

# political affairs

MAY 1954 • 25 CENTS

V. J. JEROME

- [ 1 ] May Day—1954: What  
Faces Us?

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- [ 9 ] The War Danger in the Present  
World Situation

JOHN SWIFT

- [18] The Working Class and the Two-  
Party System (*A Draft Program  
Discussion Article*)

PETTIS PERRY

- [31] The Negro People in the Struggle  
Against McCarthyism (*A Draft  
Program Discussion Article*)

GEORGE BLAKE CHARNEY

- [43] New Features in the Struggle  
Against McCarthyism

A. B. MAGIL

- [56] The Caracas Conference

# NEW INTERNATIONAL BOOKS

## SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG, VOL. I \$2.50

This first volume in what will eventually be issued as a 5-volume edition of the major works of Mao Tse-tung, covers the period of the first two revolutionary wars and the turn to the national united front against Japanese aggression, between the years 1926-1936. It includes essays analyzing classes in Chinese society, his famous military principles, writings on the peasant question, etc.

## HISTORICAL MATERIALISM Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.50 By MAURICE CORNFORTH

This companion volume to the author's previous book, *MATERIALISM AND THE DIALECTICAL METHOD*, is divided into three Parts: I. General Principles; II. How Society Develops; III. The Future: Socialism and Communism. It is a valuable contribution to the systematic study of Marxism.

## THE MIKE GOLD READER Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.50 With an introduction by SAMUEL SILLEN

A sparkling collection of the best stories, poems, columns, essays, reviews, literary reportage, and personal reminiscences of the dean of proletarian writers in the U.S.A. Michael Gold's best writings of the past forty years.

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

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



Vol. XXXIII, No. 5

May, 1954

# political affairs

*A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism*

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## May Day-1954: What Faces Us?

An Editorial Article

By V. J. Jerome

The First of May this year presents before the American working class issues and tasks of a magnitude unprecedented in the entire range of its history. This stands out in the light of the two-fold meaning of labor's traditional May Day. On this First of May our labor movement has the great task of defending and strengthening its hard-gained achievements and of unifying its forces in the face of the gathering economic crisis and the mounting McCarthyite attacks. Upon it devolves the task of leadership in building a powerful peace movement to halt the warmakers and thus to safeguard the vital interests of the nation. In this way the American working class can best meet its international obligations in this grave hour when the world is being pushed to the brink of war by Wall Street imperialism.

A new role devolves upon the working class as the government of

millionaires more and more leads the country down the ruinous course of wars of aggression abroad and fascism at home. Our country is confronted with the threat of the scuttling of the Bill of Rights and of all constitutional liberties. Indeed, at stake is human life itself, which is threatened with annihilation if the people do not paralyze the hand of the H-bomb imperialists.

In this situation the working class must feel itself called upon to assume the role of leader in the national salvation. The high responsibility of leading force in the nation became the historical task of the working class with the setting in of the imperialist epoch, when the bourgeoisie had outlived its historically progressive role and was entering upon a policy of "reaction all along the line" (Lenin). Today, in the period of its deepened general crisis which brings capitalism everywhere

to resort to desperate means—to fascism and war—in the hope of salvaging its doomed system, the working class in each capitalist country faces the task of national salvation in a qualitatively new way. This is particularly imperative for the working class of the United States, which has a special role to play because Wall Street imperialism is today the citadel of world reaction and the domineering organizer of a new world war.

How and to what extent has the American working class assumed this responsibility? And what is lacking for its fulfillment?

\* \* \*

It might be easy—yet very deceptive—to write off our working class and declare it has not moved at all along the course of struggle against the program and policies of Big Business. But the scientific assessment of a process is more than a blanket judgment of *yes* or *no*. What is necessary to see is what movement there has been, and what has to be done to accelerate its pace and enlarge its perspective.

The working class has engaged in a range of important and even major economic struggles. These numerous and militant strike struggles, many of them hard-fought, have involved hundreds of thousands of working men and women, Negro and white, throughout the country.

A notable advance in the trade-union movement is its growing realization of the necessity to meet the

threat of mass unemployment. This represents a decided change for progress as against the policy of turning the back on this problem and on the unemployed which characterized the attitude of the dominant trade-union officialdom during the Great Economic Crisis when the Communist Party initiated the demand for unemployment insurance. Since then, the organization of the mass production industries which has brought the trade-union strength to 15 million, has patently made the threat of mass unemployment a threat to the trade-union structure itself.

Thus, the two main trade-union centers, the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., at their last conventions, adopted “anti-depression” programs, as did various international unions, notably the U.A.W., as well as state and city labor councils. These programs, though varying in form, range of demands, and political level, nonetheless constitute an encouraging basis for labor’s united action to meet the looming threat of unemployment and its consequences.

In the words of the Draft Program of the Communist Party:

... the American people are no longer going to accept hard times as just “hard luck,” or as the process by which individuals are made “rugged” under capitalism. They refuse to blame themselves or fate for mass unemployment. They expect the economic system and the Government to guarantee them jobs at a living wage as workers, and a living income as farmers.

\* \* \*

A factor for progress in the course of the labor movement is the strength brought to it by the organized Negro workers. There is an increasingly greater consciousness in the labor movement of the meaning of struggle for Negro rights as part of the general struggle for democratic rights and for economic betterment of the whole working class. The organization of two million Negro workers into trade unions, their militant participation in struggles alongside their white fellow-workers, and the break-through in some instances to positions of leadership have given a setback to the traditional policy of division with which the white ruling class has sought to play Negro worker against white worker, and thus have weakened the whole base of jimcrow. Needless to say, this is only a beginning, in terms of what has still to be done to break the backbone of the white chauvinist evil that still persists in the labor movement.

In noting this aspect of advance by the labor movement, we need to take into account the fine contributions of the National Negro Labor Council, which is in the field representing the special interests of the Negro workers. Its impact is felt in the struggle around such issues as F.E.P.C., seniority, upgrading, wage equality, hiring of Negro workers, employment of Negro women in industry with equal rates of pay and non-discrimination in working conditions, and promotion of Negro

workers to trade-union leadership. Of particular import is the organization’s stand on the issue of colonialism, a position far in advance of that taken by the workers generally.

A further positive feature to be noted at this stage is the fact that the post-election policy of top trade-union officials for “adaptation” to the Eisenhower Administration has been weakened by the developing pressure from below. It is significant that C.I.O. President Reuther, who tried to tie labor’s anti-depression program to Eisenhower’s “initiative” for effecting it, has assailed the Administration’s tax bill as a “bonanza to the wealthy.” More and more the trade-union struggle is shaping up on a different level. While at the outset there was still an orientation toward awaiting some changes that would alleviate the Taft-Hartley tyranny, now the new spate of anti-trade union measures sponsored by the Administration reveals the delusions of all such earlier expectations.

There is opening up a wide perspective of economic struggle in the face of the threat of economic ruin, fascism, and war—a struggle that demands the united action of all labor’s forces and that will, in turn, strengthen and solidify labor’s fighting ranks.

\* \* \*

In context with these positive features, it must be said, however, that the working class has not yet risen to its task in relation to the central issues of our time. It has not yet

come forward to give leadership to the people in the struggle against the fascist danger, in its currently acute McCarthyite manifestation, and in the fight for peace, which is interconnected with that struggle. The labor movement is becoming increasingly a powerful factor in the anti-McCarthy struggle, but the initiative of this struggle is not yet in the hands of labor. And as to the struggle for peace, despite the overwhelming desire for peace on the part of the working people of our country, their central trade-union organizations are not voicing that urge. Unfortunately, certain top leaders seek to commit organized labor to support of the war-mongers. What can be more dastardly, more treasonous to the deep-felt peace aspirations of the American workers than A.F. of L. chieftain Meany's delirious demand for rapid-tempo plunging into war in Indo-China?

How is it that such a stooge of imperialism can presume to speak officially for millions of peace-desiring organized workers? It is because the working class in its mass, despite tremendous advances in trade-union organization and despite continuous conduct of economic struggles in a spirit of true militancy, still lags behind in the full understanding of its role as class. It lags in the consciousness of being what Engels termed, "a class in itself and for itself," in the realization of its role in the nation as mobilizer and leader of its democratic-spirited, peace-desiring, and

freedom-aspiring allies, in the first place the farming masses and the Negro people.

"Labor does not play its full role today," declares the Party's Draft Program. "It does not give a clear and firm lead because it is unclear and divided itself, because its own ranks are infected with Red-baiting and the 'cold war,' because its top leaders still play the part of errand boys to Big Business politicians."

The issue is cardinal. It affects every area of working-class struggle. In the sphere of struggle against the consequences of the developing economic crisis, to take a major instance, this continued subservience to Big Business robs the program of an important essential that is a key to furnishing extensive employment, namely, the demand for East-West trade. The opening up of normal trade relations with the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the People's Democratic states of East Europe would result in millions of jobs for American workers.

Even the Big Lie smokescreen cannot choke off the growing awareness in the ranks of the workers—as increasingly they join the swelling columns of "recession" victims—that East-West trade can open an ever-widening path to jobs for themselves, stable markets for farmers, as well as new opportunities for understanding between the American people and those of the Socialist and People's Democratic States, to lay the foundation for an enduring peaceful

co-existence. The facts of the demagogic manipulations that aim to thwart this understanding, the facts of the conspiracy to frustrate the normalizing of trade relations, to block countless legitimate bids for food-stuffs and other goods produced by American workers in factory and on farm, are notorious.

Such is the sickening anti-Soviet hate-and-spite policy of the reactionary Social-Democratic and reformist leaders that they cold-bloodedly doom millions of A.F. of L. and C.I.O. trade unionists and their families to unemployment and starvation rather than allow the demand for ending the East-West trade embargo a place in the "anti-depression" programs of their conventions. Well did Mary Norris, writing in these columns in the March issue, comment: "The fact is that to date a more forthright stand on this question has been taken by some businessmen than by the main sections of labor leaders in the United States."\*

The extent of this harmful position can be seen from the fact that the jobs-and-wages policy of the top labor leaders is still geared to Wall Street's maximum-profits economy of arms production, which is falsely presented as the road to prosperity and the guarantee against depression. What this panacea means to the laboring people is summed up in the

Draft Program in one sentence: "The arms economy is proving to be not the road to prosperity, but to economic ruin."

Just as the main labor officialdom gears the jobs-and-wages program to the arms production economy of Big Business, so they work desperately to subordinate the policy of the working class to the main political program and objective of the ruling class. With every means at their disposal they trumpet the Big Lie of the Soviet "threat" to this country, the hoax of Communist "aggression"—the stock-in-trade of McCarthyism. By means of this colossal deception they succeed in large measure in tying the labor movement to the political machine of the ruling class, thus retarding the independent political expression of the workers as a class. As the Draft Program states:

The responsibility for this rests on the official leaderships of the major trade union centers, the A.F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods and Mine Workers. By their support of Wall Street's foreign policy and the anti-Communist drive they have misled the workers.

Only the heightening of the struggle on the economic and political fronts waged in unity will expose the lie in the Big Lie.

\* \* \*

The Draft Program concludes on this point: "The labor movement must change its course if it is to save itself and help save the nation."

Such a change of labor's course

\* A number of progressive-led unions, it should be noted, have put forth demands for resumption of East-West trade, among these being Mine, Mill, U.E., Fur, and I.L.W.U.

means moving along the road of true independent political action in united struggle for economic security, peace, democracy, and Negro rights. Such a course will end the tutelage to the two-party system of monopoly capital and lay the foundations for a mass third party of the people led by labor.

"Important sections of the labor movement," the Draft Program points out, "are becoming increasingly conscious of the life-and-death need for labor unity. Some of these are also beginning to point in the direction of increased independent political action, are beginning to think in terms of forming a great political alliance under labor's leadership."

Certainly, the old Gompersist "non-partisan" line of political abstentionism has more and more given way to political participation by the trade unions. This has come about with the increasingly evident pervasion of politics in every issue and struggle, no matter how "neutral," and with the increasingly open involvement of the masses in political issues and in political aspects of economic issues. This development has found an expression in the political arms of the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L.—P.A.C. and L.L.P.E.—and in the beginnings of joint action of both in some areas.

In noting this positive development, we need to observe, however, that, just as the "non-partisan" policy of Gompers was used to hold the workers back from fighting the reac-

tionary *political* commitments of the labor bureaucracy to the ruling class, so today the dominant labor officialdom seeks to make of the political participation a participation in support of the program of monopoly capital, in the center of which is the drive to war for world dominance. This is so, notwithstanding certain important issues of struggle on matters of domestic policy which bring the trade unions into conflict with monopoly. Because of the subordination to the basic program of monopoly capital, with its foreign policy, even these struggles on domestic issues are not effectively led. Outstanding instances are the weaknesses in the struggle for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and for enacting a Federal F.E.P.C.

The forward movement in trade-union political action marks the strong tendency of the workers to act as a class, with a class program. This irrepressible trend is, however, still expressed on the elementary level of class feeling; it requires to be galvanized into class consciousness. This development is essential, if the working class is to assume its role of leader of all the oppressed in the anti-monopoly, anti-fascist, and anti-war coalition that will be able to score important victories over Big Business reaction.

\* \* \*

To hasten this development, it is necessary to engage today and constantly in political activity around various issues within all existing fa-

avorable frameworks in a way that will open up ever-wider possibilities for independent political action by the working class and its allies.

In the light of this, the labor and progressive movements must intervene in the crucial election struggles of 1954 to guarantee the defeat of the McCarthy and McCarran candidates and the rabid warmongers and to elect an anti-McCarthy majority in Congress. In the words of the Draft Program, the "objective must be to help bring about regrouping and realignment within the Democratic Party nationally and within the Republican Party in local areas."

The labor and progressive movement must place their imprint on this election campaign in order to elect a bloc of pro-labor Representatives and spokesmen for peaceful negotiations. It is high time that the labor and progressive forces should advance the cause of labor and Negro representation through electing labor and Negro candidates. In the 1954 election year the conditions exist for the development of a closer alliance between the working class, the Negro people, and the farmers for the defeat of repressive anti-labor and anti-people's legislation and for a positive legislative program to be fought for in the common interests.

The key to developing a working-class program for labor and to building a democratic people's coalition is *unity of struggle* against the common danger of McCarthyism and the war plotters, the effective conduct of

which demands the leadership of organized labor. But the labor movement cannot become the welding force of this democratic unity when it itself is weakened by the splitting policies of the misleaders, whose hatred is directed, not at the class enemy, but at the sincerest fighters against that enemy—at the Communists and all militants and progressives. The watchword for today must be *unity of struggle*.

\* \* \*

It is a struggle to break through and defeat the divisive policies of the dominant labor leadership whose minds are set in reactionary-reformist and Right Social-Democratic molds. Through united front actions from below more and more advances can be made in this direction. Pressure *can* be exerted on the top leadership. The situation becomes more favorable as ever newer voices are heard from trade-union bodies, union organs, and official labor spokesmen in warning against the threat of fascism and of involvement in a new war.

Strong counter-voices to the official trade-union policy are beginning to be heard. Of signal importance is the United Mine Workers' statement, in its official publication, appealing to the nations of the world to "make another desperate try at eliminating war" and urging U.S.-Soviet agreement to outlaw the H-bomb. The recent statement by Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, U.A.W., hit out at those who con-

tend that "peace and depression are synonymous" and warned :

The American people are being conditioned to adding to the already heavy burden of dollars the blood of America's youth to perpetuate the French colonial system in Indo-China.

And in mid-April a delegates' conference of the progressive-led Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' Union adopted resolutions that condemned McCarthyism and spoke out strongly against attempts to involve us in the war in Indo-China, with a concluding call on the U.S. to seek "an international agreement to outlaw the atom and hydrogen bombs and to convert the fissionable materials in existing stockpiles to peaceful uses."

The struggle for unity to save the country from fascism, to prevent war, to safeguard the people's living standards is stressed as an imperative need in the Draft Program, which declares:

No one group in America can achieve these things. The unity of all democratic and peace-loving forces is needed—unity on one issue, or a score of issues—unity irrespective of ideological and political differences on other questions and on longer-range goals. . . . This alliance, if it is to become fully effective, must include the Left and the Communists, who have a vital and indispensable contribution to make.

And the Communists have made and are continuing to make a vital and indispensable contribution. It is for this contribution to the cause of the working class, the Negro peo-

ple, and all the oppressed, for this contribution to the cause of peace and democracy, that the Communist Party has been made the first target of McCarthyism. And, let all workers realize, no effective struggle against McCarthyism can be waged which continues to accept the McCarthyite Big Lie of "Communist conspiracy" and "Communist aggression."

It is because of our Party's indispensability to the struggle for peace, democracy and economic security that its defense is an urgent task for today. The demand for the repeal of the Smith and McCarran Acts, for the reversal of Smith Act convictions, for amnestying Eugene Dennis, Ben Davis, and all political prisoners is a fundamental aspect of the whole fight against McCarthyism.

The Communist Party, in its new clarion call to the people—its Draft Program—summons the American masses to hold true to the high tradition of working-class advance, of democratic achievements, of struggle for Negro rights, of peace and working-class internationalism, of solidarity with colonial-liberation struggles, of freedom. Only this path of struggle will advance the working class to the final realization of Socialism. On this May Day the Communist Party calls upon the working class to rededicate itself to the struggle around those issues that stand foremost in the life of our country today and on whose resolution depends the destiny of the working class and the nation.

## The War Danger in the Present World Situation

By William Z. Foster

THE GUNS of World War II were not yet silent when the Communist Party of the U.S.A. raised the warning of a danger of a new world war. At the Emergency Convention of July, 1945, held while the war against Japan was still going on, the main resolution, after pointing out the sinister moves of American imperialism at home and abroad, declared that "the most aggressive circles of American imperialism are endeavoring to secure for themselves political and economic domination of the world," and that, "if the reactionary policies and forces of monopoly capital are not checked and defeated, America and the world will be confronted with new aggressions and war and the growth of reaction and fascism in the United States."

This resolution was a fundamentally correct Marxist analysis, and its forecasts have been completely sustained by the subsequent course of events. Many comrades, at the time, here and abroad, felt that this was something of a leftist analysis, an over-correction against the opportunist pest of Browderism, which we were then cleaning out of the Party. But it was not long until

the whole socialist and democratic world was speaking out actively against the growing war danger, signalized by the super-aggressive imperialist policies of the United States.

During the post-war years, the United States continued increasingly to give the most dramatic proofs that it was indeed out to master the world and that, in so doing, it contemplated the fighting of another great world war—against the USSR and the People's Democracies. No other interpretation than this could sanely be placed upon the intense military action of this country; the get-tough-with-Russia policies, the NATO, the atom-bomb diplomacy, the Truman doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the crude domination of the United Nations, and the growing boasts of American imperialists that it was the fate and duty of the United States to lead (*i.e.*, to rule) the world. That this was a grave war danger was obvious.

On the other hand, a number of most important developments have been simultaneously taking place in the world, which have tended definitely to knock on the head the conception of an early and easy conquest

of the world as held by Wall Street. Let me cite three of the most important of these:

a) There took place an enormous strengthening in the post-war period of the world forces of Socialism and democracy—that is, the vast growth in power of the U.S.S.R., the establishment of the European People's Democracies, the winning of the great Chinese Revolution, and the wide growth of Communist Parties, trade unions, and youth, women and peace organizations throughout the world. The active peace policies of all these bodies enormously increased the people's restraints upon the Wall Street imperialists and warmongers.

b) Then there was the growth of a tremendous anti-war spirit among the masses throughout the entire world, both socialist and capitalist. This elemental peace will of the bulk of humanity has become all the more powerful with the breaking of the American A-bomb "monopoly" by the U.S.S.R. (Truman announcement, September, 1949), and with recent developments which have made the H-bomb an even more dreadful weapon than the A-bomb. These world-wide masses, who more and more hate and fear the United States, are coming to understand that the fight for peace is the fight for existence. This anti-war spirit has been vastly increased by the horrible implications of the recent H-bomb tests at Bikini.

c) Finally, there was the growing

unwillingness of most of the capitalist countries themselves to follow the lead of the United States into a catastrophic atomic war. This resistance to American domination, dictation, and war policies (represented by the hesitant attitude of Great Britain, India, France, Italy, Canada, etc.) is partly a result of the mass pressure for peace and partly a result of the inherent capitalist antagonisms and conflicts of interests among the imperialist powers. This capitalist opposition to the insane war program of American imperialism is becoming more marked with Eisenhower's desperate efforts to extend the Indo-China war.

#### PEACE VICTORIES OF THE PEOPLES

These elementary and very powerful peace forces of the world have put many stumbling blocks in the path of aggressive American imperialism. They have done this in the face of the most flagrant betrayal by Social-Democratic trade-union and political leaders both here and abroad, who are almost everywhere playing the imperialist game of Wall Street.

The most spectacular demonstration of the power of the international peace forces was the compelling of the Korean armistice by the peoples of the world in the face of the most determined, almost frantic, efforts, of the American government to keep the war going. But

the peace forces have many other major victories to report, a number of them subtle and undramatic. Among them were the stubborn refusal of the U.S.S.R., which fights tirelessly for peace, to be intimidated by the A-bomb threat; the history-making resistance of the North Korean and Chinese Volunteer armies to the combined armies of the American war alliance; the blocking of the attempt of the United States militarists to use the A-bomb in North Korea and China; the mass opposition to the sending of American boys to die in Indo-China; the stubborn protest against the re-arming of West Germany and Japan; the mounting world pressure for the admission of People's China to the United Nations, etc., etc.

So great, in fact, has the mass peace resistance been to American imperialism, that the original world-conquest plan of Wall Street has long since been made bankrupt. This plan obviously was to establish American domination by means of atomic-bomb intimidation, or if this did not succeed, by a "preventive" shower of A-bombs on Russian cities and industrial centers. This nightmarish scheme was openly advocated at the time. The A-bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki more as a warning to the Soviet Union than as a military means to crush already-defeated Japan. But this whole atom-bomb strategy was knocked into a cocked hat when the Soviet Government let

it be known that it was also making A-bombs.

This unexpected development caused a swift re-orientation and improvisation in American war policy. The early complete reliance upon the A-bomb, to the practical exclusion of "conventional" arms, was dropped; the N.A.T.O. was established and furious efforts were initiated to form a great all-capitalist alliance, the heart of which, together with the United States, would be a re-armed West Germany and Japan. But this new plan also suffered shipwreck. Originally the idea was to create a militant anti-Soviet alliance, which would march into war aggressively against that country, much as the Anti-Comintern Axis did in World War II. As remarked above, however, the resistance of the peoples and the governments of the capitalist world to becoming cannon fodder for Wall Street, has paralyzed the whole N.A.T.O. project.

In view of this growing failure of the N.A.T.O. strategy and the invention of the H-bomb, within the last couple of years, there has been another shift of American war plans. This has produced the so-called "new look" policy, with its central stress upon the H-bomb and its threat of a preventive war—the so-called "massive instant retaliation" strategy. The capitalist owners and bosses of the United States have accepted the dreadful perspective of an all-out atomic war. Hence, the big emphasis upon the air force and the

feverish building of monster air-fleets, erection of numberless air bases throughout the world, and the creation of ever more horrible types of H-bombs. There is a tremendous and rising mass opposition throughout the world to the murderous H-bomb and the war strategy connected with it, but the task still remains for the international peace forces to knock out the deadly H-bomb menace.

### IS THERE A CONTINUING WAR DANGER?

Beyond question, during the past few years, the peace forces of the world have won very important victories, and, for a time, succeeded in considerably easing world tension. This fact led many to believe, not only in the ranks of shallow-pate liberals, but even in the Communist Party itself, that the war danger was a thing of the past. Such comrades did not come out with clear-cut theses to the effect that there was no further war danger, but they expressed themselves this way privately, and with their line they definitely influenced sections of our press in this general direction. Not only did these comrades cast aside the fact that there was a continuing serious war danger, but they therewith also jettisoned the Party analysis that American imperialism is seeking to establish world domination on the basis of another world war. All concepts of an active fight

against the warmongers also went out of their writings. This was the grossest Right opportunism, and, if continued, it could do grave damage to our Party and the working class.

At the recent National Conference of our Party, Comrade Stevens, in recognizing the continuing war danger in the world, despite the manifest easing of international tension that had taken place after the Korean armistice, and in stressing the need for persistent struggle for peace, said:

We must emphasize the fact that this possibility [for peace] implies a *whole period of struggle* for its realization. If previously the main danger we had to contend with was the influence of the theory of the inevitability of a new world war, then as we enter into the period marked by these new possibilities, the danger increasingly becomes a tendency to feel that "peace is in the bag," that the war danger has disappeared altogether—a failure to understand that possibilities can be transformed into living reality only in the process of the sharpest struggle against the war policies and war orientation of the Eisenhower Administration.

This warning of Comrade Stevens, based upon a realistic analysis of the American and world situation, was a most timely one. Obviously, however, the comrades, advocates of the "peace-is-in-the-bag" illusion, failed completely to profit from it. They also ignored the Draft Program now before the Party, which gives a clear line on the war danger and how to fight for peace.

It seems absurd, at this late date, that Party comrades have to be told that there is a continuing war danger in the world, but this appears, nevertheless, to be necessary. Lenin and Stalin repeatedly pointed out that so long as imperialism lasts there will be the danger of war, and their general warning is especially applicable in this period of the rapid deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system. It is not, however, simply with such a general war danger that we are dealing, but with the concrete danger of a Wall Street-organized war against the Soviet Union, People's China, and the European People's Democracies.

The war danger in the world stems from the aggressiveness of American imperialism (which is Wall Street finance capital). The most malignant manifestations of this danger now are the monstrous H-bomb threats to the peace of the world and the deliberate effort to spread the Indo-Chinese war. But there are a host of others, among them: the \$50 billion yearly budget for war preparations; the stimulated growth of McCarthyism, which is definitely an outgrowth of war hysteria; the construction of air bases all over the world, their planes all directed against the U.S.S.R.; the persistence in the N.A.T.O. war alliance, and especially the re-arming of West Germany and Japan; the so-called "liberation policy," which is the fomenting of civil wars in countries that refuse to do the bid-

ding of Wall Street; the sabotage of the Korean peace treaty; the barring of People's China from the United Nations; the so-called "massive retaliation" policy which would give to the President the authority, upon his own initiative, to plunge the world into a great war, without even consulting Congress; the sabotage of East-West trade as a pro-war measure; the ultra-arrogant character of United States diplomacy, with repeated A- and H-bomb ultimatums and threats from Eisenhower and Dulles to the U.S.S.R. and People's China; the blatant insistence from bourgeois spokesmen that the United States is the rightful leader (ruler) of the world, the flagrant war preparations now going on upon all sides, the violent persecution of Communists and other peace advocates, etc., etc.

The malignancy and danger of these militaristic and warlike policies is emphasized by the fact that they are the policies of by far the most powerful capitalist government in the world, controlling a country with over 65 percent of the capitalist world's industrial production, and that the government of the United States is in the hands of semi-McCarthyite pro-fascists. The atomaniacs controlling this monster military machine might well throw our country into war. It is idle, every time there is an easing of world tensions, to hop to the conclusion that the war danger has vanished.

In view of the aggressive, warlike policies of the United States, it is politically silly, not to say grossly opportunistic, to assert that there is no war danger in existence. The leading statesmen of the world, not dominated by Wall Street, continue to point out the reality of the danger. Premier Nehru of India has signaled the danger upon many recent occasions, especially with regard to the setting up of American war bases in Pakistan. Premiers Ho Chi Minh of Indo-China and Chou En-lai of China have given many similar warnings. At the recent Berlin conference of Foreign Ministers, Molotov, despite the diplomatic need to speak softly, declared that U'nited States imperialists have taken the course of preparing a new war against the U.S.S.R. and the people's democracies." And a short while afterward, Premier Malenkov warned the world that the policy of cold war (American) was preparing a new world slaughter which would mean the destruction of civilization. These are the voices of reality.

Wall Street monopoly capital is definitely orienting towards war. This course it is impelled to because it represents the greatest imperialist power in the world, because it thinks it sees in this direction world domination, fabulous profits, and the destruction of world Socialism. It can be driven from this suicidal course only by being overwhelmingly defeated by the peace forces of the world. Not even the realization that

a great war would result in the H-bombing of the United States is terrible enough to deter them from their war orientation. Only the aroused peoples of the United States and other countries can halt them. Such is the madness of monopoly capital in this period of the decline of world capitalism and the rise of world Socialism.

#### HOW TO FIGHT THE WAR DANGER

It is not the purpose of this article to review the work that the Party has done in the field of anti-war struggle, to detail concrete organizational steps to be taken, nor to list precise slogans for the peace forces; but simply to stress the reality of the war danger and to indicate a few general principles of how to fight it.

The first thing to be grasped firmly is the Party's method of establishing its policy regarding the war danger. Our Party does not, on the basis of some super-clever analysis, decide definitely (under present conditions) that there is or is not going to be a war. It does not say that war is inevitable, nor does it say that there is going to be no war. Its policy is determined by the great growth of militarism and imperialist aggression, which implies clearly that there is a danger of war. It is this war danger, which is now under our very noses, that the Party fights.

It may possibly be that the break-

ing of the A- and H-bomb monopolies by the U.S.S.R., or the relative failure of N.A.T.O., or the enormous growth of peace sentiment all over the world, or all of these factors together, have already defeated the attempt of American imperialism to launch a third world war; or it may be that they have not succeeded in so doing. Only the next years can answer this basic question. In the meantime, it would be extreme folly to conclude that there is no war danger, as some did after the Korean truce was signed. Our task is to fight the concrete war danger as it looms up, as of now.

This fight against the war danger must be a continuous, resolute and energetic one. Of course, it cannot be carried out in any mechanical spirit; its slogans must be attuned to the degree of urgency of the international situation at the given time. For the past few weeks, with the acute situation in Indo-China and the advent of the monstrous H-bomb "tests," the war danger has been a rising one and must be fought aggressively.

A most important thing for us to grasp is, as Comrade Stevens indicated so cogently and emphatically in his report, that any easing of the international situation, such as after Korea, is not a signal for us to abandon or slacken our peace fight, as some comrades tried to have us do. On the contrary, our task is to intensify this fight. The great victory of the peoples in forcing through the

Korean truce must not be followed by laying down our oars, but by working more energetically than ever to defeat the would-be launchers of an atomic war. When one has the enemy on the retreat, he must drive to destroy him. Any tendency to slacken the peace fight at this time, on the grounds that the war danger has lessened, or even disappeared, tends to liquidate the peace movement, to give the warmongers a free hand, and thus, in the final analysis, to increase the war danger.

The question of the war danger cannot be departmentalized and dealt with as though it were some kind of a separate question. On the contrary, it is the basic problem of this period, it permeates and saturates all other questions. On this basis it must be combatted. The war danger must be fought in both a general and a specific sense. That is, while pointing out the broad menace of the war danger, we must also show concretely how it affects every other question. This means to demonstrate its key relationship to the developing economic crisis, to McCarthyism, and to the various other economic and political questions and problems now confronting the American people.

Especially the Party must present the war danger as an urgent, present-day question for the people—not only in the sense of the possibility of an eventual dreadful atomic war, but as a reactionary force in many ways harmfully affecting their

everyday lives. Thus, the workers must be made to understand that the war preparations are directly responsible for the present high taxes and high cost of living, and for the growth of anti-union sentiment in reactionary circles. They must be taught the utter folly of depending upon munitions-making to furnish jobs. The Negro people must be warned, by concrete examples, that they, of all the sections of our general population, have the most to lose by the growth of fascism and the war spirit. The farmers must be shown, too, that if their incomes are dropping while surplus farm products pile sky high, a major reason for this is because "cold-war" conditions have largely resulted in closing world markets to American farm commodities.

It is necessary, too, to center the main fire upon those aspects of Wall Street's program that are currently the most dangerous or which are the most hated, by the people. Thus, we should militantly fight against every step being taken by the war hawks to expand the Indo-China war and involve us in it. We should demand the immediate outlawing of the use of the H-bomb, the halting of its production, and the prohibition of any further test explosions. The prohibition should also include all forms of chemical and bacteriological warfare. We should battle against the so-called "massive retaliation" policy of Dulles and Eisenhower, which is a covert

way of getting power to the President to launch us into a world war any time he sees fit, without congressional or popular consideration. Also we should concentrate against the so-called "liberation policy," which is the present-day version of the Truman doctrine for the instigation of civil wars in countries refusing to bow to Wall Street. We should fight relentlessly the Federal budget, now before Congress, calling for a one-year war appropriation of \$50 billion, we should vigorously combat every attempt to rearm West Germany and Japan; and, as a great peace measure, we should demand the admission of People's China to the United Nations. In fighting McCarthyism we should show its basic relationship to the pest of militarism and warmongery now affecting our country. We should alarm the people to the grave danger of such semi-McCarthyites as Eisenhower and Dulles arbitrarily controlling, as they virtually do now, the horrible H-bomb.

As the Draft Program points out, the peace movement offers the broadest opportunity for united front activities. All ranks of the people, especially those who work in the industries and on the farms, are deeply aroused against the war danger, and daily they are becoming more opposed to it. The mobilization and leading of these masses in struggle for peace is one of the very greatest tests our Party has ever experienced in all its history.

A fundamental consideration for us also is to base our activities upon the working class. We must not be deceived by the pro-war activities of the Meanys, Reuthers, Becks and other Social-Democratic labor imperialists. The great masses of the American working class are opposed to war, and they are in dread of the malignant H-bomb activities of the Eisenhower-Dulles government. They are increasingly ready for a strong pro-peace movement. It is the task of our Party to give such leadership.

The coming November election will be among the most important in our country's history. It is necessary that in this election the Communist Party raise the war danger question sharply and in all its ramifications as outlined above. Although the masses are ready for a strong anti-war movement, only the Communist Party can be depended upon to raise the question in its full significance. Our Party must link up this whole matter with its fight against the menace of McCarthyism and the growing economic crisis. The Draft Program gives a clear and comprehensive line on this peace struggle in all its ramifications.

All of our anti-war work, our struggle for peace, must culminate in the most powerful effort we are capable of to demonstrate to the American people that the only pos-

sible sane perspective for the world's peoples is one of peaceful co-existence of the capitalist countries with the U.S.S.R. This especially must be tied in with the fight against the H-bomb. Anything else is sheer political madness. We must especially shatter the "big lie" that the U.S.S.R. in any sense constitutes a war menace.

Wall Street's aggressive policy, based upon its determination to rule the world and its motivating conception that war is inevitable, could only lead the world's people to their worst disaster in all history. The greatest ideological trend in the world today is the rapid swing of the world's peoples, under the terroristic pressure of America's H-bombs, to the basic conviction that there is no other alternative for mankind than to achieve a working arrangement between the Soviet Union and the capitalist powers—an arrangement upon which the U.S.S.R. is basing its whole policy.

Finally, in its handling of the elementary questions of peace and war, our Party must realize that as the proletarian party located in the heart of the basic source of the present war danger, the United States, it is our solemn international duty not only to combat every phase of the warlike policies of American imperialism, but also to expose them before the workers of the world.

# The Working Class and the Two-Party System

(Draft-Program Discussion)

By John Swift

"The two party system remains the form through which the overwhelming majority of the American people now express themselves in politics" (*Draft Program of the Community Party*).

THIS IS A FACT which can be hardly disputed. But it is important to know why it is so.

The allegiance of the masses to the two-party system is not something new. It has been with us for decades. Can one reason therefore that nothing new has transpired in the political thinking of the masses? After all, exactly thirty years ago, in 1924, the organized labor movement did support the third party candidacy of Robert M. LaFollette and helped roll up the imposing total of nearly five million votes—the equivalent of over ten million votes today! Is this not, as the lawyers would say, "prima facie evidence" that the labor movement since then has gone even backward politically?

But if this were true, what then is the practical possibility of realizing the immediate political tasks outlined in the Draft Program? Certainly these cannot be fulfilled if the masses have gone backward or if the nature of their attachment to the two-party system has undergone no change.

It is the purpose of this article to discuss this question, to explain why the masses, especially the labor movement, are still tied to the two-party system, and what is the actual present day level of political consciousness.

Some of the historical factors which have operated as brakes upon the political independence of the working class were dealt with by Engels in one of his letters written to Frederick Sorge in 1893. He wrote:

It is not to be denied that American conditions involve very great and peculiar difficulties.

First, the Constitution, based as in England upon party government, which causes every vote for any candidate not put up by one of the two governing parties to appear to be lost. And the American, like the Englishman, wants to influence his state; he does not throw his vote away.

Then, and more especially, immigration, which divides the workers into two groups: the native born and the foreigners, and the latter in turn into . . . many small groups, each of which understands only itself. . . . And then the Negroes. To form a single party out of these requires unusually powerful incentives. Often there is a sudden violent *elan*, but the bourgeois need only wait passively, and the dissimilar

elements of the working class fall apart again.

Third, through the protective tariff system and the steadily growing domestic market the workers have been exposed to a prosperity no trace of which has been seen in Europe for years now. . . . (*Letters to Americans*, p. 258).

To what extent do these factors still hold? Let us discuss the last one first. Conditions since 1893 have greatly altered the world position of U.S. capitalism. But the factor of "prosperity" cited by Engels has undoubtedly remained. Comrade Foster, in his recent article on "Marxism and the American Working Class," points out that "the rise of American imperialism as a world power, especially since the period of World War I . . . has produced economic and political effects which have definitely checked the growth of Socialist perspectives for the working class" (*Political Affairs*, Nov. 1953, p. 6).

Over the long stretch, this factor of relative prosperity has been undoubtedly the *main* historic cause for the political lagging of the American workers behind their European brothers. But this is not the only explanation for the failure of a third party to develop in recent years.

In the first place, a third-party movement, under present-day conditions, would tend to be more specifically anti-monopoly than anti-capitalist in general. In fact, all strivings toward third parties in recent times

have been mainly anti-trust in character. The LaFollette third party in 1924 was not a socialist movement. Its ideology was petty bourgeois; its goal, "trust-busting." In 1924, the labor movement which endorsed the La Follette third-party candidacy was far from socialist consciousness. It was a labor movement made up largely of the most skilled and best paid workers, the "aristocracy" of labor, and led by dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries such as Samuel Gompers.

The labor movement of today is far in advance of the labor movement of thirty years ago. In the past quarter of a century we have witnessed the growth of the trade-union movement from three to fifteen million. And while there is no straight line or mechanical one-to-one relationship between the level of trade-union organization to that of political consciousness, there is nevertheless some relationship between these two.

Trade-union consciousness concerns itself only with defending the economic interests of the workers under capitalism, not with replacing capitalism. It is, therefore, still part of capitalist ideology. But can anyone deny that trade-union consciousness, especially today, carries with it important political elements? It represents the embryonic, instinctive wrestling of the workers for class unity and class understanding. Furthermore, while the American workers are not yet anti-capitalist, in ever growing numbers they are opposed

to the economic and political power of the monopolies and view them as their enemies. It is in the past twenty-five years that American labor finally has broken through the citadel of trustified industry and achieved the organization of the majority of the workers in the mass production industries. This tremendous quantitative surge forward of the working class has carried with it certain qualitative elements of enhanced political consciousness.

This is most strikingly evident in relation to the second factor mentioned by Engels—the division of the working class into separate and frequently hostile groups of native and foreign born, of white and Negro, and of skilled and unskilled workers. The American working class is still divided ideologically and organizationally, but tremendously important headway has been made toward its homogeneity. No longer is organized labor made up exclusively of higher paid, native-born, white, skilled workers. It is no longer true that “the bourgeois need only wait passively, and the dissimilar elements of the working class fall apart again.”

Likewise, never before has organized labor so concerned itself with political problems and with what it calls “political action.” The network of Political Action bodies which criss-cross the labor movement and which flare up with renewed activity before election time is now a permanent feature of American trade unionism. Much of this political action

consists of using labor to help elect boss-controlled politicians. It does, however, at the same time, represent the recognition on the part of the workers of the close relationship between the economic struggle and politics, and from an organizational point of view at least, the need for independent political action.

The present generation of trade unionists does not expect labor to “stay out of politics.” In fact, even if the workers are still tied to the two-party system, and more particularly the Democratic Party, an increasing number of them tend to view this allegiance as something flowing from their first loyalty to their elementary class organization, their trade union. This represents an important new development from which great new advances are possible.

In dealing with the economic factor of “prosperity” we also must keep in mind that the past quarter of a century has included a full decade of tough times for the workers—the period of economic crisis referred to as the “Great Depression.” In this period, illusions about permanent prosperity and American “exceptionalism” received some hard blows on the hard anvil of bitter experience. Unrest and dissatisfaction were rife, taking the form of a great mass upheaval—one which left its indelible mark on all subsequent developments and on the mass consciousness. It was this period which finally culminated in a whole number of political victories and in the

emergence of the labor movement as a powerful majority movement of the industrial workers.

Yet the turbulent thirties did not produce a new third party, not even a repetition of the brief 1924 experience. (The 1936 Lemke third-party movement was not a progressive but a reactionary development.) This occurred despite the fact that the economic position of the workers and farmers, of the city middle classes, and particularly of the Negro people was indeed precarious and frequently desperate. Surprisingly enough, the great political upsurge of that period took another course. It expressed itself in a mass shift of these groups to one of the two old parties, the Democratic Party. So overwhelming was this wave that it swept the Negro vote out of its traditional Republican column, swallowed up the socialist vote, which fell from 880,000 in 1932 to 187,000 in 1936, absorbed the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota, and completely wiped out the Progressive Party of Wisconsin.

Why this development?

A clue to part of the answer can be found in Engels' remark that the American worker “wants to influence his state,” and “does not throw his vote away.”

But was this not also true in 1912 and 1924, in which years some five million votes were given to minor party candidates? The difference can be explained in but one way: the worker was ready to dump the old parties *only* when he was convinced that there was no appreciable dif-

ference between them. So long as he thought that there was something to be gained from one or the other major party he refused to “throw his vote away.”

We may disagree with the wisdom displayed. We may point to the treachery of labor leaders who misled the workers into frequently seeing a difference in substance where there was only a difference in shadow. But we cannot deny that this thinking on the part of the worker greatly explains the way he voted. We must not quibble with facts. Fault finding is never a substitute for fact finding.

There was one major “exception” to the trend in the thirties. This was in the state of New York, where the American Labor Party was born in 1937-8. The A.L.P. arose in revolt against the entrenched, reactionary, corrupt Democratic Party rule in New York City. It was made possible because in New York there was a strong bloc of independent and progressive voters and an important Left-wing influence. But the above two factors were not sufficient to establish the American Labor Party.

It required still another—the special feature of the New York election law which enabled the formation of *electoral coalitions* between different parties and party groupings. In New York State, contrary to most other states in the nation, cross-filing was permitted—that is, a candidate was permitted to run on more than one party ticket at the same time. This peculiarity of the New

York election law enabled the independent voters in New York to form a new party without thereby endangering the election of those major party candidates who in their eyes still deserved support. In practice, this performed the function of delivering an even larger vote to the Democratic Party presidential, state and congressional tickets. This "exception," therefore, even though it brought about the defeat of the Tammany machine in New York, did not contradict the national trend, it only served to strengthen it.

This leads us to the point made by Engels about the difference in the American electoral system as compared with continental Europe. In a letter written in 1895, shortly before his death, Engels explained why the British workers were so slow in forming a labor party. The workers, he wrote, have a "socialist instinct" which "is becoming ever stronger." But: "Almost all the labor leaders are unreliable," and "the two big bourgeois parties stand ready, money bag in hand, to buy up whomever they can." At the same time, continues Engels, "a periodical costs a tremendous amount of money, as does a candidacy for Parliament. . . . Hence anyone who does not sell himself to one of these parties finds it hard to become a candidate." On top of all this, adds Engels, "there is no second ballot, the relative majority or, as you Americans say, a plurality being sufficient for election. Everything is arranged with *only two* parties in mind; a third party can at

most tip the balance one way or the other until it is as strong as the other two" (*Letters to Americans*, pp. 268-9).

It is as if Engels had written of the United States today. Here, too, the workers have a basic class instinct, which is becoming stronger. Here, too, most top labor leaders are unreliable—to put it mildly. And there is no country in the world where such a Big Business monopoly exists over the press and all avenues of communication, (radio, TV, etc.), and where such shamefully large sums of money are poured out to buy elections.

In the U.S. there is also no second ballot and a plurality is sufficient for election. What this means in practice can strikingly be seen when contrasted to other countries. In France, for example, it is possible to vote for a first-choice candidate one week and then, if no candidate has received a majority, to switch to a second choice in the final election the following week. Thus there is less fear of a "lost vote." Weaker parties can run candidates, strive to get a maximum vote for these, and then, if necessary, form a coalition with other groups on the second ballot to defeat the most reactionary candidates.

Furthermore, in European countries, including Britain, national administrations are elected by parliament and not by direct popular vote as in this country. The American system has the appearance of being more democratic, actually it is less so.

Where administrations are set up and responsible to parliaments, they can be forced out of office by a "lack of confidence" vote. Hence they must be more responsive to the popular mood for they do not automatically stay in office for four years as in this country. Also, minor parties, through their votes in parliament, can help elect, maintain, or defeat an administration and can form coalitions within parliament corresponding to the issues of the time and the exact correlation of class forces.

In the United States—starting with the way an Administration is elected, to the way in which Congress organizes its work and sets up its committees, all the way down to each election district—it is the two-party system which is given precedence, preference, and, not least of all, patronage. Electoral laws are stacked against minor parties. New restrictive moats are dug constantly to fortify the two-party structure and shield it from popular assault. Even the victory won by the Populists and Bull Moose movements, in compelling the establishment of the direct primary system for the selection of candidates has helped bolster the two party system by increasing its elasticity. It has provided a first and second ballot arrangement, but one that is contained within and helps buttress the two-party arrangement. And since then, state after state, particularly the most highly populated industrial states, have erected new barriers for getting on the ballot as, for example, they frequently demand

that the independent candidates file before the result of the Primary Election is known, and prohibit or restrict the nomination of the same candidates by different parties. This is now even true in New York State, where the election laws have been amended to prevent independents from filing in other party primaries and where the right to cross filing depends on the prior approval of the county political bosses.

Thus, "everything is arranged with only two parties in mind," everything is done to impress upon the voter that anything short of a vote for a major party candidate is a "lost" vote.

\* \* \*

If all this has been a deterrent to the formation of a mass new party, it is by no means sufficient to prevent one when the people are determined to make the break. When that day comes, these impediments will be swept away like brushwood in a flood. All that is required is what Engels called "unusually powerful incentives."

Have there not been "powerful incentives"? There certainly have, especially during the "Great Depression" decade. Why then did large masses think they had nothing to lose from taking a third party course in 1912 and 1924 but thought otherwise during the crisis '30's?

The correct answer to this question is of great importance. It will enable us to grasp that which is *new* in the political life and understanding of the working class of this generation.

In 1924, to take that year as an example, the independent voters did not believe it made much difference which major party won. As between John W. Davis, the Democratic corporation lawyer, and Calvin Coolidge, the Republican Boston police strike-breaker, many millions of workers and farmers saw neither a lesser choice nor a lesser evil. To them it made little difference which reactionary candidate or party won.

In the '30's, something changed. Large masses became aware of a new danger, the danger of *extreme* reaction. This fear of extreme reaction arose from two vital experiences: the economic crisis and the rise of fascism.

The economic crisis was a period of powerful mass struggles from which the masses learned much. In the first place they learned that this crisis was different than preceding ones in both depth and duration. It led not to a new prosperity but to a new economic plunge in 1938. Instinctively they sensed that henceforth they could expect even less security than in the past. American capitalism was no longer what it had been cracked up to be. From the seething sea of ferment—from bonus marches and hunger marches, from street demonstrations, sit-down strikes and picket lines—there arose the ever more insistent demand that the government had a responsibility to guarantee the people with jobs and livelihood, and the determination to judge parties, Administrations, and the economic system as

such, by their readiness to accept this yardstick.

The demand for jobs and security was met head-on at first with brutal ruling-class violence. But the very strength of the popular movement, in time, compelled a change from repression to concession. The switch, under mass pressure, to a policy of concession and reform was not new for the bourgeoisie. Traditionally, capitalism rules by either the method of repression or reform, and in democratic countries most frequently by a combination of both. This was how the ruling class in previous periods of difficulty was able to "get off the spot" so to speak, and to prevent any permanent upsets to its two-party system of rule. In the instance of the '30's the policy of agreeing to reforms had advantages for the ruling class. First, it still had ample reserves from which to make concessions. Second, through such a course it could, temporarily at least, save the two-party system from the threatening rise of powerful independent political forces and likewise replace old illusions with new ones about a "democratic capitalism."

There are always differences within the ranks of the ruling class as to which method is preferable for dealing with the masses. In the '30's, however, these differences began to assume a new significance. The dominant monopolies were violently opposed to a policy of concessions. They saw in the emerging "New Deal" something exceedingly dangerous and sinister. They recognized that

due to the chronic nature of the crisis which capitalism was facing, due to the new level of mass struggle and consciousness, even small concessions could prove dangerous for them. Small concessions would not solve much and would only feed the demand for larger and more substantial ones. This was a Pandora's box which when opened could start a process threatening their entire empire of loot and plunder.

Both these factors—the new vitality and breadth of the popular movement for change, as well as the two-fold ruling class reaction to this new development—finally made possible the emergence of a loose kind of alliance between the labor movement, the Negro people, and other democratic and pro-reform sections of the population. The Democratic Party, which for partisan reasons required a broader social base to transform itself into a majority party, allied itself with these independent political forces and became their electoral vehicle. The 1932 elections represented a swing from the "ins" to the "outs," but by the time of the 1936 elections the new alliance had become a fact.

Thus, in the eyes of many, the Democratic Party nationally became associated with a policy of reform, of being ready to intervene in the economic process to aid the "little people." The Republican Party, on the other hand, by its vociferous opposition to all progressive "New Deal" measures, by its branding these as "creeping socialism," became identified as the party of privilege.

The coming to power of fascism in Germany, the experience of the whole anti-fascist world struggle, the rise of the Liberty League, the America Firsters, and pro-fascist demagogues such as Father Coughlin and Gerald L. K. Smith also left their imprint on the thinking of the people.

Thus the fear of extreme reaction became a new factor with which to contend.

Were the masses justified in this fear? They certainly were. Our Party played no small part, especially from 1935 on, in teaching the masses the meaning of fascism. We taught that, in this period of capitalist decay, powerful forces of monopoly were seeking to wipe out and destroy the very democratic liberties which capitalism had brought into being when it was still a progressive force. For these bourgeois democratic liberties, given new life and meaning by a great and aroused movement of the people, could lead to important people's victories.

The danger of extreme reaction and fascism did not end with the victory in the war. In certain respects it became even more menacing. American imperialism had emerged from the war as the most powerful economic and military state in the capitalist world. Thus it was "prepared" to embark on a new course to solve its market problems and its need for maximum profits—the course of achieving complete world domination. The drive toward reaction and fascism, as our Party and

its leaders, Comrades William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, repeatedly pointed out, became the hand-maiden of the drive toward a new world war for world domination.

This danger was all the greater for still another reason. New illusions had dulled the instinct and corroded the thinking of large masses. These illusions grew out of the full employment which came with war production. For the older generation the fear of economic crisis was still acute, but so long as they had jobs and steady incomes, they closed their eyes to the seamy side of events. They refused to see those things they did not want to see. In this they took their cue from the top labor leadership. While the workers were dissatisfied with the Truman Administration, they nevertheless held on to the belief that he was a continuer of the Roosevelt policies and a barrier, even if weak, to the political dominance of the extreme reactionary anti-labor forces. As for the young people, the depression decade was entirely out of their ken—something they heard about or vaguely remembered but had not actually experienced. The fact that the U.S. was on the anti-fascist side of the Second World War also made many Americans completely insensitive to the aggressive, reactionary character of post-war U.S. foreign policy. All of these factors strengthened illusions in the progressive nature of American capitalism.

Thus the fear of extreme reaction carried over into the postwar period

—especially for the workers and the Negro people. What the progressive minded masses failed to comprehend, however, was that the new anti-democratic threat stemmed directly from the country's reactionary foreign policy. The Truman Administration was no barrier to this virus; it was its carrier. Truman's policies were undermining the victories won in the '30s and '40s, were demoralizing and dispersing the progressive majority of Roosevelt's day, and thus paving the way for the victory of extreme reaction.

The failure of the working class, the Negro people, and other progressive social forces to see this *new* situation explains what happened to the Wallace third party vote in 1948. It had great vitality and potentiality in the early part of the election campaign but evaporated into thin air by election day. This was especially true after Truman put on his special election duds, styled after F.D.R., and appealed to the peace, labor and Negro votes. Many workers agreed with the criticisms of the Progressive Party but feared that by taking the plunge in a third party direction they could lose all that had been gained under the "New Deal." They feared that by voting for the greater good they would wind up with the greater evil.

\* \* \*

Thus, through all the vicissitudes of two decades of rich political change, the alliance of the workers, the Negro people and other low income groups with the Democratic

Party has remained intact. Nor is this likely to change now that the Republicans have taken power. On the contrary, the rise of McCarthyism has made the menace of fascism both grave and imminent. While both major parties have McCarthyite forces within them, there is no question but that the Republican Party at this time is its main incubator. Also, the fact that the Republican Party is in power as the new economic crisis unfolds, feeds the illusions that the Democratic Party is an anti-depression party.

This already can be seen by the results of the 1953 off-year elections. Of special interest was the election in the 9th Congressional District of Wisconsin. Here, a predominantly Republican district, which never before had gone Democratic but which had been in the '20s a hot-bed for LaFollette Progressivism, did not go in a third party direction again, but instead went Democratic for the first time. This was made possible by a sweep of Republican farm votes into the Democratic column which together with the labor Democratic vote, clinched the election.

Likewise in the South, where new Negro and white independent electoral forces are emerging with great vitality, the struggle is centered within the primaries of the Democratic Party. This movement may become rapidly transformed into new state parties where the Dixiecrats cannot be dislodged from control, but that is not its orientation at this time.

Had the Democrats won in 1952, the approaching economic crisis would have resulted in a strong mood in the ranks of organized labor for a new party. It also would have brought about a more sweeping shift to the Republican Party, particularly to its extreme McCarthy wing. This wing, because of its special type of demagoguery, could best take advantage of the economic crisis.

Hence the Republican victory *prior* to the outbreak of an economic crisis has two consequences. It strengthens the immediate danger of extreme reaction, holds up an earlier crystallization of a national third party, and continues the illusions of large masses in the Democratic Party. On the other hand, it guarantees that the Republicans will be held responsible for the crisis by wide masses, even if the McCarthy faction will attempt to hold both the Democrats and Eisenhower responsible. That is one reason among others why the McCarthyites, from a tactical point of view, want to be able to separate themselves from the failures of the Eisenhower Administration while at the same time pressing upon it to carry out more and more of their program.

A mass national third party led by labor is not likely to develop, therefore, until the immediate menace of fascism is defeated. For labor and its allies will not break away in a third party direction so long as what Engels said still holds true, namely, that "a third party can at

most tip the balance one way or the other, until it is as strong as the other two."

Does this mean that the perspective of a new nationwide party, a farmer-labor party, is now out of the picture or relegated to the far distant future? It does not. Given the defeat of McCarthyism by a popular majority "so strong that it not only changes Administrations but imposes on a new Congress and a new Administration a new course in domestic and foreign affairs" (*Draft Program*), many new alignments will begin to shape up. For the nature of the problems confronting the nation is bound to sharpen up differences inside both old parties and bring them to a head.

In the Democratic Party, labor, the Negro people, the working farmers and small business cannot for long live in one political house with the McCarran-Farley-Dixiecrat forces of reaction. Sooner or later these antagonistic class groupings must seek divorce. In the last two presidential elections the Dixiecrats refused to support the Democratic ticket and in 1952 threw their support to the Republican, Eisenhower. In Nevada, too, McCarran supported the Republican candidate for U.S. Senate when his own machine candidate was defeated in the Democratic primary election. Thus the outlines of the split in the Democratic Party are more than evident.

The main danger in the Democratic Party nationally at this moment is not its outright capture by

the Farley-McCarran-Dixiecrat forces. It is the Adlai Stevenson policy of *uniting with* these forces and the failure of the labor movement to take the leadership of the fight against McCarthyism on all fronts, including against McCarthy's allies within the Democratic Party. Any appeasement of McCarthyism within the Democratic Party can only demoralize the very independent electoral forces without whom the Democratic Party cannot hope to win.

In the Republican Party, too, antagonistic class groupings must fly apart with the accelerated pace of economic and political events. Even now the only bond which unites these is the pork barrel of federal patronage and corruption. Driven from control of Congress and the Administration, the Republican Party, too, will begin to pull apart like taffy over heat. When McCarthyism receives its first major electoral trouncing its vote getting lustre will fade into its opposite, and many who today support it for partisan reasons will be anxious to dump it. Nor can one exclude the emergence of a new extreme reactionary party such as Col. McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune* has been threatening for some time.

In still another of his revealing letters about the American political scene, Engels, in 1892, wrote:

There is no place yet in America for a *third* party, I believe. The divergence of interests even in *the same* class group is so great in that tremendous

area that wholly different groups and interests are represented in each of the two big parties, depending on the locality, and almost each particular section of the possessing class has its representatives in each of the two parties to a very large degree, though *today* big industry forms the core of the Republicans on the whole, just as the big landowners of the South that of the Democrats (*Letters to Americans*, p. 238-9).

Most of this is still true. But there is also something new. These "wholly different groups and interests" could continue to be represented in each party as long as American capitalism was a rising and expanding system, for then the collision of interests within the "possessing class" and between it and the exploited masses could be resolved without upsetting the ideal arrangement—for the ruling class—of the present two-party system.

The period ahead is bound to be different. It is bound to be a period of sharp class battles and sharper differences within the ruling class as well—differences over how best to hold the masses in check—over which course to pursue in foreign affairs—and, over how to divide up the shrinking profit pie.

In this process old political forms will be discarded and be replaced with new ones. What the exact process will be depends on many circumstances, but one thing is certain. Through it all the *present* two-party system will disappear and the working class will march under its own

political flag as the leader of a great new coalition party capable of leading the entire nation against the small handful of monopolists.

Thus, to sum up, it can be said that the present attachment to the existing two-party system is not exactly what it was in the past. It has a new quality arising from the new period in which we live—the deeper general crisis of capitalism, the new level of mass organization and consciousness, and the dire threat of extreme reaction to destroy all bourgeois democratic liberties. Only by winning the fight against extreme reaction can further headway be made, for losing it means losing all that the American people have won over generations. It means fascism and war.

To defeat McCarthyism and extreme reaction requires a new level of united mass struggle for peace, jobs and democratic rights. It requires a new, more united, more independent and advanced role of organized labor in the political arena and in behalf of the entire nation.

The 1954 elections are rapidly approaching. Their outcome will decide much. At this particular moment there is a grave danger that the labor and liberal forces will not swiftly and energetically enough enter the primary elections with the aim of selecting the *best possible* candidates. By winning primary election victories, labor and its allies can strengthen their political position, perfect their independent election machinery, broaden and cement their alliance,

gain new confidence in their own political strength and save themselves from the dilemma of being compelled to choose between greater and lesser reactionary candidates in November.

In the unfolding struggle ahead the role and responsibility of the Communist Party is great. While concentrating on the immediate struggle it must see the whole line of march, the present difficult terrain

with its marshes and pitfalls as well as the distant peaks still to be scaled. The Draft Program helps our Party to see and point the way ahead. It shows the various stages in the struggle and the relationship of one to the other. To understand this Program and to learn how to fight for it ever more effectively should become the objective of every Communist.

---

A Russian edition of William Z. Foster's *Outline Political History of the Americas* was published in the Soviet Union in 1953, and was reviewed at length in the March, 1954 issue of *Kommunist* (Moscow) by V. Yermolaev and G. Sevostyanov. The Soviet scholars begin their review by remarking:

Foster's book represents a great contribution to the study of the history of the peoples and countries of the Western Hemisphere. It gives an outline of the history of the peoples of the Americas, practically for the first time in historical literature, on the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology, an outline which is quite extensive both as to the scope of the problems raised and the depth of their treatment.

This paragraph is followed by a 12-page exposition and analysis of the contents of the volume, and the concluding paragraph of the review reads:

Foster's book is of serious political and scientific importance. It serves not only as a rich source for the study of the past and present of the peoples of the Americas, but at the same time discloses the means of struggle of these peoples for peace, democracy and Socialism. This book will help historians in their further studies of the problems of the history of the peoples and countries of the Americas. At the same time it will serve to assist Soviet students and teachers. It will be received with great interest by broad circles of the Soviet public.

We are happy to be able to inform our readers that this volume, first issued by International Publishers in 1951, and out-of-print for some time, will be available again this summer.—*Ed.*

---

## The Negro People in the Struggle Against McCarthyism

(Draft-Program Discussion)

By Pettis Perry

THE DRAFT PROGRAM of the Communist Party entitled "The American Way to Jobs, Peace and Democracy," is offered for discussion and consideration of the workers, farmers, the Negro people and all who may be concerned with the advancement of economic well-being, of peace, of a democratic America, as against the growing menace of depression, fascism and war.

The Draft Program states:

McCarthyism is on a rampage. It is trying to brow-beat into submission every independent point of view, every thinking person. It burns books and destroys art and culture. It aims to smash the labor movement, to further enslave the Negro people, to stir up racism and anti-Semitism, to gag the young generation, and to wipe out all vestiges of liberty. McCarthyism seeks to turn America into a land of yes-men, a land where patriotism is replaced with jingoism, independent thought with conformity, courage with servility.

Obviously, this McCarthyism affects, directly and profoundly, the 16,000,000 Negro people in our country. It is upon this question that I wish to concentrate in this article.

The Party's Draft Program is a

powerful document. It offers to the Negro people a broad perspective in the fight for democratic rights, which has been central in the whole history of the Negro people for over 300 years. The Draft Program also lays great stress on the fight for peace which is the basic question now confronting all humanity, as the ruling class of our country, brandishing the hydrogen bomb, maneuvers in every direction to plunge the world into war. Remembering that U.S. imperialism has just emerged from a war against the colored colonial people of Korea and is today aggressively supporting French imperialism in its merciless war against Indo-China and is threatening to spread that war throughout Asia, it becomes clear that the question of war or peace is of particular importance to the Negro people. The greatest urgency appears, therefore, as the Draft Program states, for the building of the broadest unity of the American people to halt the drive towards war and fascism.

No group in this country is so completely denied its democratic rights as is the Negro people. The struggle to realize those rights is a basic part of the general struggle to

make real our constitutional liberties and to defeat McCarthyism. The year 1954 is a crucial one in this battle. This must be the year of an intensification, on the electoral and many other fronts, of a mass struggle for democratic rights and for peace.

The year 1954 must be marked too, by an increased struggle for Negro representation. And in some states, especially in the South, the fight for Negro representation today must move from the general question of representation to that of proportional Negro representation. This is an intermediary slogan which could lay the basis eventually for the slogan of self-government and later for self-determination. The fight for Negro representation today must include broad non-partisan committees and groups that would also support a broad program for Negro rights.

Today, the struggle against McCarthyism, which is the American variant of fascism, needs to be a many-sided struggle. The Negro people are an integral part of this struggle and must become more so as we move ahead into the '54 and '56 electoral struggles.

At the recent N.A.A.C.P. meeting, Walter White stated: "The Communist Party is now trying to create a popular coalition movement of diverse groups in the United States." He then went on to distort the Party's Draft Program, and called upon the Negro people to keep the Communists out of the Negro liberation movement.

It is significant, however, that Mr.

White had to take note of our statement. And in opposing the Party's call for a popular coalition, he seems to have forgotten that it was precisely such a coalition, of which the Communists were part, that saved the Trenton Six, that saved Wesley Robert Wells. Was it not such unity that began to force the ruling class to take some steps, terribly feeble, hesitant and partial though they are, in the direction of considering at least some of the problems facing the Negro people? Was it not such unity that made possible serious consideration on the part of the Supreme Court of the cases against segregation? And further advances will be made in the future only to the extent that such a political coalition, despite differences, is formed, and all forces are united. This is the fundamental lesson that Mr. White should draw and this would do more good for the Negro people than his constant cowering to the Eisenhower Administration. In this connection White sees what very, very few other Negroes are able to see, namely, outstanding achievements on the part of the Eisenhower Administration. Eisenhower stated a few days before he addressed the N.A.A.C.P. convention that he was opposed to F.E.P.C. Eisenhower insulted the Negro people when he came before Congress with his message without mentioning any of his campaign promises. Eisenhower insults the Negro people when he writes seven or eight messages to Congress, since his

State-of-the-Union message, without once raising the Negro question. The fact that Eisenhower makes one or two appointments does not answer this question—not in the least.

Only in such unity as our Program calls for lies the possibilities of compelling the Eisenhower Administration to reverse its course. It is time for Mr. White to learn that we gain nothing by the Negro leaders getting under the coat-tails of the Eisenhower Administration. Our program cannot be answered by stating, as Mr. White does, that it is demagogic. It can be answered only on the basis of its being tested in life, in struggle against McCarthyism, against unemployment, against Jim Crow, for democratic rights. Even to Mr. White, we extend our hand in a unity movement around the program of the N.A.A.C.P. and are ready to work energetically for its full realization, notwithstanding the political differences we have with Mr. White.

#### MOUNTING RESISTANCE TO McCARTHYISM

The fact of the matter is that, among the Negro people there is developing, at a mounting pace, resistance to the encroachments of McCarthyism.

The June, 1953 Convention of the N.A.A.C.P. went on record condemning McCarthyism. The anti-McCarthyite feeling among Negro people leaped forward beginning in July 1953. It was during that time that a great number of authors who

had written books on the Negro question were called before McCarthy's inquisitorial committee; they included Herbert Aptheker, Doxey Wilkerson and Eslande Goode Robeson, one of the world's outstanding women fighters for peace.

On July 11, the *Baltimore Afro-American* had this to say: "As far as Senator McCarthy is concerned all books which expose America's racial discrimination can be burned—and the sooner the better." *The Norfolk Journal and Guide*, never noted for a Left outlook, said on July 7, 1953: "The proper question to ask the two Republican senators [Mundt and McCarthy] . . . is: 'Do you approve of the discrimination Mr. Wilkerson bared?' Do they think that the banning or burning of this book will hide from the world the indignities which this democratic nation still imposes upon its Negro minority?"

Many Negro organizations, led and stimulated by the Negro press, have increasingly expressed alarm over McCarthyism. During the month of March the Negro press again reacted very sharply to McCarthy's attempted frame-up of Mrs. Anna Lee Moss, who was brought before his pro-fascist committee and humiliated. The Negro people cried out against this outrage, as did many other democratic forces.

This movement on the part of the Negro people is part of the overall struggle that is shaping up in our country against McCarthyism. Though these struggles are not uni-

fied, they are parallel movements and once joined can be a real obstacle against McCarthyism.

There are many other struggles that are shaping up in the Negro movement that easily lend themselves to the advancement, in a broader sense, of the struggle against McCarthyism. For every fight on the part of the Negro people against Jim Crow, for full citizenship rights, is objectively (even though not always consciously) a step in the direction of smashing McCarthyism. To the extent that these struggles are joined with the labor and democratic forces in the overall fight for democracy, to that extent will they be further strengthened. Among some of these struggles, and space permits but sampling, are the following:

#### DEVELOPING MASS STRUGGLES

The N.A.A.C.P., is today engaged in a mass recruiting drive, with the goal of reaching over 300,000 members by the end of 1954. Obviously such an effort can succeed only on the basis of a real program in the interests of the Negro people. This program is tied to the mass slogan adopted at the convention, "Free by '63," and it merits the support of the whole progressive movement.

In Cleveland, there is shaping up a broad united front movement, embracing almost 100 Negro and labor organizations, around the question of registering the Negro to vote. This in turn will have its effect upon the

fight for Negro representation, for in Cleveland there are eight Negroes running for the State legislature. In Cleveland, also, there is a Negro running for Congress on the Democratic Party ticket. This entire electoral movement can serve to implement further the whole program for Negro rights and can weld a powerful coalition of all strata of the Negro people. It has the real possibility, too, of attracting to its side a broader section of the white progressives, in the first place the labor movement.

A similar development is taking place in Chicago, where the question of political action work on the part of the N.A.A.C.P. is paralleling the activities of L.L.P.E. and P.A.C. Thus the possibility is created of very much increasing the mass registration of Negro and labor voters. If this is tied up with the question of jobs, slum clearance, with better hospitals, schools, for peacetime employment, for an overall healthy economic program, it would stimulate the whole Negro population and create a firm base for broader unity between the Negro people and labor. Thus, it would create a splendid possibility for an electoral alliance in the 1954 elections.

In the South, in Birmingham, Alabama, the head of the N.A.A.C.P., Arthur Shore, is running for the State legislature. He is one of the leaders of the Right-to-Vote movement in the South. This has inspired the Negro people throughout the South and indeed throughout the country.

Let us take a look at some of the

other organizations, such as the Elks. Here one finds increasing interest and activity, manifested in a whole series of workshops on economics, youth, etc., on social and political questions in general. At the last national convention of the Elks, that met in Atlanta, Ga., in September 1953, some 25,000 Negroes marched the streets of that city, and an official delegation was sent from this group demanding parole for Mrs. Ingram. Here a program was adopted urging peace, better housing on a non-segregated basis, the elimination of Jim Crow education. The membership was called upon to mobilize the Negro people to vote so that they could participate in all levels of government.

These two organizations alone can and are serving as a great stimulating force in Negro life on a number of burning issues. Thus, the Negro movement is constantly surging forward, striving to reach new goals in the advance towards freedom.

In 1944 there were only 200,000 Negroes in the South registered to vote. The N.A.A.C.P. seeks to assure three million eligible Negro voters in the South by 1956. Three million Negro voters in the South would be a tremendous step forward. It would lay the basis for sending Negroes to the state legislatures of many Southern states. It would increase immeasurably the possibilities of ensuring a number of Southern Negro Congressmen. In short this would provide the possibility for breaking the political Jim Crow set-up in the

South. It would strengthen the possibilities for the labor and progressive movement in the country to begin to move rapidly in the direction of making the South a democratic area instead of the reactionary Dixiecrat center that it now is. This Dixiecrat set-up is a powerful influence on the entire life of our country. It helps to make foul the atmosphere in the country as a whole. It helps to perpetuate Jim Crow everywhere. It helps to prevent more widespread social security, better housing, working and living conditions for the people all over the country.

#### ON NEGRO REPRESENTATION

The movement for Negro representation is a powerful one in the country today and it is growing. However, except for Cleveland, where a Negro is running for Congress on the Democratic Party ticket, nowhere else is the Democratic Party coming forward positively on this issue. Yet, the Republican Party in Philadelphia and Baltimore is putting forward Negro congressional candidates, and it is doing this also in a number of areas with regard to the state legislatures. The Republican Party did this last year with regard to the municipal elections in a number of places.

Why is it that at this particular time the Republican Party, the preferred party of reaction, is putting forward Negro candidates? Can it be said that the Republican Party is

doing this because it is turning back to the Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln? Can it be that the Republican Party is taking this step to begin to fulfill some of its electoral promises of 1952? None of this is the case. The Republican Party is taking this step because it wants to embarrass the Democratic Party, to split the political alliance of labor and the Democratic Party, and because of its own demagogic interests.

How are the Democrats meeting this question and what may be the consequence unless a change is made? Except for Cleveland, the Democrats are hedging on this question. In New York City it was only after all other political parties had selected a Negro candidate for Manhattan Borough President, and after additional intense pressure, that the Democratic Party followed suit. In the 4th Congressional district of Philadelphia, the Democratic Party has been confronted with a rising demand by the Negro people for ten years, to have that seat. Constantly the Democrats attempt to put off the demand by saying that the incumbent is what nowadays may be called a "progressive Democrat," but this does not answer a ten-year-old demand for Negro representation. In Baltimore, the Democrats didn't even consider the question. In Los Angeles, there is a most scandalous situation in the 26th district, the home of tens of thousands of Negro citizens. After James Roosevelt was forced out of the race because of personal accusations made against

him, the Negro people raised very sharply the demand that the Democratic Party come forward with a Negro candidate, a demand which here, too, is of at least a decade's duration. Immediately thereafter, and with no serious concern for the demand by thousands of the constituents, James Roosevelt comes back into the race and the Negro people are again left out in the cold. In all this, labor tails behind the Democratic Party and offers no opposition whatsoever. It is to the credit of the Communist Party in California that this callousness and chauvinism was denounced. It is important that the progressive forces and the labor movement dissociate themselves from this policy, thereby exerting pressure on the Democratic Party to support and bring forward Negro candidates for office. For, if the situation continues as it is, sooner or later the Negro people will put the question: What is the value of the political alliance with the Democratic Party and the political alliance with Labor? Unfortunately, when this question is raised, some people, including our own, ask the question: How would it be possible for the Negro people to desert such an alliance? Where would they go? Obviously the answer to that question is that it is possible that in the midst of such a situation the Negro people may decide to go it alone. This, in our judgment, would be wrong, not that we believe, however, that the Democratic Party is the answer to the problems of the Negro people.

It is important for all to realize that the Negro people are in nobody's pocket, and that the Negro movement is surging ahead. Of course, it would be best if that movement had the leadership of, or at least an alliance with, Labor, for without that it cannot move very far ahead before it runs into a blind alley. But this problem cannot be answered simply by polemics with the Negro people. This is especially serious today when the Democratic Party is showing little evidence of conducting a vigorous fight for civil rights. It is especially important at this time when Labor is tolerating this situation. In the interests of Labor, a drastic change should be made in its whole approach to both the fight for civil rights and, particularly, the fight for Negro representation. It is important for the whole anti-war, pro-democratic movement. All progressives must face the question of the absolute necessity of the broadest unity of Negro and white, first of all the Negro people and organized Labor.

Some lessons should be drawn from the situation that emerged in New York in the past two years. In New York, the Negro people and Labor were able to break the Jim Crow set-up in the State Senate by a broad alliance formed through the Harlem Affairs Committee, a committee which unites wide segments of the Negro people with major sections of Labor. Through this coalition, for the first time in history, a

Negro was elected to the New York State Senate. In Bedford-Stuyvesant, the Negro community in Brooklyn, there emerged a broad coalition, called the Bedford-Stuyvesant Political League, that united against the machine Democrats. This coalition placed in the race for a judicial post a Negro candidate, Lewis S. Flagg, and he was elected. This coalition is continuing and is flourishing. It has an excellent program for that community, involving all its residents.

From these experiences, the conclusion emerges: For a broad coalition to appear in the Negro community which is made up of all strata of Negro life, it is necessary to project programs and conduct activities which bring forward candidates and help to influence candidates in the proper direction, and which also help in establishing a bridge between the Negro community and labor on a new and higher level. This is what happened in both instances in New York.

#### NEGRO WORKERS AND THE ECONOMIC FRONT

We should take into account that something new has entered the Negro movement, namely, today some two million Negroes are in the organized labor movement with a million and a quarter of them in the A. F. of L. Hence any broad movement in Negro life today cannot and must not be limited simply to lawyers, doctors and the clergy but must base itself in the broadest

possible way upon these Negro workers, many of whom are leaders of community organizations. Such a development could be quite a force in helping to unite the Negro community on the one hand, and on the other, in helping to bring influence upon the white workers. This kind of outlook is a must in all Negro communities if the movement for Negro liberation is to proceed as effectively as it can and should. In this way an effective struggle against white chauvinism and for Negro rights could be developed.

On the economic front there are a number of struggles that are taking place in the fight for jobs. In some places these are taking place under the leadership of the N.A.A.C.P., in other cases under the leadership of the N.L.C. These are important movements despite the fact that they are uneven. It must be said, however, that in a number of areas one sees no evidence of struggles at all or a minimum of struggle on any job issue.

The fight for jobs is fundamental to the Negro people; for the ratio of Negro unemployment to white is two to one. The bulk of the Negro people entered industry during the Second World War and during the immediate post-war period. Today, with layoffs hitting people with as much as ten years seniority, especially heavy blows are being levelled against the Negro workers. This in turn is affecting the whole Negro community—Negro workers in the first place, but also Negro professionals

and businessmen, who depend upon Negro clientele and Negro markets. Thus, possibilities of developing broad unity movements in Negro life around this important question are great.

In this respect the N.L.C. can play quite a stimulating and unifying role. In fact, the N.L.C. has already exerted considerable influence both in Negro life and in the labor movement. Readers are referred to the two national conference reports of Andrew Stevens and Hugh Bradley, and my article in *Political Affairs* for February 1954, for further material on this subject. It is quite unfortunate that we still have a counterposing of the N.L.C. versus the N.A.A.C.P. among some of our white progressives. But this counterposing, in the main, is not based on any appreciable support that either the N.A.A.C.P. or the N.L.C. is getting, because neither is taking place. This must be changed drastically. It is in fact crass white chauvinism. This is liquidationism, or in some cases "Left" sectarianism. It plays down the role of the progressive forces and the unique role that Negro progressives can and must play in Negro life.

#### WHITE CHAUVINISM

Yet there are some who pretend that white chauvinism is not an issue or is a problem that the Negro should reconcile himself to because it will be with us until we have Socialism. Unfortunately, these

people fail to see that we will never have Socialism without the most unremitting struggle against white chauvinism. It cannot be denied that Negro-white unity can be brought about only through struggle against white chauvinism and for Negro rights, nor can it be denied that it is impossible to build in the United States a broad effective coalition in the fight for peace without the unity of Negro and white. It cannot be denied further that the progressive movement in this country will be unable to build an effective coalition in the struggle against McCarthyism or on the electoral front without taking seriously into account ways and means of bringing about the broadest unity between Negro and white. Can it be argued, therefore, that the unity of Negro and white can be formed on the basis of either no struggle against white chauvinism or at best an occasional struggle against it? Yet this is precisely the line that some people are taking. The struggle against white chauvinism is a continuously one. It can be successful only to the extent that white comrades and white progressives stand in the very forefront of that struggle.

Perhaps the question should be put this way: In all capitalist countries—and ours is no exception—we are confronted with a many-sided struggle as we move forward to help form the broad coalition that our Draft Program so effectively projects. What are some of the pitfalls that are daily with us? We

have before us the need to re-intensify the struggle against white chauvinism inside of the Party, and especially among the broad masses of non-Party members. Secondly, side by side with this struggle, there must be an intense struggle against Negro nationalism and against Negro reformism. In these struggles our white comrades need to play the key role in the struggle against white chauvinism and for Negro rights, while the Negro Marxists must wage a never-ending struggle against Negro nationalism and Negro reformism. Only by this two-sided struggle can the people be led to effective unity of Negro and white.

Third, one of the key questions before us today in the movement as a whole is to fight against "Left" sectarianism, which is isolating us from the masses. This struggle was unfolded by our Party in a sharp way in the 1950 Convention and further carried forward by the National Party Conference. Our Draft Program also helps to further the effort at linking us with the broad masses of the people.

At the same time we need to carry on a sharp struggle against Right-opportunism. We must fight "Left" sectarianism but we must not close our eyes to the growing signs of Right-opportunism.

It is precisely this that many of our comrades are losing sight of in the fight for Negro rights because there is beginning to emerge now an attitude that the main question and main danger before the Party

is Negro nationalism. That is not so and will not be so in the foreseeable future. The main danger is white chauvinism. But simultaneously with this, Negro nationalism must be fought, thus avoiding one-sidedness in this struggle. Another thing emerging on this front: when the question of white chauvinism is raised, comrades immediately, especially white comrades, begin to point to this or that action, this or that act, this or that promotion of this or that Negro comrade as proof that we do not have white chauvinism.

That is what Comrade Foster had in mind in his article in the July 1953 *Political Affairs* when he laid heavy stress on the need to transform the struggle against white chauvinism from purely an inner struggle into a mass struggle. Yet, there are some who are interpreting Comrade Foster's article—or rather misinterpreting it—to mean that Comrade Foster protested against the struggle against white chauvinism. This, of course, is absurd and dangerous.

#### NEGRO REFORMISTS

We pass now to some of the main problems and difficulties within the Negro movement. There exists the danger coming from a section of the Negro reformists and misleaders. It would be wrong to say, however, that all of the Negro reformists and all of the Negro bourgeoisie no

longer are capable of making a contribution to the Negro liberation movement. The Negro liberation movement is an all-class movement. But to be effective the Negro workers who are part of the working class of this country, must be more and more brought to the fore in this titanic struggle. This does not mean, however, that every possible force among the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois elements among the Negroes that can be worked with in alliance to further the liberation effort should be neglected. At the same time the Negro Marxists, particularly, must wage a relentless battle against all disruptive elements within the Negro movement. Without this struggle such a movement would be undermined and diverted by those forces whose job it is to do just that.

Benjamin E. Mays, for example, the head of Morehouse College in Atlanta, Ga., in his column in the *Pittsburgh Courier* of March 20, 1954 goes so far as to call for the outlawing of the Communist Party, and he is joined in this, in the same issue, by Mr. Prattis. Mr. Mays, while demagogically pretending that he is for the protection of the so-called "little people" against inquisitionist committees, says the following:

I raise another question. The Communist Party has not been outlawed in this country; it is not a crime to be a member of the Communist Party. Isn't it contradictory to go out on a Communist hunt while at the same time

we recognize the legality of the party? Why don't we be honest and straightforward? If there is no place for Communists in this country, why not outlaw the party?

Mr. Mays seems to forget that the rise of fascism is marked by the outlawry of the Communist Party. This country with its history of centuries of oppression of the Negro people is marked by white chauvinism, jim-crowism, lynching and terror against the Negro people. Fascism, which is based on terror and the fiercest oppression, will be a particularly merciless force against the Negro people.

Fascism, let it be noted, represents the ascendancy of the most chauvinist, the most imperialist, the most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie. Fascism in power would mean unrestrained violence against the Negro people and against all minority groups. Fascism in power in this country would mean driving down further the low level of existence of the Negro and other minority groups. Fascism in power would mean the closing down of all people's organizations, including such organizations as the N.A.A.C.P., including the Negro press, the Elks, etc. Fascism in power would make Mississippi look like child's play. That is what fascism would mean to the American Negroes.

The drive to outlaw the Communist Party is a drive to fascism. The drive to fascism in the United States finds at its head one of America's greatest racists, McCarthy, sup-

ported by the most reactionary section of Southern Bourbons, the Dixiecrats, the oilmen of Texas, the leading finance capitalists of Wall Street, all of whom are the traditional enemies of the Negro people. And when Mr. Mays calls for the outlawing of the Communist Party, he is lending himself to the fascist forces in this country who would by no means spare him once they were fully entrenched in power. Actually both Mr. Mays and Mr. Prattis seem to have forgotten that with the arrest and jailing of the Communist leaders under the Smith Act, including the imprisonment of that outstanding Negro and Communist leader Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., there have been stepped-up attacks against the Negro people. And it cannot be otherwise. The drive to fascism and the persecution of Communists and peace fighters can only fan the flame of further oppression and attacks against the Negro people.

Mays, Prattis and a few other Negro leaders are a part of the exponents among Negroes of "the free world" and "western civilization." Have Mr. Mays and Mr. Prattis forgotten that Shepard and Irvin were shot down in handcuffs in Florida in 1951, that Shepard died instantly with no one being punished for the murder; that Irvin, though maimed for life, has just now been re-sentenced to death by a Jim Crow Florida court? Is this Messrs. Mays' and Prattis' "free world"? Is this the "western civilization" that they are trying to uphold?

Or take the Wells case in California. Wells was slated to die on April 9th. Was it the Communists that were trying to put him to death? No. Everyone sees now that it took almost the whole population of California and many from outside that state, Communist as well as non-Communist, to mobilize such a protest movement as to finally force Governor Knight to grant him a stay. Is the Wells case what Mr. Mays and Mr. Prattis have in mind when they speak of the "free world" and "western civilization"? Is it because of our outcry against these indignities that these gentlemen demand our blood? Is this not exactly what McCarthy is saying? Is this not what Martin Dies is saying? Is this not what every Southern lyncher and oppressor of the Negro people is saying? Is this not the same thing that is being said by those who are bombing the homes of Negroes? Is it not this concept which permeates the thinking of many people who deny Negroes jobs at a decent wage?

These gentlemen seem to forget that the reason the white ruling class of this country wants to destroy the Communist Party is because this is part and parcel of their mad drive for world conquest and world domination and not for any "saving of western civilization"; that in order to carry this through, they need fascism, and the road to fascism

is the destruction of democratic rights—in the first instance, those of the Communists.

We Communists are second to none in the fight for Negro rights. We stand without reservation for economic, political and social equality for the Negro people and for their right to self-determination in the Black Belt. And this is not only true of Negro Communists, but it is true of the entire Communist Party—Negro and white. Our white comrades, as against the white Social-Democrats and white bourgeoisie that Mr. Walter White is tied to, fight in the very forefront of the struggle for Negro rights. That is why we are hated as a Party. That is why the ruling class wants to outlaw the Communist Party. That is why the Negro people have deep respect for our Party. The Negro people can have nothing but utter contempt for such a line as peddled by Messrs. White, Prattis, Mays, etc.

The task before us is to move forward along the line of our Draft Program, attempting in every way to unify the broadest strata of the American people, to try in every way possible to influence and lead the working class in alliance with the Negro people and all allies of the working class in the struggle against McCarthyism, for peace, economic security and for full freedom for the Negro people.

## New Features in the Struggle Against McCarthyism

By George Blake Charney

### I. INTRODUCTION

TO ANALYZE THE swiftly-moving developments in the struggle against McCarthyism is a difficult task, due in part to the fact that this struggle has reached a new level. The tremendous national debate has penetrated into every corner of America, every organization, every home.

The people are beginning to realize the profound and many-sided character of this struggle. The immediate focus is on the issue of democratic liberties, but more and more the people are beginning to associate the fight against McCarthyism with the fight against the growing economic depression and the new all-pervading fear of an H-bomb war. They are beginning to associate it with all the vital issues of the day.

### II. NEW FEATURES IN THE ANTI-McCARTHY STRUGGLE

What are the main features of the anti-McCarthy movement at this moment?

1. The outstanding feature is the scope achieved in the past few months, notwithstanding the absence of a cohesive and unified national center. *The anti-McCarthy movement now embraces a majority of the*

*people.* The Schine episode and the Fort Monmouth fiasco erupted into a popular upheaval which has brought *new* millions into opposition to McCarthy and McCarthyism. These episodes served to touch off and crystallize the already *accumulating* sentiments of the people. The press, radio and television are becoming great forums on the issue of McCarthyism. The *concern* expressed at the time Truman was attacked has now been converted into *fear* that the witch-hunts of yesterday are passing over to a reign of terror today.

2. The anti-McCarthy movement has emerged in this period as an *all-class* movement which cuts across party lines. The anti-McCarthy movement has not only manifested mass growth in *general*; it has also experienced an extension and change in terms of *class* and *party*.

What is evident to begin with is the strengthening of the *working-class* sector of the anti-McCarthy coalition. Not so long ago the most articulate opposition, aside from the Left, came from the ranks of the middle class, from individuals and groupings of professionals, intellectuals and sections of the Protestant clergy. Not so long ago, Senator

Lehman was a voice in the wilderness, in the Democratic Party and in the Senate. A few trade-union leaders, such as Jacob Potofsky, Hugo Ernst and Ralph Helstein, spoke earlier. This situation has definitely begun to change. While it cannot be said that the labor movement has assumed *leadership* of the anti-McCarthy movement, a large number of trade unions have adopted a fighting position on the issue. Official statements of union leaders correspond more closely with the anti-McCarthy moods of the rank and file.

The recent resolution of the New York C.I.O. Council "condemning the criminal failure" of the Eisenhower Administration to stop McCarthy, the statement of Macy Local 1-S identifying McCarthyism with repressive legislation such as the Smith and McCarran Acts, the hard-hitting articles in *Labor's Daily*, published by the International Typographical Union, are among the most recent expressions from labor that are representative of its growing militant hostility to McCarthyism. The U.A.W.-C.I.O. Educational Conference in Chicago in which Walter Reuther and Bishop Sheil joined in a blistering attack on McCarthy, is a new development of great importance. The Catholic hierarchy, led by Cardinal Spellman, has openly encouraged and supported McCarthy. Catholic sentiment has been divided and confused on the issue, which to some degree retarded and paralyzed the struggle against

McCarthyism in some of the trade unions. A recent Gallup poll, however, revealed that Catholic support had declined 10 per cent in the recent period, with 46 per cent favorable and 41 per cent hostile.

The general growth of anti-McCarthy sentiment among the masses helped to bring out the latent antagonism of many Catholic workers, previously held in check by the hierarchy. The speech of Bishop Sheil, who in the past was associated with the struggle of the packinghouse workers and the New Deal, reflects these changing sentiments and will further strengthen the participation of Catholic workers in the anti-McCarthy movement. What is most important to note, therefore, is the substantial strengthening of the working-class component of the unfolding anti-McCarthy coalition.

A related phase of this development in the ranks of labor is the growth of anti-McCarthy sentiment in the Negro communities. The influential Negro press, the N.A.A.C.P. and other leading organizations, a large group of church leaders and elected government officials, have voiced these sentiments. *The fight against McCarthyism has merged with the mass struggle for Negro rights.* John Wesley Dobbs, vice-chairman of the Republican State Committee of Georgia and Grand Master of the Elks, issued an open letter to Leonard W. Hall, National G.O.P. chairman, castigating the Jenner Committee and similar witch-hunting bodies. He makes the strik-

ing observation that the underlying motive of these attacks is to preserve the status quo in American life, that is, segregation and discrimination. The avalanche of protest in the Wells case was linked with the fight against McCarthyism. Just as the Wells case illuminated to masses of Negro people the ugly, racist and ultra-reactionary trends in the country, exemplified by McCarthy, so the popular movement against McCarthyism encouraged and stimulated the storm of protest in the Wells case that compelled Governor Knight to commute the sentence of death. A remarkable editorial appeared in the *Los Angeles Tribune*, long known for its anti-Communist position, that draws the following conclusions: "People are finding their sympathies quickened by the Wells case . . . and not only the Wells case, the injustices under the McCarran Act. People are reacting against the conscienceless brutality of McCarthy . . . and taking action, whatever the risk, whatever the label."

Anti-McCarthy sentiments have continued to grow in the ranks of the middle class, in the big cities and in the countryside. There are signs of new groupings of small and medium-sized business men in the cities and farm organizations in the mid-west expressing opposition for the first time. The Protestant Church has become increasingly articulate on the issue.

What is particularly new is that the anti-McCarthy movement has now reached into sections of Big

Business. In the present period, increasing anti-McCarthy expressions have been voiced by representatives and organs of Big-Business groups, who in the past either tolerated or gave encouragement to McCarthy. The anti-McCarthy position of the *New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune* reflects this trend. The position of the Columbia Broadcasting System is another illustration.

Thus, for the first time, sections of the bourgeoisie reflecting conservative groupings in American political life have come into open clash with McCarthyism. For the most part, these forces continue to give support to the foreign policy of the Eisenhower Administration. They continue to pursue an anti-labor policy at home. Some favor legal steps against the Communist Party. Nevertheless, they find themselves compelled, for internal and external reasons and under the general pressure of the mass movement, to resist the imposition of a McCarthyite regime on the country at this time. They fear the extremist program of McCarthyism as a leap into the unknown. They are also concerned, many of them, that McCarthyite tactics will prematurely alarm and arouse the masses to struggle against Big-Business reaction that will go beyond their capacity to control.

This development of opposition to McCarthy and McCarthyism is an expression of the sharpening tactical difference in the ranks of the bourgeoisie. It is a development of great importance in this phase of the strug-

gle against McCarthyism.

A united but distinct phase of the emerging all-class character of the anti-McCarthy movement is the fact that it is now extending into the ranks of the Republican Party. The anti-McCarthy movement is no longer confined to the masses in the Democratic Party, to progressives and independents. It has cut deeply into large sections of the city and rural voters who supported Eisenhower in 1952. In Missouri, the state chairman of the G.O.P. announced that he wanted no part of McCarthy in the campaign. Similar acts have come from Minnesota, Wisconsin and Connecticut. The recent polls which show a *switch* in sentiment, as contrasted to a *growth* in sentiment against McCarthy, are a reflection of the changing trends in the ranks of Eisenhower and Republican Party voters.

3. Another feature of great importance is the growing awareness that McCarthyism is fascism. This analysis was first made by William Z. Foster, in his articles in the *Daily Worker*, but little time elapsed before it found expression in broad circles. Almost every trade union which has spoken out on McCarthyism has expressed this viewpoint. The *Railway Clerk*, organ of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, said on December 1, 1953, immediately after the Brownell-McCarthy attack on Truman:

It would be well to remember that the type of men most active in the

present smear campaign were among those who thought we could do business with Hitler and who approved Hitler's method of handling German working-men. They are, to speak plainly and this is a time for plain speaking, incipient American fascists and they will stop at nothing to accomplish their purpose.

Similar expressions have come from the *Oil Worker* (organ of the Oil Workers International Union, C.I.O.), from *Labor* (organ of the Railroad Brotherhoods), the Textile Workers Union, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters ("McCarthyism is the symptom of fascism"), and from central bodies and conventions of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions everywhere.

Outside of the labor movement, similar concepts have been expressed. As but two examples among a growing number: Mrs. Agnes Meyer, writer and educator, wife of Eugene Meyer of the *Washington Post*, called McCarthy "America's No. 1 Fascist"; the Right Reverend Horace Donegan, Episcopal Bishop of New York, spoke of the "neo-fascist pattern which seems to be unfolding before our eyes."

Thus, there is a growing awareness, expressed in varied forms, that the country is dealing not with a publicity-hungry demagogue guilty of sporadic assaults on democratic institutions, but with a *movement* which is backed by powerful ultra-reactionary interests whose aim is fascism.

4. Another recent feature of the anti-McCarthy movement has been

the fact that it has passed over from the stage in which it was limited largely to expressions of sentiment and opinion, to the *stage of action and struggle*. It has taken the most varied, original and grass-roots forms.

Petitions are circulating all over America. Conference, mass meetings, forums, debates are taking place everywhere. The "I-Believe-Benton" movement is assuming mass proportions. On the campuses, college students have taken to wearing a new insignia, a green feather. They are "flaunting" their "subversive" support for Robin Hood.

What is significant is the fact that:

1. Hitherto passive people are joining actively in the fight;
2. There is a powerful trend toward united action of many groups and organizations;
3. Despite the atmosphere of fear which still prevails, the fact is that people who felt gagged yesterday are voicing their thoughts today. Anger and humor mix in a lively creative combination that sharpens the edge of the struggle.

It is impossible to recapitulate all the events. One can hope at best to present a kaleidoscopic view of the movement. It reflects something of the spirit taking hold of the American people in the struggle against McCarthyism.

### III. THE DANGER OF MCCARTHYISM

The spectacular rise of the anti-McCarthy movement has already ad-

ministered a setback to McCarthy. Whatever the final outcome of the army inquiry, the fact is that for the first time McCarthy has been placed on the defensive; the investigators are being investigated. The people are in no mood to accept a white-wash or sell-out.

At the same time, the growth of the anti-McCarthy forces should not blind us to the real and continuing danger of McCarthy and McCarthyism. The recent Gallup poll shows 38 per cent support for McCarthy. It is still, despite the drop, a formidable figure. The rise of Hitler to power was marked by fluctuation in popular support. McCarthy has powerful support from sections of monopoly capital in addition to the grouping of Texas oil millionaires. They provide the "Junker" element; but the primary "Ruhr" element comes from Wall Street. He has powerful support in the Administration which relies desperately on McCarthy to heat up the issue of anti-Communism, to confuse and disperse the growing popular movement in the country, and to advance more effectively its reactionary aims at home and abroad. He has support from large sections of the Democratic Party, especially the Dixiecrats. He has the sanction of most of the Catholic hierarchy.

Unlike the period of the late 30's, the fascist movement in America is highly focused under the direct leadership of McCarthy. It is more difficult to disperse.

The Eisenhower Administration

will maneuver as pressure is increased against McCarthy. It will employ its own agencies, with the prestige of the government, to accomplish itself what it relied on McCarthy to do. It may attempt to build up other figures. There is no dearth of eager demagogues and fascist-minded fuchrers to play the part of McCarthy.

What must be borne in mind is that the strategic purpose of McCarthyism is to build a *mass base* for fascism and war. The most reactionary and fascist-minded sections of the bourgeoisie cannot achieve their aims without this. The success or failure of this movement is still to be determined. The critical period lies ahead as the economic depression matures. Hugo Ernst, President of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers International Union, issued a warning after a comparison of the use of the Big Lie technique by Hitler and his American imitation:

But there is one point of difference. McCarthy, unlike Hitler, has not yet come forward with a 'plan' full of sweeping economic promises for solving everybody's problems. . . . A time like the present, with mounting signs of hard times, is certain to figure in McCarthy's timing. Should the G.O.P.'s assurances that good times are just over the hill prove wrong, and three or four million more unemployed start looking for work, then watch out!

Ernst could have reminded his readers of the position McCarthy took on the issue of farm parity. He stood for 100% parity and presented himself as the Senatorial

champion of the farmers. He has made similar demagogic maneuvers on veterans' housing and on government contracts for small businessmen.

The favorable developments in the labor movement are far from uniform. McCarthy has a substantial base among sectors of the working class. The split in the labor movement, constant jurisdictional strife, the continuing attacks upon the Left-led unions, provide opportunities for McCarthy. Thus, Carey of the I.U.E., *speaks* against McCarthy, but *acts* with him in his disruptive raids against U.E. The influence of years of Red-baiting, white chauvinism, and the spread of corruption in the trade unions provide fertile soil for the development of McCarthyite ideas; in any event, they hamper the struggle for clear-cut unity against McCarthyism.

The struggle will not lessen. It will sharpen. The anti-McCarthy movement has not yet reached the point where it can effectively challenge and defeat McCarthy and McCarthyism. The movement is still scattered; its aims are unclear. The relation of the present struggles to the 1954 elections is crystallizing slowly. Above all, the labor movement has not yet assumed vigorous leadership of the movement to weld it together more firmly on the basis of a common program.

#### IV. SOME IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS

What are some of the ideological

and political problems that bear on the further growth and consolidation of the democratic coalition?

##### 1. *Relation of McCarthy to Eisenhower Administration*

The analysis in the Stevens report on this relationship remains basically sound. The current struggle around the army episode has revealed the extreme reluctance of the Eisenhower Administration to challenge McCarthy even under the most provocative circumstances. It has pursued a double-faced policy and, as a result, the prestige of Eisenhower has suffered considerably. The main popular outcry in this period has been against his surrender to McCarthy.

The elements of unity and conflict still persist in the relationship of McCarthy and the Eisenhower Administration. The duality must necessarily affect the tactics pursued in the struggle against McCarthyism.

The cardinal point made in the Stevens report, that "the struggle against McCarthyism is *objectively* (my emphasis—G.B.C.) a struggle against the policies of the Eisenhower Administration" and that it represents the "broadest tactical link" for setting the masses into motion, remains a sound one. The anti-McCarthy movement is an extremely broad movement. It is developing unevenly. It now includes many individuals and groupings who still have illusions in the Eisenhower Administration, notwithstanding their concern for his feeble stand against

McCarthy. They seek to prop up the Eisenhower Administration as "an alternative" to the seizure of power by McCarthy. They are prepared to fight McCarthyism within the strictest limits of continued support to the Republican Party. The Alsop movement in Connecticut against McCarthy, for example, is presented as a movement of "decent conservative Republicans."

There cannot be a negative attitude to such a movement. Opposition to the Eisenhower Administration cannot be the prerequisite for united struggle against McCarthyism. The main expression in these typical movements is not *support* for Eisenhower, but *opposition* to McCarthyism. Such groups represent a considerable force for putting pressure on the Administration within the Republican Party to compel it to take issue with McCarthy.

At the same time, the sharpening of the struggle as a whole makes it possible and urgent, especially in the labor movement, to combine the fight against McCarthy and McCarthyism with more vigorous opposition to the policies of the Eisenhower Administration itself and the monopoly groupings backing it.

The upsurge of anti-McCarthy sentiment in the ranks of labor has developed, not out of general or abstract concern for civil liberties, but out of fear of the looming economic depression, the new war threats and the danger they pose to the rights of labor and its program.

While workers generally view Mc-

Carthy as their deadly enemy, nevertheless the necessity of the struggle brings them into direct and increasing conflict with the Administration. There is growing awareness that the fight against McCarthyism cannot be viewed apart from the fight against the reactionary, anti-labor program of the Eisenhower Administration. Hugo Ernst in the article referred to above poses the question as to whether Eisenhower would ask the people to join in the fight against McCarthyism. He answers: "But Ike isn't likely to ask. The same powerful people who are stealing the chickens while McCarthy & Co. go off in full cry, leading the public on a false scent, are the same people who put Ike in power."

The necessity of sharpening the struggle against the Eisenhower Administration, while placing the main emphasis on the anti-McCarthy movement, is demonstrated by the extremely reactionary and, in fact, McCarthyite, "Brownell Plan." The Administration is determined, whatever criticisms it is compelled to make of McCarthy, to defend and carry forward the spirit and program of McCarthyism, and *enact it into law*. Its especially insidious character is reflected in this pseudo-constitutional program of repression.

Walter Reuther at the A.D.A. convention in April stated: "The problem is more serious than Joe McCarthy. Whenever Nixon does it, when Brownell does it, that is McCarthyism too."

At the same time, the mounting

mass movement against McCarthyism can have the effect not only of curbing McCarthy, but of checking the adoption by the Eisenhower Administration of the McCarthy program.

## 2. *The anti-McCarthy Movement and the Big Lie*

Notwithstanding the spectacular growth of the anti-McCarthy movement, it is still plagued by the influence of the Big Lie. It obsesses the movement and is its chief divisive factor. Some of the most vigorous anti-McCarthyites have expressed support for outlawing the Communist Party. Many argue, like Drew Pearson, that the danger of McCarthyism lies in the fact that its emphasis on imaginary dangers at home diverts us from the "real menace of Communism abroad." Some Right-wing Social-Democrats now argue that the purpose of the anti-McCarthy fight is to create an anti-Communist movement free of McCarthyite techniques! The effect of this is to blunt the sharp edge of the anti-McCarthy movement and weaken and disperse the rising people's movement for democratic unity.

Few anti-McCarthy spokesmen have attacked the Big Lie, or in any way asserted that the fight for the political rights of the Communist Party is an inseparable part of the fight to preserve democracy. Carey McWilliams, in the *Nation*, argued that the acceptance of the Big Lie was the most vulnerable feature of the anti-McCarthy movement: "The

weakness of the anti-McCarthy movement is that it accepts his assumptions." This, however, remains an isolated expression.

It must be repeated, with greater emphasis, that "to the degree that this viewpoint dominates the struggle against McCarthyism, it will be impossible to defeat McCarthyism" (Stevens).

However, there are indications that a more effective fight can be made on this question. The bulk of the anti-McCarthy forces does accept the Big Lie as a basic premise. It is deeply imbedded in their consciousness and therefore seriously impedes effective anti-McCarthy struggle. However, it is not its most active or foremost characteristic. The growth and spread of the anti-McCarthy movement by itself creates more favorable opportunities to press the fight against disunifying elements and concepts. The logic of the movement, its trend and direction, is for greater unity and to mitigate hardened political attitudes conceived in the cold war.

This will not be an automatic process. The anti-McCarthy forces will have to be convinced, in the course of common struggle, that adherence to the Big Lie jeopardizes the unity and fighting power of the movement.

The defeat of the Big Lie in the anti-McCarthy movement will not take place overnight. It will be a process, hard-fought, painful, uneven. It will take on unique and even distorted forms and yet express

inchoate and indirect opposition to anti-Communist propaganda and persecution. In many liberal circles, the fight on the Fifth Amendment has been resumed with great vigor. The recent speeches of Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School on this subject have been a strong affirmative expression in the fight for an all-inclusive application of the Bill of Rights even though they are accompanied by anti-Communist references. There are many such examples around the fight on the Butler Bill, the anti-Communist measures in Congress, the McCarran-Walter Act, etc.

Another such expression is the manner in which increasingly the present danger in America is evaluated. What is the effect of Keenan's speech in Chicago, in which he unequivocally stated that the main immediate danger is fascism? The very placing of the question in this form makes it more difficult to whip up anti-Communist hysteria or equate Communism with fascism. It creates a more favorable climate to launch a more effective fight against the Big Lie in all its aspects. In the labor movement, frequent reference is made to the fact that "McCarthyism is fighting labor under the guise of fighting Communism." The idea that fighting Communism is a valid cause for labor persists and serves to contradict the whole spirit of anti-McCarthyism, but the main emphasis is increasingly placed on the *McCarthyite attack on labor*.

However, it is by day-to-day strug-

gle in the shops and unions, in the neighborhoods and mass organizations, with *our* participation in the struggle around the crucial economic and political issues, that the Big Lie will be weakened and eventually defeated in the mass movement. Propaganda and general debate will not be effective in overcoming divisive influences unless directly associated with the daily struggles of the people, where the people can learn from their own experiences how anti-Communism weakens their fight for peace, jobs, security and democracy.

The experiences in recent important union elections in Butte, Montana, Essington, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, are proof that the fight for the unity of the workers against these corrosive influences can be won.

### 3. *McCarthyism and the Struggle for Peace*

The relationship between the fight against McCarthyism and the fight for peace has assumed new significance, with the danger of direct armed intervention in Indo-China and the threat of "massive retaliation," with the H-bomb, against the Soviet Union and People's China.

The growth of the anti-McCarthy movement in the recent period can be attributed in large part to the growth of peace sentiment in the country, to the truce in Korea and the general lessening of war tensions. Even though the peace issue only "edges" into the anti-McCarthy

struggle and is far from having achieved programmatic sanction, nevertheless it has been a major underlying factor accounting for the mass proportions of the movement. The new climate created by the Korean truce has encouraged people to speak out on controversial issues at home and, in turn, the movement against McCarthy has encouraged new forces to express open dissent on foreign policy matters.

The H-bomb issue and the Dulles threats on Indo-China have aroused tremendous mass concern in the U.S. as well as throughout the world. The people want no part of the Dulles program of American intervention in Indo-China. They favor a world-wide ban on A- and H-bomb weapons. The position of the *United Mine Worker*, of Local 600, U.A.W., of the A.C.W., are some early indications of the popular outburst of feeling on these issues, curbed though it is by reformist and Social-Democratic pressures. It is significant that Lewis Mumford, distinguished author and quite influential in liberal circles, in a letter to the *N. Y. Times* published on March 28, 1954, issued a ringing condemnation of the H-bomb policy of "massive retaliation." Many will echo the question raised by Max Lerner, columnist of the *N. Y. Post*: "Suppose McCarthy had control of the H-bomb?"

The fight for peace, for negotiations and trade will impart new content to the anti-McCarthy struggle. Among other things, it will help in

a decisive way to undermine the Big Lie which feeds on the theory of inevitable war.

### V. MCCARTHY AND THE 1954 ELECTIONS

The fight against McCarthyism must be carried forward and intensified on a whole series of fronts. The varied and uneven character of the movement, and the impact of new issues, dictate a many-sided approach to the struggle. The fight against McCarthyite legislation, Taft-Hartley, the Butler-Goldwater-Rhodes Bills, and the rash of anti-Communist bills, is a major phase of the battle. The same is true of the Smith and McCarran Acts. The campaign against the McCarran-Walter Act continues to be one of the broadest and most concrete areas of struggle against McCarthyism. The main stress must be placed on the activity of the labor movement. The key to the further unfolding of the anti-McCarthy movement depends on how labor with its allies, in a militant and consistent fashion, lead the fight against McCarthyism in relation to the economic issues, the struggle for peace, and for defense of the Bill of Rights.

The struggle on all these fronts bears on the 1954 elections. The Congressional and State elections can represent a major setback to McCarthyism and prepare the way for a new Administration in 1956 which "starts to build again where the New Deal left off" (Draft Program).

The fight in the 1954 elections must be conducted against McCarthyism and McCarranism in *both parties*. At the same time, the main fire must be directed at the Republican Party. This is the party of McCarthy, of Eisenhower and Dulles, the preferred party of Big Business, the party in power. The defeat of the Republican Party and its outstanding McCarthyites would be a big step in the struggle to check McCarthyism.

However, this will occur only if Democratic candidates conduct a vigorous fight against McCarthyism. Senator Lehman in an earlier period stated that it was necessary to fight McCarthyism, even if it meant defeat. Today it can be said that the fight against McCarthyism is the way to achieve victory. Democratic candidates will not gain the necessary support of the people and guarantee clear-cut victories unless they adopt a program that corresponds to the needs of the people and unless they differentiate themselves from the Administration program on Indo-China and the H-bomb. The pressure of the labor movement and of the Negro people is the decisive factor in the fight to influence the program of Democratic candidates and to determine the consistency with which they oppose McCarthyism.

### VI. THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

In the past period the Party and the Left have played a more active

role in the mainstream of the anti-McCarthy movement. They are learning to influence the program and to bolster the fighting capacity of the movement as loyal participants in the struggle. This must be continued and multiplied on a grass-roots level, in shops, union locals and community organizations. Every Party member has a role to play, every club, every organization. The main expression of our vanguard role must be to stimulate the widest *united front actions* on the issue of McCarthyism and to help crystallize a common approach by the anti-McCarthy movement to the 1954 elections.

We can be helpful as participants in the movement to combat harmful tendencies and moods among the masses. There are certain tendencies, for instance, to view the battle as already won, which is an underestimation of the scope of the struggle against the man and especially the *ism*. There are defeatist tendencies which are expressed in this form: "What's the use; if it isn't McCarthy it will be some other demagogue"; or variants which underestimate how the fight against the man has strengthened the fight against the *ism* and encouraged the development above all of the people's democratic coalition against fascism.

There are tendencies, frequently expressed, to lump all conservative movements or label every reactionary, anti-Communist expression, no matter from whence it comes, as "McCarthyism." This is wrong. It

can only confuse and retard the mass movement. Reactionary or divisive ideas must be combatted; but we must be careful to differentiate between reactionary ideas in general and McCarthyism in particular.

There are continuing tendencies to judge the quality of the movement in a narrow way from the vantage point of the Left; and to view the mass movement with suspicion and skepticism because of its impurities and contradictions that stem from its motley, all-class character. Such negative attitudes are harmful to the struggle and contribute only to isolation without aiding the movement to overcome its weaknesses. Today this is the main danger. On the other hand, there is a tendency for Left forces to *merge completely* with the anti-McCarthy movement and forego opportunities to *advance* it without endangering its unity. Oft-times actions organized by the Left that could stimulate the anti-McCarthy forces, are falsely viewed as necessarily sectarian and in conflict with the mass movement and the fight for unity.

There is no contradiction between well-organized, independent actions by the Left and the fight for a broad coalition policy. One contributes to the other. Therefore the Communist Party, steered, militant, devoted, and possessed of a scientific understanding of the nature of society, is an indispensable component in the struggle against McCarthyism. As the Draft Program of the Party says:

But while the issue today is not Communism, the true nature of the Communist Party and the role which it plays in American life is very much an issue. The American people must know the truth about this issue lest the monstrous deception now practiced on them lead to the loss of the democracy and freedom they prize so dearly.

The defense of the Party, the battle against the Smith and McCarran Acts, the effort to achieve amnesty for the Communist leaders and other imprisoned victims of McCarthyism, constitute a central issue in the whole fight to repel American fascism.

The campaign to build the circulation of the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* and of the *Morning Freiheit* is an integral part of the fight against McCarthyism. It is an integral part of the effort to strengthen the role of the Left in the coalition. The continuous attack by McCarthy on the *Daily Worker* is proof of its vitality in the struggle. The *Daily Worker* is the best fighter against McCarthyism.

The future struggle will be difficult and sharp. No one can predict its exact course or guarantee its outcome. The situation is fraught with great danger. At the same time, the advance of the anti-McCarthy movement beyond expectations of six

months or a year ago reveals the great opportunities for building a movement which can stop McCarthyism in time. It may be that alongside of the growth of the movement, the attack against the Left will sharpen. We cannot permit our movement to be disoriented by such an eventuality or, severe as the blows are, deem the struggle lost. At the same time, it would be erroneous to assume that such a contradictory situation could continue indefinitely and result in a pattern of political relationships in which the mass movement continues to thrive while the Left suffers complete repression.

The growth of the mass anti-McCarthy movement offers the best opportunity to create a new political atmosphere in the country in which to advance the fight for peace and democracy. It is only in such an atmosphere that all sections of the labor and democratic movement, including the Left, can maintain a legal existence, keep the nation united, and bring an end to the era of the cold war.

As the *Los Angeles Tribune* stated:

The McCarthys may belabor, the labelers plaster at will, but the people have had their fill of fear, and are tired of running, and have turned to fight.

# The Caracas Conference

By A. B. Magil

THE *New York Times* of March 8 quoted a Latin-American delegate at the Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as saying: "If the United States wanted to bady enough, it could have a resolution passed declaring two and two are five."

This statement casts a revealing light on the grim reality of the relations that exist in that sector of "the free world" that stretches from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn. Twenty supposedly sovereign Latin-American republics may propose, but it is Wall Street and Washington that dispose.

## THE BACKGROUND

The Tenth Inter-American Conference was called by the Organization of American States (OAS). This is the successor to the Pan-American Union and is an outgrowth of the Pan-American system established at the first of these conferences, held in Washington in 1889-90. From the beginning this system has been an instrument of U.S. imperialist policy, serving the twin objectives of furthering the oppression of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of Latin America and combatting the

influence of imperialist rivals in that area. With the emergence of the United States as a global power in World War I, the Pan-American system began to be increasingly utilized to promote U.S. imperialist ambitions on an international scale.

In World War II Wall Street extended its domination of Latin America through increased capital penetration, the monopolization of trade, and the establishment of military bases and missions in almost every country. At the same time it eliminated its German, Japanese and Italian rivals and greatly reduced the influence of the British and French. After the war the Truman Administration, using this increased power as both carrot and club, and taking advantage of the fact that the Latin-American countries had entered into joint commitments with the United States to further the anti-Axis struggle, drew up plans for a tighter Pan-American system to serve Wall Street's aggressive aims. It is no accident that April 1948 saw the almost simultaneous birth of the Marshall Plan and the Organization of American States. The latter, whose headquarters, both physical and political, were estab-

lished in Washington, was made a regional agency of the United Nations in violation of the spirit of the UN Charter.

The O.A.S. was created at the Ninth Inter-American Conference at Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948. Shortly before this, in August 1947, a special Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security took place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. This adopted the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. The conclusion of such a treaty had been recommended at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, held in Mexico City in March 1945. It had been recommended at a time when the war was still in progress and when such a proposal bore an anti-fascist, peace-seeking character.

But by the time the Rio conference met more than two years later the entire context of world relations had changed. With the Washington-instigated cold war moving into high gear, the Rio Treaty was converted into a vehicle of the aggressive Wall Street drive for world domination. Whereas the Mexico City conference of 1945 had limited the concept of aggression to attacks by another state "against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state," the Rio Treaty also included acts of "aggression" against an American state that occur outside the western hemisphere. And whereas the Mexico City resolution clearly

had in mind an armed attack or the threat of such attack, Article 6 of the Rio Treaty extended this to embrace "an aggression which is not an armed attack," or "any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America."

The obligations assumed under the Rio Treaty include the adoption of one or more of various measures (Article 8), ranging from "recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions" to "use of armed force."

Since, among all the American republics, it is only the government of the United States that brands as "aggression" against it the fact that the Chinese people have taken over China and the Vietnamese want to be masters in Vietnam; and it is only the government of the United States that sees "aggression" in a large Communist and Socialist vote in Italy or the nationalization of oil by a conservative government in Iran, it is clear that in signing and ratifying this treaty the Latin American governments put their heads in a noose, with the business end of the rope held in Washington.

Article 6 was incorporated virtually verbatim in the Charter of the O.A.S. at Bogotá in 1948, which also refers to the obligations assumed under the Rio Treaty. But this was not enough. The cold war against world peace also required an internal war against democratic liberties. The U.S.-sponsored resolution toward this end met with considerable hostility on the part of key Latin American delegations and was in

danger of defeat when a monstrous provocation was organized: the murder in Bogotá of Jorge Eliécer Gaitán, leader of the Liberal Party of Colombia, the country's majority party. The stormy events touched off by this outrage served as a pretext for the reactionary, Washington-backed minority government to launch a reign of terror. Charging that the angry popular protest was the work of the Communists, Secretary of State George Marshall, under cover of synthetic hysteria, whipped the Latin-American delegates into line.

The resolution entitled "The Preservation and Defense of Democracy" for the first time spoke of "international Communism." It proposed the adoption within each of the American republics of anti-democratic measures in the name of safeguarding democracy and peace.

Reaction as usual spelled "Communism" in its own way. In Colombia the Franco agent who had presided over the Bogotá conference, Laureano Gomez, seizing the Presidency, branded the Liberals as "Communists" and installed one of the most brutal dictatorships in Latin America, murdering over 100,000 people.

While the Bogotá conference was in session, a Washington-instigated revolt ousted the democratic government of Costa Rica. Before the year was out, U.S.-backed militarists in Peru and Venezuela, invoking the conference resolution, overthrew democratically elected governments—the very governments which, ironically enough, had voted for the reso-

lution. The Brazilian and Chilean governments, sensing which way the Washington wind was blowing, had anticipated the conference decision and outlawed the Communist Party and other democratic activity in 1947.

Washington of course did not lag behind. Only a couple of months after Bogotá the U.S. government launched the Smith Act frameups of the Communist leaders as part of its stepped-up war crusade. About the same time Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers began their F.B.I.-directed performances before the House Un-American Activities Committee, which led to the frameup of Alger Hiss and the later McCarthyite witch-hunts and smears that cut a wide enough swath to include ex-President Truman.

Thus the Bogotá conference enabled the most reactionary Wall Street monopolists and their subervient government to give a new impetus to the drive toward war, fascism and national enslavement.

Wall Street and Washington took advantage of the Korean war to carry this a step further. They called a conference of the foreign ministers of the American republics at Washington in March-April 1951 in order to organize "defense" against "the growing threat of international communist aggression." This was openly a war conference. Summoned at the behest of the Truman Administration, it was based on the perspective of expanding the Korean war. Despite restricting amendments introduced by some Latin-American

delegations, the conference resolutions, adopted unanimously, had the effect of extending and strengthening the pro-war and anti-democratic commitments of the Rio Treaty and the Bogotá conference. They also served to gear the economies of the Latin American countries more closely to the needs of U.S. war economy to the detriment of those countries.

#### POLITICAL SITUATION IN LATIN AMERICA

The Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas in March 1954 took place in a situation that differed in important respects from the situation at the Bogotá meeting six years earlier and also from that at the foreign ministers' conference in 1951. An even more aggressive and reactionary government had come to power in the United States, one more closely linked with McCarthyite fascism. Its policy in Latin America is likewise more aggressive and reactionary than that of its predecessor. However, the world forces of peace, democracy and national liberation, headed by the Soviet Union, have grown more rapidly in this period than those of reaction and war. This has led to such outstanding developments as the victory of the Chinese Revolution, the emergence of the organized world peace movement, and the imposition on the Eisenhower-Dulles war cabal of an armistice in Korea.

In Latin America, at the time of the Bogotá conference the anti-im-

perialist and democratic forces were in retreat from the offensive of Wall Street and Washington and their feudal-capitalist top sergeants below the Rio Grande. With the active assistance of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. high commands, the trade-union movement in country after country had been or was in process of being split and progressive labor leadership ousted or weakened.

The Caracas conference, on the other hand, met at a time when the retreat had been halted and the beginnings of an anti-imperialist and democratic counter-offensive were visible. These found reflection at the conference itself and influenced its decisions. Guatemala, its anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution moving steadily forward, represents the vanguard of this movement. But it is also evident in diverse forms in other countries. For example:

*Bolivia:* Overthrow of the reactionary dictatorship by a popular uprising in April 1952. Expropriation of the foreign-owned tin mines and enactment of an agrarian reform law. Unification of the labor movement.

*Brazil:* Defeat of the government's attempt to send troops to Korea. Success of the peace movement in winning legality and obtaining more than 5,000,000 signatures for a five-power peace pact. Creation of a broad movement in defense of Brazilian oil against the predatory U.S. trusts. Powerful movement against the military agreement with the United States, which compelled the Congress to delay ratification for thirteen months. Revival of the trade-union movement and big mass strikes in arch and April 1953.

Continued growth in influence of the illegal Communist Party.

*Chile:* Defeat of the Washington-backed Gonzalez Videla dictatorship in the 1952 election and restoration of democratic liberties. Reunification of the trade union movement. Strong movement against the military pact with the United States, which delayed ratification for many months. Creation of a Communist-Socialist alliance and growing unity trends with other democratic parties.

*Mexico:* Rupture of negotiations for a military pact with the United States in 1952 as a result of nationwide resistance. Emergence of a formidable opposition to the reactionary pro-Washington Aleman regime in the 1952 elections. As a result, the new Administration of President Adolfo Ruiz Cortines has had to modify both internal and external policy.

*The colonies:* The rise in the Puerto Rican independence movement in recent years compelled Washington and its colonial lackeys to fabricate as elaborate camouflage: the so-called Commonwealth. This has failed to stem independence sentiment. In British Guiana and Belice (British Honduras) democratic and anti-imperialist parties won majority support, but the British, with State Department backing, used force and fraud to prevent these enslaved peoples from taking any steps toward escape from "the free world."

To these positive phenomena, which are still in their initial stages, there should be added the widespread solidarity movement with Guatemala that has developed throughout Latin America except where the most savage fascist repression exists. In some countries, notably Mexico and Chile, this movement includes important

sections of the legislative bodies.

## II

In the evaluation of the Caracas conference five principal considerations need to be kept in mind.

1. The Caracas conference was part of the world picture. U.S. policy at Caracas was part of its world policy. The battle that Secretary of State Dulles fought at Caracas was part of the war against the heroic people of Vietnam; part of the campaign to undermine the Geneva conference on Far Eastern problems opening on April 26; part of the assault on the Molotov proposal for a general European security pact; part of hydrogen bomb diplomacy and the desperate effort to prevent the settlement of international differences through peaceful negotiation.

U.S. policy at Caracas also had as its purpose what Foreign Minister Guillermo Toriello of Guatemala called "the internationalization of McCarthyism."

In its specifically Latin-American aspect Washington policy sought to curb the rising national liberation struggles; to facilitate intervention against Guatemala and any other country that seeks to free itself from feudal and foreign domination; to prop up reactionary puppet regimes, and tighten the grip of the U.S. trusts.

2. The Caracas conference was part of the world picture in the economic sense as well. For the feeble, backward economies of the Latin

American countries the postwar period has been a series of convulsions. The short-lived Korean war boom was followed by sharp reductions in the prices of such basic commodities as copper, tin, zinc, lead, sugar, cotton, on which the economies of a number of Latin American countries depend. Depression and serious economic crisis besieged such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Cuba even before an economic decline developed in the United States. Growing depression in the U.S. is likely to have consequences that will be truly catastrophic for the Latin-American countries in view of their extreme economic dependence on the U.S.

Washington policy at Caracas sought to head off the efforts of the Latin-American delegations to exact concessions that would provide economic relief—above all, measures in the direction of "parity" prices between the raw materials that the Latin-American countries export and the manufactured goods they import.

3. The resolution against "the intervention of international Communism" adopted by the conference was by no means all that Washington wanted. Nevertheless, it constitutes an additional political weapon against the sovereignty of Guatemala and other Latin-American countries. It commits the seventeen governments that signed it to consultations that might lead to the adoption of the aggressive measures envisaged in the Rio Treaty whenever Washington decides that "the political in-

stitutions of any American state" are dominated or controlled by "the international Communist movement."

This is a McCarthyite war resolution directed at the national independence of every Latin-American country. And it is not without significance that the operative paragraph of this resolution is similar in language to the operative paragraph of Dulles' notorious "united action" speech of March 29, in which he said that "the imposition on Southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally, by whatever means, would be a grave threat to the whole free community."

4. At the same time, the circumstances under which this resolution was adopted undoubtedly weaken its effectiveness and constitute a moral defeat for the Wall Street government. Unlike the "anti-Communist" resolutions of the Bogotá and Washington conferences, this one was not adopted unanimously. The negative vote of Guatemala and the abstention of Mexico and Argentina meant that governments of countries with nearly one-third the population of Latin America failed to support the U.S. position, despite the customary pressures and threats.

Moreover, the support of the other delegations, except for those representing the most servile dictatorships—Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, Batista of Cuba, etc.—was decidedly reluctant, and several announced formal reservations after the vote. Uruguay's Justin de Arceha

expressed the general sentiment of this captive group when he said: "We contributed our approval without enthusiasm, without optimism, without joy and without the feeling that we were contributing to the adoption of a constructive measure."

Above all, the courageous fight of the Guatemalan delegation electrified the conference, brought an ovation from the Latin-American delegates, put Wall Street's emissaries on the defensive, and for the first time gave the peoples of Latin America a spokesman at such a gathering. *Time* magazine quoted a South American delegate as commenting on Toriello's speech: "He said many of the things some of the rest of us would like to say if we dared."

All this, however, does not justify the conclusion of some progressives that the Caracas resolution was a "paper victory" or a "pyrrhic victory" for Dulles. Certain it is that the circumstances surrounding the resolution's adoption give it elements of pyrrhic victory. Certain it is too that these elements can be further intensified by the struggle of the peoples of the entire continent, including the people of the United States, against all that the resolution represents. But to conclude at this time that the resolution automatically represents nothing but a pyrrhic or paper victory is gravely to underestimate the threat of U.S. imperialist intervention and the extent of Washington control over most of the Latin-American governments.

5. The Caracas conference laid bare as never before the sharpening

conflicts between the Latin American nations and U.S. imperialism. Though these conflicts emerged at the conference in limited form because only one of the delegations truly represented its people's interests, no one could mistake the intimations of the storm that is brewing for the U.S. ruling class throughout the vast enslaved area below the Rio Grande.

### III

On the economic questions and on the issue of colonies in the Americas the United States once more found itself on the defensive and suffered a series of defeats. At the Bogotá conference and at the Washington foreign ministers' conference a conflict of emphasis emerged between the United States and the Latin-American delegations, which was in reality a basic conflict of interests. While the U.S. delegation wanted to concentrate chiefly on political questions, the Latin Americans were most concerned about the economic issues.

This conflict thrust its way into the Caracas conference with even greater sharpness and dominated all the discussions. It helps explain the abstention of Mexico and Argentina on the "anti-Communist" resolution and the reluctance of other delegations to support it. It also was an important factor in the complete isolation of the United States on the question of the European colonies and occupied territories in the western hemisphere, the conference voting 19-0 (with the U.S. abstaining) in favor

of ending the rule of extra-continental powers.

The colonial resolution marked a significant advance over resolutions on this question adopted at previous inter-American conferences. The U.S. government would obviously have no objections to ousting its British, Dutch and French rivals from the American continent, provided it could be certain of taking their place. The resolution, however, did not propose any such replacement. Washington's opposition to this document—asserting its "irrelevance"—exposed the hypocrisy of its alleged anti-colonialism. The denunciation of the racist policy pursued by the U.S. in the Panama Canal Zone, offered to the Conference by Mrs. Cecilia de Ramon, wife of the President of Panama, similarly was most embarrassing for the Wall Street delegation.

On the other hand, a serious weakness in the anti-colonial resolution and in the discussion around it was that the issue of the U.S. colonies—specifically, Puerto Rico—was not raised. And the fascist Venezuelan regime obligingly helped keep the door closed on this skeleton in the U.S. closet by denying visas to a delegation from the Independence Party of Puerto Rico.

The exclusive interest of Washington in the "anti-Communist" resolution was underlined by Dulles' hasty departure from the conference immediately after it was passed. This contemptuous attitude toward the conference as a whole and specifically toward the urgent economic

questions that so deeply concerned the Latin-American delegates evoked widespread unfavorable comment throughout Latin America. Dulles' lieutenants then added injury to insult by short-circuiting the economic aspect of the gathering with a proposal that a special conference of the finance ministers of the American republics be called to discuss these questions the latter part of this year. Undoubtedly Washington expects to utilize the intervening months to soften up the various governments so that they will abandon such "Communist" notions as that the prices they get for raw materials and those they pay for manufactured goods ought not to be fixed unilaterally by the Wall Street trusts.

However, this move did not save the State Department from suffering defeat on a number of lesser economic questions involving measures of self-defense against U.S. restrictions on imports of raw materials and semi-manufactured goods, U.S. dumping of agricultural surpluses, and the U.S. ban on trade in strategic materials with the socialist countries. Over U.S. opposition the conference also adopted an important Guatemalan-Bolivian resolution calling for agrarian reform.

### IV

On the eve of the Caracas conference Drew Pearson wrote from Washington:

Not since the sixth Pan-American conference in 1928, when the United States faced a buzz saw of protest over the landing of Marines in Nica-

ragua and the bullying of Mexico regarding oil, has a U.S. delegation faced such an unfriendly atmosphere (*New York Mirror*, March 1).

The reference to the invasion of Nicaragua was decidedly apt. For little more than a month before the opening of the Caracas conference the Guatemalan government made public documentary proof of a plot for a similar invasion of Guatemalan soil. The organizers and paymasters of this conspiracy were in Washington and Boston, headquarters of the United Fruit Company. The tools were the satellite dictatorships of El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, and Nicaragua—especially the last.

Even before the conference opened the “unfriendly atmosphere” in Latin America had caused the State Department to abandon its original plan for organizing at Caracas direct and explicit collective measures against Guatemala as a prelude to armed intervention.

Instead of isolating Guatemala, the U.S. delegation was itself isolated, despite the big majority vote it wrested for its resolution. *Visión*, a Spanish language news magazine published in New York for circulation in Latin America and strongly suspected of State Department backing, put it this way (April 2): “The truth is that at this meeting its [U.S.] prestige has declined.” And an English language bulletin issued by *Visión* stated (March 26) that “the United States failed to secure the political leadership and the hemi-

spheric unity it was aiming for.”

Why this State Department preoccupation with little Guatemala, a nation of 3,000,000 people? Certainly, the United Fruit economic stake in Guatemala is only a drop in the bucket of the six billion dollars of U.S. private direct investments in all Latin America. It is clear that the State Department is aiming at something much bigger and more menacing to the economic and political control of the corporate overlords. As R. Villa writes in an article in the March issue of *Fundamentos*, Marxist-Leninist theoretical monthly published in Cuba:

The insistence of the government of the North American monopolies on subjugating Guatemala is due to the fact that the heroic resistance of the Guatemalan people and the patriotic conduct of the government of Arbenz constitute a lesson and an example for all Latin America.

Guatemala has demonstrated that its smallness, economic weakness and lack of military defenses are not insuperable obstacles to a just policy of national resistance.

Latin America is the chief colonial domain of the United States, with almost 40 per cent of all U.S. private direct foreign investments located there; providing nearly one-third of all U.S. imports and a market for one-quarter of U.S. exports. And next to the United States itself, Latin America is the principal economic and strategic base for the Wall Street policy of international aggression and world conquest. The rift that Guatemala represents in the

once-solid Latin-American bloc of captive states is spreading. That is why the question of Guatemala is of such crucial importance to those who want not only to keep Latin America enslaved but to extend that slavery to the rest of the world.

Yet U.S. foreign policy, already racked by serious crisis because it refuses to accept the premise of live and let live in relation to the socialist one-third of mankind, has proved unable to resolve this new crisis within its own immediate empire. On the contrary, the Eisenhower-Dulles policy at Caracas, despite the new weapons it seized for terrorizing and attacking Guatemala and all other Latin American countries, only served to accentuate that fundamental crisis. And through little Guatemala millions in many lands are learning that the king is indeed naked. And they take heart in the common struggle.

Let us, however, not underestimate the massive task that faces the peoples of the continent. Resolutions at conferences will not change the basic relationships. Only struggle will do that: the widest unity of all patriotic forces and the most stubborn resistance.

As for the people of the United States, especially the working class and the Negro people, those at Caracas who refused to back Dulles' “anti-Communist” resolution were also defending their peace, liberties and independence. All democratic-minded people in our country need the support of all the Latin-Ameri-

can peoples, as they need ours, against Wall Street imperialism, McCarthyite fascism and war. We should therefore insist that the AFL top leadership and certain CIO leaders end their shameful support of U.S. intervention in Guatemala.

The recently published Draft Program of the Communist Party exposes the fact that our economic royalists are using the cry of “Communism” in order to seize “the tungsten of Korea, the rubber of Indo-China, the oil of Iran and Venezuela, the diamonds and gold of South Africa, the bauxite of Guiana, the fruit of Guatemala, the nitrate and copper of Chile, the tin of Bolivia, and the immense super-profits derived from cheap colonial labor everywhere.” This program expresses the real interests of our working class, of all Americans who want jobs, peace and democracy when it proposes: hands off Guatemala, full independence for Puerto Rico, “full equality and democratic rights for Hawaii,” “complete political and economic freedom for the Philippines,” “the right of all nations to restrict and control all foreign investments,” and a policy of real friendship and cooperation with the peoples of Latin America and all nations.

In the name of international solidarity, in the service of anti-imperialism, so fundamental to the interests of the working class, the Negro people, and all democratically-minded Americans, full support for such a policy of real friendship is urgently needed.

# **NEW AND RECENT BOOKS**

---

## **THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN AMERICAN HISTORY**

**By William Z. Foster**

This encyclopedic work of Marxist-Leninist theory on the Negro question, covers the entire history of the national liberation struggle of the Negro people from the earliest arrival of slave ships to these shores up to the present day. (*International*) Price \$6.00

## **PRAGMATISM: PHILOSOPHY OF IMPERIALISM**

**By Harry K. Wells**

A full length critique of pragmatism as a system of philosophy which serves the needs and interests of U.S. imperialist expansion, including an analysis of pragmatism in philosophy, history, law, psychology and education. (*International*) Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.75

## **THE LAST ILLUSION: America's Plan For World Domination**

**By Hershel D. Meyer**

This invaluable political reference book, literally an entire library between the covers of a single volume, sifts, weighs, distills and interprets massive evidence to show that the world imperialist system is entering its final crisis. (*Anvil-Atlas*) Price \$3.00

## **LAUREATES OF IMPERIALISM**

**By Herbert Aptheker**

A forceful exposition on the degeneration of scholarship in the U.S.A. today and its complete subservience to the interests of the biggest war-mongering trusts and monopolies, showing how Big Business is re-writing American history.

(*M&M*) Paper \$.60; cloth \$1.25

---

*Distributed by*

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