ruinous struggle. They say, too, that the warring capitalist countries would become the prey of anti-capitalist revolutions from their war-weary peoples. And they are also sure that the world capitalist system could never stand the physical shock and revolutionary upheavals that a World War III would produce. Despite this most lugubrious outlook, however,

American big capital is preparing to try the reckless gamble of war.

Nevertheless war is not inevitable. The people of this country and the world can halt the war being prepared, if they will throw their great power athwart the path of the American warmongers and imperialists. But the American people will have to accept the logic of the situation. While it is profoundly true that rising socialism and declining capitalism can live peacefully together, it is clear that the condition for such peaceful co-existence is a mutual desire for it on both sides. But an aggressive American imperialism bent on world domination rejects this possibility of peaceful co-existence which is the most decisive condition today for world peace. Hence, if the world is to be saved from another and greater blood-bath, the power of American monopoly, the poison source of fascism and modern war, must be broken. As our convention draft resolution points out, the peace measures of the new, third party can undoubtedly advance the cause of peace, and check the plans of the warmakers. But it must never be forgotten that to eliminate finally the danger of war it is necessary to eliminate the source of that danger, capitalism. To achieve the kind of world in which alone peace will be absolutely guaranteed, the peoples of the capitalist world, especially the United States, must be mobilized for an attack upon the economic and political power of the monopolies as the historic condition for the advance toward socialism.

RESOLUTION OF THE INFORMATION BUREAU CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN THE C. P. OF YUGOSLAVIA*

COMMUNIQUE

Meeting of Information Bureau of the Communist Parties

DURING the second half of June, a meeting of the Information Bureau was held in Romania. The meeting was attended by the following representatives:

Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists), Comrades T. Kostov, B. Chervenkov; Romanian Workers' Party, Comrades G. Georgiu Dej, V. Luca, A. Pauker; Hungarian Workers' Party, Comrades M. Rakosi, M. Farcas, A. Gero; Polish Workers' Party, Comrades J. Ber-man, A. Zavadski; Communist Party

of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Comrades A. Zhdanov, G. Malenkov, M. Suslov; Communist Party of France, Comrades J. Duclos, E. Fajon; Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Comrades R. Slansky, V. Siroky, B. Geminder, G. Bares; Communist Party of Italy, Comrades P. Togliatti, P. Secchia.

The Information Bureau discussed the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and unanimously adopted a resolution on this question.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION

The Information Bureau, composed of the representatives of the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists), Romanian Workers' Party, Hungarian Workers' Party, Polish Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Communist Party of France,

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Communist Party of Italy, upon discussing the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and announcing that the representatives of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia had refused to attend the meeting of the Information Bureau, unanimously reached the following conclusions:

1. The Information Bureau notes that recently the leadership of the

Communist Party of Yugoslavia has pursued an incorrect line on the main questions of home and foreign policy, a line which represents a departure from Marxism-Leninism. In this connection the Information Bureau approves the action of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.), which took the initiative in exposing this incorrect policy of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, particularly the incorrect policy of Comrades Tito, Kardelj, Djilas and Rankovic.

2. The Information Bureau declares that the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party is pursuing an unfriendly policy toward the Soviet Union and the C.P.S.U.(B.). An undignified policy of defaming Soviet military experts and discrediting the Soviet Union has been carried out in Yugoslavia. A special regime was instituted for Soviet civilian experts in Yugoslavia, whereby they were under surveillance of Yugoslav state security organs and were continually followed. The representative of the C.P.S.U.(B.) in the Information Bureau, Comrade Yudin, and a number of official representatives of the Soviet Union in Yugoslavia, were followed and kept under observation by Yugoslav state security organs.

All these and similar facts show that the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have taken a stand unworthy of Communists, and have begun to identify the foreign policy of the Soviet Union with the

foreign policy of the imperialist powers, behaving toward the Soviet Union in the same manner as they behave to the bourgeois states. Precisely because of this anti-Soviet stand, slanderous propaganda about the "degeneration" of the C.P.S.U.(B.), about the "degeneration" of the U.S.S.R., and so on, borrowed from the arsenal of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, is current within the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

The Information Bureau denounces this anti-Soviet attitude of the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia as being incompatible with Marxism-Leninism and only appropriate to nationalists.

3. In home policy, the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia are departing from the positions of the working class and are breaking with the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle. They deny that there is a growth of capitalist elements in their country and, consequently, a sharpening of the class struggle in the countryside. This denial is the direct result of the opportunist tenet that the class struggle does not become sharper during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, as Marxism-Leninism teaches, but dies down, as was affirmed by opportunists of the Bukharin type, who propagated the theory of the peaceful growing over of capitalism into socialism.

The Yugoslav leaders are pursuing an incorrect policy in the country-

* Reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties, Bucharest, No. 16, July 1, 1948.

side by ignoring the class differentiation in the countryside and by regarding the individual peasantry as a single entity, contrary to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of classes and class struggle, contrary to the well-known Lenin thesis that small, individual farming gives birth to capitalism and the bourgeoisie continually, daily, hourly, spontaneously and on a mass scale. Moreover, the political situation in the Yugoslav countryside gives no grounds for smugness and complacency, in the conditions obtaining in Yugoslavia, where individual peasant farming predominates, where the land is not nationalized, where there is private property in land, and where land can be bought and sold, where much of the land is concentrated in the hands of kulaks, and where hired labor is employed—in such conditions there can be no question of educating the Party in the spirit of glossing over the class contradiction without by so doing disarming the Party itself in face of the difficulties connected with the construction of socialism.

Concerning the leading role of the working class, the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party, by affirming that the peasantry is the "most stable foundation of the Yugoslav state" are departing from the Marxist-Leninist path and are taking the path of a populist, kulak party. Lenin taught that the proletariat is the "only class in contemporary society which is revolutionary to the end . . . must be the leader in

the struggle of the entire people for a thorough democratic transformation, in the struggle of all working people and the exploited against the oppressors and exploiters."

The Yugoslav leaders are violating this thesis of Marxism-Leninism.

As far as the peasantry is concerned it may be that the majority, that is, the poor and medium peasants, are already in alliance with the working class, with the working class having the leading role in this alliance.

The attitude of the Yugoslav leaders disregards these theses of Marxism-Leninism.

As can be seen, this attitude also reflects views appropriate to petty-bourgeois nationalism, but not to Marxists-Leninists.

4. The Information Bureau considers that the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is revising the Marxist-Leninist teachings about the Party. According to the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Party is the main, guiding and leading force in the country, which has its own, specific program, and does not dissolve itself among the non-Party masses. The Party is the highest form of organization and the most important weapon of the working class.

In Yugoslavia, however, the People's Front, and not the Communist Party, is considered to be the main leading force in the country. The Yugoslav leaders belittle the role of the Communist Party and actually dissolve the Party in the non-party

People's Front, which is composed of the most varied class elements (workers, peasants engaged in individual farming, kulaks, traders, small manufacturers, bourgeois intelligentsia, etc.) as well as mixed political groups which include certain bourgeois parties. The Yugoslav leaders stubbornly refuse to recognize the falseness of their tenet that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia allegedly cannot and should not have its own specific program and that it should be satisfied with the program of the People's Front.

The fact that in Yugoslavia it is only the People's Front which figures in the political arena, while the Party and its organizations do not appear openly before the people in its own name, not only belittles the role of the Party in the political life of the country, but also undermines the Party as an independent political force, which has the task of winning the growing confidence of the people and of influencing ever broader masses of the working people by open political activity and open propaganda of its views and program. The leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party are repeating the mistakes of the Russian Mensheviks regarding the dissolution of the Marxist party into a non-party, mass organization. All this reveals the existence of liquidation tendencies in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

The Information Bureau believes that this policy of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia threatens the very exist-

ence of the Communist Party and ultimately carries with it the danger of the degeneration of the People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

5. The Information Bureau considers that the bureaucratic regime created inside the Party by its leaders is disastrous for the life and development of the Yugoslav Communist Party. There is no inner Party democracy, no elections, and no criticism and self-criticism in the Party. Despite the unfounded assurances of Comrades Tito and Kardelj, the majority of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is composed of co-opted, and not of elected members. The Communist Party is actually in a position of semi-legality. Party meetings are either not held at all, or meet in secret—a fact which can only undermine the influence of the Party among the masses. This type of organization of the Yugoslav Communist Party cannot be described as anything but a sectarian-bureaucratic organization. It leads to the liquidation of the Party as an active, self-acting organism, it cultivates military methods of leadership in the Party similar to the methods advocated in his day by Trotsky.

It is a completely intolerable state of affairs when the most elementary rights of members in the Yugoslav Communist Party are suppressed, when the slightest criticism of incorrect measures in the Party is brutally repressed.

The Information Bureau regards as disgraceful such actions as the ex-

pulsion from the Party and the arrest of the Central Committee members, Comrades Djuiovic and Hebrang because they dared to criticize the anti-Soviet attitude of the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party, and called for friendship between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union.

The Information Bureau considers that such a disgraceful, purely Turkish, terrorist regime cannot be tolerated in the Communist Party. The interests of the very existence and development of the Yugoslav Communist Party demand that an end be put to this regime.

6. The Information Bureau considers that the criticism made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.) and Central Committees of the other Communist Parties of the mistakes of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, and who in this way rendered fraternal assistance to the Yugoslav Communist Party, provides the Communist Party of Yugoslavia with all the conditions necessary to speedily correct the mistakes committed.

However, instead of honestly accepting this criticism and taking the Bolshevik path of correcting these mistakes, the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, suffering from boundless ambition, arrogance and conceit, met this criticism with belligerence and hostility. They took the anti-Party path of indiscriminately denying all their mistakes, violated the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism regarding the attitude of a po-

litical party to its mistakes and thus aggravated their anti-Party mistakes.

Unable to face the criticism of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (B.) and the Central Committees of the other fraternal Parties, the Yugoslav leaders took the path of outrightly deceiving their Party and people by concealing from the Yugoslav Communist Party the criticism of the Central Committee's incorrect policy and also by concealing from the Party and the people the real reasons for the brutal measures against Comrades Djuiovic and Hebrang.

Recently, even after the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (B.) and fraternal parties had criticized the mistakes of the Yugoslav leaders, the latter tried to bring in a number of new leftist laws. They hastily decreed the nationalization of medium industry and trade, though the basis for this is completely unprepared. In view of such haste the new decision only hampers the supply of goods to the population. In a similar hurried manner they brought in a new grain tax for which the way is also not prepared and which can, therefore, only dislocate grain supplies to the urban population. Finally, only recently the Yugoslav leaders in loud declarations declared their love for, and devotion to, the Soviet Union, although it is known that in practice they are pursuing an unfriendly policy toward the Soviet Union.

Nor is this all. Of late the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have, with perfect aplomb,

been declaiming a policy of liquidating the capitalist elements in Yugoslavia. In a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.), dated April 13, Tito and Kardelj wrote that "the plenum of the Central Committee approved the measures proposed by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee to liquidate the remnants of capitalism in the country."

In accordance with this line Kardelj, speaking in the Skupschina on April 25, declared: "In our country the days of the last remnants of the exploitation of man by man are numbered."

In the conditions prevailing in Yugoslavia this position of the leaders of the Communist Party in regard to the liquidation of the capitalist elements, and hence, the kulaks as a class, cannot be qualified as other than adventurous and non-Marxist. For it is impossible to solve this task as long as individual peasant economy predominates in the country, which inevitably gives birth to capitalism, as long as conditions have not been created for the large-scale collectivization of agriculture; and as long as the majority of the working peasantry is not convinced of the advantages of collective methods of farming. The experience of the C.P.S.U. (B.) shows that the elimination of the last and biggest exploiting class—the kulak class—is possible only on the basis of the mass collectivization of agriculture, that the elimination of the kulaks as a class, is an organic and integral part

of the collectivization of agriculture.

In order to eliminate the kulaks as a class, and hence, to eliminate the capitalist elements in the countryside, it is necessary for the Party to engage in detailed preparatory work to restrict the capitalist elements in the countryside, to strengthen the alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the working class, to make socialist industry capable of producing machinery for the collective administration of agriculture. Haste in this matter can only lead to irreparable harm.

Only on the basis of these measures, carefully prepared and consistently carried out, is it possible to go over from restriction of the capitalist elements in the countryside, to their liquidation.

All attempts by the Yugoslav leaders to solve this problem hastily and by means of decrees, signify either that the venture is foredoomed to failure or that it is a boastful and empty demagogic declaration.

The Information Bureau considers that by means of these false and demagogic tactics, the Yugoslav leaders are endeavoring to demonstrate that they are not only for class struggle, but that they go even further, beyond those demands which—taking into account the real possibilities—could be advanced by the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the matter of restricting the capitalist elements.

The Information Bureau considers that since these leftist decrees and declarations of the Yugoslav leader-

ship are demagogic and impracticable in the present conditions, they can but compromise the banner of socialist construction in Yugoslavia.

That is why the Information Bureau considers such adventurist tactics as an undignified maneuver and an impermissible political gamble.

As we see, these leftist demagogic measures and declarations on the part of the Yugoslav leaders are designed to cover up their refusal to recognize mistakes and honestly correct them.

7. Taking into account the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, and seeking to show the leaders of the Party the way out of this situation, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.) and the Central Committees of other fraternal parties, suggested that the matter of the Yugoslav Communist Party should be discussed at a meeting of the Information Bureau, on the same normal party footing as that on which the activities of other Communist Parties were discussed at the first meeting of the Information Bureau.

However, the Yugoslav leaders rejected the repeated suggestions of the fraternal Communist Parties to discuss the situation in the Yugoslav Party at a meeting of the Information Bureau.

Attempting to avoid the just criticism of the fraternal parties in the Information Bureau, the Yugoslav leaders invented the fable of their allegedly "unequal position." There is not a grain of truth in this story.

It is generally known that when the Information Bureau was set up, the Communist Parties based their work on the indisputable principle that any party could report to the Information Bureau in the same way that any party had the right to criticize other parties.

At the first meeting of the Nine Communist Parties, the Yugoslav Communist Party took full advantage of this right.

The refusal of the Yugoslav Party to report to the Information Bureau on its actions and to listen to criticism by other Communist Parties means, in practice, a violation of the equality of the Communist Parties and is, in fact, tantamount to a demand for a privileged position for the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the Information Bureau.

8. In view of this, the Information Bureau expresses complete agreement with the estimation of the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party, with the criticism of the mistakes of the Central Committee of the Party, and with the political analysis of these mistakes contained in letters from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B.) to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia between March and May, 1948.

The Information Bureau unanimously concludes that by their anti-Party and anti-Soviet views, incompatible with Marxism-Leninism, by their whole attitude and their refusal to attend the meeting of the Information Bureau, the leaders of the

Communist Party of Yugoslavia have placed themselves in opposition to the Communist Parties affiliated to the Information Bureau, have taken the path of seceding from the united socialist front against imperialism, have taken the path of betraying the cause of international solidarity of the working people, and have taken up a position of nationalism.

The Information Bureau condemns this anti-Party policy and attitude of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

The Information Bureau considers that, in view of all this, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia has placed itself and the Yugoslav Party outside the family of the fraternal Communist Parties, outside the united Communist front and consequently outside the ranks of the Information Bureau.

* * *

The Information Bureau considers that the basis of these mistakes made by the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia lies in the undoubted fact that nationalist elements, which previously existed in a disguised form, managed in the course of the past five or six months to reach a dominant position in the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and, that consequently, the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party has broken with the international traditions of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and has taken the road of nationalism.

Considerably overestimating the in-

ternal, national forces of Yugoslavia and their influence, the Yugoslav leaders think that they can maintain Yugoslavia's independence and build socialism without the support of the Communist Parties of other countries, without the support of the people's democracies, without the support of the Soviet Union. They think that the new Yugoslavia can do without the help of these revolutionary forces.

Showing their poor understanding of the international situation and their intimidation by the blackmailing threats of the imperialists, the Yugoslav leaders think that by making concessions they can curry favor with the imperialist states. They think they will be able to bargain with them for Yugoslavia's independence and, gradually, get the people of Yugoslavia orientated on these states, that is, on capitalism. In this they proceed tacitly from the well-known bourgeois-nationalist thesis that "capitalist states are a lesser danger to the independence of Yugoslavia than the Soviet Union."

The Yugoslav leaders evidently do not understand or, probably, pretend they do not understand, that such a nationalist line can only lead to Yugoslavia's degeneration into an ordinary bourgeois republic, to the loss of its independence and to its transformation into a colony of the imperialist countries.

The Information Bureau does not doubt that inside the Communist Party of Yugoslavia there are sufficient healthy elements, loyal to Marx-

ism-Leninism, to the international traditions of the Yugoslav Communist Party and to the united socialist front.

Their task is to compel their present leaders to recognize their mistakes openly and honestly and to rectify them; to break with nationalism, return to internationalism; and in every way to consolidate the united socialist front against imperialism.

Should the present leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party prove to be incapable of doing this, their job is to replace them and to advance a new internationalist leadership of the Party.

The Information Bureau does not doubt that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia will be able to fulfill this honorable task.

STATEMENT ON THE INFORMATION BUREAU RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN THE C. P. OF YUGOSLAVIA*

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER and EUGENE DENNIS

THE EIGHT parties of the Communist Information Bureau have rendered an outstanding service to the cause of world peace, the independence of nations, and the fight for socialism, by exposing the betrayal of that cause by the present leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

In a communique sharply condemning the policies of Tito, Kardelj, Rankovic and Djilas, the Communist Information Bureau reveals that the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia has departed from the path of Marxism-Leninism.

Recently it has been following a course hostile to the Soviet Union, and attempted to curry favor with Anglo-American imperialism. It has abandoned working-class internationalism for bourgeois nationalism and expressed hostility to the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. It has tended to liquidate the Yugoslav Communist Party. It began to pursue a policy which could only result in the

restoration of a capitalist state in Yugoslavia under the domination of imperialism.

The U.S. imperialists, through their press and the State Department, are distorting the meaning of the Communist Information Bureau statement, and the situation out of which it arose. In reality, the communique demonstrates that the leading forces in the world camp of peace and democracy are alert to every danger. Their timely action dooms to failure the efforts of the Marshall Planners to split and disorient the anti-imperialist camp of peace and social progress.

But the Wall Street warmongers are boasting that their "get-tough" policy and Marshall Plan strategy have begun to pay off. And they proclaim that they are now "justified" in continuing and intensifying their atom-bomb diplomacy and their preparation for a new world war.

The American people must reject all such distortions as the most dangerous type of warmongering. Despite the betrayal by the present

* Issued to the press, June 29, 1948.

leadership of the Yugoslav Party, the anti-imperialist peace camp is growing. Its unity and effectiveness will be strengthened by the exposure and expulsion of the traitors. In our country as everywhere in the world, the forces struggling for peace recognize that its cornerstone is friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union, whose influence is felt increasingly among freedom-loving peoples in every land.

The Information Bureau communique has made public a course of development in Yugoslavia whose significance has largely been hidden until now. It has thus given a powerful weapon to the Yugoslav Communists for correcting the policies which

could only lead their Party and people to disaster. We have every confidence that the sound core of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia will restore their Party to the Marxist-Leninist path of struggle for peace and socialism.

As for the American people, they must vigilantly guard against Wall Street's attempts to engineer new war provocations. They must redouble their present efforts to stop monopoly's bipartisan drive to fascism and war. To this end, we American Communists will strengthen the Marxist-Leninist understanding in our ranks and unitedly fulfill our responsibility to the American working class and people.

THE YUGOSLAV LEADERS ON THE PATH OF BETRAYAL

By V. J. JEROME

THE SITUATION in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia must be viewed, not as a thing apart, a mere episode, or, as Louis Adamic amiably suggests, "a question of manners" (*New York Star*, July 11). It must be seen as a manifestation that is part of the global struggle of the two contending camps in world society today: the forces of peace, democracy, national freedom, and Socialism, which have in the Soviet Union their consistent champion; and the forces of monopoly oppression, feudal landlordism, clerical reaction, and fascism—the war camp, headed by American imperialism which is directing its bipartisan policies toward world domination. Thus viewed, the action of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties in warning of the presence of a weak sector in the anti-war front, and in exposing the essence of the weakness in that sector, has contributed in a major way toward fortifying that sector speedily in order to prevent a break-through by the enemy later. In this light the prompt and forceful statement of Comrades Foster and Dennis greeted the action of

the Information Bureau as "an outstanding service to the cause of world peace, the independence of nations, and the fight for Socialism, by exposing the betrayal of that cause by the present leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia."

The imperialist camp, notoriously allergic to truth, has seized upon the occasion for an orgy of falsification and confusion through press, radio, and forum. The main purport of the bourgeois propaganda—liberal as well as reactionary—is, first, that the Resolution of the Information Bureau now "proves to the hilt" that the Communists have merely toyed with the People's Front policy and have now "given it up." We are asked to read the evidence in the Resolution's emphasis on the vanguard role of the Communist Party with respect to the People's Front. With all this evidence the Communists finally stand convicted that they are "really for Socialism"! Hence, reaction, aiming to split the peace front, shouts that the Communists neither can nor will have any alliance save on the basis of the acceptance of Socialism: "The fiction of the People's Front is . . . torn apart" (*New York Herald Tribune*, editorial, July 2).

The bourgeois propagandists further distort the Resolution to mean that there is no existence for Communist parties anywhere except under "the dictatorship of Moscow"; that we have here "a basic clash between different kinds of commu-

nism: an 'international' communism that is directed completely by the Kremlin, a 'national' communism that leans toward autonomy and its own development" (*New York Times*, editorial, July 4). Stalin, we are told, is bent on annexing the Balkans: the "lowdown" was supplied by no less an "authority" than Rebecca West in a letter to the *Herald Tribune* of July 2, namely, that Tito has "been told to rebel by the Soviet government itself," since this "gives an excuse for the entry of Soviet armies into Yugoslavia." (That staid newspaper, editorially on June 30, did indeed calm us with the thought that "the reports of Russian troop movements into Yugoslavia and actual fighting on the frontiers may be premature.")

And what can be more touching than the noble readiness to forget rancor which marks the tributes of imperialist-minded columnists and special correspondents to the suddenly "audacious and brave" Tito standing up to defend Yugoslavia against the "Soviet annexationists"? And lest anyone think that there is truth to the Resolution's charge of bourgeois nationalism and desertion of Marxist theory and practice, there is no lack of vouchers for Tito's Marxism. Thus Tito is offered credentials as "a sincere Marxist" by Cyrus L. Sulzberger in the *New York Times* (July 4). Likewise, Raymond Daniell attests in the same issue of the paper: "A Communist through and through, he [Tito] still

sought to interpret communism primarily to suit the needs of his country. . . ." And so overnight yesterday's "puppet of Moscow" and "oppressor of his people" has been metamorphosed into "a loyal and prideful Yugoslav," a Balkan Communist William Tell defying a Moscow Gessler!

It is significant that while the arrogant answer of the Yugoslav Party leaders to the Resolution is hailed as the "spirited reply of the Communists of Yugoslavia," Albania's courageous denunciation of Tito's policy has been set down as merely "Kremlin pressure."

To translate the rhetoric into reality, the entire Yugoslav affair merely "confirms the basic theory of American foreign policy," according to the Alsop brothers in the *Herald Tribune* of July 2, which depends for its victory in Eastern Europe on "the combined pressure of Western competition and internally divisive forces"—in plain English, the Truman Doctrine's Marshall Plan plus a Fifth Column!

This is how W. H. Lawrence spells it out in his Washington dispatch to the *New York Times* of July 9, in which he sees Tito "of real value to our policy of splitting the Eastern bloc if this is possible."

Small wonder that for *Life* magazine it was "Good News for Europe" and for *Newsweek*, "Hope Springs."

* * *

What factors brought about the

situation in Yugoslavia that occasioned the Resolution of the Information Bureau?

There is not available to us at present full knowledge of all the detailed developments that culminated in the treachery of the Yugoslav leadership. Nonetheless, the basic factors are clear.

In the first place, the external factor is the pressure of American imperialism, principally through the Marshall Plan. The Yugoslav Party leaders, the Resolution declares, manifesting "their intimidation by the blackmailing threats of the imperialists, think that by making concessions they can curry favor with the imperialist states" and "bargain with them for Yugoslavia's independence." In so thinking, "they proceed tacitly from the well-known bourgeois-nationalist thesis that 'capitalist states are a lesser danger to the independence of Yugoslavia than the Soviet Union.'"

This orientation toward the capitalist states is manifest in the unfriendly position of the Yugoslav leadership toward the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies. This hostile attitude was displayed, the Resolution charges, in "defaming Soviet military experts and discrediting the Soviet Union," subjecting Soviet official representatives to "surveillance of Yugoslav State security organs," "identifying the foreign policy of the Soviet Union with the foreign policy of the imperialist powers," and "behaving toward the Soviet Union in the same manner

as toward the bourgeois states."

This anti-Soviet conception is directly related to the Yugoslav leaders' desertion of proletarian internationalism and acceptance of "ideas which are more suitable to petty-bourgeois nationalists than to Marxist-Leninists."

The Yugoslav leaders protest their innocence and proclaim their friendship for the U.S.S.R.; but such assertions are the sheerest hypocrisy in the light of their anti-revolutionary struggle against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and against the Information Bureau, whose united and integral existence and activity represent a vital force in the cause of world peace and the independence of nations.

In their extensive reply to the Resolution, the Yugoslav leaders have not disproved the concrete accusations of hostile acts toward the Soviet Union. The Yugoslav leaders, to the delight of the imperialists, have created a breach in the anti-imperialist peace front. How can this be regarded as anything but aid to the imperialist camp, as anything but an orientation toward the capitalist states?

What is the meaning of an orientation toward the capitalist states today?

Can it be that the Yugoslav leaders do not recognize that Wall Street, lusting for control of the globe, is bent on defeating the forces of democracy and Socialism by fomenting civil wars as a means of achieving "Greek" governments? Or, are they

unaware that to this end American imperialism is intensifying its Marshall Plan "recovery" blandishments and bludgeonings? And what sort of independence can they gain for Yugoslavia by making concessions to the imperialist blackmailers?

Let the *United States News and World Report* survey of February 27, entitled, "What U.S. Gets for Aid Abroad," furnish at least part of the answer:

The Administrator of the [E.R.P.] program actually is to become a director of world business. He will be in a position to tell France, for example, whether to rebuild railroads or to improve highways. He can decide whether farms are to be mechanized. He will determine whether Britain or the Ruhr gets first call on coal-mining machinery. And he can stop the dollar flow altogether if countries do not abide by his terms. . . .

He has power to decide whether timber shall be purchased from Finland, Sweden, or Canada; whether U.S. wheat or Canadian wheat should get priority in dollar sales; whether Brazil or the U.S. should supply cotton to European textile mills.

Would Yugoslavia fare any better at the extortionate hands of the Marshall Planners? Can there be any doubt that a Marshallized Yugoslavia would not only lose its economic and political independence but would also be turned into another war base against everything for which the Yugoslav people have fought!

Among the internal factors in the

Yugoslav situation must be noted, to begin with, the difficulties encountered in the transition to Socialism in such a country, erstwhile semicolonial, with a population eighty per cent peasant, with a low technical level in agriculture, with a weak industry and a small working class, with divisive tugs of economic particularism in the component republics, and with a complex national question.

These special difficulties of socialist construction, in context with a weak theoretical armament, have given rise in the leadership to moods of capitulation and to a line of "least resistance," that is, an orientation toward the capitalist states.

A further internal factor is the social composition of the Yugoslav Communist Party. At the outbreak of the war the reconstituted Party counted 15,000 members. In the course of the armed insurrection against the occupation forces, 12,000 of those members, steeled in illegal struggle, fell. The present membership of 400,000 came to the Party through the resistance movement during the war, and in the postwar reconstruction period. Many bourgeois nationalists—peasants and intellectuals—saw in the Party the organizer and sole leader of the national resistance and joined in mass. The Party membership is almost completely new and theoretically not yet mature. With the population overwhelmingly peasant, and with a numerically inconsiderable in-

dustrial proletariat, the Party is predominantly composed of peasants and intellectuals, social strata particularly subject to bourgeois-nationalist sentiments. Bourgeois nationalists have honeycombed the Central Committee and other leading bodies of the Party. Until recently these elements disguised their true position; but in the past months they have operated with increasing openness.

The nationalist spirit was further stimulated by intoxication with successes of the liberation movement and reconstruction immediately following the war. The Party leadership, departing from Marxian internationalism, in a purely opportunist fashion, encouraged this spirit of conceit and self-sufficiency, and itself sank to the low level of bourgeois-nationalist megalomania.

The world will always applaud the heroic Yugoslav people in the struggle for national liberation. But courage and heroism, though essential, are not enough for firm Marxist leadership; these qualities must be combined with Communist clarity deriving from a profound study of Marxism-Leninism, if, indeed, they are not to become in themselves factors of disorientation.

Thus, the Resolution exposes the dangers of the bourgeois-nationalist ideas which pervade the Yugoslav Party leadership:

Considerably overestimating the internal, national forces of Yugoslavia and their influence, the Yugoslav leaders think that they can maintain Yugo-

slavia's independence and build socialism without the support of the Communist Parties of other countries, without the support of the people's democracies, without the support of the Soviet Union. . . .

Under the influence of this nationalistic spirit the Yugoslav Party leaders have displayed an attitude of chauvinist arrogance toward the brother parties of the Information Bureau. In defiantly spurning the fraternal criticism of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Parties of the Information Bureau, and in refusing to attend the Bureau meeting, the Yugoslav Party leaders, as the Resolution declares, "have taken the path of seceding from the united socialist front against imperialism, have taken the path of betraying the cause of international solidarity of the working people. . . ."

* * *

Capitalism constantly exerts ideological pressures upon the working class and seeks also to affect the Communist vanguard. The imperialist bourgeoisie intensifies its pressures when the working class is allied with other classes and social forces, in order to prevent the proletariat from assuming leadership and to subordinate it to capital.

Failure to be constantly on guard against these pressures can only harm—sometimes gravely—the working class and its vanguard. A tendency toward ideological weakening manifested itself in a number of

Communist parties during the war, as well as in the period preceding the war, expressing itself in the blurring of class distinctions and class goals. This tendency is traceable in the main to two sources: 1) an incorrect application of the People's Front and proletarian United Front policies, and 2) a confused orientation in the war-time alliance. Both sources gave rise to mistakes in theory and practice as regards the position of the working class in its alliances, the role of the Communist vanguard in these coalitions, the relationship of the immediate aims of the working class in the alliance to the ultimate goal of Socialism, the role of the Soviet Union in international relations, the interrelationship of the struggle for national independence and the principle of proletarian internationalism, and the dialectics of the class struggle in the stage of transition to Socialism.

Extreme ideological weakening occurred in our Party during Browder revisionism, when we abandoned Marxism-Leninism with respect to the question of American imperialism, the working class and the class struggle, the essence and role of the Communist Party, the Socialist objective, and working-class internationalism.

To understand what happened in Yugoslavia, let us remember that imperialist states never flag in their maneuvers to build up anti-Socialist forces within countries that have removed themselves from the orbit of

capitalism. The thwarting of the Trotsky-Bukharin collusions with foreign capitalist states to hinder the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union has not ended either imperialist efforts at further collusions with Trotskyites and Right opportunists or the permeation of Trotskyite-Bukharinite ideas among weak, petty-bourgeois elements. The imperialists will never fail to regard any breach with Marxism opened up by persistent opportunism within the Party as a fissure for their penetration.

The Bureau Resolution exposes the line of the Yugoslav Party leadership as incorrect on basic questions of foreign and internal policy and as representing a retreat from Marxism-Leninism.

This departure from Marxism-Leninism is evident in the Tito leadership's anti-Soviet attitude. Such conduct denies the international significance of the October Socialist Revolution and of the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union. It belittles the Bolshevik Party, whose integrity was forged under Lenin and Stalin during half a century of struggles for revolutionary Marxism. It ignores the great lessons of leadership to be learned from that vanguard Party which led the proletariat of Russia to power and Socialism, and which captained the Soviet people to the victory that saved mankind from fascist enslavement.

The attitude of the Yugoslav Party leaders reveals little recognition of

the fact that the rise of *all* the peoples' democracies, their existence as independent states, was made possible by the victory of the Soviet Army over the fascist aggressor. Had the Yugoslav resistance been ten times as effective, it would still have been hopelessly limited to guerrilla skirmishing had not the Red Army bled the Nazi hordes white and decimated their main forces.

The Soviet Army, by its very presence in Eastern, Central, and South-Eastern Europe, prevented the resurgence and regrouping of the native fascist and generally reactionary forces and made possible the conditions for the people's forces to affirm themselves as new democracies taking the path of Socialist development. Who can deny that it was the Soviet Union which thwarted the notorious Churchill plan for military occupation of these countries, General Scobie fashion? Who can deny the immense contribution of the Soviet Union toward releasing the popular forces to crush reaction and consolidate the peoples' democracies? The rise of the postwar peoples' democracies is part of the anti-fascist and anti-imperialist struggle of world scope led by the Socialist Soviet Union against the world-supremacy policies of finance capital, centered in Wall Street.

The Yugoslav leaders not only belittle the liberating role of the Soviet Union, but also depart from the Leninist principles guiding Socialist construction. Their retreat from Marx-

ism-Leninism is manifested in the incorrect policy in the villages. The land has not been nationalized. The peasantry consists predominantly of individual small holders, although co-operatives, limited to a consumer-distributive type, are present. The number of state farms is small. Land is purchased and sold. The wealthy peasants, owning much of the land, are able to strengthen their position.

Holding to the un-Marxist idea that the peasantry is a "most stable foundation of the Yugoslav state," the leaders have turned the Party upon the path of "a populist, kulak party," as concerns the leading role of the working class. This deviation proceeds from their denial of the Leninist teaching that in the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism the class struggle becomes intensified and from their Bukharin-like view of a diminishing class struggle and a harmonious growth into Socialism.

Such an un-Marxist approach brought the Yugoslav Party leaders to blur the class differences and the class struggle in the village and to tolerate the growth of rural capitalist elements. It caused them to magnify the role of the peasantry in the class relations and to negate the leading role of the working class in the transition to Socialism on the basis of the people's democracy.

The revisionist negation of the role of the working class led Tito to the blurring of distinctions between the

Communist Party and the People's Front.

This line is present in his report to the Second Congress of the People's Front of Yugoslavia and in the reports of Kardelj and Djilas to the founding conference of the Information Bureau. In these reports the People's Front, whose 7,000,000 members comprise not only workers and small farmers, but also traders, small manufacturers, and kulaks, as well as bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and mixed mass organizations, stands out as an undifferentiated supra-class entity. It is "one strong collective of unity of thought and action," "an alliance of all the patriots . . . of all those who have embarked upon the new task of building up and strengthening the new Yugoslavia," with a "monolithic" organization—in short, one homogeneous revolutionary mass! *Ergo*: "The People's Front program is the Communist Party's program"; "their program is, in fact, one and the same."

This means purely and simply the denial of the Party as the highest form of organization, the denial of the Party as vanguard. This Menshevik conception, expressed in levelling the program of the Party to that of the People's Front, has encouraged the dispersal of the Party. Such a policy, the Resolution declares, "threatens the very existence of the Communist Party and ultimately carries with it the danger of the

degeneration of the People's Republic of Yugoslavia."

Here it is worth dwelling on the demagogic assertions in the bourgeois press that this criticism by the Information Bureau signifies that the Communists everywhere are "through" with People's Front alignments. In this context, the liberal Del Vayo, for instance, writing in *The Nation* of July 10, would have us consider the Information Bureau Resolution as "the prelude to a revision of the Communist position in relation to other left groups and working class parties." With this perverse logic he concludes that the Party in Yugoslavia was singled out for criticism for no other reason than that there the People's Front "is more effective than in any other country of the Eastern bloc."

What gulfs between such allegations and reality!

What is the People's Front and what are its relations to the Communist Party?

The People's Front is not an array of tin soldiers that can be taken out of a box at will and laid away at will. The People's Front is a coalition whose political essence and organizational scope are determined by objective historical circumstances in the stage of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. It involves diverse class forces impelled to action by the common threat of fascism. Decisive to the effectiveness of the People's Front in realizing its aims is the leading role of the working class.

Due to its position in capitalist society as the basically exploited class, with no stake in the system, the fundamental interests of the working class lie in the abolition of all exploitation. This is why the working class is the most consistent and dependable progressive and democratic force in the nation. From this flows the special role of the vanguard Party of the working class, the Communist Party, in the People's Front. Just as the Communist Parties signalized the threat of fascism and initiated the People's Front, they remain within the coalition the main guiding and cementing force. To emphasize the danger of submerging the Party within the Front and thus liquidating its vanguard role is not to give up the People's Front, but to prevent its degeneration. To strengthen the Party and affirm its role is not to weaken, but to strengthen and consolidate the People's Front.

Negating the true role of the Party in the People's Front must lead to the distortion of the Leninist organizational principles of the Party. The Yugoslav leaders have annulled Party democracy and instituted a bureaucratic regime which terrorizes the membership. The Central Committee is in its majority not elected, but co-opted. Party meetings are either not held or are conducted in secret. The Communist Party—in the land where the people are in power!—"is actually in a position of semi-legality," says the Resolution. The elementary rights of the members are suppressed. Criticism of mis-

takes is not tolerated, but is met punitively, while self-critical acknowledgment and examination of errors and defects—what Lenin called "the earmark of a serious party"—are observed only in their non-practice.

The liquidationist manifestation is directly reflected in the Party's inner life. The Party's organizational principles cannot be maintained in soundness when its programmatic principles are violated. Between the political essence of a party and its organizational structure and procedure there is an interactive unity. Thus, in 1903, the struggle waged by the opponents of the organizational principles which Lenin formulated at the crucial Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party only revealed the profound division of the Party into revolutionary and opportunist wings as regards basic program.

Justly the Resolution states:

This type of organization of the Yugoslav Communist Party . . . leads to the liquidation of the Party as an active, self-acting organism, it cultivates military methods of leadership in the Party similar to the methods advocated in his day by Trotsky.

* * *

When, in 1925, in the course of answering a series of questions submitted to him at Sverdloff University, Stalin was asked whether the Party was threatened with the danger of degeneration, he replied:

The danger is, or rather, the dangers are, real enough. . . . In my view, there

are three main dangers to reckon with:

a) The danger of losing sight of the socialist goal which is the aim of all the work of reconstruction in our country; this danger, therefore, is an intensification of the tendency to relinquish the conquests of the revolution.

b) The danger of losing sight of the international revolutionary goal—the danger of a short-sighted nationalism.

c) The danger that the Party may lose its position as leader, and, therefore, the possibility of the Party becoming no more than tailpiece to the State apparatus.

These three dangers now threaten the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the People's Republic of Yugoslavia with utter degeneration.

The Resolution of the Information Bureau is a tocsin sounding the gravity of this danger. It is a call to the true Communists of Yugoslavia to rally to the banner of Marxism-Leninism, to re-establish the inter-

nationalist traditions of the Yugoslav Communist Party, to restore Yugoslavia to her honored position in the united Socialist front. The Resolution expresses confidence that "the Communist Party of Yugoslavia will be able to fulfill this honorable task."

The Resolution of the Information Bureau condemning the revisionist and liquidationist line of the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia renders a vital contribution to the struggle of the peoples' forces to hold the peace front strong and unimpaired. It will have the effect of strengthening the international links of the working class and of fortifying the world camp of Socialism. It will take its place among the enduring historic documents from which Communists can derive guidance in the struggle that must constantly be waged to safeguard Marxist-Leninist principle and to promote Marxist-Leninist policy.

THE "GRAND" OLD PARTY

By MAX GORDON

IT CANNOT BE SAID that the orators at the recent Republican national convention in Philadelphia were modest in their claims to world rule.

Perhaps because of his alleged youth, the national chairman of the Young Republicans, Mr. Ralph E. Becker of New York, was slightly more brash about this than the rest. But his humble willingness to yield to mass world demand that he lead the peoples everywhere out of the wilderness was repeated in one form or another by nearly every other speaker and by the party platform.

Said the youthful Mr. Becker, who hails from a swank town in Westchester County:

The rest of the world looks to us for economic assistance, but we know that primarily it seeks and needs us for spiritual and intellectual leadership. The entire world is locked in a battle for freedom, and we can be humbly thankful that our party has the necessary leadership to continue to champion these principles to fulfill this world hope and need.

The convention demonstrated overwhelmingly that the Republican leadership of the nation is solidly united in viewing it to be America's sacred mission to dictate to other peo-

ples their forms of government and their economies. Whether the speakers were of the "Old Guard," like Herbert Hoover, Gov. Dwight Green of Illinois, or Speaker Joe Martin of the House, or whether they were the somewhat ragged "New Look" Republicans like Sen. Raymond E. Baldwin of Connecticut, Mr. Becker or candidate Thomas E. Dewey himself, there were no differences on this one essential point.

"Republicans may disagree as to method but they never disagree as to final objective," said retiring National Chairman B. Carrol Reece in one of the few convention statements that bore any relation to objective fact.

Since the statement applies pretty much to the ruling bourgeoisie as a whole, Mr. Reece might have added that there is no disagreement on objectives with the Democratic Party leadership either.

The essential unity within G.O.P. ranks was expressed in the general approval for the record of the Republican-led 80th Congress, both in its foreign and domestic aspects.

But within the framework of this unity on aims, there were important divisions, both behind the scenes and in full public view. These divisions were based on contending interests of powerful financial and industrial groups; on differences on methods of achieving similar goals; on rival ambitions of individuals and political machines with enormous vested interest in control of the government bureaucracy. Regardless of the

sources of these differences, any serious political opposition to the bipartisan program of monopoly capital must take them into account and know how to exploit them.

* * *

The chief line of division—that between the so-called “internationalists” and the “isolationists” (or “nationalists” as they now dub themselves)—cut across both foreign and domestic policy, though it had its origin in the problem of overseas relations. The point at issue was, and remains, how far to commit America’s economic, political, and military resources to the struggle for Wall Street’s domination of Europe.

The “internationalists,” representing the viewpoint of the major monopoly financiers of the nation—the Morgan, Rockefeller, DuPont, Mellon groups and their associates—want no limit placed on the use of these resources. They are prepared to go the whole hog in their drive to subject the economies and political regimes of the European continent to Wall Street control and exploitation.

The tactics developed by the “internationalist” group in pursuing its goals are the classic ones of carrot and club. While brandishing the club in the form of a massive arms and military conscription program, its position at the convention showed it had by no means abandoned the carrot in order to attract middle-class “liberal” and Social-Democratic labor backing within the nations abroad for those goals. Its policies

were heavily couched in terms of “economic aid” for “reconstruction,” as well as in terms of maintaining “freedom” against “Communist totalitarianism.”

Domestically, too, the “internationalist” crowd attempted to steer the convention in the direction of winning some popular support among workers and Negroes for its program. It did this through its choice of candidates and its demagogic platform promises. Both because of its own political tendencies and the pressures of the “Old Guard,” its efforts along these lines were distinctly limited.

The opposition to the “internationalists” came from two general sources. One, the so-called “nationalist” group, represents the thinking of important midwest industrial and banking circles more concerned with exploitation of the home market and of Latin America than with Europe.

To some degree, these circles, in competition with the first-line financial and industrial monopolies of Wall Street, fear expansion of the Morgan and Rockefeller-controlled concerns. The greater such expansion, the more advantageous the position of these concerns in relation to their smaller competitors.

Some of the most vociferous foes of an all-out expansionist drive in Europe have been the “Little Steel” industrialists, who are not happy about the privileged position of Morgan-controlled U. S. Steel in the European “aid” set-up.

Because their immediate economic

interests are not directly served by the all-out drive, the midwest crowd balks at committing without reserve the nation’s economic and political resources to the European drive. Their own predilection for “economy,” tax-cutting, less government “interference” in world economic activities comes into play. They also gag at the liberal-sounding demagoguery, both in relation to foreign developments and to domestic affairs, which the “internationalist” bunch promotes in the effort to win popular backing for its expansionist aims.

The most direct spokesman for this “nationalist” group at the convention was Herbert Hoover himself. Said Hoover, in his address to the gathering:

With all the good will in our hearts, our friends abroad should realize that our economy must not be exhausted or over-strained by these burdens, or the last hope of the world is lost. . . .

Our friends abroad should realize that we are today certainly straining our American economy to the utmost. Warning signals already clang in our ears. Relief and defense will soon be costing us over 22 billion dollars a year. Our Federal budget threatens to increase to 50 billions a year, unless we delay many plans for internal social and economic improvement. . . .

. . . Our reputed prosperity has begun to walk on two stilts: one is the forced draft of exporting more than our surplus through relief; the other is a great armaments program. We cannot go higher on these stilts, or we will break a leg getting down. . . .

Hoover, obviously, was not talking to “our friends abroad.” He was warning the convention to place limits on foreign “aid” in the interests of governmental “economy,” and was demanding that resources needed by the groups interested primarily in domestic production not be shipped too heavily abroad.

Adding to “nationalist” strength was the large number of delegates who were small-town bankers, businessmen, local grain dealers, and well-to-do farmers, with all the insularity, prejudices, and narrow economic views of these groups. Their chief interest was to eliminate all possible checks upon their profit-taking, including a reduction of taxes, curbing of the trade unions, ending of government “regulation” and “interference,” etc.

Tactical differences existed within the “internationalist” group, too, such as the Dewey-Stassen dispute on how to handle the Communist movement in the United States, and the dispute between Stassen and others on the extent of interference with nationalization processes in nations receiving U.S. “aid.” Stassen demanded, in pre-convention primary campaigns, suppression of the Communist Party and prohibition of all measures of nationalization. He was opposed for fear that such steps would tend to lose popular backing for the Marshall Plan among the peoples of Europe, and would weaken American standing as an “island of freedom.” These disputes and their effect on the primaries helped

shape the final result at the convention.

* * *

Months before the convention opened, it was clear that the favored candidates of the Wall Street "internationalist" group were Senator Arthur Vandenberg and Governor Thomas E. Dewey. The Rockefeller and DuPont interests, always close to the New York Governor, were in his corner. The Morgan group leaned toward Vandenberg.

It was also clear, however, that all leading candidates were pretty much in line with Wall Street's expansionist program. This included Harold Stassen; Governor Earl Warren of California; and even Ohio's Senator Robert A. Taft, previously the darling of the "nationalists," who had made substantial concessions to Wall Street's viewpoint in the months before the convention. Such "dark horses" as Representative Joseph W. Martin and Hearst's man-on-horseback, General Douglas MacArthur, who might have had different views, were never serious threats.

Taft, despite his concessions, remained the first choice of the "nationalist" crowd and its supporters. He was never fully accepted by Wall Street.

Because of this general devotion to Wall Street's foreign policy it was evident that other factors would enter into the struggle for the Presidential nomination. Not the least of these was the effectiveness of Governor Dewey's campaign, a model

of thoroughness and painstaking organization.

But Dewey had other important considerations in his favor. His chief rival, Vandenberg, had been weakened by the general feeling, partly shared by himself, that the most efficient execution of Wall Street's foreign policy required he remain as head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The bitter battle on Marshall Plan funds in the final weeks of the Congressional session, in which the "nationalist" group showed unexpected power, strengthened that feeling. Moreover, by taking an uncompromising stand on the issue of Marshall Plan funds, Vandenberg became anathema to the "nationalist" group, and hence unsuitable as a candidate who could unify all factions of the party.

Dewey's other major rival, Taft, was associated with the Taft-Hartley Law, and hence would solidify labor opposition to the G.O.P. if he became the candidate. As Senate majority leader, Taft also had to assume responsibility for failure to pass any of the civil rights measures, as well as for other actions of Congress.

Harold Stassen had begun his drive for the Presidency disguised as a "liberal." He made a good deal of headway because of this pose. But as he began to drop his demagogy in order to accommodate himself to the party hierarchy, he began to lose his special appeal. Dewey, by a slick tactical move, smoked him out from behind his liberal disguise by waging the Oregon primary struggle on the

issue of opposition to Stassen's demand for a ban on the Communist Party. Dewey's lieutenants claim Stassen was licked on this issue. For the New York Governor, of course, the issue was not one of principle but a tactic for destroying Stassen's "liberal" reputation.

Not associated with Congress, Dewey had been able to avoid taking a position on the basic conflicts rending the nation these past two years. While his attitude on foreign policy was unequivocally that of his Wall Street backers, he was formally in the clear on the Taft-Hartley Law, prices, taxes, civil rights, etc. Furthermore, as Governor of the state with the most powerful and vocal progressive movement, he had been compelled to take a "moderate" position in relation to labor, and to adopt certain limited progressive measures which could be exploited among Negro and Jewish groups. He had had strong A. F. of L. backing in his 1946 gubernatorial race. While much of this had been dissipated in 1947 when he promoted the Condon-Wadlin Act to bar public workers from striking, there was a chance he could regain it, certainly to a greater degree than his chief rivals. At this writing, there is talk of possible endorsement by the New York State Federation of Labor.

Governor Earl Warren was in a strikingly similar position, but had nothing resembling the New York Governor's organization, which for two years had been building up a network extending into virtually every

state in the Union. For the same reasons that made Dewey acceptable as presidential nominee, Warren was finally chosen as the vice-presidential candidate. Significantly, both Dewey and Warren felt impelled to clear their skirts by putting themselves on record for the Taft-Hartley Law just before the convention opened.

* * *

It would be wrong to minimize the part played by the candidates' campaign organizations, their personal ambitions, and the rivalries of the various state machines in determining the final result. As Engels once remarked, we are dealing here with "great cartels of politicians, who are supposedly [the nation's] servants, but who in reality exploit and plunder the nation." This plunder and exploitation, because it is so enormous, is itself a big business, and the battle to get in on the inside is no small one.

Here the Dewey organization was supreme. Smooth, efficient, unhampered by scruples of any kind, exploiting every conflict and antagonism, it "blitzed" the convention before an anticipated deadlock could develop.

This finished off Vandenberg, who had depended upon a deadlocked convention which would turn to him as the "compromise" nominee.

Dewey's chief tactic was to buy off the "favorite sons" of various delegations before the nominations even got under way. This effectively prevented a deadlock, since the large "favorite son" vote was supposed to

have been the barrier to an early majority for any one candidate.

The sequence of events is interesting. On the evening of the first day of the convention, Monday, June 21, John Foster Dulles, Wall Street attorney and Dewey's brain-truster on foreign policy, met with Senator Vandenberg—not yet an avowed candidate—presumably to persuade him not to allow his name to come before the convention. Apparently Dulles did not succeed. Thus, on Tuesday morning, Senator Edward Martin, "favorite son" of the 73-man Pennsylvania delegation, second largest at the convention, got the "blitz" rolling by declaring himself for Dewey and "releasing" the Pennsylvania delegates from their pledge to cast a first ballot for him.

By Wednesday morning, when Vandenberg finally got around to declaring himself a candidate, three other "favorite sons" had followed Martin's example.

Dewey had been able to win Senator Martin by exploiting an internal struggle in the Pennsylvania G.O.P. The powerful and notoriously corrupt Grundy machine, of which Martin is a part, was in a scrap with Governor James H. Duff, who for reasons of his own was trying to build another machine. By pledging federal patronage to the Grundy machine, Dewey was able to win its support. He paid off immediately by turning over to Grundy and Martin the choice of a G.O.P. national chairman. They chose Representative Hugh Scott, a snobbish Philadelphia

blue-blood who hailed originally from Virginia and hobnobbed with pro-fascist elements. Doubtless Dewey, a smart politician, would have preferred not to be saddled with such a character.

But a bargain is a bargain—sometimes. Scott's appointment as national chairman was insurance that Grundy would get federal patronage should Dewey be elected.

It was also widely believed that Dewey had promised Representative Charles A. Halleck, the Indiana "favorite son," the vice-presidential nomination. According to reports, Representative Halleck understood it that way when he broke for Dewey. But Halleck is one of the "Old Guard." As House majority leader, he is tarred with the Congressional record. And so he was turned down for Warren.

* * *

The platform adopted by the convention is, by and large, a generalized statement of G.O.P. opposition to most sin, to labor, and to taxes. It is designed to slide over differences within the G.O.P. and to obscure the real program of the party from the people.

In its foreign policy aspects, it is a reiteration of the bipartisan foreign policy. Interestingly, the "nationalist" elements were able to wrest certain verbal concessions from the dominant Wall Street crowd, as can be seen from a comparison of the draft platform with the final product. They knocked out a pledge of "adequate appropriations" to accompany foreign

policy commitments; a reference to atom control by the United Nations; and a promise of support to the reciprocal trades treaties, which the "nationalists" had succeeded in emasculating in Congress.

On the domestic side, the platform is a distinct retreat from earlier G.O.P. pledges, which were not kept anyway.

It eliminates earlier specific commitments for an F.E.P.C., for federal aid to education, for extension of social security coverage to all employed, for assistance to farm tenants to buy their farms, and for crop insurance to farmers. It opposes any specific action to halt price increases, confining itself to the usual G.O.P. shibboleths of government "economy," lower taxes, and higher production as the way to bring prices down. It backs down on former statements of support to public power projects, confining its promises only to projects associated with flood control and waterways. It comes out flatly for state ownership of the oil-rich tidelands, which the courts have ruled belong to the federal government. The point at issue here is that the big oil monopolies are more powerfully entrenched in state governments than in the federal government. While that condition will not prevail if Dewey is elected, it is nevertheless easier for the oil monopolies to make under-cover deals with state governments than with Washington.

On public housing, the platform adopts the position of the foes of the

Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing measure by suggesting federal public housing only after private housing has failed and state and local governments have demonstrated they cannot foot the bill.

The final platform contains a clause, not in the original draft, calling for application of all existing laws against the Communists and suggesting new ones be enacted if necessary. The clause was added on the insistence of Representatives Karl Mundt and Richard Nixon, authors of the notorious Mundt-Nixon Bill, who wanted a flat endorsement of their measure, and were given this as a compromise.

Elimination of the more liberal-sounding aspects of the draft in the final platform is not, in itself, of great significance. It reduces by a few items the pledges the G.O.P. will not keep and it indicates simply that the "Old Guard" elements in the party were powerful enough to limit the demagoguery of the "New Look" crowd. Both elements are adept practitioners of reaction and Red-baiting.

* * *

The Negro question was prominent in the convention, as G.O.P. leaders strove mightily to try to stem the tide toward Henry Wallace. Efforts were made to restrain the Jim-Crow elements and to give the impression that there was absolute equality of Negro and white within the G.O.P. It did not quite come off.

Out of the 1,094 delegates, there

were only some 37 Negroes, according to the best estimates available. About ten were from Northern and border states. The rest were from the South, chiefly from Mississippi and Georgia. Some of the Southern delegations were "lily-white." Others had one or two Negro delegates or alternates to cover up their actual "lily-white" status. The bitter credentials committee battles around the Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina delegations, behind which was the struggle for votes for this or that Presidential candidate, revealed the shameful manner in which the Negro was being used as a catspaw by the party hierarchy.

Before the convention started, a conference of Negro delegates presented the Platform Committee with a 9-point program on civil rights, which included anti-lynch, anti-poll tax, and F.E.P.C. legislation; an end to Army Jim-Crow and to segregation in all inter-state travel; enforcement of the constitutional provision to reduce Congressional representation of those states that limit the vote; federal aid to education; granting the right to vote to citizens of the District of Columbia; and admission of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska as states of the Union.

Scant attention was paid to the document, and the chairman of the committee that drafted it, Hobson R. Reynolds, a Philadelphia city magistrate, later joined a picket line and delegation organized by Negroes to try to put this program through. Reynolds was a convention speaker,

virtually the only one not enthusiastic about the record of the 80th Congress.

The Negro delegates were not impressed by the rather frantic efforts of convention leaders to appear as champions of equality, and several were sharply critical of the way the convention handled the issue.

* * *

It is fantastic to offer the G.O.P. convention as evidence that American politics are democratic. In the first place, the delegates are carefully screened by the state machines, themselves usually run by the most powerful financial and industrial groups in the state. In most cases, the delegates are "men of substance" who, in the words of one delegate, must be able to "kick in" to the campaign "kitty."

Secondly, even the bulk of these delegates have no contact with, or knowledge of, the back-room deals by delegation heads which throw their votes one way or another. The evening before Senator Martin announced himself for Dewey, the Pennsylvania delegation had voted to back him as "favorite son" for an indefinite number of ballots. Yet he made his announcement without consultation with the delegates. He later had to account for his actions to an angry caucus and did a mighty weak job of it. By that time Dewey was virtually the candidate.

No serious contender could possibly come forward who was not backed by powerful financial or industrial groups prepared to spend

millions to take power. These groups control the state machines and the machinery of the G.O.P. itself. It is a neat lesson in the technique by which the bourgeoisie in our kind of democracy ensures its control of the state apparatus.

* * *

The plutocratic character of the G.O.P. convention needs to be widely exposed, as part of the basic task of exposing the two-party system. The apologists for the two-party system brought into play all the techniques of mass communication and propaganda on a grander scale than ever before to parade the convention as an example of "democracy in action," and to cover up the domination of the party by Big Business.

The convention also has posed before progressives the task of laying before the public the common aim of all factions in the G.O.P. leadership to develop aggressive imperialist policy which is heading us toward a new world war, to suppress democratic rights, to shift the inflation burden onto the people and to con-

tinue economic policies that will head us for a deep, prolonged crisis.

The sham nature of the "liberalism" of Governors Dewey and Warren, upon which the G.O.P. counts heavily to gain votes especially among Negroes and workers, also must be brought out into the open. Their state records and their public utterances give ample evidence of the fake character of their "liberalism."

The extent to which the facts concerning the reactionary backing, program, and leadership of the G.O.P. is brought to popular attention will help determine how great will be the break-away of Republican voters to the new party headed by Henry Wallace. There is ample evidence that this break-away can be substantial.

It will also help to persuade large sections of independents, disgusted with President Truman, not to shift to the G.O.P. but to switch their vote to Henry Wallace as the sole Presidential candidate who is a genuine opponent of the present warlike foreign policy and reactionary direction in domestic affairs.

THE NEW STATE OF ISRAEL

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

THE EMERGENCE of the state of Israel at this time is of considerable international significance. For the Jewish people this marks a great milestone in its history.

It can be safely assumed that the struggles of the Jewish masses against national discrimination and for equal rights in countries where Jewish communities suffer from anti-Semitic persecutions and inequality, will become intensified and strengthened because of the rise of Israel. Depending upon the degree of influence which the anti-imperialist and labor forces in Israel will be able to exercise upon the policies and development of the new state, Israel may in time become a very important factor in the struggle for national liberation and for peace throughout the Middle East.

INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF STRUGGLE FOR ISRAEL

The struggle for the independence and territorial integrity of the new Jewish state is part of the general struggle for peace, national independence, and democracy. It is also a struggle for the liberation of the Arab peoples from British and Anglo-American imperialist domination. It is a fight to prevent the

imperialists and warmakers from turning the Middle East into a major base of military operations in a new world war.

It is necessary to say at this point that the anti-imperialist forces of the world, the peace forces headed by the Soviet Union, have played a decisive part in enabling the Jewish people of Palestine to attain their own state. This must be said now, not only because many leading Zionists tend to forget it, but especially because the fate of Israel as an independent and democratic state — its very existence—is inextricably bound up with the progress and success of the anti-imperialist and peace camp.

It is necessary to say further that Communists generally have played a very important part in the emergence of the Jewish state at this time, and that the American Communists have made serious contributions to the struggle for Israel.

In this fight we were guided by the fact that there lived in Palestine two peoples, not one—an Arab people and a Jewish people—and that the principle of national self-determination required that each of these two peoples be given the right to decide for itself the kind and form of national existence it wanted to have.

Some comrades had difficulties for a while in seeing that the Jewish people in Palestine had the right to self-determination. The source of these difficulties was the inability to recognize that the Jewish people of Palestine was not just an aggregation of so many immigrants or chil-

dren of immigrants, but that, in the course of recent history, a Jewish community had arisen which had begun to develop all the characteristics of a nation—and every oppressed nation is entitled to the right to self-determination. This applied equally to the Arabs of Palestine whose community also began to develop the characteristics of a nation. That is why the anti-imperialist forces, including the Communists, are the only consistent supporters, and now the best fighters, for the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947, which calls for the setting up of two independent and democratic states in Palestine—a Jewish state and an Arab state.

Another source of difficulty for some comrades in recognizing the progressive nature of the struggle for Jewish statehood in Palestine *in the present period*, as distinct from the time when there were no progressive forces interested in and capable of realizing it, was the fact that Zionism—bourgeois nationalism—was the original political movement championing the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Here the misapprehension was twofold. First, there was a lack of realization that historically the bourgeoisie was the leading force in the rise of many nations and states, in the period when the bourgeoisie was still capable of progressive actions. The fact that it was the Jewish nationalist bourgeoisie which originally raised the political demand for a Jewish state could not in itself—abstracted from the concrete his-

torical conditions — invalidate the progressive nature of the demand. Moreover, these comrades did not grasp the fact that the fight for the right to national self-determination even today, in the imperialist era, is of a general democratic character and not of a socialist character.

The demand for a Jewish state in Palestine *in past periods* was not utopian and reactionary because bourgeois nationalists were leading the fight for it. The demand was utopian and reactionary because there was no Jewish nation in Palestine and no progressive forces internationally interested in and capable of realizing this demand.

Secondly, there was the lack of understanding that in the imperialist era it is the working class and its Marxist party that are capable of leading a consistent fight for national self-determination and freedom. Who is it, if not the working class, led by the Communist Parties, that is now rallying the peoples of Western Europe to resist enslavement by Wall Street imperialism and to defend the national independence of their countries? And who is leading the fight for the national freedom of China? Again it is the working class, led by the Communist Party of China, that is building the alliance with the peasantry, the middle classes and all other anti-imperialist forces, and that is leading the fight for national freedom.

There was also a certain lack of understanding that Communists can—and must—carry on the fight for the national independence of their

peoples not as bourgeois nationalists but as working-class internationalists. It is in the nature—the class nature—of bourgeois nationalism to tend to narrow down the fight, to vacillate between imperialism and anti-imperialism, to mistrust the working class and to seek to prevent its emergence as the leader of the national struggle for independence and, consequently, as the leader of the nation in the struggle for socialism. All this makes bourgeois nationalism highly inconsistent and wavering in the fight of the people for their national freedom. It produces tendencies of capitulation to, and compromise with, imperialism, and strengthens the efforts of the reactionary forces in the Zionist movement to betray the national liberation fight completely.

But the nature of working-class internationalism is qualitatively different. It is consistently anti-imperialist and seeks the complete overthrow of imperialist domination. It bases itself upon the working class and all the other democratic forces of the people and seeks to make the working class the leader of the fight. It looks for allies internationally among the consistent anti-imperialist forces, the forces of peace, democracy, and socialism, the camp headed by the Soviet Union. It links up the fight for national liberation with the historic struggle of the exploited masses of the people for social liberation. It wages the fight for national freedom in such a way as to make it a stage in the struggle for socialism.

Inability to see clearly that the fight for Jewish statehood in Palestine can and must be carried on by Communists not as bourgeois nationalists but as working-class internationalists, was in part responsible for the temporary difficulties of certain comrades in recognizing the progressive nature of this struggle *in the present period*. This same inability to distinguish clearly enough between the bourgeois-nationalist and working-class internationalist policies in the struggle for the Jewish state has been and continues to be a source of errors and weaknesses of a bourgeois-nationalist nature in our own midst.

Communists aim to help bring about the broadest coalition of democratic and anti-imperialist peace forces, including Jewish bourgeois nationalists, to help Israel defend its independence, democracy, and territorial integrity. But in this broad coalition movement, Communists exert all their efforts to advance the working class to positions of leadership and to help the movement rise to the levels of ever greater anti-imperialist consistency—to the struggle to undermine the power of the monopolies. In other words, Communists fight and work in this broad coalition as working-class internationalists and not as bourgeois nationalists. This is one of the major conclusions that can be drawn from the application to this question of the draft resolution of the National Committee for our coming Party convention.

Consequently, we must view the

fight for Israel in its broadest aspects. It is a fight for national freedom and independence. Why? Because Anglo-American imperialism threatens at present both the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of the new Jewish state, using for this purpose the so-called “truce” resolution of the United Nations and its “mediator.” It is an anti-imperialist fight for peace because it aims to prevent Anglo-American imperialism from turning the Middle East and Israel into a strategic bridgehead for Wall Street’s new world war. It is a fight for the liberation of the entire Middle East from imperialist domination and oppression—from the rule of the oil monopolies and their political agents.

In other words, we must see the fight for Israel as an organic part of the world struggle for peace and democracy, AND WE MUST SO WAGE IT. This means that the fight for Israel requires a struggle against the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, against Wall Street’s imperialist expansionism, against Wall Street’s pro-fascist offensive upon the democratic liberties of the American people at home. It means, finally, that the fight for Israel can and will be won decisively and completely only by joining it with the fight of the camp of anti-imperialism and democracy headed by the Soviet Union.

We must not allow ourselves to be influenced by the pressures of bourgeois nationalism which seeks to narrow down and, hence, seri-

ously weaken the fight for Israel by separating it from the general fight for peace, democracy, and national freedom. Opportunist tendencies to give in to these pressures must be energetically combated at the same time beating off all sectarian resistance to the building of the broad coalition of Jewish democratic unity as part of the general American people’s anti-imperialist coalition.

THE FIGHT FOR ISRAEL AND THE INTERNAL POLITICAL SITUATION OF THE U. S.

What is the effect of the fight for Israel upon the general political situation in the United States? What is the effect upon the American Jewish national group, the immediate effects and those of longer range?

Both parties of the Wall Street monopolies are parading as the friends of Israel, as its fathers and mothers, in order to win the votes of the American Jews in the coming national elections. And leading American Zionists are working hand in hand with Wall Street’s parties to achieve this result: Rabbi Silver and his friends work for the Republican party, while Democratic Zionist politicians work for the Democratic party.

There is, of course, considerable worry among the imperialist politicians and their allies in the Zionist leadership about the success of their maneuvers among the Jewish masses. For the fact is that wide masses of American Jews have shed their illusions about the sincerity of the Israel-loving professions of the Tru-

mans, Tafts, and Deweys, and the other Democratic and Republican politicians. The further fact is that the peace coalition of the American people and the Wallace-for-President and third-party movement have already penetrated very deeply into the American Jewish national group. Finally, Communist influence among the more advanced Jewish masses is distinctly on the increase due to the vanguard activities of the Communist Party in the fight for Israel, even though these activities were uneven and not sustained.

Thus we have two effects on the internal political situation arising from the fight around the new Jewish state. The efforts of Wall Street's political parties, assisted by leading Zionist circles, by means of pro-Israel demagogy, to bind the Jewish masses to the imperialists, to prevent them from joining the anti-imperialist camp of the American people and the third-party movement, to get the votes of the Jewish masses for the Democratic and Republican parties—this is one effect which, if uncombated by the anti-imperialist forces, may achieve certain successes.

The other effect is the process of disillusionment in the two major parties among wide Jewish masses, including broad Zionist circles, due to the insincerities and outright treacheries of these parties with respect to Israel. Moreover, the unfolding of the bipartisan foreign policy of Wall Street imperialist expansion and war preparation, accompanied by a pro-fascist and anti-Semitic offensive at home, has

deeply disturbed and aroused the masses of the American Jews. These masses view the major political parties with great suspicion and distrust, and the course of the fight for Israel in the United States tends to strengthen this suspicion and distrust. The course of this struggle is also bound to hasten the turn of ever larger Jewish masses toward the anti-imperialist peace coalition and the third-party movement. The splendid fight for Israel of the Wallace-for-President and third-party movement is making a deep impression upon the American Jews.

This brings us to the effect of the fight for Israel upon the American Jewish national group. The first and most significant effect is the speedup in the process of political realignment among the American Jewish masses. Basic sections of the Jewish bourgeoisie, assimilationist as well as Zionist, together with the Right Social-Democrats and reactionary trade union bureaucrats of the *Forward* and "Jewish Labor Committee" group, are becoming ever more closely attached to the imperialist war camp of Wall Street. On the other hand, the masses of Jewish workers, middle classes, professionals, and intellectuals are moving in ever larger numbers into the anti-imperialist camp of peace and democracy. The fight for Israel is deeply influencing and hastening this process of realignment.

For the issue now among the American Jewish masses is no longer: for or against the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

With the emergence of Israel, as we anticipated in December, 1947, the major issue is turning around the question: How shall we help Israel to maintain its independence, national sovereignty, and territorial integrity? Do we want to help Israel grow and develop as a state of real democracy and social progress, as a state of a new people's democracy, or are we satisfied to let Israel become a cog in the American or Anglo-American imperialist war machine, dominated and exploited internally by the Wall Street and its native—Israeli—bourgeois agents? How can we help Israel become an equal and respected partner in the great, powerful world camp of peace, national freedom, democracy, and socialism, headed by the Soviet Union?

These are now the major issues in the fight for Israel that are agitating the Jewish people everywhere, including the American Jewish national group, and especially in Israel itself. It is around these issues that the political struggle is unfolding between the anti-imperialist and democratic forces in Jewish life, headed by the Jewish workers, on the one hand, and the supporters of imperialism and reaction, headed by big capitalists, reactionary bourgeois nationalists and the Right Social-Democrats of the *Forward*. These issues are already becoming tied up with the broad major issues of the American people against Wall Street, namely, peace and democracy versus war and fascism. It is in the struggle for Israel around these new is-

ues that ever wider masses of American Jews move toward the anti-imperialist peace camp and the people's peace coalition.

Naturally, the Zionist movement in the United States is beginning to be affected by this process of realignment. While there are as yet few organized expressions of this process, it is beyond doubt that the minds of the masses influenced by and following the Zionist movement are agitated and disturbed by the fact that the official Zionist leadership (Silver, Newman, etc.) is doing practically nothing to help Israel defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity at a moment when American and British imperialism are presenting such grave threats to the new Jewish state. Zionists are asking: why is our movement doing nothing to ward off these threats? How can Rabbi Silver's political collaboration with Taft and Dewey help Israel when the main line of Republican Party policy is the Dulles-Marshall-Vandenberg bipartisan line of Wall Street and the oil monopolies—the line of destroying Israel's independence and of turning it into a strategic bridgehead for Wall Street's next world war? How can political collaboration with the Democratic Party, advocated by Democratic Zionists, help Israel, when the Democratic Party administration is following the same line?

The anti-imperialist forces among the American Jews must pay considerably more attention than heretofore to helping the Zionist-influenced masses find the correct answer

to these crucial questions. That answer is that all genuine friends of Israel—Zionist and non-Zionist—must together fight Wall Street's imperialist offensive and its two parties. The answer is for Zionists to build up a strong anti-imperialist movement within American Zionism—a movement that will be of real help to Israel as well as to the cause of progress and equal rights in the United States. The answer is for progressive Zionists to become active builders of the democratic unity of the American Jews, as part of the anti-fascist unity of the American people as a whole, to fight for Israel's independence and democracy, to fight for the rights and survival of the Jewish people everywhere, including the United States.

In Israel itself, the process of realignment is developing with considerable intensity. Forces are coming to expression that are working for the unity of all anti-imperialist and democratic elements. These forces are found inside the Zionist movement in Israel. An important force is the Communist movement. And the perspective of the struggle is already becoming visible.

It is the struggle for an independent and democratic Israel, as a state of real democracy and social justice, seeking to help the national liberation movements of the Arab peoples and lands, aiming to become a factor of democracy, peace, and social progress in the Middle East, and collaborating actively with the world camp of peace, democracy,

and socialism, headed by the Soviet Union.

It is a fight against the pro-imperialist and reactionary forces in Israel—the forces that aim to make the new Jewish state a cog in Wall Street's imperialist war machine, an object of economic exploitation and oppression by Wall Street trusts and their Israeli bourgeois agents, a puppet and instrument of American imperialism. The American Jewish masses, including the Zionist masses, have a duty and responsibility to help the progressive and anti-imperialist forces in Israel to make the new Jewish state a factor for progress and democracy, a Jewish national center of which progressive Jews everywhere will be proud, a people's state of social justice which will be admired and supported by all progressive humanity.

The struggle for Israel along these anti-imperialist and progressive lines is bound to have lasting long-range effects upon the further development of the American Jewish national group. It will heighten the feeling of dignity, confidence, and self-respect among the Jewish masses. It will tend to strengthen their fighting capacity against anti-Semitism and for equal rights. It will thus enable them to become more valuable partners and collaborators in the general progressive movement of the American people, headed by labor. It should make them better fighters for the equal rights of the Negro people and for the realization of the Negro people's national aspirations in the Black Belt of the South. It is

bound to make of the masses of the American Jewish national group more valuable fighters for the equal rights of all national groups and against the whole Wall Street imperialist system of national discrimination and oppression by the Anglo-Saxon "master" and "white" race in the United States. Influenced by the progressive and Communist forces, the masses of the American Jewish national group will become a more effective force in the general anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly coalition of the American people, headed by labor, and in the new people's party.

It is clear that these developments around the fight for Israel will tend to strengthen all those tendencies which work for the perpetuation and survival of the Jewish national group as a national group. Jewish consciousness and national pride will grow and become more intense, especially among the Jewish youth. Bourgeois nationalism will seek to exploit these developments, and so will sections of the assimilationist big Jewish bourgeoisie and Right-wing Social-Democracy which are beginning to parade as "national-minded" Jews, making "friendly" gestures in the direction of Jewish bourgeois nationalism. Finally, we must not overlook the clerical-nationalist efforts of the Temples and Synagogues, particularly among Jewish children and their young parents.

This presents us with ideological and political tasks of the first magnitude. We must fight to promote the realignment in the American

Jewish national group, helping to build and consolidate the democratic unity of the Jewish masses, linking it up with the general democratic and anti-monopoly coalition of the American people, combating and isolating among the Jewish masses the pro-imperialist, Social-Democratic and reactionary-nationalist forces. *At the same time, we must meet the ideological and political task of promoting the leadership of the working class in the democratic unity of the American Jews. We must build the strength and authority of the Communist Party among the Jewish masses. We must cultivate and spread the ideology of working-class internationalism versus bourgeois nationalism.*

All these tasks go together, hand in hand, inseparably. One without the other has no meaning for Communists, and must result in failure. And this is another major, if not *the* major, conclusion to be drawn in applying the line of the draft resolution to this question.

We can safely assume that as long as the struggle for Israel is a vital issue in American Jewish life, which will probably be the case as long as the struggle for peace of the present period is a vital issue in the life of humanity, just so long will the tendencies working for the survival of the American Jewish national group continue to be strengthened, even though assimilationist tendencies will also continue to operate. This can be assumed to be true, in the main if not in all particulars, for those Jewish communities (Latin America,

Canada, England, France) which have similarities to the Jewish community in the United States. Should Israel develop along the lines of a progressive and truly people's state of social justice, becoming a collaborator in the world camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, this will most certainly tend to strengthen very greatly all tendencies working for the survival of the Jewish people *as a people*.

Our task is to make sure that these survival tendencies operate on the lines of progress, democracy, and socialism.

DEFEAT THE ANGLO-AMERICAN IMPERIALIST CONSPIRACY AGAINST ISRAEL

Under cover of the truce resolution for Palestine, Wall Street's diplomacy is seeking to promote an understanding with Bevin which would nullify in fact the partition decision of the United Nations. Rivalry in the Middle East exists in plenty between British and American imperialism. Therefore, much bargaining is taking place on the road to such an understanding. But this is the objective: to establish American and British imperialist rule in the Middle East by a division of spheres of influence and regions, to retain and extend the American and British oil monopoly there, to keep the Arab peoples in subjection, to destroy Israel or make it a minor puppet, and to turn the Middle East into a strategic bridgehead for Wall Street's next world war.

Bernadotte's "peace" proposals

made public on July 4, seek to give expression to some of these imperialist objectives. According to these proposals, King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan, an agent of British imperialism, would receive the following: the Arab part of Palestine, which is to become an independent state according to the U.N. partition decision, Jerusalem, Israel's Negev, and privileges in Israel's port of Haifa. The curtailed territory of Israel would then be "joined" to Abdullah's greatly enlarged Trans-Jordan in a sort of fake "federal" relationship, with immigration into Israel greatly limited, and with American and British imperialism dominating the whole "new" state.

Under this treacherous scheme, imperialist rule would be reestablished and strengthened in Palestine and in the entire Middle East under the management of Wall Street and its junior British partner. Israel will cease to exist as an independent state. Intensive war preparations would begin at once to turn Palestine and the entire Middle East into a jumping-off place for a new world war—a war against the Soviet Union, the colonial peoples, the new democracies, and against all democratic and socialist movements.

For the Jewish people, in Israel and everywhere, the immediate task is clear. It is to unite their own forces, and join with the anti-imperialist and democratic peace forces of the world to defeat this imperialist conspiracy. *It is to fight to save the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Israel.* In the United

States, it is the task of the democratic forces of the American Jews, together with all democratic forces, to demand of the government:

1. Help realize the partition decision of the United Nations of November 29, 1947, for the establishment in Palestine of two independent and democratic states—a Jewish state and an Arab state.

2. Grant Israel official recognition and at once exchange fully accredited diplomatic representatives.

3. Support in the Security Council the proposal that the Council itself, and not the mediator and so-called truce commission, assume direct charge of realizing the partition decision.

4. Abandon the unjust and dangerous policy of excluding the Soviet Union from the U.N. agencies for Palestine.

5. Lift the embargo and remove the blockade from Israel.

It is imperative that all Jewish organizations sincerely supporting Israel undertake joint actions in struggle for these and all other demands that may help to defeat the newest Wall Street-Bevin imperialist conspiracy against Israel. It is imperative that all progressive forces of the American people, especially labor, and the third-party movement, rally the masses in this important phase of struggle against Wall Street's war offensive, and for peace and democracy.

Communists must make sure that in carrying on this fight we resist all tendencies to narrow down the struggle for Israel to the concepts

of wavering and hesitating bourgeois nationalism. We must not let the fight for Israel become separated from the fight for peace and democracy, because the surest way to win Israel's battle is to strengthen the fight against Wall Street's warmaking and pro-fascist offensive in general.

When we fight against the bipartisan foreign policies of Truman, Marshall, Dewey, Vandenberg, Dulles, etc., we fight the very source of the imperialist treacheries against Israel. When we fight for peace and rally mass support for the proposals of Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin calling for conversations and negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, we are fighting for the independence of Israel and all peoples threatened by Anglo-American imperialism. *But when we fail to resist the pressures of bourgeois nationalism to isolate the fight for Israel from the general fight of the American people against Wall Street's imperialist and reactionary offensive (for the Wallace peace proposals, against the Mundt Bill and similar pro-fascist measures, for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley slave labor law, etc.), we fail most seriously in our duties as vanguard. We fail to project and to win support within the broad democratic unity of the Jewish people for the most effective way of fighting for Israel.* And this is in no way contrary to the policy of building the broadest unity of action in support of Israel, including among supporters of bourgeois nationalism.

Communists must also make sure that the unity in this struggle for Israel is built primarily from below, among the masses. We must make sure that it is a unity of action and struggle, of struggle for demands that can really help Israel resist imperialist pressures and blackmail. But in doing so, let us not fail to utilize the pressures of the masses from below to win the participation of leading individuals, groups, and organizations.

In all these activities we must be guided by our main orientation on promoting the realignment within the American Jewish national group. This means building and consolidating a democratic unity of the Jewish people, as part of the general American peace coalition, along the lines of anti-imperialism, peace and democracy versus imperialism, national oppression, war, and fascism.

This means that in the struggle for Israel we must seek to build a coalition along the same general lines: all Jewish anti-imperialists, supporters of the fight for peace and enemies of fascism must gather into one camp to fight the servants and supporters of imperialism among the Jewish people—to fight for Israel and equal Jewish rights. Here a most crucial field of struggle is the fight for the realignment in the Zionist movement of the United States, for winning the mass supporters and followers of the Zionist movement for joint actions for Israel and the Jewish people in general. We must not allow sectarian pressures to interfere with our work in this important field.

This is a third major conclusion that can be drawn from the application of the draft resolution to this question.

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

A Few Thoughts on Our Perspectives

By GIL GREEN

OUR PARTY can well be proud of its record of struggle since the emergency convention at which it was reconstituted on Marxist-Leninist principles.

The period of the past three years has been one of incessant reactionary attack in which American imperialism emerged arrogantly as the chief enemy of peace and democracy throughout the world.

As was to be expected, the main fire of the foe has been concentrated upon our Party. It has withstood these attacks with honor and delivered important counterblows.

There can be no doubt that the main line of our Party during this period has been basically correct and that the line of the national resolution submitted for our Convention is likewise sound. The most valid criticism of the present draft, and we of the national committee should take note of this, is that it is excessively long and repetitious in style—so that much of the *fauna* of basic analysis is lost in the *flora* of words. Once this weakness is corrected, the resolution can provide our Party with the necessary Marxist-Leninist compass by which to sail the uncharted seas of the even more turbulent period ahead.

At the same time it must be noted that our Party does suffer from many grave weaknesses. In this period of pre-convention discussions we must focus sharper attention on these weaknesses so as to be able more consciously and effectively to eradicate them.

LACK OF PERSPECTIVE

One of our main weaknesses is ideological. Ofttimes one has occasion to note that our *whole* Party does not yet grasp *all* the main features of the present period, but tends to see things in an oversimplified and one-sided fashion which distorts perspective. There is not everywhere that understanding of the relationship of class forces—not only as it manifests itself today, but as it is developing for tomorrow—that can imbue our whole party with a firm, unshakeable confidence in itself, in the American working class, and in ultimate victory. And supreme confidence in victory is essential for every army, political no less than military, particularly at times of enemy onslaught.

I do not say that there is a questioning anywhere in our ranks of the inevitable victory of our socialist cause. But some comrades see this as

something in the far distant future, while for the foreseeable future they perceive either darkness or a rather hazy fog.

In the Illinois district we have come across isolated expressions of this tendency. In one section, for example, a comrade saw no chance of defeating the recent Mundt Bill and felt that the funds used in the fight against it were being wasted. Events have proved him wrong about the Mundt Bill, but this comrade also betrayed a rather strange concept of struggle—for even if the bill had been passed, only the prior mass fight to defeat it could have laid the base for continuing the struggle under the new conditions. And the struggle must continue regardless of the conditions.

Among our foreign-born comrades there is a justifiable pride in the great achievements of the peoples of their lands of birth. But among some of them this is also coupled with a pessimism and unconcealed contempt for the American working class and its progressive and revolutionary potentials. While one can understand the feelings of impatience with the slowness of awakening in this country, the attitude of these comrades is harmful and wrong. It will not help improve our mass work. It can only lead to a negative, sectarian withdrawing from the patient, painstaking task of enlightenment and struggle.

A few comrades have also expressed their beliefs that fascism is already here, or that the trend in this direction is so far gone that it

is inevitable. These comrades view every reactionary blow as being synonymous with fascism. Hence they fail to see the process by which fascism is being prepared and they underestimate the possibilities for arousing and uniting large masses to arrest this process. In fact, they unwittingly underestimate the meaning and danger of fascism, for if fascism is already here, there is nothing worse to fear—which on the very face of it is absurd.

In the trade union movement we have also noted expressions of despair and panic at moments of temporary setbacks and defeats. This arises from a failure to see the war for the battle, from a tendency to view the battle as an end in itself and not as part of a war of many battles.

I do not want to leave the impression that the above tendencies are either numerous or widespread, but that they do exist at all, in any form, can only be traced to a lack of ideological clarity on our perspectives, flowing from a poor grounding in Marxism-Leninism.

EXAGGERATE STRENGTH OF ENEMY

What is the root cause for moods of this kind? In my opinion they stem in the main from an exaggerated estimate of the strength of American imperialism and an underestimation of the latent power and strength of the working class.

True, American imperialism is the strongest power in the capitalist world. True, also, that the present course of the ruling class to subju-

gate the rest of the world by a combination of economic, political, and military means, is not a temporary or transitory development. It represents a fixed course, for there is no other that American imperialism can pursue in the world of today.

But this very truism is more an indication of the inherent weakness of monopoly capital than of its strength. In fact, the source of its greatest strength — a productive power greater than the rest of the capitalist world combined — is the very source of its greatest weakness. For American capitalism is plagued by an insoluble contradiction, in the long run more acute for it than for any other capitalist power. This is the contradiction between its immensely expanded productive capacity and its constantly narrowing market possibilities. Thus it can be said that the iron heel of American imperialism is also an Achilles heel.

American imperialism cannot resolve this basic contradiction by its effort at world expansion. All it can do is temporarily postpone the ultimate day of reckoning, and this at the price of sharpening all world contradictions. As our national resolution correctly indicates, the forces of the working class and of peace and democracy on a world scale are stronger than those of American imperialism and its reactionary satellites. And as the struggle for world markets, for investment outlets, and for sources of raw materials sharpens, we are going to witness a sharpening also of the contradictions within the imperialist camp itself,

especially the Anglo-American contradiction.

In the United States, the relationship of forces is not the same as on a world scale. Here reaction does at present have the upper hand. *But*—and this is of decisive importance—given the necessary fortitude and struggle on the part of our Party, and its ability to link itself together with, and give leadership to, ever wider masses, the relationship of forces within this country can also be changed. It will take some time to accomplish this, but there should be no doubt in our minds but that it can be done.

EFFECTS OF ECONOMIC BOOM

It must be seen that some of the difficulties of struggle in this country today arise from certain factors that have temporarily operated in favor of the ruling class. First and foremost of these has been the existence of an economic boom. The wartime and postwar economic booms have created many illusions. Despite the growing inflation and huge profiteering which have reduced living standards, the bourgeoisie has been able to maintain relatively full employment and to use its gluttonous super-profits to bribe and corrupt strata of the population. It is precisely this subtle combination of outright assault coupled with economic bribery that makes the present moment so complicated and creates confusion and illusions on a wide scale. It is this which has made possible a temporary mass base for the opportunist lackeys of Wall

Street in the ranks of organized labor.

Some sections of the working class, large sections of the middle class and the farming population are affected by this. Certainly, the boom in agriculture of the past ten years is a far cry from the chronic agricultural crisis that hung its pall over the countryside from 1920 all the way to World War II. While many farmers have been hard hit by the rising prices of manufactured goods, while many eke out but a bare existence from their own sweat and toil, there can be no doubt that the agricultural boom has been a deterrent to their being drawn into the struggle on a scale such as will be possible tomorrow.

But every passing month will bring a sharpening of the inherent contradictions of American capitalism. As world agricultural production returns to "normal," the crisis in American agriculture will become more imminent, and this agrarian crisis may break even before the economic crisis itself. And when the horrors of an economic crisis descend upon the land, the ruling class will no longer be able to maneuver in the same way, nor have the same material reserves with which to bribe and corrupt.

THE COMING CRASH

Because the bourgeoisie has been able to ward off temporarily the outbreak of the economic crisis through its much more than tenfold increase in military expenditures and through the Marshall Plan, it would be fallacious

to believe that it has succeeded in indefinitely postponing this crisis.

Had the program which our Party advanced to meet the oncoming crisis been put into effect, the crisis could have been postponed for a longer period of time and its depth and extent somewhat diminished. But the licentious profiteering, the uncontrolled inflation, the irresponsible speculation, the rejection of every demand for increased social security, the refusal to raise real wages and to adopt a slum clearance and housing program, are all factors that hasten the crisis and indicate that when it breaks it will be with unprecedented violence. The very means of artificial respiration by which the bourgeoisie has undertaken to postpone the crisis, only guarantee that when it does come the patient will be very sick indeed. And because the rest of world capitalist economy has never been so dependent upon Wall Street as it is today, the crash in America will have wide reverberations throughout the capitalist world.

The coming economic crisis must therefore be part of the thinking of our Party if it is to have a clear perspective for the period ahead. This crisis will bring untold suffering to tens of millions. And the ruling class, having less maneuvering room, will even more unabashedly remove its democratic mask and attempt to carry out its plunderous objectives by brute force—at home and abroad—if it can get away with it.

Thus the approach of an economic crisis will not remove the danger

of war and fascism. In a certain sense it will increase it. For the ruling class has learned something from world history and from the last economic crisis. That is why it is trying to meet this crisis *in advance* with fascism and war—the only ways by which it believes it can cheat history from paying the full penalty for its crimes. But this is not entirely up to it, for it will still have to reckon with the people.

One thing is certain. The outbreak of the economic crisis will unleash forces on an unprecedented magnitude and scale. Whether under such circumstances the American people, under the leadership of the working class, will be able to establish the necessary understanding and unity to take a leap forward in the fight for democracy, peace, and socialism, will depend in no small part on our Party and on how it fights and works today.

That is why every battle is so important, why the enemy is so fearful of our Party, even though it is still far from being a mass Party, and why the enemy is consciously trying to build up a mass base for an American form of Social-Democracy which can mislead militant masses. And the possibilities for struggle today are truly enormous.

EFFECTS OF DEEPENING GENERAL CRISIS

If this is a period of economic boom, it is no normal such period. It operates within the framework of the deepening general crisis of the world capitalist system. And this is

instinctively sensed by large masses who may never have heard of the general crisis of capitalism and who may even be conscious defenders of the capitalist system. But unconsciously there is a growing questioning, a growing uncertainty, skepticism, and doubt.

In contrast with the period of economic boom which preceded the 1929 tailspin, when large masses believed that the Kellogg Peace Pact had outlawed war for all time and that American capitalism had found the secret of perpetual economic motion and permanent prosperity, the present period is one of ever gnawing fear of impending disaster, whether of a new war or an economic crash. Even the conservative middle-western farmer who may tell you he is earning more today than previously, will also, with a worried look in his eyes, tell you that it can't last, that we're sitting on an economic volcano which is sure to erupt.

It is this highly charged atmosphere—constantly recharged by war-hysteria and war preparations, by rising prices, by reactionary attacks upon labor, the Negro people, and civil rights—which has made possible the emergence of something qualitatively new in American political life—a new political party. The birth of this third party, based on a new coalition of class groupings directed against the parties of monopoly capital, is something profoundly significant not only for the 1948 elections, but for the whole future of this country. In this year 1948, it is possible to lay the steel

and granite foundations for a giant political skyscraper that can in a relatively short period of time dominate the American scene—just as the Republican Party, born in 1854, took over the reigns of government in 1860.

The great opportunities for unfolding mass struggles, for delivering blows against reaction and also winning partial victories, can be seen in two recent developments. First of these was the defeat of the Mundt Bill, which, as Comrade Foster has already pointed out, constitutes an important victory, even if not a decisive one. The second example is the wage movement. Big Business had made up its mind ruthlessly to block any attempts at a third round of wage increases. Reactionary labor leaders were ready to go along with this, while liberals were ready to throw in the sponge. The New York *PM*, in one of its week-end editions, carried the following front page headline: "CIO'S 3RD ROUND WAGE DRIVE FACES DISASTER." But it was *PM* that faced disaster, not the wage fight, for due to the correct policy of our Party, due to the superb militancy of workers in such industries as packing, printing, auto and farm equipment, a third round of wage increases is taking place.

THE GROWING AWAKENING

In viewing the American scene today, it is therefore incumbent upon us to see the difficulties and not to underestimate them, but also to see the growing signs of awakening, the

immense and expanding opportunities, and the inevitable trend ahead. We must constantly remember what Engels emphasized a number of times for America—that when the mass awakening begins here, it will move with a specific American tempo, with seven league boots, and rush rapidly toward a climax. Engels drew this conclusion from watching the struggle in America in the period of still ascendant capitalism. How much more true is this for the period of the general crisis of capitalism.

Bearing this perspective in mind, it is our great historic responsibility today, so to build and strengthen our party, ideologically and organizationally; so to steel our Party in struggle and prepare it for rapid shifts in the forms of struggle; so to utilize every opportunity to undermine the lackeys of imperialism in the ranks of labor and the people, as to prepare ourselves and great mass reserves for the even more decisive battles ahead.

This means that we cannot operate on a hand-to-mouth basis, from campaign to campaign and from issue to issue. Through every campaign and every struggle must run a red thread which links all these together in an over-all strategy aiming at the solution of our most fundamental problems. This is too often lacking in our work today. Frequently, we are so intent on making the next move on the chess board, that the move is not sufficiently related to the strategy needed for winning the game itself.

THE PARTY MUST LEARN TO CONCENTRATE

Our Party must co-ordinate and plan its work far better than it has to date. We must guarantee a better distribution of our human and material resources to the decisive tasks and the key fronts of struggle. We must give far more attention to the training and promotion of new cadres, coming from struggle and especially from the ranks of the workers, the Negro people, and the youth. And above all else, we must learn how to *CONCENTRATE* on that which is decisive, even at the expense of temporarily weakening other things.

Key to everything is the strengthening of our Party's work in industry and, in the first place, the basic industries. Let us admit quite frankly that our work is not yet concentrated upon winning the working class. Let us also admit that the class composition of our Party is poor for a working-class party and that we have not made much headway in improving it. But the winning of the working class *MUST* be the central orientation of our Party, whether in the building of the third-party movement or in anything else we do. This understanding must permeate our entire organization, every section and branch of it.

BUILD THE PARTY ON NATIONAL SCOPE

Our party, too, must more aggressively break through and become a party on a national scale. We have

talked much of this, but there are whole states and hundreds of important industrial communities in which we have no organization whatsoever. The whole area from the Mississippi River to California is still largely undiscovered territory for our Party, its soil rich with militant tradition, but lying fallow.

It may appear that to raise the question of building our Party on a national scale is to violate the precept of concentration. But this is not so. Many of the basic industries of this country are located in states and areas of states in which we are exceedingly weak.

We must rekindle a crusading, pioneering spirit in our ranks and particularly among our youth. More comrades must be ready to volunteer to meet the rigors and trial of going where they are most needed.

Our Party must grow in strength and influence everywhere, but we cannot merely permit this growth to take place spontaneously. If we do, we shall not build either a Party rooted deeply in the basic working class or one national in scope. And we of the larger centers such as New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, etc., must be ready to see this problem and give up some of the narrow provincialism that characterizes our approach today. To distribute our forces and resources correctly, at each level of Party organization, and in accord with a plan of concentration, is one of the chief tasks before us.

These are but two of the larger problems we must give thought to when we begin to approach our

work with greater perspective, not just for the moment but for a longer period of time. Our Party is today immersed in many battles and these are of great importance, but we must also foresee the even more crucial ones to come and prepare for them in time. Only in this way can we build the kind of Party that can fulfill its historic responsibilities with honor as a true vanguard of the American working class and people.

For New Approaches To Our Work Among Women

By CLAUDIA JONES

THE DRAFT RESOLUTION places as the central task before our Party the building of the people's anti-monopoly and peace coalition against American imperialism. It likewise stresses the imperative need for the people's coalition, and particularly the working class, to fight aggressively on those issues which can win the support of every section of the population that can add solidity, numbers, and strength to the battle against American imperialism.

The resolution, however, does not sufficiently stress the need for the people's coalition to fight for the special social, economic and political needs of the masses of American women. Nor does it emphasize the Party's vanguard responsibility in organizing and winning working-class women to the anti-imperialist camp.

The resolution does not adequately emphasize the developing counter-offensive of the women themselves, as evidenced in their growing interest in the new people's

party and in their fight against high prices, war, and for democratic liberties. While the resolution notes that a mood of resistance is growing among American women, it does not sufficiently expose the attempts being made by the monopolists to influence them.

The importance of winning American women, especially in working-class and Negro communities, to militant resistance to Wall Street's program of fascism and war, can be fully understood only if we correctly assess the decisive role American women can play in the political life of the nation.

To begin with, women represent over half of the nation. Moreover, there are nearly 16 million women wage-earners, one-fifth of whom are heads of families. Thirty-seven million women are housewives in cities or on farms. Eight per cent of these are working mothers. There are forty-seven million women eligible to vote in the United States—

over a million and a half more than men!

As regards their degree of organization, nearly 30 million women are organized in various types of clubs and national women's organizations which are, in the main, bourgeois-led.

* * *

Wall Street imperialism has not been lax in recognizing the potentially powerful political force that women represent. It is paying increasing attention to reaching and influencing them. As part and parcel of its general reactionary offensive, it has, since the war's end, unfolded a tremendous ideological campaign, to influence the minds of the people along reactionary channels as regards American women.

Heart of its ideological campaign is the false Hitlerite slogan that "women's place is in the home." This slogan is primarily designed to obscure the source of the many existing inequalities in the social position of women in the United States. It further seeks to obscure the fact that the many social and economic advances made by women during the anti-fascist war are today being undermined.

No sooner was the war ended than a drive was made to send women back into the kitchen. In place of employer eulogies to "angels with dirty faces" women are discovering that because of their sex they have two strikes against them today in competing for jobs.

Furthermore, the majority of job openings are in clerical, sales, and

service fields, which means that rates received by women workers are lower than those they received in wartime jobs. There are growing trends which show that these postwar employment difficulties are falling most heavily on Negro women, who were the first to be fired in the layoffs especially in the heavy industries.

We are beginning to witness a growing trend in which Negro women wartime workers are being forced back into domestic work because no special fight has been put up to secure jobs for them in basic industry by the trade unions. Generally, a retraining job program must be outlined and fought for by the trade unions, if the wartime skills gained by women are not to be completely obliterated. While women are "still a major factor in industry, in the whole national economy, and in the labor movement" as the draft resolution notes, their widespread ouster from heavy industry during reconversion has resulted in a general falling off of their membership in the trade unions.

The drive of reaction, has on the whole, not succeeded in ousting women from industry. This is due mainly to their determination to remain in industry and trade union protection won in some industries during the war. As evidenced in numerous polls, moreover, work for these women is a necessity, to make ends meet, because of invalid husbands, sickness, inadequate wages of their menfolk, support of their families, etc.

The present reactionary attack on

the position and condition of women in industry should be a challenge to progressive trade unions to organize women workers. The demands for a retraining program, for equal pay for equal work, for protective legislation for women, which monopoly capitalism seeks to remove by Constitutional amendment, loom today as some of the major issues with which to reach the woman wage earner. Some reactionary successes in wiping out progressive legislation and in extending the working day for women occurred last year with very little protest by the trade unions. The emasculation of the appropriations by the G.O.P.-controlled Congress has also seriously crippled the valuable work of the Women's and Children's Bureaus of the Department of Labor.

Side by side with attempts to put women back into the kitchen has come a serious reduction of the all too inadequate social services. The wartime nursery program for working mothers has been cut down to a minimum. The threatened new rise in the price of milk menaces the health of millions of children. The refusal of Governor Dewey to appropriate funds for the all-too-few child care centers in New York State is an index of the callous attitudes which prevail in both of the major parties toward the needs of children.

It is around such issues that millions of women can be reached in the communities. Concern for the health of their children, for ade-

quate medical and nursing services, for correcting the completely inadequate and obsolete conditions in the public schools, are burning issues in the minds of millions of women. Around such issues we can help women to more deeply understand the real significance of the Marshall Plan. We can show them that the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine mean sacrificing the living standards and the educational system of the people. We can show them that the drive to militarize and draft our youth means retrenchment in higher education and discouraging the enrollment of our young people in the colleges. We can above all expose the reactionary essence of monopoly capitalism, which on the one hand clouts the women with rocketing prices, housing shortages, hysterical threats of war; while, on the other, it woos them with free movies, speakers, etc., on the glories of American "free enterprise."

The drive of American reaction to force American women into a reactionary path must not be permitted to succeed. The burning problems of the American women, if correctly understood and fought for by the people's coalition, can succeed in making the masses of American women, and especially the working-class women, a powerful force for progress. It is clear therefore that in such a situation our Party must correctly assess its own activities as regards work among women, if it is to play its vanguard role in this important sphere of the struggle for peace and progress.

Let us estimate the extent to which we have progressed in this vital sphere since the emergency convention.

In February, 1947, our Party established a National Women's Commission. Its establishment marked a significant reaffirmation of the importance of Communist work among women.

Our Commission has functioned rather regularly, and we were able in the course of the year to establish twelve similar commissions on a state scale. These exist in the following districts and cities: Ohio, Michigan, New York, Chicago, Eastern Pennsylvania, Western Pennsylvania, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Washington, New Jersey, and Houston.

These commissions were established in most cases as a result of special women's conferences called by our Party districts and sections. This has proved a healthy means of assessing their needs, concrete problems and ties in the community and of raising Party sensitivity as a whole to the needs of women in general.

It has proved valuable likewise in convincing many women comrades (skeptical with justifiable reasons) that our Party was serious about this phase of work. This skepticism will not be eliminated solely by the formation of women's commissions; it will only be eliminated if our Party as a whole really begins to tackle these problems theoretically and practically.

A general weakness of our work

has been failure to sufficiently integrate the work of these commissions with that of other Party departments. This is indicative of a general tendency to relegate this phase of work to the women themselves, and to consider questions of policy with regard to mass work of women the sole responsibility of the commissions and our women comrades in mass organizations.

If we ask ourselves why this situation exists, I believe we would have to conclude that it is primarily due to the fact that our Party has failed to place the question of theoretical understanding of the woman question as a "must" for every Party member. Absence of this theoretical understanding has resulted in failure to combat male-chauvinist tendencies which are rampant in our Party. It has resulted in failure consistently to assign women comrades to mass work, without which we can never root our work in this sphere among the working-class and Negro women particularly.

The recent establishment by our National Board, at the initiative of Comrade Foster, of a special subcommittee to deal with theoretical aspects of the woman question, marks the first serious step in the necessary process of equipping our Party to overcome this serious weakness.

As regards Party organization generally, we are only beginning to find the special methods and forms necessary for greater activation of our women comrades. Some of the forms which have brought results and

which should be further developed are:

1) National cadre and regional schools for theoretical training of our women comrades.

2) Daytime classes for our women comrades. Such classes have been held in practically all major districts. The Kings County Party organization in New York City pioneered in this form and has since established a continuous daytime program for women comrades. This form is especially appropriate for rapidly equipping many of our women with an elementary knowledge of basic Marxist-Leninist principles.

3) Guidance of the work of our women comrades in mass organizations. There is much underestimation still of the importance of mass concentration work among women. When we consider the inadequate size and influence of the existing anti-fascist and progressive organizations among women, especially in the working-class, Negro, and nationality organizations, we can more fully appreciate the need of real attention to this phase of work in order to enable our women comrades to do effective mass work and Party building.

4) Concrete organization of services for Party women. The continued organization of services, "baby sitter" funds and services for Party women can prove very helpful in enabling many of our Party women to do mass and Party work.

The work of the National Women's Commission still suffers from many weaknesses. These can be listed

as follows: 1) A failure to make the decisions and experiences and problems of the Commission the property of the entire Party; 2) failure to equip our Party more regularly with facts on trends among women and to organize an exchange of experiences between districts; 3) failure to integrate our trade-union women comrades in the work of the Women's Commissions. In connection with all our tasks, there is need for Party literature on the women question. Our press has to make a basic turn in its attention to, and coverage of, the problems of women.

Our Party nationally has a women's membership of close to forty per cent. While in most districts our women are demonstrating that they are capable of carrying out many-sided Party responsibilities equally well with men, there is not as yet sufficient recognition of their capabilities or their promotion into leadership posts on all levels. A notable exception is the California district, where, on a county, section, and club level, women Communists hold positions in administrative, educational, legislative and mass posts. This process must be speeded up in our entire Party.

Of special importance is the need to tap deeply the tremendous potential and organizational abilities of our Negro women comrades.

Generally in the Negro liberation movement, South and North, it is the Negro women who are leading and symbolizing many of the struggles for equality by the Negro people. Greater attention to the triple handi-

caps of Negro women can help to strengthen our Party life and the building of Negro and white unity.

Time is short. We are still in the process of catching up with our past weaknesses in this phase of work when, under Browder revisionism, work among women was liquidated as part of the whole liquidationist policy which then prevailed in our Party. But, since its national emergency convention, our Party has chalked up a proud record of mili-

tant struggle for the needs of the people, women and men, who must mutually join in a fight against the warmongers and pro-fascists as a necessary prerequisite for the attainment of our ultimate goal of socialism. The working-class women of America will respond to the message of our Party if we but organize our work in such a way as to speak out, and give leadership in struggle, on the needs and issues facing them.

Against Opportunism In Practice

By FRED FINE

THE 1948 National Convention of our Party must do more than confirm the correctness of our general direction. It must do more than concern itself with the extremely important task of sharpening and deepening our political and tactical line. The coming convention must inaugurate measures that will spur a *qualitative transformation* of our Party toward becoming a more truly Leninist Party of the working class. It must result in sharply accelerated advances in the *quality* and *style* of our work. It must open warfare against practices that flow from chronic underestimation of Leninist principles of organization. The convention must alert the Party to the continuing gap between our resolutions and the execution of the resolutions — between words and

deeds. It must mount a year-round offensive against opportunism in practice. The *entire* Party must be enrolled in this struggle.

The Emergency Convention marked a turn by repudiating revisionism and by reconstituting the Communist Party. It put the Party on its ideological guard against theories of class collaboration. It based our political line on a program of struggle against Wall Street's imperialist and reactionary offensive. Our forthcoming National Convention must call for a leap forward in the Bolshevization of our Party. This can only take place in the crucible of struggle—struggle around the needs of the workers and their allies and through a struggle for our line and against opportunist hangovers. It calls for a permeation of all

our thinking with a heightened working-class orientation. It calls for political mobilization against "liberal" tolerance of practices that belong in the parties of Social Democracy and not in a Leninist Party.

Under the leadership of our National Committee the tactical unfolding of our line and the Party's program of action in the past three years has given greater depth and clarity to the Marxist reorientation called for by the Emergency Convention. While great and fundamental progress has been made in this direction, the struggle against opportunism is a never-ending one. This is especially true in our country, which emerged from the war as the most powerful and predatory imperialist nation in the capitalist world. American imperialism, in keeping with its traditional policy, has intensified the corruption of leaders of the labor movement. Nor are Communists immune to the constant pressures and influences of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois surroundings. We must therefore be ever vigilant against the subtle and stubborn influences of the environment in which our Party functions.

There is hardly anyone who would conceal the fact that remnants of revisionism persisted in the Party after 1945. Such hangovers found expression in some serious blunders in the tactical application of our general line and in some of our organizational practices and habits.

The draft resolution speaks candidly and in the main self-critically of some of the specific errors that

resulted from the tardy correction of certain revisionist hangovers. (See section 3.) However, there is inadequate treatment of weaknesses that persist in our application of Leninist principles of organization.

AGAINST FORMALISM

In reviewing our organizational policies, attention must first be given to the social composition of our membership, the relative strength of our shop and industrial branches, and the degree to which we mobilize our membership and orient our methods of work to enhance the swiftest transformation of our Party into a thoroughly working-class party. Today our Party has less than 25 per cent of our membership in shop and industrial branches. The stress in our campaigns and the attention of our departments are still weighted toward the community branches. The inadequate assignment of forces and leadership for work in the shops, the many failures and the unsatisfactory status of our concentration program still reflect *underestimation* of the Leninist principle that the fundamental and main form of Party organization is the shop branch.

Our inadequacies in this respect also flow from our *methods* of work.

Somewhere along the road we lost appreciation of the value of control, review, and systematic check-up on fulfillment of policy decisions and the carrying out of tasks. Especially in getting at the source of so-called "permanent" defects in our work, weaknesses that carry over year after year, careful examination of the exe-

cution of our resolves must take place systematically. Results of campaigns *when concluded* must be estimated and discussed in the Party as a whole, using the searchlight of criticism and self-criticism to search out the *origin* of our weaknesses.

Just to give one example: The endless reiteration in reports and resolutions of the need for a "real concentration policy" without, at the same time, critical and self-critical exposure of the many instances of phrasemongering and lip-service as regards concentration activities is a common disease in our Party.

If political opposition to rooting our Party and its work mainly among the basic sections of the proletariat is opportunist, then the time is long past due for carrying this a step further. Adoption of resolutions on concentration in basic industries, followed only by routine gestures and empty repetition of these resolves without day-to-day warfare against complacency and neglect, without re-allocation of our forces, without an overhauling of our work methods, must be characterized as *formalism*—probably unintentional—but formalism nevertheless.

INFLUENCE OF LABOR HIERARCHY

Basing our membership and organizational forms mainly on the shops does not by itself end the dangers of opportunism, though it is the single most important step in that direction. Strong currents of opportunism operate within the labor movement itself.

For example, the draft resolution correctly characterizes the role of the social-reformists and Social-Democrats in the trade unions, who "strive desperately to keep the American working class in political and ideological subjection to the capitalist class. . . ." Although we were tardy in drawing the full political implications of this estimate in the application of our tactical line (as noted in the resolution), this analysis has, in recent months, been increasingly grasped and understood by the Party.

But have we drawn all the necessary conclusions for the work *within* our Party?

The opportunist influences at work in the trade unions, especially among the labor hierarchy, often seep deep into the very structure and system of work in the trade unions, infecting some strata of the membership. We sometimes fail to see that this has affected to no small degree even unions under Left-Progressive leadership. The imperialist-sponsored system of corruption went on at an accelerated pace during the war, when our trade union forces were in close alliance with the upper strata of the C.I.O. officialdom and when we did not fight these influences.

Today the reformist and bureaucratic practices of a large part of the C.I.O. hierarchy has led them in the direction of the class collaboration policies characteristic for so many years of the A. F. of L. officialdom. Unionists on the Left are fighting these reformist hand-maidens of monopoly. But some contamination still persists and finds lingering reflection

in certain practices of unions under leadership of Left-Progressives.

While there is much less of top-heavy full-time staffs, high salaries and expense accounts in Progressive-led unions, the question of petty bourgeois living standards of union officials remains a serious problem. The large, full-time bureaucracy also encourages the system of cash compensation for every union function and service undertaken by officers, stewards, or committeemen. It is a prevalent characteristic in many unions and, in my opinion, has been carried to a corrupting extreme. It is not an uncommon practice for some union leaders even to accept outright gifts and personal favors from employers. While much of this has been on the decline of late, it is still prevalent. The roster of Left-Progressive trade union leaders in high and not so high positions of trust who have become corrupted and finally gone over into the camp of reformism is not insignificant.

Too often the degeneration was not combated until too late. And what is more important is that attention simply to an occasional individual will not do the job. A sharpening up of our entire approach must become the foundation on which we fight for the Communist integrity of our people. Failure to wage incessant battle will permit an atmosphere that breeds individuals who "go soft" and seek a personal way out, and that encourages a bureaucracy divorced from the needs and the moods of the membership. Such an atmosphere finally leads to politi-

cal vacillation and opportunist capitulation. If not combated, these influences permeate the Party itself. We must view the growth of these Social-Democratic practices as poisonous weeds, which may choke off the proletarian influences that Leninist methods of work cause to flourish.

The many thousands of basic proletarians and trade union activists in our ranks are the corps, who under the leadership of our Party political committees can and must press the struggle hard against these tendencies. We must arm our Party with the eloquent teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin on this subject. We must be less timid as to possible temporary jeopardizing of positions of formal leadership, lest we weaken permanently our ability to give Communist leadership.

The resolution also correctly warns that struggle against influences of economism in the labor movement is a "central ideological task."

Here, too, the struggle against economism in the labor movement at large must be accompanied with incessant warfare against the many prevalent economist practices within our Party. How many leaflets, for example, have been issued directly in the name of the Party to large shops of concentration on political issues linked with the economic struggles? How many Communist trade union activists go on year after year ignoring the most elementary organizational relationships with the Party to which they profess affiliation? How many times have shop branches failed to function for weeks at a

stretch in the heat of economic struggles like a "raid," a strike, or a union election? How many have combined the struggle against compliance with the Taft-Hartley affidavits with active defense of the rights of Communists to hold office in a trade union? How many cases have we in which trade union leaders, who belong to the Party, undertake single-handedly to veto decisions of an internal Party and political nature arrived at by basic Party organizations, for fear such decisions in some way affect their position as union leaders!

RELIANCE ON TOP OFFICIALS

The resolution also speaks of the need for "resolutely developing the tactic of the united front, primarily from below."

This orientation will depend in the main on our completely overhauling the type of discussions and activities carried on by shop and industrial branches. We must take the view that the department in the shop is the chief theater of operations, and the steward the most important official in the union. Our shop branches must assume political responsibility and our Party people must learn to exercise personal initiative through giving leadership to their fellow-workers in their own departments. This holds true as regards struggle around grievances in the shop and for union democracy, as well as for educating and mobilizing workers for struggle on broader political issues. An end must be put to reliance exclusively on top union officials and boards, even in Progressive-led

unions. We must support development of union rank-and-file democracy that has vitality and meaning.

In the shops, the problems that confront our people daily, both in the struggle against the employers and against the misleaders of labor, are tough and complicated. The entire reservoir of Party experience must be put at the disposal of our comrades in the factories. We must re-learn old methods of work and master new ones. Our shop branches must be armed with the "know-how" for work in the department.

We must put flesh on the concept that the shop *branch* is the basic form and most important part of our Party organization. More and more, even at the expense of other concerns, our shop workers must go into shop branches, and our non-proletarians and white collar workers should enter basic industry.

While the Party membership has been engaged in extensive trade union struggles, has been increasingly involved in political action work, and while the Party has in a number of instances led varied struggles on numerous specific issues, both in united front with other organizations and independently, there are still strong sectarian tendencies at play in our practical work.

Treating in routine and unimaginative fashion the practical problems of giving leadership to broad masses is a form of "Left" sectarianism that must be combated.

One expression of sectarianism that cries out for correction is much of our mass agitation. It must be

stated quite candidly that we are too often sluggish and deficient in grasping the momentary psychology and mood of the workers and non-party masses and the key issue agitating them. We have not, even at our national level, mastered the language or approach necessary to bring clarity on the issues of the day and on our fundamental program to broader sections of the American people, even though there have been some notable and well-received exceptions that prove we have the capacity if we but consider it of sufficient importance (the improvements in the *Daily Worker* and the recent book on Debs are some examples). This has been a subject of wide comment in the ranks of the Party. It must be frankly stated that our Party organizations at the lower levels have often shown the better ear for the native tongue and displayed greater imagination in presentation of the Party's viewpoint, both through the written and spoken word.

What is even worse than inept and sectarian agitation is the failure to seek out and fight for *the right* to speak on the issues of the day. We are challenged every moment. In too many cases we have become inured, and totally deaf, to these challenges. This, in spite of our popular program, which would receive wide response if properly presented to the broad masses.

PROPOSALS FOR SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS

Considering the solution of these problems of determining importance

at this juncture of events, I propose:

1. That either a new section is added to the draft resolution, or an additional resolution is prepared by the National Board dealing with the system and methods of work of the Party. This resolution shall call for a sharp improvement in the *quality and style* of our work in the next period—a fundamental turn that will mean taking great strides on the road toward improving the Leninist characteristics and working-class composition of our Party.

2. The convention agenda itself should be organized to provide the necessary time for full discussion of this paramount and urgent question, guaranteeing sustained attention to the waging of this struggle by the entire leadership in the coming year.

3. All Party State and District organizations shall hold conferences in the month of September of branch and section leadership to which Control Tasks for the balance of the year shall be presented in line with the resolutions adopted at the National Convention.

4. The National Board shall appoint a Commission that shall examine specifically, concretely and, where possible, directly on the spot, the reports on the accomplishments and failures in the various State organizations in the execution of decisions called for in the Control Tasks. This Commission shall present a report to the National Committee, which shall release it to the whole Party.

5. Each issue of *Political Affairs* for the balance of 1948 shall

have an article on some phase of the quality of our work and the struggle for Leninist organizational practices.

6. All branch, section, district, and

national functionaries shall be asked to read or re-read (through self-study or study circles) material prepared by the National Education Department on these problems.

National Group Work In California

By PETTIS PERRY*

AS THE PROGRESSIVE FORCES approach the decisive months of the 1948 election campaign, they should take stock of all possible forces that can and should become component parts of the democratic coalition. From this point of view, an examination of some of the recent developments in the national group field in California will help us to draw valuable lessons for the tasks lying ahead. They will also help give greater emphasis to those sections of the draft resolution which deal with the vital field of national group work.

* * *

To begin with, California has a very large national group population. In that state there are almost a million Spanish-speaking people, the overwhelming majority of whom are Mexican-Americans. There are large concentrations of Italians, Yugoslavs, and Portuguese, not to speak of the large concentration of Oriental groups such as Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos, etc. In Los Angeles County alone there are almost 450,000 Mexican-Americans, 258,000

* Chairman, Nationalities Commission, Los Angeles Communist Party.

Jewish people, and close to 225,000 Negroes. These are the three largest but by no means the only important national groups in Los Angeles.

It is therefore obviously vital that we examine the possibilities for the development of work among these groups. We must also examine what is the unity of interests that offers the possibility for unification of these groups on the side of the labor and progressive movement. What are the concrete problems facing each of these groups, and what are the common interests among them?

* * *

As far as the Mexican-Americans are concerned, in some respects their conditions are worse than those of the Negro people. This is especially true in the field of civil rights. The Mexican community is a real hunting ground for all of the trigger-happy Ku Klux Klan-minded police officers.

This police terror against the Mexican-Americans very closely parallels the type of police terror exercised against Negroes, resulting not only in arrests and frame-ups, but in many cases, outright murder.

The Mexican-Americans also suffer greatly from very bad economic conditions. Mexican-Americans are, in most industries, given the lowest paid, the hardest, and the dirtiest jobs. It is difficult in California to obtain accurate statistics on the employment and unemployment problem among the Mexican-Americans even to the extent that they are available for Negro people. Both the State Department of Employment and the U.S. Employment Service juggle the data on the Mexican-Americans, referring to them as white, Mexican-Caucasian, and non-white.

A large percentage of Mexican-Americans throughout the Southwest are agricultural workers. Yet, for the most part, Mexican-American workers are not employed in the more skilled jobs. They are confined to the unskilled jobs and are rarely used as shed workers, etc. In the needle trades industry, too, their lot is, in the main, that of unskilled workers.

The appalling health conditions of Mexican-Americans is indicated by a report of the L.A. County Tuberculosis and Health Association in June, 1947, which stated that:

North of the central downtown area lies Chinatown and Bunker Hill with a tuberculosis case rate of almost 280 per 100,000 population for all races. Of the 102 newly reported cases, 46 were Mexican-Caucasians; 34, other Caucasians; 4, Negro; and 15, other races. . . .

The Boyle Heights area, east of the downtown area, has a newly reported case rate of over 200 per 100,000 population and a tuberculosis death rate of

almost 100. Of 213 reported cases and 78 tuberculosis deaths in 1945 over 60 per cent were among Mexican-Caucasians.

On housing, a survey of Los Angeles County made immediately after World War II, was published under the title, "A Decent Home An American Right," showed that:

59.6 per cent of Mexican-Americans were living in sub-standard units. 7 per cent of the people in areas studied were Negro-Americans; 28.6 per cent of Negro-Americans were living in sub-standard units, comprising 9 per cent of the total sub-standard units. 2 per cent of the people in areas studied were Oriental-Americans; 47.2 per cent of Oriental-Americans were living in sub-standard units, comprising 5 per cent of the total sub-standard units.

The resistance of the Mexican-American people to these conditions is finally beginning to take shape in the fight for civil rights and the response to the Wallace movement. The Civil Rights Congress has set the pace for the defense of the civil rights of this section of our population. This has met with very good response from the community itself in terms of the actions of the Mexican-American organizations in sending joint delegations to the Police Department and to the Sheriff's office; in terms of the scores of people who are joining the Civil Rights Congress. These actions have had positive results. For example, about a year ago, there was an attempt on

the part of the Police Department to engineer a frame-up of five teenage youths from this community on a rape and murder charge of an "Anglo" woman (the term used by Mexican-Americans to distinguish between non-Mexican whites and Mexican-Caucasians). Because of the mass upsurge caused by this incident the court was forced to admit their innocence and free them.

Particularly interesting is the development around the Wallace movement and the Independent Progressive Party of California. This has developed around an organization called the *Amigos De Wallace*, which at the very outset is showing tremendous possibilities. When this movement was only weeks old it was instrumental in helping to mobilize ten thousand Mexican-Americans to hear Henry Wallace, who spoke to them in both Spanish and English on May 16, in the Mexican-American community of Los Angeles. This meeting of the Independent Progressive Party was one of the largest political rallies in the Mexican-American community ever held by any political organization in the entire history of Los Angeles County. Never before has any political party had so large a response from this section of our population. This meeting was not just a gathering of people. For one thing it was the greatest *proletarian* audience of its size in the political field in Los Angeles. Yet it was a cross-section of the Mexican-American population. The content of all of the Mexican-American speeches, as well as of that of Wallace himself,

encouraged the freedom aspirations of the Mexican-American people.

This movement can grow tremendously if it is based on mobilizing the Mexican-American people around their day-to-day needs; if it is not viewed simply as a machine to get out the vote of this section of the population. It should guard against the danger of sectarianism and should be led, organized, and developed by the Mexican-Americans themselves, with the co-operation of all progressive people. The progressive forces should provide every assistance possible for this movement. They should work *with it* and not attempt to do the work *for it*. The non-Mexican-Americans should not attempt to assume the leadership of this movement which provides a real opportunity to unleash all of the latent forces of leadership in the Mexican-American community itself.

The position of the Mexican-Americans in California is dramatized in the fact that there is not a single Mexican-American in the State Legislature, nor in any of the City Councils or Boards of Supervisors anywhere in California, despite the large Mexican-American population of this state. This goes for Congress as well, even in districts that are largely inhabited by Mexican-Americans, such as Chet Holifield's District, the 19th, and Helen Gahagan Douglas' District, the 14th. Even the representatives of these two districts, which have the largest Mexican-American communities in Los Angeles, have never seemed to recognize the need to speak out spe-

cifically in the interests of the Mexican-American people.

The Independent Progressive Party of California has three Mexican-American candidates, Chavez, in the 31st Assembly District in Los Angeles and Salazar in the 78th Assembly District in San Diego, and Josephine Daniels, running on the I.P.P. ticket and cross-filed in the Democratic Party, in the 9th Congressional District in the Fresno area, who polled upward of 5,000 votes in the primaries. The I.P.P. also endorsed for the primaries a Mexican-American attorney for Superior Court judge, Richard Ibanez, who polled 138,132 votes in Los Angeles County.

In the Assembly Districts particularly, the possibilities exist for the election to office of the two Mexican-American candidates—but only if the entire progressive movement in these areas does everything possible for their election. That means organizing the work in these districts in such a way as to bring out the largest number of voters. That means putting at the disposal of these candidates all of the resources that the progressive movement can provide. These candidates must not be looked upon as a nod that is given to Mexican-American voters by simply including them on the ticket of the Independent Progressive Party. In California the question of Mexican-American representation is a vital one.

A specific struggle must be waged around the housing program. It must be recognized that the abomin-

able housing conditions arise out of the whole system of national oppression of these groups. The progressive forces must organize an energetic campaign in the communities and on a county-wide scale or on a state scale, to change this situation. There should, for instance, be all kinds of community delegations to the City Councils and Boards of Supervisors demanding that they put the heat on Washington and on the individual Representatives and Senators to fight for a decent housing program, including slum clearance. In connection with this there should be an uncompromising struggle against any form of housing discrimination against Negroes, Mexicans, Orientals, or any other groups. Such struggles could win very wide support.

It speaks badly of the whole Southwest that not a single member of Congress out of 435 members speaks in behalf of the 5,000,000 Mexican-Americans. The progressive movement of the entire Southwest, when it supports progressive candidates for the Legislature or Congress, must demand to know their stand on the problems of Mexican-Americans and on Latin-Americans in general.

It is unfortunately true that the labor and progressive forces, including the Communists, have not grappled adequately with the pressing problems indicated above. The trade unions, while agreeing in principle on the necessity of fighting the discrimination on the job against Mexican workers, have not actually organized struggles, such as a demand

for upgrading of Mexican workers in industry. Moreover, the progressive forces are missing an opportunity, in failing to impress adequately on California's progressive Congressional representatives the necessity of their waging a campaign in Congress around the slum clearance program, around a health and housing program, with the specific aim in mind of wiping out this disgraceful situation confronting the Mexican, Negro, and Oriental groups.

* * *

The problems of the Negro people of the West Coast, and particularly of California, have grown more acute than ever. During the war years, the Negro population grew from roughly 200,000 to around 500,000 on a state scale. This growth was primarily in three areas. In Los Angeles County, the Negro population grew from about 75,000 in 1940 to around 225,000 in 1948; in San Diego, from about 5,000 in 1940 to about 20,000 in 1948; in Oakland, from about 15,000 in 1940 to about 70,000 to 85,000 in 1948; and in San Francisco from 6,000 to 50,000.

These were the main areas of aircraft and ship production during World War II. By breaking down discrimination in defense industries during the war on the basis of the struggle of the Negro people and organized labor, which resulted in establishing F.E.P.C. under Executive Order 8803, it became possible for large numbers of Negro men and women to enter industry. This was the basis for the large migration to the West Coast. The housing prob-

lem was intensified, resulting in overcrowded conditions, especially because of restrictive covenants.

With cut-backs in production after V-J Day, wholesale unemployment began to develop among the Negroes. It is estimated that in February, 1947, 10 per cent of those seeking employment at the United States Employment Service were Negroes. But in May of the same year, 40 per cent of those seeking employment were Negroes—four times as large a percentage!

At the California State Department of Employment, almost fifteen out of twenty seeking jobs or drawing unemployment compensation are Negroes.

Union after union reports that unemployment among Negroes is increasing day by day. But the unions have not yet found the way to change this situation, even those unions led by progressives. Unless this situation is changed, a serious problem can very well arise between the organized labor movement and the Negro community.

The labor union should not permit a company with which it has a contract to engage in over-proportionate layoffs of Negro workers when layoffs take place. They should not permit an under-proportionate hiring of Negroes when hiring takes place, nor should they permit the companies and the California Employment Service to use the tactics of "white only" in their employment policy. This is the prewar policy which long prevented Negroes from entering industry. This is why Negroes in war

industries have not built up enough seniority to offer much protection against mass layoffs. Only through the organized labor movement taking special steps to safeguard the interests of the Negro workers can this trend be reversed.

The hardest hit group of Negro workers are the Negro women. Very few industries today still employ Negro women. This means that Negro women are rapidly being forced to return to the field of domestic work or enter the ranks of the unemployed. This leaves the Negro women with no perspective of re-entering industry unless the labor movement undertakes a campaign specifically around this question.

The labor movement should carry on a joint struggle with the Negro community on the job problems of the Negro workers. A sharp struggle on the part of the labor movement on this question would go a long way toward re-inspiring the Negro community to continue to fight on the side of organized labor. Another serious question in this regard is the promotion of Negroes to leadership within the union. This is something that is long overdue, and is a basic part of the struggle for the rights of the Negro people. Here again, if we look at the situation confronting the Mexican workers, we find a striking parallel.

Another question that confronts the Negroes of California is that of restrictive covenants. Restrictive covenants are, of course, not applied solely against the Negro people. Restrictive covenants are applied

against Negroes, Orientals, Jews, and, to some extent, Mexican-Americans.

In many areas in the Southwest, the only way that Mexican-Americans who happen to be of light complexion can prevent restrictive covenants being applied against them is by denying their national origin and claiming to be Spaniards. This is particularly true in California and Arizona.

On the question of restrictive covenants there has been the most alertness on the part of the labor movement. The C.I.O., for instance, from its inception, has carried on a fight against them, aiding in direct struggles around some of the restrictive covenant cases. One of the most outstanding developments in this state was the high level of discussion on this question at the last state convention of the State A. F. of L., a discussion that was one of the convention's highlights. Though the resolution for outlawing restrictive covenants did not pass, it was referred to the State Executive Council. This did not prevent one of the Carpenters Locals of the A. F. of L., for example, from directly taking up the case of restrictive covenants involving one of its Negro members and one of its Philippine members. This fight was not only taken up from the legal standpoint by this local, but a mass campaign was launched involving a number of A. F. of L. unions, as well as a number of the white Protestant churches.

The labor movement also has shown, more or less, some understanding in support of such demands

as those for national anti-lynching, anti-poll tax, and F.E.P.C. legislation. The fact remains, however, that the basic day-to-day struggle for the employment of Negro and Mexican workers remains the key issue. All progressives, and particularly trade unionists, must realize that the struggle against white-chauvinist ideologies must be conducted on a daily basis. The organized labor movement must fight for the upgrading of Negro and Mexican workers, for the greater employment of these workers in industry, and for the promotion of these workers to leading posts in the union. For without this, the labor movement cannot hope to win over and maintain its basic supporters, namely the Negroes and Mexicans, together with all minority groups.

* * *

Another problem confronting the people of California is the increase of anti-Semitism, which even penetrates the minority groups themselves.

With the increased anti-Semitism in this state sharpening the problems of the Jewish people, and with the problems of the Mexican and Negro-Americans being what they are, there is little doubt that the broadest base exists for united struggle of these three groups. Unity between Mexican, Jewish, and Negro Americans would have a tremendous effect upon the political life of California, especially in the major counties. In Los Angeles County alone, there are almost a half million Mexican-Americans, almost a quarter of a million

Negro-Americans, and close to a quarter of a million Jewish people—a total of about 900,000 out of the three and a half million inhabitants of this county. The coming together of these three groupings on a minimum program could be the center around which all national groups could unite. In addition, it would be a compelling force for fundamental changes in the political orientation of this state.

The idea of mutual assistance between these groups cannot be stressed too much. These groups could unite, let us say, around such issues as against discrimination in jobs and housing; for employment on an equal basis for Negro- and Mexican-Americans; against police brutality (which is a pressing problem for the Mexican-American and Negro communities); against anti-Semitism in all of its forms, combating it first of all in Negro and Mexican-American communities where it is very strong; for passage of anti-lynching, anti-poll tax, and F.E.P.C. legislation locally and nationally; and around such other issues as this grouping may decide on.

There is a base for such unity in struggle and there is sentiment for it. The progressive forces in our state must give serious consideration to the promotion of this unity. Right now it is possible for such unity to take shape very rapidly in forms of Jewish people's committees and Negro people's committees around the candidacies of Chavez and Salazar. This would accelerate to a great extent the process of unification. This

would be a great stimulus to all progressive forces in California and would broaden the basis here for an all-out struggle against American reaction in its drive toward fascism and war.

The Menace of Social-Democracy and Our Fight Against Opportunism

By GEORGE MORRIS

THE PRE-CONVENTION draft resolution frequently refers to the role of Social-Democracy's service to imperialism in the ranks of the labor movement. The resolution undoubtedly reflects a greater awareness in the Communist Party's leading circles than in the past of the urgency to combat Social-Democracy.

Nevertheless, the Party as a whole has given far from sufficient attention to the task of understanding, exposing, and combating the menace of Social-Democracy. This is a serious weakness in the theoretical armor of our membership and shows itself often in a practical way where the Party confronts the enemy in a Social-Democratic garb. The dangerous role of Social-Democracy must never be forgotten.

Social-Democracy is today the instigation of the most vicious warmongering propaganda, war provocation, and hatred of the Soviet Union and the East-European democracies. As the most zealous supporters of the Marshall Plan and other projects of American imperialism, our domestic

brand of Social-Democrats provides a useful bridge for Wall Street to Right-wing Social-Democracy abroad. They provide the missionaries and agents for splitting activities in progressive-led labor movements in other countries.

On the domestic front it is the Social-Democrats who are the principal "ideologists" for a class-collaboration policy that would paralyze the working-class movement and divert it from the path of struggle. Currently, they lead in an effort to weaken the most advanced step yet taken by the workers to break away from the twin parties of monopoly capital.

Our State Department, recognizing the valued service of Social-Democracy, recently declared in a special report that Social-Democrats are "among the strongest bulwarks in Europe against Communism."

A great part of Lenin's writings, especially his most popular classics, consisted of polemics against Social-Democratism. Summarizing the Leninist view, Stalin wrote in 1924:

It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to social-democracy in the labor movement. Therefore, the era of the dying off of capitalism [that is, imperialism—G.M.] is also the era of the dying off of social-democracy in the labor movement.*

The truthfulness of Stalin's assertion a quarter of a century ago is being demonstrated before our eyes. Right-wing Social-Democracy in Eastern Europe and in much of Germany has either disappeared or lost most of its strength; or, through a process of differentiation, its followers have merged with the Marxist stream. In Italy, France, and other Western European countries, the balance of strength in the ranks of the workers has shifted substantially Leftward, away from traditional Social-Democracy. But this change—still going on—did not take place automatically. It was preceded by a long period of struggle for Marxism, the history of which is a storehouse of lessons for Communist Parties today.

KEY TO THE FIGHT AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

But there is another extremely important element that is tied to this question. An understanding of the menace of Social-Democracy is the key to understanding Right opportunism and the revisionist theory and practice it spawns.

Three years ago, when the Party

* Joseph Stalin, *The October Revolution*, p. 164.

broke with Browder revisionism, we recognized that, essentially, Browder's line had been pulling us toward the theories and practices of Social-Democracy. We correctly declared Right opportunism to be the main danger. We have since been continually reminded, as in the draft resolution, that revisionist methods and habits still linger in the Party. Occasionally we get a demonstration of this truth in the opportunism of Communists in trade unions or other fields, comrades who loudly and, undoubtedly sincerely, disassociated themselves from Browderism. As Stalin explained in 1928:

*Under capitalist conditions, the right deviation in Communism represents a tendency, an inclination, not yet formulated it is true and perhaps not even consciously realized, but nevertheless a tendency, on the part of a section of Communists to depart from the revolutionary line of Marxism in the direction of Social Democracy.***

Both Lenin and Stalin, of course, repeatedly stressed the two-front war that Communists must wage: against Right opportunism and Leftist sectarianism. The Russian Communists grew, gained strength and became steeled in this two-front war, Lenin stressed in his famous pamphlet on "Left" Communism. But significantly, in that very pamphlet, aimed primarily against "Left" sectarianism, he emphasized that "first and principally" it was in a struggle against

** Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. II, pp. 58-59.

Right opportunism that the Bolshevik Party developed.

Unfortunately, too many of our members, thousands of whom entered our Party during or after the war, are not armed theoretically against Right opportunism because they know little of the history, roots, and practices of Social-Democracy. Right opportunism, even in Communist ranks, stems from basically the same roots. Like Social-Democracy in general, it is the form through which capitalist influence expresses itself in our ranks. One familiar with the pattern of betrayal that spells Social-Democracy is forewarned against Right-opportunist tendencies.

There is a great and urgent need in our Party for a revived study and restudy of the well-known Leninist classics on Social-Democracy written during and after World War I; for literature bringing the history of the struggle against Social-Democracy up to date; and for a more complete analysis of the forms in which Social-Democracy expresses itself in the United States.

DANGER IS UNDERESTIMATED

Why have we not given greater attention to the Social-Democratic menace?

One answer is in the small number of the Party's members who have experienced or know of the Party's history since its development out of the Left Wing of the old Socialist movement through the struggles with the Right-wing Socialists in the

needle trades unions and other fields. Nor were a majority of the members, including many of the leading comrades, Party members in days when Social-Democrats had a wider base in Europe and when, in Germany, they actually paved the way for Hitler's seizure of power. Still fewer know the history of the great World War I betrayal of the working class by leaders of Social-Democracy, and of the early revisionism that led to it.

We are especially in need of literature and study that will give us a four-decade historical chart of Social-Democracy's role. Such material would be invaluable for arming our membership against Right opportunism in all forms.

But there is a more direct reason for an underestimation of the Social-Democratic danger. Many in our ranks see Social-Democracy in America only in its classical European-like forms. Consequently, they view it as represented here only by the small Socialist Party or the no larger Social-Democratic Federation, with its influence existing mainly in the needle trades and essentially in New York. From such an estimate it would follow that Social-Democracy need not be a source of worry in the major basic industries.

This is to underestimate dangerously a vicious foe and to see the danger only where the most obvious danger sign is visible. It is a failure to see the basic function of Social-Democracy and the forms it takes in America—a land where the Socialist

tradition has not yet won a sizable mass base.

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Lenin wrote that Social Democracy is "the principal social prop of the bourgeoisie" and its leaders are "the real agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement." He frequently compared our conservative labor leaders, such as Samuel Gompers, to the leaders of European Social-Democracy. Describing the narrow base upon which these agents of imperialism depend, he wrote:

Only a small upper stratum belonged to them; and of this upper stratum only a very few were lured over and bribed by the capitalists to take their place in capitalist society as leaders of the workers. The American Socialists [Daniel De Leon—G.M.] called these people "labor lieutenants" of the capitalist class. In that country of freest bourgeois culture, in that most democratic of bourgeois republics, they saw most clearly the role played by this tiny upper stratum of the proletariat who had virtually entered the service of the bourgeoisie as its deputies, who were bribed and bought by it and who came to form those cadres of social patriots and defencists of which Ebert and Scheidemann [German World War I Social-Democratic betrayers—G.M.] will always remain the shining lights.*

Written in 1919, these words apply perfectly today in describing the role of William Green, Matthew Woll, Philip Murray or James B. Carey;

their support of Wall Street's policy of world conquest; their sacrifice of the economic interests of the workers in advancement of that reactionary policy; their effort to build a small bureaucracy and favored groups around themselves in the unions; their attachment to the two parties of monopoly capital; and their efforts to paralyze the fighting capacity of the workers by class-collaborationism.

Yet men like Murray or Green are nominally not Social-Democrats. They do not employ pseudo-Socialist language; they do not profess to have a "socialist" perspective, nor, indeed, any other perspective. They talk more loudly of loyalty to "free enterprise." They do not even make prediction of a future break with the two old parties. The thinking of the typical "pure and simple" conservative top labor leader, though it bears no tag, fits more conveniently into the pattern of John Maynard Keynes' theory that government influence upon the economy can solve the contradictions of capitalism.

The Keynesian concept of solving capitalism's contradictions through the authority of a state "above" classes, is essentially the same quicksand base upon which Social-Democracy and British laborism are built. Both in Britain and the United States, Keynesism is a more convenient reference for labor leaders than the works of a Social-Democratic Hilferding, who, long before Keynes, advanced the theory of an "organized capitalism" that would solve capitalism's contradictions. To conserva-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII, p. 511.

tive American labor leaders, Keynesism is more acceptable because it is not handicapped by association even with the meaningless "socialism" of the Social-Democrats.

The Social-Democrats of the United States long ago dispensed with even the use of socialist-sounding phrases. They find it more effective to work under the cloak of "liberalism" and through such outfits as the Liberal Party of New York and Americans for Democratic Action. In actual practice they are most notorious for their Red-baiting and their warlike anti-Soviet foreign policy, thus essentially falling into the Hearst - McCormick - Patterson category; and they stand out most for their hostility to such progressives among upholders of capitalism as Henry Wallace. In the labor movement they invariably fall into alliance with the most reactionary circles.

WELCOMED IN TOP LABOR CIRCLES

For some time, therefore, there has been a recognized affinity between Social-Democrats and the top bureaucracy in the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. The switch to a Truman Doctrine-Marshall Plan foreign policy had especially raised the market price of Social-Democrats and their role inside the labor movement. They have become the main ideologists for that policy in labor's ranks and Wall Street's most appreciated helpers in putting it over in Right-wing labor circles abroad.

Social-Democracy, while it cannot boast of much of a popular base outside its usual strongholds, has, nevertheless, won some new key positions in recent years. Walter Reuther and much of his machine in the United Automobile Workers; Emil Rieve's staff in the Textile Workers Union and a large number of officeholders in shipyard, retail, machinists, and several other unions, are Social-Democrats and Norman Thomas Socialists.

Both in C.I.O. and A. F. of L. top councils, men like David Dubinsky, Reuther, and Rieve have a strong influence. They, together with the clerical elements that have infiltrated in strength in recent years, inject into the fusion of Right-wing forces of labor a particularly poisonous and treacherous content. The Social-Democrats and their closest allies, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, have set the tone and pattern for acceptance of the Taft-Hartley Law; opposition to Wallace's candidacy; raiding, and breaking strikes of, progressive-led unions; acceptance of wage formulas, like the General Motors one, that offer greater advantage to employers; purging unions of progressives; and, as already noted, the campaign to hitch labor to Wall Street's war plans.

The State Department has cunningly helped to further the role of Social-Democrats in the labor movement. They are sought as advisers and "labor attachés" in foreign service; as scouts for splitting operations in unions and popular fronts

in countries on the Marshall Plan target, and as disrupters of the World Federation of Trade Unions. They are viewed as ideologically more effective in the cause of Wall Street than the regular run of Joe Ryan-Bill Hutcheson type of reactionary labor leader who are just good rubber stamps for Big Business.

Clinton Golden, the type of labor leader we will see more of, personifies the influence of Social-Democracy in the ranks of union leadership. The State Department named him as its labor adviser in Greece. After his mission there he was named as labor adviser in the administration of E.R.P. in Europe. Golden, former assistant to Philip Murray, has a long history of association with the Social-Democratic crowd. He has also long been a promoter of "labor-management" plans to banish labor disputes. Social-Democratic training made him a labor leader with an "ideology"—an ideology, incidentally, that condoned the mass execution of trade union leaders in Greece.

Walter Reuther, who admits to being only a "former" socialist, is another example of the "modern" and more polished, politically conscious, and more skillfully demagogic, labor leader. The owners of the press, magazines and radio know what they are doing when they build up a Walter Reuther.

THE NORMAN THOMAS BREED

The "respectability" attained by

Right Social-Democrats in the U.S. should not lead us to ignore its "left" Norman Thomas wing. The Socialist Party's professed interest in socialism and use of militant-sounding phrases, should in no way confuse it with genuine Leftward shifts among socialists such as we see in Europe. The Thomas group has essentially served as a "Left" mask for Social-Democracy's treachery. Its demagogy and socialist-sounding appeal is especially directed to confuse those in the progressive camp who are already looking in the direction of socialism.

In actual practice the Thomas outfit maintains close and friendly relations with the Social-Democratic Federation. It receives an amazing amount of free time over national radio hookups. And there is never a cross word against it in the capitalist press.

The role of the Socialist Party is best shown by its member, Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Automobile Workers. Advertised as a "militant" when elected, his first job was to lead in the campaign to comply with the Taft-Hartley Law. He then personally led in the first effort to "raid" a progressive-led union. It was he who negotiated the General Motors contract and hailed it as a victory. Reuther influenced the agreement only from a hospital bed.

Norman Thomas' Socialist Party demagogically tries to capitalize on growing sentiment for socialism.

Having no real theory and program for socialism, this party, in effect, supplies recruits for the staffs of the more openly Right-wing-led organizations like the I.L.G.W.U., the textile, auto, and retail unions.

Is it possible for Social-Democracy to gain a mass base in this country? Those who believe that in this period Social-Democratic influence could go only downward everywhere, should pay attention to what happened in Italy, West Germany, and earlier in Britain. One would think that the treachery of Social-Democracy's leaders, the part they had in bringing Hitler to power, and the two wars' blood on their hands, would doom them. But we have seen how Social-Democracy obtains a fresh lease on life in some countries, e.g., dollar imperialism actually helped give strength to a splinter group like Saragat's party in Italy. We have also seen how Social-Democracy in Western Germany provided a new channel for elements of destroyed reactionary parties and how it capitalized on a whole generation of Germans that had no experience under Social-Democracy.

Undoubtedly as more and more Americans turn their hope to socialism, reactionaries here will give more encouragement to those who would confuse and divert the movement. And our politically barren union leaders will not be averse to parading as "socialists" of a sort.

CONCLUSIONS

The above adds up to some important conclusions for our Party:

1. Social-Democracy has made some headway in obtaining important positions in the American labor movement. Its strength and potential base is far greater than may appear on the surface.

2. Our Party's membership needs to be educated on the role of Social-Democracy, taught the history of the struggle against it on a world scale and how to recognize its peculiarities in America.

3. Alertness and vigor against Social-Democracy in general is closely tied with the struggle against Right opportunism in all spheres, including where it shows itself in the Communist Party.

4. Much more emphasis is needed on Communist and Left-progressive activity in those fields, like the needle trades, where Social-Democracy has a strong base. The Right Wing is especially vulnerable on economic conditions, which are neglected in the interest of a united front with the imperialist warmongers.

5. Even in America, where open Social-Democratic followers are few, it is possible to develop differentiation between followers and the leaders. Those who believe that the Social-Democrats are actually "socialist" must be won to the banner of genuine socialism—Communism.

On the Party's Responsibility For Work Among the Youth

By MARVIN SHAW

THE DRAFT RESOLUTION correctly emphasizes the efforts of Wall Street to hoodwink and terrorize every section of the American people into support of its program of domestic and foreign reaction. In the labor and progressive movement, however, there is generally a serious underestimation of the activities of Wall Street and its agents among the youth. Too often, it is the most vicious enemies of youth who consciously influence and organize the youth, while they and their problems are ignored by their best friends.

To an extent this is reflected in the draft resolution by the lack of specific discussion of youth needs or of emphasis on organizing youth as active participants in struggle. In actual work, the problem is far more serious. Throughout the Party, in spite of the leadership demonstrated by Comrades Foster and Dennis and the National Board in turning our Party's attention to the youth and in developing youth policy, there is still little youth consciousness, little concern with activity among the youth, and little understanding of their great importance in determining the political future of our country. This is generally true within the entire people's movement. Too often the door is locked when the horse is stolen

—when a Curran establishes a major base among the newer seamen, or when the younger workers in the shops fall victim to the Red-baiting, company union propaganda of the bosses.

* * *

The bourgeoisie makes no such error. It realizes the importance of the 35,000,000 people between the ages of 15 and 30; of the 14,000,000 veterans who are mainly in that age group; of the 2,500,000 students. It will not ignore the 6,000,000 new voters who will cast their first ballots in 1948, or the hundreds of thousands who will enter industry this year.

These millions grew up in an era of depression and war. They know no "normal periods." They have not been able to plan their lives or futures. They are a generation which has seen the United States emerge as the center and stronghold of imperialism, and they are also the generation that saw the New Deal and made up the armies that helped smash the Hitlerite-Japanese alliance.

America's youth today must choose between two paths. They can go down the path of the Hitler *Jugend*, the path of degradation, war, and misery; or they can join with the

people's movement in the struggle against fascism and war, for a useful, happy future.

* * *

The monopolists are leaving no stone unturned to take the youth down the first path. A campaign of vast proportions has been launched to mobilize young people of all ages, both politically and organizationally, behind the program of U.S. imperialism.

In general ideological terms, the emphasis is similar to that general among the entire population: defense of "democracy" and "religion"; the superiority of "our way of life"; Red-baiting; fantastic lies about the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies; and chauvinism in all its rotten varieties.

In May, for example, the U.S. Office of Education announced a program "designed to alert the nation's 32,000,000 students to the dangers of Communism." Outside the schools a large variety of Big-Business sponsored and dominated organizations open their doors to young people who need and want centers for recreational activity.

Few young workers remember the days of the open shop; the struggles that established union conditions and collective bargaining took place before they entered industry. It is here that loyalty to the union is often weakest, and here that company-union, boss-organized programs of picnics, dances, etc., have recently been reorganized. Propaganda against seniority attempts to pit younger against older workers.

The offensive of reaction against Negro youth is one of open terror—to smash their protest against the brutal Jim-Crow system. But hand in hand with it go efforts to keep Negro and white youth divided; to swing Negro youth behind the demagoguery of the Randolphs and Reynolds who approve the imperialist program but who wish to "improve" its efficiency by abolishing Jim Crow. (While exposing the Randolphs, progressives must sharply distinguish between their program and the militant Negro and white youth who may be involved in "passive resistance" to Army Jim Crow. With them unity can and must be established in active struggle against the war and militarization program.)

It is natural that on the campus the ideological and political offensive of finance capital should take a wide variety of forms and be carried forward with great energy. The bourgeoisie hopes to utilize student youth as a reservoir of strength. They have received the benefits of capitalist indoctrination; they are to live as professionals and intellectuals by the bounty of Big Business; they will receive crumbs from the enormous profits the imperialists are making and hope to increase.

How is the offensive carried out? Partially by terror, suppression, and intimidation. Partially by the utilization of the classroom and lecture platform for systematic indoctrination.

Much of this activity stems from the obvious fear of reaction of the response of students to progressive

activity in general and particularly to the rapid and widespread development of "Students for Wallace" as the largest and most effective political action movement on the campus.

With the passage of the Draft Act, the activities of the bourgeoisie among youth in the past pale into relative insignificance. Here the imperialists have won one of their most important victories. The complete demands of the brass-hats were not met by the bipartisan coalition in Congress. Nevertheless, the measure passed will put over 250,000 men into uniform this year and opens the way for further militarization of the youth.

Training for the draftees will not be only in military techniques. "Citizenship classes" will be used for anti-labor, chauvinistic, war-inciting propaganda. The draftee Army will intensify the discrimination and degradation faced by Negro youth. Labor will be faced by the ever-present threat of a mass army ready for strike-breaking.

Most important of all, the passage of the Draft will encourage the Marshall Planners in their reckless, atom-bomb foreign policy.

* * *

Thus we find that in every phase of American life, utilizing their control of the schools, newspapers, mass organizations, and the factories, the imperialists are engaged in influencing the youth. The importance of this cannot be overemphasized. "Whoever wins the youth, wins the future" has been recognized again and again as a truism, and Wall

Street will stop at nothing to keep its rotten system alive.

Yet in the face of this the people's movement has been relatively inactive as regards the youth. It has in the main ignored Wall Street's activity. By a lack of concern and struggle, thousands of young people have already been surrendered to reaction. Few if any trade unions have developed special activities for young workers or pay special attention to their problems. Even in Left-progressive unions few efforts are made to orient newer members to the union or to promote youthful forces to leadership. The progressive national group organizations find that they are "dying out"; that new younger people are not coming into their organizations to fill the gaps and to give new life to activity. The splendid movements that have occurred among the Negro people have not involved masses of Negro youth. There is today no unified youth movement in the Negro communities, though militancy and a desire for unity and struggle have been demonstrated in many individual instances. Teen-age youth in particular have been left to the tender mercies of reaction. Union halls are not centers for the children of members. No efforts are made to counteract the vicious propaganda in the schools and the press. The labor movement as a whole pays inconsequential attention to the public education system it was so instrumental in establishing.

In general, political and economic programs leave out specific atten-

tion to action on the needs of youth. Nowhere was this more evident than in the struggle against the passage of the Draft Act. Nearly every labor and people's organization, including the trade unions (A. F. of L. and C.I.O.), the churches, and the farm groups opposed the bill. Congress hesitated long and hard before acting. Popular sentiment was vocal, though unorganized, against military training. The draft could have been defeated, and the war program struck a serious blow. It nearly was, due to the courageous struggle during the last days of Congress by Senator Glen Taylor and Representative Vito Marcantonio. Yet in spite of all this it was only from youth itself that organized and militant opposition to the draft came.

Here, most graphically, the lack of attention to the problems of youth has struck a serious blow against the interests of the entire labor movement and all of the American people.

While emphasizing the seriousness of the situation, it must be pointed out that although reaction has made advances, it has not won the battle. Overwhelmingly, the vast majority of America's young people belong in the democratic camp. The program of war and militarism threatens them more than any other group. They are most concerned with winning a peaceful and secure future. The organization of a youth and student movement in support of the Wallace-Taylor ticket and the policies of the New Party has given new expression to this sentiment. Clubs,

groups, and committees have mushroomed in every part of the country. Usually the program is based as much on the local needs of the members and a social program as on general political issues. The movement has the potential of making an enormous contribution toward winning millions of youth votes for the New Party, and at the same time building itself as a permanent mass center of progressive youth. This is undoubtedly one of the most significant developments in the youth picture today.

* * *

But for such a movement to move ahead, and for steps forward to be taken in other areas, youth work must stop being a question that concerns only young people. It is a problem for the entire people's and working-class movement.

Nowhere must this be more true than within the ranks of the Communist Party. The vanguard Party must consciously become the leader of the struggle for the needs of youth and for the development of attention to them on the part of the entire progressive movement. There is no field of work that is divorced from youth work, and the ways and means must be found to discover the manner in which it should be carried on in a given area. The situation in some Party conventions, where only younger comrades participated in discussions on youth policy, must change to one where the entire Party leadership, from top to bottom, is sensitive to the question. Rather than pulling active younger forces out of

youth work, new cadres must be found to reinforce those we already have in that field. Consistent and comradely help must be given to the younger people in Party leadership.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of youth work must become the property of the entire Party. It took eight years to exhaust (this last month) a printing of 5,000 copies of Lenin's and Stalin's articles on youth. The new printing to appear soon should be widely sold and studied. Attention to theory in this as in other fields will help in developing practical activity.

In no other section of the Party is attention to youth work more necessary than in the industrial clubs. Traditionally, the progressive youth movement has been weak among young workers, and recent errors in youth policy have aggravated the situation. Breaking through here will not be an easy job, but it is one that will have to be done if advances are to be made in both trade union and youth work. Undoubtedly, we know far too little about the concrete problems in this field. Studies and investigations should be made of seniority, job training, and advancement problems. Within the labor movement, Communists should particularly be conscious of the need for helping develop youthful activities, the promotion of younger workers to leadership, and their active participation in union life.

In addition to fighting for a correct program in the shops for youth, thought should also be given to pro-

moting the organization of activities for the teen-age and younger children of the workers. Let the trade union halls, especially when they are located in neighborhood communities become youth centers. Steps should be taken to combat the anti-labor poison the schools, movies and press are drilling into the minds of the children of workers.

The carrying out, after the 1948 elections, of the proposal made in the draft resolution for the establishment of a non-Party Marxist-Leninist youth organization will be of tremendous help in developing work among youth in general and industrial and Negro youth in particular. The lack of such a socialist center of militant political, educational, and cultural activity among young people, has undoubtedly been one of the main obstacles in the path of effective work among youth. The Party as a whole, and especially its local and regional leadership, must give the greatest possible material and political help to the new organization. At the same time the Communist Party must, of course, continue its own activities in the youth field—by itself participating directly in struggle for the needs of youth, by making the problems of the young generation its own, and especially by its members fighting within the labor movement for special attention to the problems of young workers.

* * *

During the coming months the labor and people's movement will have many new opportunities to

demonstrate much needed sensitivity to youth problems.

In this respect the fight to repeal the draft and to prevent further steps to militarize the youth takes first importance. Wallace, Taylor, and the New Party have already made it a major issue in the '48 elections, exposing the war program of the bipartisan coalition as the enemy of young America. Struggle around it will demonstrate the two-facedness of the Murrays, Greens, Reuthers, *et al*, whose organizations are on rec-

ord against the draft. The campaign for repeal will prove to millions of young Americans that their futures can only be secured in alliance with the anti-fascist, anti-imperialist coalition.

The youth are a potential ally of enormous power to the people's movement. They can also be a real danger if the plans of the bourgeoisie succeed. The struggle for the youth is being waged every day. It demands the attention of every Communist.

Read the August Issue and Subscribe to

MASSES & MAINSTREAM

August Contents

From McKinley to Wallace	<i>W. E. B. DuBois</i>
A Quiet Summer's Day: a story	<i>Phillip Bonosky</i>
Four Poems	<i>Konstantinos P. Kavafis</i>
The Case of the Contemptuous Wife	<i>Helen Clare Nelson</i>
The Money-Tree: a poem	<i>Naomi Replansky</i>
Three Drawings	<i>Ben Shahn</i>
Peretz: Classic of Yiddish Literature	<i>Morris U. Schappes</i>
Three Days in the Averoff: a story	<i>Dora Birtles</i>
Books in Review: by <i>Charles Humboldt, John Howard Lawson, Arnaud d'Usseau, Jose Yglesias, and Herbert Aptheker</i>	
Films: Marshall, Mothballs and Movies	<i>Matt Williams</i>
Music: Prokofiev's "Duenna"	<i>Sidney Finkelstein</i>
Communication: New British Poetry	<i>Thomas McGrath</i>
Art by <i>Amen, Bard, Cunningham, Gross, Heller, Keller</i>	

Price: 35 cents. Subscriptions: \$4.00 per year.

Checks should be made payable to national distributors:

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

NOTES FROM THE GALLOWS

by JULIUS FUCHIK

"Julius Fuchik speaks not only for the Czech working class but for all progressive humanity. . . . The example of his life and death brings honor and glory to the name: Communist."—William Z. Foster.

Price: \$.60

GENE DEBS: THE STORY OF A FIGHTING AMERICAN

by BILL CAHN and HERBERT MORAIS

Here is a popularly written biography of Gene Debs, one of the truly great figures in American labor history. Written by a distinguished historian and a veteran trade union pamphleteer, it tells Debs' fighting story from his earliest struggles against the railroads to his fight against war during the first world war.

Price: \$.65

HOME IS THE SAILOR

by BETH McHENRY and "BLACKIE" MYERS

A novelized biography of Billy Farrell, tracing his development from a skeptical, disillusioned sailor into a leader in the National Maritime Union and an active member of the Communist Party. A warm, vigorous, dramatic novel—full of meaning to everyone active in the present struggle for peace and democracy in America.

Price: \$1.25

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