

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

EUGENE DENNIS, *Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Associate Editor*
ALEXANDER BITTELMAN; MAX WEISS; HENRY WINSTON

VOLUME XXV, NO. I

Contents

JANUARY, 1946

Lenin's Method—Guide to the Grasp of Reality	V. J. Jerome	3
The New Stage in the Wage Struggle	George Morris	18
The Record of American Imperialism in China	Frederick V. Wiold	31
Party Policy in the Veterans' Field	Robert Thompson	42
How Shall We Fight For Full Employment?	Alexander Bittelman	50
On the Right To Self-Determination For the Negro People in the Black Belt	Claudia Jones	67
The 79th Congress: An Estimate To Date	Adam Lapin	78
The Postwar Role of Canadian Imperialism	Tim Buck	89

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

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

209

335.05

P759

Y.25

A NEW YEAR'S MESSAGE TO OUR READERS

With this issue, *Political Affairs* opens its second year. In the twelvemonth since January 1945, the war of the United Nations has been crowned with victory, and the struggle to consolidate the victory is the central task before the people and before the working class in particular. In this fateful situation the indispensable role of the Communists becomes most manifest.

The Communist Party would not be able to fulfill its role of political leader of the working class were it not able to register during the same twelvemonth its own victory—the victory over the revision of Marxism into which it lapsed under Browder's leadership. The break with its revisionist past and its return to the Marxist-Leninist path is a triumph, not alone for the Communist Party, but for the entire working class engaged in defending its economic interests in the face of the encroachment of monopoly capital at home and its imperialist offensive abroad, Labor's efforts to promote the broad coalition of the nation's anti-fascist forces in the struggle for jobs, democracy, and peace, will be immeasurably strengthened by the reconstitution of the Communist Party on Marxist-Leninist foundations.

As an organ devoted to the dissemination of Marxist-Leninist theory, *Political Affairs* is endeavoring systematically to clarify, with the projector of scientific Communism, the political and economic issues of history in the making. It deems it its task to contribute to bringing the working class to a fuller realization of its determining role in society in order to facilitate its own unification as a class—so that it may come forward as the unifier and leader of the labor-democratic coalition, and so that it may strengthen and prepare itself, on the basis of its cumulative political experiences, to take the road toward its historic objective, Socialism.

To this end, the Editors recognize the necessity to make of our magazine an increasingly effective instrument of Marxist-Leninist theory, an organ that will assist the cadres of our Party, as well as the advanced cadres in the labor movement, to enhance the quality of their political leadership. *Political Affairs* must help equip our membership with the weapon of Marxist science to enable it to combat the spurious, anti-working class theories that all too often infiltrate labor's ranks from without and from within.

The achievement, in 1946, of a readership of 30,000 is imperative for the realization of these aims. There are many thousands of potential readers the country over who would welcome the opportunity to get acquainted with *Political Affairs*, to derive the theoretical and political enlightenment which it has to offer. Every present reader can serve the furtherance of Marxist-Leninist teachings by putting our magazine into the hands of a new reader. Let us usher in 1946 with the resolve to deepen and extend the influence of Marxist science, to advance the positions of labor and the people for a better America and a better world.

—THE EDITORS.

Feb. 17, 1948

B.P.

LENIN'S METHOD— GUIDE TO THE GRASP OF REALITY

By V. J. JEROME

(On the Occasion of the Twenty-Second Anniversary of the Death of V. I. Lenin.)

TO BE IMBUED with Leninist initiative and boldness, to be equipped for Communist leadership under the most trying and challenging conditions, we must master the Leninist method of arriving at truth and acting upon it.

Lenin's teachings, as Lenin himself would be the first to warn us, are not to be taken solely in terms of their conclusions, but as conclusions proceeding from dialectical analysis, as truths of science involving the methods of science.

Leninism—the Marxism of our century—is not a dogma; it is a consistent set of principles. The two propositions are interrelated and involve each other. Leninism as a consistent set of principles must be conceived in the context of the unity of theory and practice, so that the theory will not be converted into dogma, but, through verification in action, serve as a guide

to action. Conversely, to say simply, "not a dogma" may well serve as an open sesame to theoretical license. Thus, in the recent revisionist past of our Party, when a wishful wave of the hand could dismiss the epoch of imperialism from the stage of history, "Marxism is not a dogma" was turned into "Marxism is not a principle." This danger is particularly great in the United States, where pragmatist influence reflects contempt for theory and tends to convert dogma with principle.

Anti-Marxists delight in portraying the dialectic method as arbitrary and mystical, as the logic of doctrinaire ideas ungrounded in experience and governed by set goals. Thus, Sidney Hook, "expert" in Marxism for the anti-Marxists, strenuously contending against the scientific nature of the dialectic method, wrote not long ago, "it is not the patterns of causality which the dialectic method uncovers but the patterns of destiny."*

Surely any reader who has studied *Capital and Imperialism* will reject with contempt all such pseudo-criticisms. For in these works, as in the entire treasury of Marxism-Leninism, the scientific character of the dialectic method will be immediately evident to anyone possessing the slightest familiarity with science.

We need only bear in mind Marx's vast accumulation of economic and social data which he found basic to an examination of the capitalist mode

* *The Journal of Philosophy*, July 6, 1939, p. 375.

of production. A great lesson in scientific endeavor is present in his very selection of England as the "classic ground" for his investigation, both because of the classic manner in which capitalism developed in England and because of the high availability of official social statistics, as contained in the reports of the English factory inspectors; in the reports on public health, on child labor and the exploitation of women, on housing and food; and in English factory legislation.

Relevant to this phase of our discussion is a review of the method of *Capital* in a St. Petersburg journal, from which Marx quoted at considerable length in his Preface of 1873 and from which we present the following passage:

Whilst Marx sets himself the task of following and explaining...the economic system established by the sway of capital, he is only formulating, in a strictly scientific manner, the aim that every accurate investigation into economic life must have. The scientific value of such an inquiry lies in the disclosing of the special laws that regulate the origin, existence, development, and death of a given social organism and its replacement by another and higher one. And it is this value that, in point of fact, Marx's book has.

And Marx adds:

Whilst the writer pictures what he takes to be actually my method, in his striking and (as far as concerns my own application of it) generous way, what

else is he picturing but the dialectic method?

In *Imperialism*, the epoch-making sequel to *Capital*, Lenin gives us an extensive statistical study of the main economic features of capitalism in its highest and declining stage. The transformation of capitalism from its ascendant and freely competitive stage into its decaying, monopoly stage is disclosed through a vast array of basic data as a dialectic transformation of quantity into quality. Lenin, in his Preface to the French and German editions, thus ascribes his scientific analysis of the imperialist war of 1914-18 to his employment of the dialectic method:

Now, proof as to what is the true social or, more correctly, the true class character of a war is naturally to be found, not in the diplomatic history of the war, but in an analysis of the *objective* positions of the ruling classes in all belligerent Powers. In order to depict this objective position one must not take single examples or isolated data...but the *aggregate* of the data concerning the *bases* of economic life of all the belligerent countries and of the *whole* world.

The Marxist-Leninist teachings constitute for the modern working class great, invincible truths in its struggle for emancipation because these teachings and their formative method are both scientific, because the world conception and the method of dialectical materialism constitute a unity.

* * *

of th
ject
crete
such
alwa
politi
conc
Of
gate
from
Ther
the
versa
Equa
scien
prop
oped
crete
tions
Th
crete,
pone
Lenin
Scien
splen
...
tract,
lend
cul.

For
mean
isolat
ism,
the c

* v.
Publish
* * L
non ed
in the L
IX and

For Lenin, the primary orientation of the mind toward knowing an object is to seek to know it in its concrete characteristics. "There is no such thing as abstract truth. Truth is always concrete." Hence, "Concrete political tasks must be presented in concrete circumstances."^{*}

Obviously, Lenin did not here negate the process of abstracting truth from the concrete data of experience. There would be no science without the process of abstracting the universal aspect from particulars. Equally, there would be no science without rejection of those proposed truths that are not developed as the generalizations of concrete data, but constitute mere assertions.

The abstract, as well as the concrete, is therefore an essential component of the dialectic method. Thus, Lenin, in his comments on Hegel's *Science of Logic*, characterized as "a splendid formula" Hegel's words:

...not only the general in the abstract, but as the general that comprehends in itself the richness of the particular.^{**}

For Lenin, the concrete did not mean the object taken as a static and isolated particular, involving relativism, which leads to scepticism and the denial of all scientific laws.

Concrete truth for Lenin involved a deepened, intensified, and fully rounded conception of the given object. Knowledge of a thing means to know it both as particular and general, the two in interconnection; to know it, not in isolation from other things, but in its universal interrelatedness and constant interaction.

Thus, the demand for a bourgeois-democratic republic in Russia, which in 1905 was a revolutionary objective, could not, from the Leninist concrete-historical approach, be generalized into a permanent, unchanging truth. In October, 1917, with the conditions ripened for the struggle to establish Soviet Power, which would usher in the higher democracy of Socialism, the demand for a bourgeois-democratic Russia had become counter-revolutionary. That which had been true in the concrete, historical conditions of the Revolution of 1905 was with respect to the October Revolution abstract, anti-historical, and false.

* * *

A key error in our past revisionist "logic" can be summarized as a violation of the Leninist principle of the concrete. The "theoretical" assumptions—better, rationalizations—were worked out by Comrade Earl Browder in his article, "The Study of Lenin's Teachings," presented in *Political Affairs* in January, 1945, ironically, "On the Twenty-First Anniversary of Lenin's Death."

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. III, pp. 100-01.

** Lenin's *Philosophical Remains*, p. 17 [German edition, Vienna, 1932; originally published in the *Leninski Sbornik* (Lenin Miscellany), Vols. IX and XII (1929 and 1930)].

In that article Browder set out by speaking of the need for seeing situations concretely; let us therefore see what concreteness meant for him.

We begin with the first phase of his discussion, sub-titled "Class collaboration or class struggle"? There we read:

At the crisis of World War I Lenin fiercely denounced class collaboration with capital and demanded class war against capital. Today, in the crisis of World War II, we, Americans who are proud to consider ourselves disciples of Lenin, are in practice collaborating with capital, and fiercely denounce those who advocate a class war against capital in the United States today.

Invoking the authority of Lenin, Browder bade us turn back to Lenin to see how he had dealt with that question concretely. Browder made reference to Lenin's article of May 19, 1917, entitled, "Class Collaboration with Capital, or Class War Against Capital?", from which he quoted the opening sentence:

That is the way history puts the question; and not history in general, but the economic and political history of the Russia of today. (*Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 137.)

On which Browder commented:

Thus, with his first words, Lenin emphasized that he was not laying down a formula for all countries in general, but for Russia; and that he was not even speaking of Russia in general, but the Russia of May, 1917... his con-

clusion was that *in that country and at that moment* the problems could be solved only by the working class making war against capital...

Today in America, the facts are *fundamentally* different from those upon which Lenin based his conclusion. (Emphasis mine—V.J.J.)

What was the situation obtaining in Russia in May, 1917? And what were the "fundamentally different" facts in the situation of which Browder wrote?

The bourgeois Provisional government had lost the confidence of the masses. It could maintain its power only by screening the bourgeois dictatorship with petty-bourgeois "Socialist" representation in the ministry. Accordingly, it pressed for a "coalition government" to include representatives of the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties, which then controlled the Soviets. These two parties entered the coalition government, with the approval of the Petrograd Soviet, over the opposition of the Bolsheviks. Lenin condemned this capitulation as a coalition against the revolution. For Lenin, the "crisis of power" demanded, as the imperative course for the Russian proletariat, an end to the existing dual power and the transfer of full power to the Soviets. Hence, he branded the action of the false Socialists as "the experiment of class collaboration with capital."

Of course, Lenin raised the question concretely, as the situation in Russia at that time demanded. How-

ever, did Lenin's position against class collaboration with capital, but for class war upon it, relate so restrictedly, as Browder sought to interpret it, to "the Russia of May 1917"? Was it so uniquely a case of "in that country and at that moment?"

In the month preceding, in his "Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers," Lenin had spoken of "the series of revolutions which are arising from the imperialist war with objective inevitability" and ended the letter with the slogan, "Long live the proletarian revolution *which is beginning in Europe!*" Class war against the imperialist bourgeoisie which had assumed political power in the February Revolution was the breath of everything Lenin uttered, not only from the first moment in which news of the revolution had reached him in exile, but from the first moment in which he had become a Marxist. Lenin's position as expressed in the article under discussion stemmed from his teachings on class relations and the class struggle, which are, in their basic principles, regardless of changes in their tactical applications, as valid for January 1945 as for May 1917, in present capitalist United States as in bygone capitalist Russia.

Marxism - Leninism, of course, holds it axiomatic for the working class in given situations to enter into labor-democratic coalitions that include, not only its historical allies, but also bourgeois components whose position, however transitory and contingent, is rendered by such

situations objectively progressive. Such coalitions have in the course of labor's history been notably effected in times of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and of national wars; the advent of fascism placed them on the order of the day for labor on a world scale. But with the issue of these coalitions arises the question of their political content, in the concrete sense in which that question can be determined, namely, the place that the most advanced and consistently progressive social force, the working class, occupies in relation to its allies. It is a question of whether the working class shall so combine for common action as to renounce its independent political action and drag behind the bourgeoisie, to its class detriment, in the traditional class-collaborationist sense, or whether it shall strive to become the backbone of the coalition, as the main champion of the national interests in the people's sense; whether it shall conceive such inter-class action on specific issues as a reconciliation of opposites, as cancellation of the class struggle (as if that were possible in a class society!) or whether it shall see in such united action the conflict of opposites under new conditions, the transference of the class struggle within the framework of the labor-democratic coalition, in the interests of its basic purposes.

Clearly, in thus approaching the issue, the labor-democratic coalition can, for the working class, have nothing in common with what the

advanced workers everywhere have always healthily fought as class-collaborationism. The labor-democratic coalition, as Marxists see it, does not mean going back to Gompersism or Kautskyism, which sought to keep the labor movement forever tied to the bourgeoisie and which subordinated the workers' interests to those of capital; it means enhancing labor's strength and anti-fascist influence through its increasing independent political action, it means combining *dialectically*: "to keep distinct in order to strike together." Therefore, neither in essence nor in designation can the labor-democratic coalition be conceived as class collaboration.

Brazen indeed is the sophistry that seeks to turn Lenin's struggle against class collaboration with capital into a this-time or that-clime conclusion. Browder seized upon a statement by Lenin which should be understood to mean that to discuss concretely the issue of class collaboration and class struggle one should not *limit* oneself to its general aspects, and twisted it to mean that one should *exclude* its general aspects. In that same period, in his first of the "Letters from Afar" (March 20th), Lenin had put stress on the fact that he alone can know the true state of affairs "who appraises every 'given moment,' not only from the point of view of its present, current peculiarities, but also from the point of view of the deeper-lying springs, the deeper interrelation of the interests of the proletariat

and the bourgeoisie, both in Russia and throughout the world."*

For Marxism-Leninism the heart of dialectics is the principle of the unity and conflict of internal contradictions, through which all things manifest their self-movement and development in an unending process of quantitative and qualitative change. What place did this cardinal element of the dialectical method find in Browder's "Study of Lenin's Teachings"? For Browder, the deeper-lying springs, the basic and determining internal contradictions, were reduced to an occasional, isolated instance. He sought to turn the absolute into the relative, the norm into the exception. He offered a conception of movement in which at a certain moment in time and point in space contradictions set in. And this, in the name of Lenin!

To say, as Browder did, that in the United States at the time of his writing the facts were "fundamentally different from those upon which Lenin based his conclusion" can mean only for any serious student of Marxism that the material and social foundations in America under the Roosevelt war-government differed *qualitatively* from those of Russia under the Ministry of Prince Lvov—in other words, that the epoch of imperialism had come to an end, at least in the United States. The difference in the political character of the world wars, upon which Browder based his differentiation of the

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 8.

two respective periods, is, of course, of the highest importance. But it is one thing to say this, and another to assume that the facts in the two periods were *fundamentally* different.

Browder, in his supporting statement that "capital, the bourgeoisie, is conducting a just war as an ally of the Soviet Union," denied the imperialist purpose underlying the support of the war against Nazi Germany on the part of the dominant sections of American capital—a fact not fundamentally different from the imperialist purpose of the Russian bourgeoisie in 1917 to keep Russia in the war. Nor can it here be contended that purpose as a factor is subjective; for, though it is subjective as regards the bourgeoisie, it has its direct objective bearing, as we have all too well seen, on the conduct of the war and the postwar policies—both marked by the fear of the democratic consequences of the victory over fascism.

Only in disregard of the fact that the imperialists were operating as imperialists in a new situation, could Browder see the bourgeoisie "no longer united upon a program of reaction," in a way that "the problem is no longer how to combat the whole bourgeoisie but how to strengthen the progressive against the reactionary sector," since "under such circumstances the policy of class war against capital would only strengthen the reactionary forces against the progressive."

Of course, the interests of the

working class, of the people as a whole, rendered the all-democratic coalition for victory over the Axis an imperative necessity. The national unity thus correctly combined workers, farmers, professionals, small-business men, the Negro people, and those sections of the bourgeoisie who supported the Roosevelt anti-Axis program. But did the American bourgeoisie during the United Nations phase of the war therefore cease to be reactionary *as a class*?

The question can be answered in the affirmative only if we should assume that the economic position of the American ruling class was no longer imperialist. For since, as Lenin long ago pointed out in refuting Kautsky, imperialism is not a policy but a historic stage of capitalist development, a temporary progressive policy of a given imperialist bourgeoisie or its "dominant sections" cannot annul the inherently reactionary character of that bourgeoisie as a class.

Browder answered the question in the affirmative because, in the first place, he invested the pro-Roosevelt grouping in the bourgeoisie with an inherent progressivism which brought that sector *fundamentally* nearer to the working class than to the capitalists that opposed Roosevelt's war policies. (No other basis can be given for the surrender of "the policy of class war against capital.") Secondly, since that sector was, according to him, dominant, its

position of necessity modified the entire socio-economic structure of the American nation.

This revisionist analysis of the bourgeoisie reflected itself in Browder's projected policies for postwar America in the only outlook consistent with it:

Whatever may be the situation in other lands, in the United States the consequence of Teheran means a perspective, in the immediate postwar period and for a long term of years, of expanded production and employment and the strengthening of democracy within the framework of the present system—and not a perspective of the transition to Socialism.

And in the interest of this long-range prosperity for the workers and its accompanying democratic reinforcement "we Marxists, who are convinced socialists, are accepting for a long period the necessity to cooperate in making capitalism work in America."!!

* * *

This was a perspective of compromise *ad infinitum*. Indeed, Browder sought to base his policy of surrendering the class struggle on Lenin's rejection of the out-and-out "no compromise" slogan. In thus referring to Lenin's criticism of the adolescent Leftist objection "in principle" to compromise, Browder distorted that criticism to mean a denial of the uncompromising nature of Leninism and *raised compromise itself to a principle*.

Browder attempted to bolster his position with the instance of Lenin's proposal in September, 1917, to support a government of the Socialist Revolutionary and Menshevik parties in order to "guarantee the peaceful advance of the whole Russian revolution." Browder quoted at length from the article, "Compromises," written on September 14, 1917, in which Lenin had stated:

At this moment, and only at this moment, perhaps *only for a few days*, or for a week or two, such a government might be set up and consolidated in a perfectly peaceful way. It is extremely probable that it would guarantee the peaceful advance of the whole Russian revolution. . . . For the sake, and only for the sake, of such a peaceful development of the revolution—a possibility *extremely rare* in history and extremely valuable . . . the Bolsheviks, partisans of world revolution and of revolutionary methods, may, and should, in my opinion, consent to such a compromise. . . . Perhaps this is already impossible? Perhaps. But if there is even one chance in a hundred, the attempt to achieve such a possibility would still be worth while.

From these words Browder concluded:

Thus we see that even in the dark days of 1917, when there existed none of those great world factors which underlie and make possible the program of American Marxists today, Lenin was searching with a keen eye for any and every small possibility for peaceful paths of social progress, for mitigating or avoiding class war, for "compro-

mise"
one
Surely
with
chanc
presen

Th
chan
know
throu
tion.

Brow
days
to m
keen
ing o
ject
Unit

"
whos
the
mid-S
shevik
Sovie
issu

Must
situat
for pr
"a ret
power

ment
Mens
viets"

"Stud
"dark
brigh
pects
future

The
Lenin

mise" to that end even if it had only one chance in a hundred of success. Surely Lenin would see, if he were with us today, much more than a chance in a hundred of success for the present policies of American Marxists.

There are times when through a chance remark we may learn to know a man far more accurately than through long speeches of self-revelation. Such a "chance remark" is Browder's reference to "the dark days of 1917" by which he intended to make Lenin's "searching with a keen eye . . . for mitigating or avoiding class war" an even greater object lesson to us in present-day United States.

" . . . the dark days of 1917"—by whose prospect? Surely not that of the Bolsheviks. Why should the mid-September days, with the Bolsheviks rapidly gaining control of the Soviets (on September 25-27 Lenin issued his letter, "The Bolsheviks Must Assume Power") and with a situation, however brief, favorable for proposing, in the words of Lenin, "a return to the pre-July demand: All power to the Soviets and a government of Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks responsible to the Soviets"—why should those days, in a "Study of Lenin's Teachings," be "dark" as compared with even the brightest, *but non-Socialist*, prospects of America in the immediate future?

The voluntary compromise which Lenin offered to the S. R.-Menshe-

vik bloc came in a moment, not of political deterioration, but of betterment. It was because that bloc, following the suppression of the Kornilov revolt, had dissociated itself, albeit temporarily, from the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, that Lenin considered the moment auspicious to support a government of these petty-bourgeoisie Socialist parties, should it form itself. It was not an act of compromising with the bourgeoisie at the expense of the working class. As a compromise that was voluntary (*i.e.*, not enforced upon the Bolsheviks by the situation), it was offered, in Lenin's words, "not to the bourgeoisie, our direct and main class enemy, but to our nearest adversaries, the 'ruling' petty-bourgeois democratic parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks," and, then, even "to these parties only by way of exception." But to what end—to what end did Lenin propose that compromise? This is the heart of the question. To the end that Browder envisaged for America—and the whole capitalist world: "to make capitalism work?" Lenin saw only one aim in the days between February and October—the further development of the revolution to its culmination in the establishment of the political power of the proletariat. To this end, and only to this end, within the stated relationship of forces in mid-September, he considered that his proposed compromise with the S. R.-Menshevik bloc would, by securing to the Bolsheviks

full freedom of propaganda, facilitate their struggle within the Soviets for dominant influence.

Browder spoke of a peaceful development of capitalist society. Lenin had reference to a specific possibility, given certain conditions (including the existing condition of armed workers and soldiers in the Soviets), of a peaceful further development of a revolution in process—development to its Socialist stage, of a revolution that had not been initiated by peaceful means. Browder sophistically sought to make an analogy—or, even more, an identity, between the two currents of development. But, even were the analogy permissible, the possibility of which Lenin spoke was a moment, not only rare, but as fleeting as the river under Heraclitus' feet. Was Browder's compromise for class peace perchance also conceived for one of those *extremely fleeting* moments—lasting only some generations or so? Marxism deals, not with abstract possibilities, but with concrete possibilities arising out of concrete situations. It was the concrete situation described above that made Lenin advance the concrete possibility of a compromise in the service of principle.

Lenin wrote at the opening of the article under discussion:

The task of a truly revolutionary party is not to renounce compromises once and for all, but to be able *throughout all compromises*, when they are unavoidable, to remain true to its

principles, to its class, to its revolutionary purpose, to its task of preparing the way for the revolution and of educating the masses for victory in the revolution.

In Browder's text Lenin "was searching with a keen eye . . . for mitigating or avoiding class war, for 'compromise' to that end." According to Browder: "When one really knows Lenin, however, one learns that he specifically repudiated the characteristic of being 'uncompromising.'" And so, under Browder's brush, we got a picture of "Lenin as a master-compromiser."!!

It was quite consistent for a disciple of such a "Lenin" to declare, in defense of the negative argument in a public debate of the subject, "Is Communism a Menace?"—

Communists are continuously advocating better conditions for workers in industry, and to the degree that these things are achieved the workers are reconciled to the existing system and rendered immune to revolutionary impulses. The Communists are the most zealous and selfless workers for the removal of conditions making for revolutionary unrest among the masses; the Communists are in this sense the truest conservatives in the population.

* * *

But the class war in class America refused to be revised out of existence by the revision of Marxism. It required but a few months after Browder's "Study of Lenin's Teachings" was written to prove it far from

a Leninist study. "Britain and the U.S.," Browder had stated at the end of 1943, "have closed the books finally and forever upon their old expectation that the Soviet Union as a Socialist country is going to disappear some day." But the imperialist motives of the dominant section of American monopoly capital in the war against Nazi Germany loomed increasingly larger as the fighting neared its end. At the San Francisco Conference American imperialism and its British counterpart abandoned the Jacob-voice with which they had spoken at Moscow, Teheran and Yalta, and now bared their Esau-hand.

The guarantee of Browder has proved hollow: Teheran has not cancelled out Munich. The imperialist bourgeoisie, essentially reactionary in war and peace, is reunited upon a program of reaction. Munich-minded imperialism is even now seeking to turn the course of history into an everlasting treadmill of tragedy. World peace is for the imperialists but an ever-dwindling interlude between recurrent world wars. The anti-Axis coalition of the British and American nations with the Soviet Union means for them an Anglo-American-led coalition against the Soviet Union. The global war for them was a war for global domination. Freedom of the nations for them is their freedom to ride rough over the nations. The imperialist interventions in Greece and Indonesia and China are not intended to

be the parting shots of World War II. The peace-desiring peoples must intervene to prevent these shots from becoming the opening salvos of World War III.

* * *

The man who made the profoundest of all studies of Lenin's teachings, who engineered the fashioning and directed the wielding of the Socialist Power that saved the world from a fascist fate—that man, Joseph Stalin, wrote in his essay, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, in discussing the principles of interconnection, movement, and change:

The dialectical method regards as important primarily, not that which at the given moment seems to be durable and yet is already beginning to die away, but that which is arising and developing, even though at the given moment it may appear to be not durable; for the dialectical method considers invincible only that which is arising and developing.

For Browder the primarily important was not that which is arising and developing. He conjured up a vision of re-ascendance in the decay of the seemingly durable, an image of towering strength in a body-politic diseased with the canker of its own contradictions.

Only by thus throwing the shadow of the old to darken the advance of the new upon the path of American political life, could Browder have conceived the fetichism of a perpet-

ual two-party system in the United States, which left no basis for ever building a mass popular third party and furnished the thesis for liquidating the Communist Party. The historical approach would have revealed, not an abstract truth, which is no truth, but the concrete actuality that the "permanent" two-party institution merely attested to the failure over many decades to integrate and afford effective organizational expression to the strivings for independent political action in the ranks of labor and the progressive forces generally. It would have revealed that the wartime coalition of labor and its allies of the middle class and the Negro people, which preponderated in the re-election of Roosevelt, was not a mere adjunct of a neo-Third Estate to be led by the bourgeoisie, but a social force of the new type vigorously proceeding toward independent political action, the fulfillment of an urge native to its class character. *There* was the movement of "that which is arising and developing"! But Browder's eyes, overawed by the power of the old, saw only "the stone wall of the two-party system." Instead of proceeding from the Leninist teaching that the tactic of the common front must always help to advance the positions of the working class, strengthen its independent political role, and thus enhance its political leadership, Browder proceeded from a fixation of a long-lasting, if not eternal, two-party system—the Amer-

ican way! To depart from this arrangement would mean to be regarded as "a sect which has withdrawn itself from the practical political life of the nation."

Browder's conclusion, so securely settled on the "stone wall" of the two-party structure, has, like Humpty-Dumpty, had a great fall.

The fast-moving events have greatly accelerated the trends toward labor's independent political action and have opened the prospect for a third—a labor-democratic, anti-fascist party. President Truman's rapid abandonment of the 1944 election platform of the Roosevelt-labor coalition has already resulted in an open break between the labor movement and the Federal Administration.

This was made signal in C.I.O. President Philip Murray's speech of December 4, in which he indicted the Truman Administration for having "completely ignored the grave human problems which stand unsolved" and for having "embarked upon a policy of continued appeasement of American industry in the face of its contemptuous attitude toward the American people and the government itself." It was further registered in the statement, early in December, of the important Negro weekly, the *Chicago Defender*, attacking the Truman Administration, as well as the Republican Party, for scuttling the Fair Employment Practices Committee and the Full Employment Bill.

These developments, and similar

trends among professionals, sections of farmers, and other groups, give instant confirmation of the Communist Party's correct estimate of the situation as presented in the report of Eugene Dennis to the November meeting of the National Committee, which declared:

Labor and the progressive forces must have a perspective as well as an instrumentality to realize this. The American people must have an alternative to the two-party strait-jacket; they must be in a position to have a choice in 1948 other than between a Truman and a Dewey or a Vandenberg. Labor and the people must not drift into the position of having to choose a "lesser evil" in the next presidential elections.

The struggle against Browder's revisionist position demands for its success a struggle against sectarianism. For the working class, the class struggle is a process underlying all policies it undertakes and all combinations it enters. But only an unrealistic un-Marxian estimate of the political situation in the United States could lead one to construe our correct policy of today as a simple formula of class-against-class policy.

For what is the concrete form that the class struggle assumes today in the United States?

The unfolding postwar period in the United States reveals that, notwithstanding the military defeat of the Axis, we are still in the historic period of the struggle against fas-

cism. We are in that phase of the anti-fascist struggle which has as its objective, on the domestic scene, the defeat of the camp of reaction and fascism in order to prevent its re-consolidation to beat down labor's living and working standards, crush the labor movement, and fascize America. As regards the foreign-political tasks, the struggle is to prevent the camp of reaction and fascism, whose imperialist base in the United States has been strengthened in the war relative to the general weakening of world imperialism, from thwarting the complete destruction of fascism in the defeated Axis countries, impeding the development of the democratic peoples' governments in liberated countries, and reviving anti-Soviet aggression.

Accordingly, the democratic forces of the people must be rallied to the side of labor for an intensive struggle against the monopolies, breeder of fascism. The attempt by Trotskyites and others to represent this program as a continuation of Browder's line is, of course, the sheerest demagoguery designed to undermine the struggle against fascism. The program is in sharp difference from the Browder policy of combining with the monopolists and therefore condemning the anti-monopoly struggle as serving reaction. That is why, side by side with the necessity to build the Communist Party, the party of the working class, the party of Socialism, the party that is essential to the fight against fascism and

against the monopolies, the working class faces the task of uniting all anti-fascist forces in a common front of struggle.

What the situation demands is an anti-fascist coalition broad enough in scope to include labor, farming masses, the Negro people, professionals, and small businessmen, in conjunction with the democratic forces among heterogeneous-class organizations, such as war-veterans, the youth movement, and women's groups. Such a coalition, to be truly of a labor-democratic anti-fascist character, must direct its strength to check the encroachments of the trusts against labor and all other sections of the people oppressed by monopoly capital. The logic of the development of such a coalition cannot but lead to its independent crystallization, outside the two-party system, into a third party, although every care must be taken against premature actions, either locally or, especially, on a national scale.

However, even in such a coalition class differences and conflicts do not disappear; but they are waged under the differently obtaining conditions. Not all its components will see in the coalition the same thing. Not all will be equally prepared to break with bourgeois politics.

In the labor-democratic anti-fascist coalition, the working class must be the backbone and the driving force. The words spoken by Dimitroff in 1935 that "the working class is fighting for the future of the nation" are

still true for the present day. The working class fights, not a class struggle simply, but a class struggle that is national in form; not only a struggle in defense of its interests as a class, but in defense of the true interests of the nation. This very anti-fascist struggle is, in the deeper sense, a certain transitional stage in the struggle for Socialism.

Whatever the form that will be assumed by the present projections toward a national coalition outside of the two-party system, the emergent factor is labor's growing affirmation of its will to independent political action. And, as Engels once said, speaking of the American working class: "The great thing is to get the working class to move *as a class*; that once obtained, it will soon find the right direction. . . ."

* * *

The finding of that direction is not an automatic or spontaneous process; it involves the guidance of the political leader of the class, the vanguard Party armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory, which is both critical and revolutionary, which extends the criticism of conditions within the existing class society to the principles and the program for the Socialist transformation of the society. In its vanguard, the working class brings forward the instrumentality for its own preparation, on the basis of its class experiences in successive phases of struggle, for the climactic conflict to achieve the

Soc
com
Par
the
By
the
mea
the
jecti
ism;
wor
lar
diate
work
senc
in L
appa
force
tive
Th
Atom
poten
very

Socialist objective. Thus, by its very coming into being, the Communist Party manifests the historic urge of the working class for emancipation. By never losing sight of that urge, the Communists will learn to permeate their daily activities among the masses for current and partial objectives with the teachings of Socialism; they will learn to reveal to the workers the general in the particular and the ultimate in the immediate; they will be able to guide the workers' understanding from one essence to a deeper essence, reducing, in Lenin's words, "the exterior, the apparent, to the fundamental driving forces, to the development of productive forces and the class struggle."

They will be able to say of the Atomic Age: Here are the untold potential productive forces, whose very potentialities for constructive

industrial and agricultural ends rise up in rebellion against the constricting capitalist mode of production. This means that Socialism is not some vague and fanciful aspiration that can be postponed for generations, but a goal that is historically imperative and scientifically realizable in our day, and, hence, the struggle for Socialism is inseparable from the day-to-day struggles of the masses. On Socialist foundations, our people could make of this country, land of such tremendous industrial and technological powers, truly the New World, beyond the dreams of the planters of the "American dream." America's granaries would, in the sense of plenty, truly be ever normal, her governmental powers would truly be derived from the consent of the governed, and her ways would truly be ways of peace.

THE NEW STAGE IN THE WAGE STRUGGLE

By GEORGE MORRIS

AMERICA ENTERS the new year on the crest of the greatest wage struggle in its history. The demand for an increase of \$2 a day or 30 per cent, raised by the "big three" C.I.O. unions some weeks after V-J Day, has caught on like wildfire. A majority of the C.I.O.'s membership has already been polled in strike balloting under the Smith-Connally Act, with votes for a walkout generally running from 80 to 90 percent.

The movement is not as noticeable in the A. F. of L. as in the C.I.O., mainly because the A. F. of L. as a body is giving neither leadership nor impetus to the movement other than a general statement for wage raises. But the current for wage raises is no less strong among the A. F. of L. members. Numerous locals and regional bodies of A. F. of L. affiliates are pressing for wage demands similar to those of the C.I.O. The outstanding nationwide wage movement among non-C.I.O. workers affects the 1,500,000 railroad workers, including those in the A. F. of L. (about 75 per cent of the total) and the five unaffiliated Railroad Brotherhoods. Their joint negotiations for approximately 30 per cent have

reached a deadlock and are now entering the strike-balloting and Railroad Labor Act stage.

Actual strikes, until this writing, have not reached beyond the half-million mark. The General Motors walkout is the only major one on the basic 30 per cent issue. The other strikes are over local issues, most often a result of employer provocation.

The real impact of the strike movement, unless it is headed off by some real wage concessions, may come by mid-January. The walkout of 800,000 steel workers set for January 14, and the other major industry strikes that would inevitably follow, will unquestionably climax the struggle.

At this point, the contest is principally between a few of the top corporations and labor's major unions in the basic mass production field. The rest of labor and capital appears to be waiting for the outcome of what is expected to be a general pattern for both wages and labor relations.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE STRIKE MOVEMENT?

It is interesting that the traditional reactionary howl, blaming "agitators" for stirring up a strike movement, is hardly audible today. How could such a claim sound plausible even to most gullible people in face of the overwhelming pro-strike majorities under government-supervised balloting?

John Snyder, director of War

Mobilization and Reconversion, said that return to the 40-hour work week means a cut in average wage take-home of 23 per cent. This figure checks with the Department of Commerce survey of business last September which found that average weekly earnings in manufacturing at pre-war hours would go down to \$35.60 as compared with \$46.35 in June, 1945. It takes an average increase of 30 per cent over wage rates to restore the loss of \$10.75 in the weekly pay envelope. How pressing this has become is seen from the fact that the University of California's Heller Committee's minimum health and decency standard for an average family based on wartime price levels, calls for \$57.97 a week.

With restoration of the wartime takehome, wages would still average nearly 20 per cent below the Heller Committee's standard. Propagandists of the capitalist class would have the country believe that earnings in munition-boomed industries are typical of the general picture, and that even with the drop in hours, wages are presumably still considerably higher than in 1941. But the fact is that the drop in employment and complete shutdown of plants was, in the main, precisely in those sectors of industry that have shown the highest wartime rise in wages. This resulted in more than a proportionate influence upon the general wage decline.

What the situation is in some industries to which high-paid war

workers are now returning, is indicated by wages for textile workers. The War Labor Board in its late 1944 study found that 90 per cent of the Southern and 75 per cent of the New England cotton textile workers earned less than 72 cents an hour. Even 72 cents, in terms of the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost of living index, buys today only what 57 cents bought in January 1941.

A dollar an hour seemed big in pre-war days. Now \$40 a week is equal to \$30 of pre-war purchasing power by U. S. estimates, \$27.60 by the C.I.O.'s estimate. A majority of America's working-class families have been able to maintain standards, thanks to overtime, generally eight hours for 12 hours' pay; temporary promotion to higher classification or shift to higher paying industries, and by more than one working in the family. Today, many a family finds its income cut by as much as 50 per cent, where two or three factors combined to cause the decline.

Unemployed war workers are only now beginning to exhaust their unemployment insurance credits, but already there is evidence of very heavy cashing in of war savings bonds. Redemptions of E bonds are now exceeding normal purchases. In September \$531,000,000 was cashed in, and the October total reached \$616,000,000, while the first 23 days of November, according to the U.S. Treasury Dept., showed \$410,000,000. And this is the situation, despite the continued shortage of goods for

which the public has long hungered. Automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, radios and homes were not yet available. Even ordinary clothing or furnishings that were available during the war, disappeared from the market. Manufacturers chose to take a "rest" for the remainder of 1945 because they generally held from the tax collector only 14.5 cents of every profit dollar for that period.

This is the picture that has brought disturbance in the majority of working-class homes. But that is only half of the story. Shattering before the worker's eyes is the dream of a better postwar world. The "New Bill of Rights" and 60,000,000 job horizon projected by Roosevelt expressed itself to workers and small-income people in a series of bills. Among them bills for full employment, \$25 for 26 weeks jobless insurance, 65-75 cents minimum wage, permanent fair employment practice, a vast Federal housing program, a Missouri Valley Authority, etc., etc. The worker sees all these bills either emasculated or killed. Occasional lip service for them from President Truman only brings sardonic smiles. Post-V-J Day honeyed words by Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson that "we are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 per cent better" proved to be insult added to injury.

WHY THE RISE OF MILITANCY

Just because the worker feels dis-

appointment on all sides, and is rapidly losing confidence in the Administration, his interest is concentrated in the one aspect of his postwar dream that is not subject to direct legislative action—wages. The fear of a still higher rise in prices, unemployment, and another 1929 crash haunts the workers and makes them all the more determined and aggressive in the wage fight. The worker draws conclusions from the simple test of his own experience. Secretary of Commerce Wallace's department confirms his fear graphically by revealing that already now the cut in the wage take-home is so deep that it will total \$25 billion in 1946 and the resultant cut in the national income will be even greater.

This disappointment explains the aggressiveness of the workers and their readiness to respond to a strike call. The fear that a four-year no-strike policy and arbitrary decision of labor disputes by a government agency would take the militancy and strike experience out of the working class has been definitely dissipated. Strike solidarity in almost every instance is 100 per cent. Workers report for mass picketing despite cold and rain. Even workers that have never been involved in strikes learn to put a strike machinery into operation overnight. Vigilance is at a particularly high level. Wartime experience, especially the recent disclosures of huge corporate profits and the postwar Government-financed protection assured to business, has

apparently made the worker more mistrustful of his employer than ever in the past. He is very sensitive and suspicious of maneuvers and also keeps a watchful eye upon his own union spokesmen.

Perhaps most indicative of this current of militancy and mistrust was the recent rank-and-file strike of New York longshoremen in defiance of "King" Joseph Ryan of the International Longshoremen's Assn. Dictator-run and racket-ridden for more than two decades, members of the I.L.A. were always pointed out as workers who have been terrorized into submission to a point that not a semblance of democracy was visible in the union. Nevertheless, what seems like a "small" issue—the size of sling-loads hoisted into a ship each time—proved to be sufficient to tie up the vast waterfront for three weeks, despite every conceivable strikebreaking trick of Ryan, the shipowners, Mayor La Guardia and the Federal government. The strike machinery of the Rank-and-File was a very loose one, with many of the 40-odd locals not even connected to it. Just the same, the lines held solidly.

The General Motors strike, shutting down the company's entire system of 93 plants in a score of states, gives an indication of both the union consciousness and the organized level of the workers. Although very little was visible in the way of strike machinery prior to the strike date, an efficient strike machinery sprang up

everywhere. Workers took to immediate mass picketing and a system of card checks to ensure every striker's participation was instituted.

The strike ballots of recent months, taken under government supervision, involving several million workers, including non-union workers, also showed the measure of union loyalty among the workers. They answer the often-asked question whether workers would remain by their union when war work stopped. A five to one vote for a strike, such as was given by the steel, electrical, auto and other workers, was a vote of confidence in the unions that hardly leaves room for speculation.

No less significant is the fact that those ballots were among the C.I.O.'s members and they gave pro-strike majorities that are generally much heavier than those of A. F. of L. unions.

NEED UNITED LABOR STRATEGY

Labor unfortunately has neither unity nor unified strategy in this struggle. Division has even sharpened because the controlling group in the leadership of the A.F. of L. sees the moment as offering advantages for a struggle against the C.I.O. In this their strategy is linked to the National Association of Manufacturers and other big business foes of the working class.

Even in the C.I.O., the elements of a "Big Three" unified strategy began to appear only in mid-December,

after a Pittsburgh meeting of leaders of the United Steel workers of America, United Automobile Workers, and the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers. But Murray's leadership, recognized in almost all C.I.O. affiliates, is a big unifying influence in the C.I.O. Murray's steel union, quite naturally, forms a hub of the C.I.O.'s wage fight.

Business Week for December 1 points out that for the last quarter of 1945 85.5 cents of every profit dollar that was lost to GM was really lost to the tax collector. The corporation tried to provoke the strike even earlier in the year. Its policy was one of deliberately causing grievances, letting them pile up and refusing to follow the disputes procedure provided in the contract with the union. GM President Charles E. Wilson's cynical "counteroffer" of a 45-hour week at straight time if the union would join with him in a campaign to amend the Wage-Hour Law was part of that strategy of provocation.

But, as is well known, GM's policy of provocation was only part of a general pattern of Big Business strategy. The bookkeeping of almost every large corporation shows that the maximum profit for the year that could be retained was already raked in during the first two or three quarters of 1945. The loss to the company would be almost negligible if a strike stretched through the last three months.

Responsible labor leaders were faced with quite a difficult task—to

hold off a strike showdown as late as possible and at the same time keep the confidence of the workers who have been growing very impatient and restless in the face of employer stalling and provocation. Finally, there is the big task of winning the general public to labor's side, which also needed more time for more publicized evidence of the production sit-down by Big Business.

This is the policy that Murray followed. He has carried the fight to the people and has carried the membership of his union with him in that struggle. The union has engaged a large staff of experts to dig into steel profits, taxes, prices, and productivity. Through well-documented evidence well publicized through many channels, the union showed that the steel companies could grant the 25 cents an hour raise almost entirely from 1946 savings on excess profit taxes and by elimination of overtime payments, so that their huge profits would hardly be touched and prices need not rise.

Murray's policy of putting the plain facts before the people has set a pattern for many C.I.O. unions. As a result, recent weeks turned public discussion on issues that put Big Business on the defensive. Americans now know why electrical products were not available for the Christmas season or why building materials are still not available, why a discharged veteran is unable to buy a suit, or why only some 50,000 cars were produced by the end of the year against

a scheduled output of 500,000. A great part of the American public is convinced that instead of a strike of labor being responsible it is a sitdown of capital.

Murray's policy is one of making good use of time against the employers—time that employers had hoped to use to their advantage before the high tax year of 1945 expired. This, obviously, is the reason that the steel strike was set for January—the probable month in which the electrical strike, too, will be declared.

The reluctance of employers as much as to talk to union representatives, as well as their general arrogance, made it quite clear since the first weeks after V-J Day that they hoped the major strikes would break out much earlier. It was also apparent from the start that the corporations were hungry for an opportunity to blame labor for capital's slowdown of reconversion to civilian production.

The development of a more fully coordinated C.I.O. policy in the wage fight will also greatly clarify and advance the wage fight of each of its affiliates, as well as the GM strike. Examples of avoidable mistakes have already revealed themselves in the GM strike. They are referred to here only with the view of helping to strengthen the strike and the wage fight as a whole.

The U.A.W.'s GM division has made continuance of current price ceilings a condition for agreement in its negotiations with the corporation.

It is commendable for a union to stress the importance of maintaining price ceilings, because the policy of compensating wage raises with a price increase amounts to robbing the worker of his gains. It is also important for a union to study prices from the standpoint of showing how an employer rakes in immense profits on the basis of those prices, for he obviously does it on the basis of increased productivity. Murray has handled the price issue in that correct manner. But the struggle for price control is not in negotiations with GM, but through a general struggle of labor and the people generally against those in government who would yield to GM and other like corporations.

With the union placing primary emphasis on prices in negotiations with GM, the corporation was only too pleased to take advantage of it in order to justify its sitdown on wages. The corporation utilized the issue to give the general public an impression that the union's price condition is an obstacle to a settlement.

There is, further, the "divide-the-bosses" concept. The strategy, mostly at U.A.W. vice-president Walter Reuther's inspiration, conceived of a "one-at-a-time" strike on the theory that the "Big Three" in the auto industry are in sharp competition. The net effect of such an outlook is to build illusions among the workers, but it does not divide the employers, who seldom divide when facing

labor. Murray understands that point and did not divide the steel fight.

Experience in the auto negotiations have proved the futility of basing a strategy on "employer division." Negotiations are separate for each of the "Big Three," but the union received essentially the same counter-proposal for restoration of open shop conditions, penalties upon workers for participation in "wildcat" strikes, and reduction of the number of shop stewards. Their inadequate wage offers were not far apart.

Closely related with these erroneous policies was a proposal by Richard T. Leonard of the Ford negotiations committee of the U.A.W., under which workers participating in unauthorized stoppages would be fined \$3 for each day of idleness on the first occasion and \$5 on the second. This was capitulation to company propaganda to put a label of irresponsibility upon labor. And yet, labor has always, and correctly, pointed out that the chief cause of unauthorized walkouts is company provocation, often deliberately carried out through company agents and disruptive elements within the union. To give the company the club of penalties over workers is a serious disregard of basic union principles that have been traditionally established through many years of hard struggle and experience.

It is not to be wondered, therefore, that John Bugas, the Ford Motor Company's spokesman, found praise for only this suggestion of the

union, of all that have been presented to him. Taking advantage of that opening, the company presented a counter-offer which agreed only to the penalties principle of the union but added a whole pattern of other provisions that would, in effect, render the union ineffective in Ford plants.

SUBSIDIZING A 1946 SITDOWN

There is still another and even more important reason that makes it urgent for labor to win the general public support. Big Business also has an inducement for idleness in 1946 thanks to a sitdown strike fund subsidized by the United States Treasury. The cited issue of *Business Week* points out that GM would lose only 16.5 cents of every dollar lost in a strike in 1946 thanks to the carry-back provision of the tax law. The government's guarantee of profits for two postwar years up to almost the level of pre-war profits, would assure GM of a sufficient tax kickback to compensate for months of idleness.

Thus, the weight of the company's desire to weaken the union and to prolong the hunger for consumer products so as to blackmail the government into dropping price controls, or raising ceilings would be balanced against a negligible risk in profit loss. Similarly, in the case of Chrysler. If the corporation makes its average pre-war profit of \$57,000,000 in 1946, it would retain \$35,000,000 clear, *Business Week* finds.

But, if its profits are cut to \$30,000,000, it would retain, under 1946 taxes, \$18,600,000. The tax kickback, however, would raise the profit to a total of \$30,885,000, not much below what it would clear at full capacity operation.

United States Steel, by breaking even in 1946, would receive a sum of \$67,340,000 in tax kickback. This compares to its average annual wartime profit after taxes of \$82,726,000. The same goes for all corporations. Industrialists, therefore, will be very much inclined to sit it out while workers picket.

A further consideration for the industrialists is their longer range view in the objective of crippling and smashing labor unions. With labor on the offensive now, employers may limit their immediate hopes to cutting labor's wage gains to a minimum. But they would regard concessions they are ready to give, as cheap at the price, if, in exchange, laws would be put on the statute books restricting labor unions. The employers hope at the earliest opportunity to take full advantage of such laws with a drive to take away far more than labor may be able to gain now.

The line of the industrialists, therefore, is to utilize their sitdown and deliberate policy of prolonging disputes and strikes for political blackmail against the nation. They pour out many millions for propaganda to smear labor unions as the obstacle to rapid reconversion to peacetime

production. They insist on legal restrictions upon strikes and the union shop. They demand that unions be subject to prosecution under the Anti-Trust Act. Their pet amendment to the Wagner Act would give an employer a right to call for a collective bargaining election when it is most advantageous to have one for a company union. Above all, the employers are pressing for a disputes machinery patterned after the Railway Labor Act, under which a whole chain of "cool-off" steps tie down an organization to many months of procedure until a strike may be legally permissible.

Such legislation, plus a demand for still further reduction of taxes for corporations and elimination of price controls, is the program the N.A.M. and Big Business generally are demanding in place of the progressive post-war bills before Congress. The congressional bloc of poll-taxers and Republican Tories needed no special urging to sponsor this reactionary program.

A strike today cannot be limited to an endurance contest with corporations whose profits are guaranteed by the government and whose coffers are swollen with wartime assets. It is a political struggle affecting the national interests. Labor of necessity, is forced to take its case to the people and rally a general struggle against the sabotaging policy of Big Business. Negotiations, in effect, are no longer mere bargaining "across the table." Both sides seek to

win the support of the middle class, professional, farm and small business people. Labor, of course, has the great advantage of stressing that its purchasing power is decisive for the general economy of the country.

THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

What is the government's role in this situation? Labor in recent weeks has received quite a jolt to remind it that some very significant changes have taken place in Washington. For a time after V-J Day there were some strong illusions among workers that Truman continues the Roosevelt policy. His several messages to Congress asking for passage of labor-supported bills helped very much to foster that illusion.

Results have shown, however, that those messages were little more than lip service to those bills. Warnings that the Administration's venture along an imperialist path abroad is bound to have a counterpart domestically were not taken too seriously by many labor leaders. The weeks during and since the Labor-Management conference met at Washington have gone a long way to convince the average trade unionist that this, indeed, is the development that has taken place.

In weeks of maneuvering in preparation for the Labor-Management conference and during its four weeks of deliberations, the government worked to get labor's "voluntary" agreement for a "cooling-off-fact-

finding" disputes procedure. The President was not specific in public on what he wanted, but he made that clear after the futile conference adjourned. Perhaps the most sinister part of this policy was the attempt to take advantage of the A.F. of L.-C.I.O. split.

As is known, C.I.O. President Murray declared weeks in advance of the conference that unless the fundamental issue of wages was taken up, the conference would not deal with the real cause of strikes. He further warned that limitation of discussions only to disputes procedure, would inevitably confine their scope to the points in the anti-labor Ball-Burton-Hatch Bill.

Murray and his C.I.O. associates were alone in this fight. A. F. of L. leaders even went on the radio jointly with spokesmen of the N.A.M. to state their common stand against Murray. When President Truman opened the conference he did not even mention the wage question. He did issue the warning that if the conference did not agree on a program to block strikes, legislation would be passed in Congress to do so.

When the conference got under way it soon became evident that the employers carried as their blueprint the BBH Bill, the heart of which calls for application of the Railway Labor Act procedure to all industries. The test for the conference was put by Murray when he renewed pressure on the wage issue. Refusal to deal with this problem in face of the

developing strike wave exposed the real intention of the employers. They did not want really to go into the causes of strikes. They wanted labor voluntarily to submit to handcuffs. Certainly there were no illusions among employers that any of their tricks would work. But they went through the motions of "pleading" with labor so as to be able to throw up their hands later and say in public: "See, there is no use trying to deal with them in a friendly way. Only laws will do the trick."

Despite division in labor ranks and even open association between some A.F. of L. leaders and the N.A.M. labor was united at the conference in rejection of all anti-union maneuvers. This is mainly due to the aggressive role of the C.I.O. and the sentiment among the rank-and-file of the A. F. of L. which the leaders knew was in no mood to accept restrictions.

COOL-OFF AND FACT-FINDING

When the President finally revealed his program it received general acclaim in the ranks of business and unanimous condemnation in the ranks of labor. He put forward essentially what employers had pressed for at the Labor-Management Conference. The modification in the President's proposal such as cutting the "cool-off" period to 30 days instead of the 60 in the Railway Labor Act should fool no one. The basic feature of the proposal is the proposition that labor would no longer be legally free to

prepare and call a strike when it sees fit to do so. Nineteen years of operation under the R.L.A. gives conclusive evidence that, in effect, the "cool-off fact-finding" procedure is the nearest thing to compulsory arbitration without formally being so. The cumbersome procedure at times drags through a year and longer before it is exhausted. There have been no strikes of consequence on railroads since the R.L.A. was enacted in 1926.

Restraint of labor's main weapon, the strike, has resulted in a gradual lowering of railway workers' standards as compared to those of other major industries. This is graphically shown in a recent Bureau of Labor Statistics study (*Labor Monthly*, October, 1945) showing that while weekly earnings for workers in manufacturing industries increased in 1944 to \$46.08, or 93 per cent, over 1939, the railway workers' average reached \$46.59, only 48.8 per cent over 1939. The same study shows that workers in manufacturing averaged in 1944 45.2 hours weekly, railroad workers worked an average of 48.7 hours.

In 1926 railroad workers were in the high brackets, averaging \$30.17 weekly. By 1941, they climbed to an average of only \$36.83. But workers of major manufacturing industries, much below railroad rates in 1926, climbed to \$42.34 for automobile in 1941, \$39.35 for electrical manufacturing, and to similar increases in other fields. And the railroad work-

ers are still on the basic 48-hour week.

Mr. Truman's plan does not have the unanimous support of the employers. They particularly express the fear that fact-finders may get the right to subpoena company books to determine ability to meet wage demands. But, in the main, dissatisfaction with the proposal stems from the claim that it "doesn't go far enough." This is the view of the *New York Times*, *Journal of Commerce*, *Wall St. Journal* and the N.A.M.

Whatever the differences in the ranks of the employers, the main point to remember is that the Truman proposal and the whole chain of anti-labor bills for which he now opened the gate, aim to block the progress of labor's aggressive wage struggle. They would tangle labor in a procedural maze and delay the showdown stage of the struggle. The corporations, meanwhile, would have more time to sow confusion and division in the ranks of the workers, to foment veteran-labor strife, and possibly reap some benefit from an increased unemployment.

That strikebreaking is the prime objective, was well exposed when the President, simultaneously with his message to Congress asking for anti-labor legislation, appealed to General Motors strikers to return to work, which he did without even advance consultation with the leaders of the U.A.W.

There is a great deal of liberal hairsplitting that the Truman pro-

posal is a "lesser evil" and that it would not be so harmful in the long run. But this type of reasoning overlooks the President's proposal as a tactical move to take the swing out of labor's wage fight now. It is quite apparent that the issues at stake are not confined to the companies and unions now locked in a strike battle. Since Big Business is not yielding appreciably in face of the determination and militancy the GM strikers are showing, reinforcements will have to come out very soon. The Ford and Chrysler workers will have to come out as steel, General Electric, Westinghouse and GM's electrical division are due to come out. The President's proposal would deprive labor of a right to time strikes in accordance with a winning strategy. The right to strike is meaningless without the freedom to develop a strike strategy.

CONCLUSIONS

The labor movement is unquestionably on the threshold of a big historic moment that may well affect its course for a long time to come. The outcome of the struggle in the coming weeks and months may prove equally significant for the country as a whole, for it will indicate whether the path taken will once again be the open shop path of the 'twenties or whether labor will preserve its strength and influence in the life of the country.

It is with that basic alternative in view that organized labor and its

leaders must draw conclusions today. Among those that are particularly pressing and apparent as the great struggle of 1946 blazes out, are the following:

1. Labor unity is the No. 1 urgency. All sections of the labor movement are agreed on the general wage aims. All were united in repelling the maneuvers of the employers at the Labor-Management Conference as they are in opposition to the President's "cooling-off, fact-finding" scheme. All sections are united against repressive legislation now pending and favor the whole chain of post-war measures that have been shelved by Congress. Nevertheless, division between the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. is sharper than ever. And this in face of the greatest threat labor has faced in a long time—a threat far more serious than the open shop drive of the 'twenties, for labor today has much more to lose. Defeat of labor would surely open the field to an American brand of fascism.

President Philip Murray of the C.I.O. recognizes that the country is facing a serious crisis. But the seriousness of the situation has not yet impressed itself within the A. F. of L. Unless the A. F. of L.'s membership is alarmed and aroused to the situation, its leadership will not be moved for united action with the C.I.O. and other unions.

2. Labor's fight must be brought to the people, not as one that is concerned exclusively with a worker's wage interest, but as leadership in the

general struggle of the people against the monopolists. The close relationship of the worker's pay envelope to the welfare of all other small and middle-incomed people must be strongly stressed. The sitdown of big capital must be exposed. Only such an approach reaching many millions of people will thwart the efforts of Big Business to isolate and eventually destroy labor organizations.

3. The approach of winning broad support for labor's struggle is also the key to a proper policy on the government's role in the present struggle. The nationwide protest of labor against the union-busting course that the President is now following should become the protest of all the common people. The Truman Administration must be made to realize that its continued service to Big Business is losing it the support of labor. In this respect, Murray's broadcast of the C.I.O.'s stand on the Truman anti-labor proposal was a fine example of leadership.

4. The struggle to beat the anti-labor bills now pending in Congress must not be neglected as principal attention is shifted to strike struggles. Both the strike struggle and the legislative fight are part of the same struggle. Both affect wages and working standards.

5. Labor needs a unified strategy in the wage fight. The plain fact is, and every A. F. of L. or C.I.O. leader admits it, that any major industry wage agreement has a great influence on the general wage pattern that is

shaping for the country. An agreement, at least on basic policy, in the current wage fight is absolutely necessary. An integral part of this problem is the urgency of a unified strategy in the C.I.O. itself, anchored on the fight of its major unions and able to concentrate the entire C.I.O. behind the struggle.

6. The General Motors strike was only the opening battle. The struggle must be broadened quickly if it is to continue on the asendency and if the employers are to be blocked from seizing the offensive. This means that the other divisions of the U.A.W., along with the steel and electrical unions, will soon be forced to call their strikes. At this writing (mid-December), those unions still have no other alternative and there is no GM settlement in sight.

7. The tremendous task of financing these gigantic struggles, and they need millions, demands well-planned coordination within the C.I.O., so that resources are channeled where most needed from the standpoint of

the general struggle. Moreover, a strong appeal for aid should be directed to A. F. of L. unions. The rank-and-file will respond, fully realizing that labor in both the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. has a great stake in the outcome of the struggle.

8. The workers are backing the wage fight by overwhelming majorities because the 30 per cent raise is a *must* for them. They need it to maintain the standard of living of 1941. The ability of the labor movement to hold its 13,000,000 members, maintain their loyalty to unions and expand further into unorganized fields, will be determined largely by the kind of settlement that is made. The employers know well that, not only their immediate profits, but their plans to demoralize labor and "soften" it up for an open-shop blitz, depends on holding down a wage increase to insignificance. On the other hand, it need hardly be stated that a substantial wage raise could be a great spurt to new advances for labor and the common people generally.

THE RECORD OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN CHINA

By FREDERICK V. FIELD

American foreign policy is determined at home. It is not determined by a Hurley or a Wedemeyer in China nor by a Berle in Brazil. These men may influence and temporarily divert policy, but essentially their work simply reflects the existing relationship of forces within the United States. The resignation of Ambassador Hurley came partly in response to the protest of the American people and partly from the failure of the crude methods he had employed to execute the policy of American imperialism. Hurley's departure from the scene is to be welcomed as a repudiation of his role. It does not, however, signify a repudiation of the policy of reactionary intervention.

This point can be put in another way. What we are faced with in the policy of intervention against Chinese democracy is not a mere aberration in American foreign policy. It is not an exception which can be set off from policy toward other

parts of the world. It is part of a general pattern of American imperialism's foreign policy which, while adopting different tactical approaches to different parts of the world, shows a reactionary consistency throughout. This explains the appeasement of Franco, diplomatic intervention in the Brazilian elections, financial support of an imperialist puppet for the presidency of Mexico, obstacles to free and democratic elections in the Balkans, the sudden sale of supposedly "surplus" war property in Iran to that country's anti-Soviet government, the massacre of Indonesians and Indo-Chinese by American weapons "without labels," the delicate handling of the Japanese oligarchy, the fostering of Filipino collaborationists and Falangists, the imposition of a coalition of the "Right" upon the Koreans, the obliteration of a "Lidice" in North China, and the undermining of Big Three unity and the authority of the Security Council of the United Nations.

We cannot therefore isolate our struggle against the interventionist policy in China. We must link it up with the struggle on all other fronts of foreign policy. Neither can we apply to our task the metaphor of the single broken link breaking the whole chain. We must fight for victories and welcome them when achieved. But our ability to force a change for the better in the policy toward one area, for example the Philippines, will not in itself alter the basic, imperialist nature of foreign policy. For the foreign policy of the

United States is inextricably bound with the domestic scene and cannot be separated from it. As long as the Truman Administration identifies itself with and increasingly assumes the leadership of that section of American life represented by the gigantic trusts we can achieve nothing more than temporary, tactical victories in the field of foreign relations.

In his report to the recent meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, Eugene Dennis said:

The United States emerged from this war as the strongest imperialist power in the midst of a weakened world capitalist system. Today the dominant sections of American monopoly capital aim to utilize in an imperialist way the gigantic postwar military and economic power of the United States. Despite important differences over methods, the big monopolists are united around one central objective—to achieve American world domination, to augment America's spheres of influence and trade advantages through oppressive policies toward other peoples, to buttress American and hence world capitalism. It is this which explains the main line of foreign policy of Washington since V-J Day.

THE "OLD IMPERIALISM" OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

To understand the present American policy in China and to arm ourselves with the necessary knowledge to struggle successfully against it, we must not only see its place in the broad pattern of reactionary foreign policy and its connection with in-

ternal policies, but we must also view it historically. The current armed intervention phase grows out of policies that have been evolved out of more than a hundred and fifty years of contact with China. The history of American trading relations with China is in fact coextensive with the history of the United States as an independent nation.

Three important periods of this history may be distinguished. In each, policies were formulated and designed to protect and advance the interests of an expanding American capitalism. The policies and the methods whereby the government sought to achieve them were in each of the three periods adjusted to the needs of the capitalists of the time. However, since the history of the American nation spans the era of free enterprise, the development of the internal market, the growth of monopoly and the advent of finance-capital, the policies and the tactics toward China went through corresponding transformations.

The first period to be distinguished takes us to the close of the nineteenth century. It is the period of the "old imperialism," that is, the form of expansion which capitalism took before the development of the present stage of finance-capital. The signals in those days were called by the British, who during the eighteenth century had pioneered the China market via the mercantilist British East India Company. British industrialization, speeded by profits from

India, broke the East India Company's monopoly in favor of a long period of competitive capitalist trade sponsored by England's new manufacturing class. Owen Lattimore has coined a phrase to describe the American effort in China during the nineteenth century. He calls it "hitchhiking imperialism," a phrase that has merit because it accurately relegates the American merchants to a role secondary to that of the British.

"For the American trader in China," writes T. A. Bisson (*America's Far Eastern Policy*, The Macmillan Co., 1945) "the watchword was equality of commercial opportunity, and the State Department supported him in this plan." Spelled out, this policy meant that the American capitalist demanded any and all privileges which any other foreigner enjoyed in doing business with the Chinese. The policy was legally buttressed by the famous "most-favored nation clause" which had been wrung from the Chinese by the British in 1843 and which subjected the Chinese to the principle that any privilege won from them by any foreign country accrued to the nationals of all other foreign countries.

Through this device Americans shared in all the advantages of the notorious "unequal treaties" under which China became exploited by a system of collective imperialism imposed by all the foreign imperialist powers. The standard was set by the Treaty of Nanking in 1842, following the Opium War, whereby the

British obtained: (1) a large indemnity to pay for the cost of the war which they themselves had provoked; (2) a foreign-controlled customs service and the establishment of a fixed import tariff of 5 per cent; and (3) the setting aside of "treaty ports" for the special use of foreigners and the imposition of the law of extraterritoriality whereby foreigners operated under their own legal system rather than that of China, the country where they were residing and doing business.

The United States never staked out any territorial concession of its own; but it took full advantage of those of the British, French and Russians, and it participated directly in the government of the International Settlement of Shanghai. As the junior partner of British capitalism, the United States became part of the imperialist octopus which constricted the political and economic development of the Chinese people.

AMERICAN MONOPOLY COMES OF AGE

The primary reason for America's secondary position during this period was, of course, its youth and relative weakness as an independent capitalist nation. The middle part of the nineteenth century found the country deeply absorbed in its internal affairs. There was the settlement of the West and the discovery of gold in California which attended it. And there was the Civil War

and the period of reconstruction and disillusion which followed.

The second period of American relations with China was inaugurated by the Spanish-American War. What was important in connection with America's China policy was not the acquisition of the Philippine Islands in 1898 but the fact that the motives which impelled that war and colonial conquest also caused a new adjustment in the policy toward China.

American capitalism had been changing. The decisive nature of that change became apparent in the first decade of the new century when both the Standard Oil Company and the United States Steel Corporation were founded. American monopoly capitalism was coming of age. Free enterprise gave way to monopoly capitalism, competition became transformed into imperialism, "the highest stage of capitalism." With this change came a corresponding development in the policy toward China.

A similar development had taken place in Europe. "For Europe," Lenin writes (*New Data for Lenin's "Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism,"* International Publishers, 1940, p. 38) "the time when the new capitalism definitely superseded the old can be established with fair precision: it was the beginning of the twentieth century." In tracing the history of monopolies, Lenin says (*Ibid.*, p. 39):

Thus, the principal stages in the history of monopolies are the following:

(1) 1860-70, the highest stage, the apex of development of free competition; monopoly is in the barely discernible, embryonic stage. (2) After the crisis of 1873, a wide zone of development of cartels; but they are still the exception. They are not yet durable. They are still a transitory phenomenon. (3) The boom at the end of the nineteenth century and the crisis of 1900-03. Cartels become one of the foundations of the whole of economic life. Capitalism has been transformed into imperialism.

Along with the growth of monopoly capitalism, and as a natural derivative of that growth, there had occurred during the 1890's a frenzied scramble for spheres of influence in China. That country was imminently threatened with partition into several protectorates of the foreign powers. The French were thrusting northward from Indo-China, the British sought a monopoly in the rich Yangtse Valley and inland from Hongkong and Canton. In the north, and particularly in the Manchurian provinces, Czarist Russia was pressing her claims to this redivision of Eastern Asia. The decadent Manchu Dynasty had been ignominiously defeated by the upstart imperialist power, Japan, and was in no position to protect the Chinese nation.

To American capitalists with no particular sphere of influence nor with any territorial base of their own in the Treaty Ports this partitioning of China threatened to destroy the principle of equality of commercial opportunity and to ren-

der obsolete the legal protection of the most-favored nation clause. It was under these circumstances that in 1899 and 1900 the American Secretary of State, John Hay, in two notes dispatched to foreign capitals, enunciated a new policy which thereafter became the cornerstone of all American actions toward China.

The more famous of these notes, which established the so-called "Open Door" doctrine, was nothing other than a demand for non-discriminatory treatment of American capitalists. It referred specifically to harbor dues, railroad rates, the Chinese tariff and existing treaty ports and "any vested interests." It made no demands for limiting special privileges enjoyed by the foreign powers; only that such privileges must be shared among all imperialists instead of being monopolized by any one nation. American imperialism, in other words, demanded a continuation of the system of joint or collective imperialism for the obvious reason that otherwise it would find itself out in the cold as far as the China market was concerned.

This doctrine prevailed, despite the relative weakness of American imperialism at the turn of the century, primarily because it found an ally in Britain. Its own interests threatened by the encroachments of Czarist Russia, Britain momentarily found in the American proposal a way to form an imperialist alliance which would protect its China stake. Even British imperialism was not

powerful enough to cope single-handed with the complicated rivalries over the body of China.

The corollary to the Open Door doctrine was enunciated by the American Secretary of State the following year and prevailed for the same reason. It was the doctrine of China's territorial and administrative integrity, which eventually became embodied in the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922. The policy had little to do with the actual territorial and administrative integrity of the Chinese nation; it was directed solely against any single power or group of powers that might attempt to gain privileges not accorded the others. Again, this was the doctrine of an imperialist alliance in which the fate of China was secondary. The United States had announced and succeeded in winning the point that it refused to be barred from participation in the exploitation of China.

The following decades were marked, not by harmony among the imperialist allies, but by continual struggle for advantage over the others. World War I cut Germany out of the cabal. The October Socialist Revolution which destroyed the foundations of imperialism in Russia took the Russian people out of the arrangement voluntarily. World War II has, to date, not removed Imperial Japan from the arrangement but merely reduced it to a position subordinate to that of the imperialist victors. It has also

substantially weakened the position of Britain.

A TYPICAL IMPERIALIST VENTURE

Before turning to the present and third period of American policy toward China it will be illuminating to pause for a moment to look into one of the transactions negotiated by the imperialist alliance against China during the early 1900's. A score of examples come to mind, any one of which could be used to illustrate the typical operations of capitalism at the stage of imperialism. The Reorganization Loan of 1913 will serve our purpose as well as any other of these episodes.

This was a loan negotiated between the Consortium, an international banking syndicate composed of American, British, French, German, Russian and Japanese financiers, and the corrupt and reactionary government of Yuan Shih-kai. American participants were J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn Loeb & Co., the First National Bank, and The National City Bank. After many months of dickering, an agreement was finally reached in the spring of 1913 for a loan bearing the face value of £25,000,000. These bonds were sold to purchasers on the New York, London, Paris and other markets for 90 per cent of their face value, giving the bond holders a 10 per cent profit plus the 6 per cent interest charge the bonds carried. The bankers took another 6 per cent

for their efforts in handling the transactions. At this point, therefore, the Chinese government would get a net of only 84 per cent of the amount of the loan or £21,000,000. But that was only part of the story, and the smaller part at that. For we find that the proceeds of the loan were to be used, among other things, to pay arrears on the Boxer Indemnity to foreign powers, to repay advances made by the Consortium while the Reorganization Loan was being negotiated, to pay off a previous Belgian loan and two made by the Japanese, and, finally, an item of £2,000,000 to reorganize the Salt Administration on which the whole enterprise was hypothecated. All of these items took off another £12,780,000 from the amount which the Chinese government actually got. The final figure going to China out of a loan having a face value of £25,000,000 was £8,220,000, or 33 per cent! (Cf. F. V. Field, *American Participation in the China Consortium*, University of Chicago Press, 1931.)

So much for this vignette. The history of the period was replete with similar ones.

AMERICA'S IMPERIALIST PRE-WAR STAKE IN CHINA

Statistically, the United States, just before the outbreak of World War II, had little to show for the long history of the "old" and the "new" imperialism. In the years 1931-35 China took little more than

3 per cent of America's foreign trade, 1.5 per cent of the exports, and 3.4 per cent of the imports. From China's point of view, however, the figures looked bigger; the United States indeed had become the largest trader. China's imports from the United States constituted 20 per cent of the total imports, and in certain items, like copper, tobacco, office machinery, films and aircraft, 85 to 100 per cent was coming from the United States, with petroleum and products as well as machine tools forming a large proportion of total purchases abroad. Chinese exports to the United States, predominantly hides and skins, bristles, tea, tungsten and tung oil, while small in terms of total U.S. imports, accounted for 27.6 per cent of all Chinese exports.

The American capital investment in China was also very small, only \$250,000,000 in the middle 1930's. Considering that China had a population of well over four hundred million, it is interesting to note that American capitalists had at the same period a somewhat larger capital investment in the Philippines, which had a population of about fifteen million. One quarter of the funds invested in China were in the oil business, and most of the remainder was in real estate, utilities, banks, and sales agencies located in the treaty ports. Two-thirds of the whole investment was located in Shanghai. The Americans in this respect were running a very poor

third to the British and Japanese, each of whom had about five times as much money invested in China. It is obvious from the nature of the American investment—and the same held true for the British and Japanese—that it did little to develop China's resources, to modernize her agriculture, or to develop her mass purchasing power.

Not enough attention has been paid to the character and smallness of the American stake in China. Why after decades of strenuous imperialist diplomacy did an enormous nation of over four hundred million people, a nation endowed with manifold natural resources, count for such a minute proportion of total American foreign trade? Why was the capital investment just before the outbreak of war so insignificant? It is not the purpose of this article to go deeply into the subject. It is, however, important to pose the questions, for they are relevant to current notions about the rapid development of China's post-war market under imperialist auspices.

During the war and in the months since V-J Day there have been numerous proposals put forward regarding postwar trade and investment in China looking to a speedy raising of Chinese mass purchasing power, to a rapid process of industrialization, and to the modernization of Chinese economy under the benevolent guidance of the United States. Such a program has

been strongly advocated as offering temporary relief to the crisis of capitalist production within the United States. I refer not simply to Browder's revisionism, but to the arguments of representatives of capitalism as well. Henry Wallace, for instance, while still Vice-President, wrote in the spring of 1944 (*Our Job in the Pacific*, American Council Institute of Pacific Relations, pamphlet):

Rather than invest only in the older regions of the world, it would seem wiser from the standpoint both of sound investment and of stimulation of world trade for us to look for opportunities in pioneer areas of the world where populations are growing and new resources are being discovered and developed. The two leading areas of this type are South America and Eastern Asia. There is no doubt that in Eastern Asia American investments can be made to result in such a rapid rising of the standard of living of a billion people—half the population of the world—as to unleash significant forces for the peace and prosperity, not only of America but of the world.

Asia's need after the war will be for capital and technical assistance. America's need will be to utilize fully our greatly expanded industrial capacity. Orderly and continuous progress on both sides of the Pacific will depend on success in matching up both kinds of need for the benefit of everyone concerned.

"Orderly and continuous progress" is a fine phrase and describes a condition which is sorely needed

on both sides of the Pacific. But it is a phrase descriptive of Socialism, not imperialism. Imperialism seeks to impoverish, not to raise living standards. Monopoly tends to limit the market in any given area, not to broaden it. Are we to expect the trusts to behave differently toward the Chinese masses than they do toward the workers at home? If duPont and General Motors refuse a living wage to their own factory workers, are they likely to raise the masses out of their poverty in China and Latin America? Let us remind ourselves of the passage in which Lenin said, "if capitalism did these things it would not be capitalism." In *Imperialism* (Lenin, *cited work*, p. 138-9) he wrote:

It goes without saying that if capitalism could develop agriculture, which today lags far behind industry everywhere, if it could raise the standard of living of the masses, who are everywhere still poverty stricken and underfed, in spite of the amazing advance in technical knowledge, there could be no talk of a superabundance of capital. This "argument" the petty-bourgeois critics of capitalism advance on every occasion. But if capitalism did these things it would not be capitalism; for uneven development and wretched conditions of the masses are fundamental and inevitable conditions and premises of this mode of production. . . .

Lenin was here explaining how surplus capital was produced by monopoly and why it had to seek outlets abroad where "profits are usually high, for capital is scarce,

the price of land is relatively low, wages are low, raw materials are cheap." Surely we cannot believe that imperialism in its foreign operations will behave differently toward the semi-colonial masses than it does at home!

THE PRESENT POSITION OF U. S. IMPERIALISM

We may therefore come without too much astonishment to a preliminary examination of the present and third period of American policy toward China. Imperialism acts like itself, not like its opposite, Socialism. The policy which the United States today pursues toward China is the policy of imperialism at a particular stage of its American development. What is that stage? It was described in the first sentence of the passage already quoted from Dennis' report to the National Committee: "The United States emerged from this war as the strongest imperialist power in the midst of a weakened world capitalist system."

America is no longer the "hitchhiking" imperialist power of the nineteenth century. Nor, as far as China is concerned, is it any longer in the position of having to seek alliances with its stronger rivals in order to retain the right to trade and do business. Those considerations motivated the Open Door doctrine of 1899. Today they are as obsolete as the free trade of the 1840's. American imperialism, in view of the drastically weakened position of

its main competitors brought about by the war, today seeks to monopolize the China field. Japan has been eliminated as a serious rival, Britain has been reduced to a secondary role. Thus, the imperialist situation in China has, in the course of little more than a quarter century, been reversed. The policy of American imperialists has undergone a corresponding change.

This has not yet been recorded in any new doctrine to replace equality of commercial opportunity, most-favored nation treatment, the Open Door, or the territorial and administrative integrity of China. It is being recorded in deeds of violence against the people of China and in cynical violation of the international commitments of the United Nations.

Such is the new phase of American policy toward China, the policy of the most powerful imperialist state in the world. Such are the forces which we condemn when we raise the slogans:

Stop the reactionary intervention of the U.S.A. in China's internal affairs! Repudiate Byrnes and Wedemeyer! Withdraw American troops from China! Speed demobilization and bring the boys home!

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST FORCES ARE ALSO STRONG

The foregoing analysis is intended to help us understand why the forces of American imperialism today act as they do in China. The policy

of armed intervention is not an accident; it is the culmination of a long period of imperialist development. The action slogans which we raise require that we understand the strength and nature of the foe.

In no sense, however, does this analysis mean that we should adopt a fatalistic attitude. There is nothing fixed about the present American policy of reactionary intervention. The die has not been irrevocably cast against Chinese democracy. The triumph of the most reactionary sector of American society has not been consolidated. The United Nations and the leadership of the Big Three have been injured but not put to death.

Forces exist on a world scale and in the United States, and will increase, which must take up the struggle against reaction and win it. As was stressed by Dennis in his report to the National Committee:

The reactionary offensive of American imperialism collides with the vital interests of all freedom-loving nations, while the natural and compelling common interests of the peoples of the United Nations operate in favor of those powers and forces seeking to maintain and consolidate postwar unity of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

Among the peace-loving nations there are states that have demonstrated in the stern tests of the anti-Axis war that they are able to defend their national independence and security, and to thwart the plans of any aggressor power, or powers, to dominate the world.

In America and Britain, the majority

of the people fought for peace and long for its continued maintenance. They can be mobilized for its defense and for effective opposition to all schemes for anti-Soviet adventures and a World War Number Three.

The broad masses of organized labor in the United States are not taking the present line of the Truman Administration lying down. Scientists and professionals of all types are protesting the atomic bomb foreign policy of the President and Secretary Byrnes. The great minority groups, particularly the Negro and Jewish people, are becoming increasingly aware of the threats which today face American democracy. In addition, there are those sections of the bourgeoisie who, in the interests of American imperialism, are apprehensive of the possible consequences of the Administration's "atomic" policy and the undermining of American-Soviet collaboration. These bourgeois circles, in that they represent an impeding factor with regard to the government's current reactionary offensive, constitute an element that objectively and indirectly aids the fight of the people's forces for peace and democracy.

Imperialism, moreover, benefits only the top crust of finance-capital. The small and middle business man has everything to lose by a continuation of the present policies. China is a good example. The imperative needs of the American economy include, not only a rising stand-

ard of living based on higher real wages at home, but also the development of the world market. Before the war the entire American trade with the Far East, including India, came to approximately one billion dollars a year. That amounts to one dollar's worth of trade per inhabitant in the Far East. Our trade with Canada, in contrast, amounted to about \$70 per Canadian. The beneficial effects upon the American economy of raising the per capita trade with the Far East to even one-tenth of that with Canada would be so great as to stagger the imagination. Policies designed to bring about such conditions are precisely what all Americans, except the imperialist minority, need.

Large reciprocal trading relationships between the United States and China can be established only if the Chinese standard of living and therefore purchasing power is rapidly raised. And these objectives can be achieved only through a united, democratic Chinese nation which rids itself of feudalism and imperialist domination. That is the program of the Chinese Communist Party and of all other democratic groups in China. It is the program against which the feudal pro-fascist dictatorship of the Kuomintang under Chiang Kai-shek has set itself—with the armed assistance of American imperialism.

The nature of the struggle must be clearly seen. Let no one for a moment believe that it is the "logic"

of American imperialism to develop China's economy, or that our industrial and financial leaders can be "counted on" to lead the world toward an expanding economy. On the contrary, the policy of American imperialism is to preserve Japanese reaction and to destroy Chinese democracy. Such forces must be fought, not appeased.

We may conclude, therefore, by saying that in order to defeat the present policy of the Truman Administration toward China it is necessary for the American people to mobilize the maximum forces of democracy at home for common struggle with all our allies abroad, in China, in the colonies, in the Soviet Union, and among the democratic forces throughout the capitalist world. The goal of the American people is to preserve and strengthen the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition as the indispensable leadership of the United Nations for the promotion of world peace. This is a goal that cannot be achieved until the present stranglehold of the most reactionary sector of American capitalism over the foreign policy of the United States has been broken. But it is a goal that can and must be achieved through extending and strengthening the anti-fascist labor-democratic coalition.

We are faced with an immense task which will require all of our wits and all of our energy. Let us set our sights to save the peace!

PARTY POLICY IN THE VETERANS' FIELD

By ROBERT THOMPSON

CORRECT PARTY POLICY in relation to veterans requires a correct estimate of the role which it is possible for veterans to play in impending economic and political struggles.

The 14-odd million Americans who have served in various branches of the armed forces during the war are not a homogeneous class force. They are a fairly scientifically arrived-at cross-section of all class, national and regional groupings within their age level, and especially of the male population. Service in the armed forces during time of war has subjected this body to a set of common circumstances and experiences not shared in most respects by other sections of the population. This distinct community of war-time circumstances and experiences has not, however, been of such a nature as to obliterate class and other divisions. Nor has it been of such a nature as to make of the veteran some one who stands apart from, or above, class and other divisions.

A correct starting point, therefore, for evaluating the potential role of veterans in the political life of the country is the fact that they are a non-homogeneous, mixed, group-

ing of various forces and in particular of class forces. From this it follows that the veterans of this war cannot, any more than the veterans of the last war, play an independent role within the country. To the extent that they play a distinct role as veterans on issues of general importance to the country it will be as allies of one or the other major class force.

A correct estimate of the potential role of the veterans of this war can be arrived at, therefore, only by rejecting and fighting against the liberal middle-class, and Social Democratic, concept that the veterans are an independent force, which must be encouraged to stand aloof from the class struggle.*

In order for our Party to have a correct estimate of the role which it is possible for veterans to play, it is necessary to reject and fight against other wrong conceptions. Two such conceptions in particular are very widespread and especially harmful.

One of these tends to ignore completely the fact that in many important respects the veterans of this war are a distinct political grouping and force. It regards the veteran only and purely as a worker, a farmer, a professional, a student, a Negro, a Jew, etc. It leaves out of account the fact that the entire body of veterans, especially the decisive section of veterans (*i.e.*, the several millions who have engaged in actual physical combat against the Axis

* This viewpoint is elaborated in Charles Bolte's recent book, *The New Veteran*.

forces in co-ordination with our Allies, and especially the Red Army), have undergone a distinct experience which leaves a deep and lasting imprint on their attitudes and thinking. It disregards the fact that all veterans are confronted with a common difficulty not shared in the same way by other sections of the population, namely, re-integration into the economic, political and social life of the country. This poses for them a host of special problems, among which are pensions, jobs, resumption of education, housing, bonuses, and other matters of legislation, etc. It leaves out of account the fact that irrespective of anyone's desires, the most powerful veterans' movement this country has ever experienced is already in the process of shaping up.

This viewpoint, which ignores or belittles the special characteristics and problems of the veterans of this war, is responsible for many grave shortcomings in organized labor's activity in the field of veterans' affairs. It is at the root of much of labor's slowness aggressively to champion and initiate struggles in behalf of the special interests and needs of veterans. It explains in large measure the aloofness and lack of concern of major sections of the labor movement, even of many Left-led unions, with respect to the organizations of veterans.

The second and even more harmful conception prevalent in the labor movement is one that looks upon

the veteran as a natural ally of reaction. In part this attitude stems from the labor movement's bitter experiences after the last war with the Legion and other veterans' groups. In part, further, it arises from a pacifist viewpoint that regards all wars and all armies as breeding grounds for reaction. In the last analysis it is an attitude of surrendering in advance the bulk of the veterans of this war to reaction.

Are these reactionary forces, trends and moods operating among the veterans? Of course they are. Is there a danger that reactionary and pro-fascist circles may establish a powerful base among veterans? Of course, there is. These facts are indisputable, yet are not the real question. The real question is: "*Can the overwhelming majority of the veterans of this war be won for a policy of struggle against the foreign and domestic program of monopoly capital?*" Or, to put the same question in another way: "*Can the majority of veterans be won for a policy of joint struggle with the labor movement, for a policy of alliance with the labor movement?*"

Three factors are of key importance in answering this question. First, the needs which the veterans feel most strongly and for which they will fight most militantly necessitate a struggle against the postwar program of monopoly capital and are of such a nature as can find most consistent and powerful support from the ranks of labor. This is true with respect

to the struggle for a durable peace; with respect to jobs, housing, wage and living standards; with respect to the struggle for equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro veterans, and against anti-Semitism; with respect to most basic matters of legislation in veterans' interests; and so on down the line. Second: The general conditions under which this war has been fought, the fact that it has been fought *against* fascist States and armies, *in alliance with* the Soviet Union and the Red Army, in addition to such factors as the win-the-war role played by labor on the production and political fronts, has generated vastly more favorable and progressive attitudes among the veterans than was the case following the last war. Third: the labor movement has a far greater capacity to exert influence and leadership over the veterans than was the case after the last war. Organizationally the trade unions are in a vastly stronger position, having organized the basic mass production industries and extended their ranks to over 13 million members ($3\frac{1}{2}$ millions of whom are veterans of this war). Politically, the working class is substantially more mature and alert, has gone through great struggles since 1918, and has produced its own political party—the Communist Party.

The leaders of the labor movement do not need to be, and cannot afford to be, afraid of the veterans of this war. The trade unions, for example, cannot afford to be manuev-

ered into a position where to millions of not fully informed servicemen they appear to be defending themselves *against* the veterans—as was the case on the issue of job seniority. In their overwhelming majority the veterans of this war can be won for a policy of joint struggle with the labor movement and under its leadership against the program of monopoly capital. It is this estimate which must form the basis for the program and the tactics of the labor movement in relation to veterans.

LABOR AS THE CHAMPION OF THE VETERANS' INTERESTS

The various wrong conceptions prevalent in the labor movement regarding the role which it is possible for veterans to play in impending struggles find expression within the ranks of our Party. The fact that this is so, retards the working out of clear-cut Party policy in the veterans' field and hampers the Party's mass work in this field. It is therefore necessary that our Party carry through a struggle within its own ranks to overcome these wrong conceptions. Further, it is necessary that our Party play an aggressive and effective role in arming the labor movement with a correct estimate of the potential role of the veterans of this war in American political life, thereby making a most important contribution to the struggle to achieve and consolidate a stable labor-veteran alliance.

The first and most important aspect of the fight to achieve the labor-veteran alliance is the initiative and leadership which organized labor displays in the fight for the demands of the veterans. The most urgent need of the moment is for a campaign of national proportions in which organized labor plays an initiating and leading part on a number of issues affecting veterans and servicemen. Most important among such issues are the following:

The campaign for rapid demobilization and for a halt to American armed intervention in China. Our Party's national campaign on these issues, the N.M.U.'s splendid 24-hour work stoppage demonstration, the highly effective actions of the I.L.W.U. on the west coast, the activities of a number of C.I.O. Councils such as in New York City, have broken the ice on this issue and have already had a marked effect on attitudes in the armed forces and among veterans toward the labor movement. This campaign must not be allowed to peter out or lag. The beginnings that have been made must be utilized to galvanize into action still broader sections of the labor and progressive movement. Broader and more effective forms of struggle must be developed. The campaign must be extended and deepened in the direction of becoming a frontal assault all down the line on the part of the democratic coalition against the course being pursued by the Truman Administration in world affairs.

The fight to establish fully the role played by Negro servicemen in the war against the Axis powers and to win for the Negro veteran full equality of status and opportunity. The Negro servicemen played a part in the war against fascism comparable only to his contribution to the cause of democracy and social progress in the American Civil War. As was the case after the Civil War, the record of the Negro people and in particular the Negro soldier in this war constitute a solid basis for a new upsurge and new sweeping gains in the struggle for Negro rights. Highly aware of this, monopoly capital, especially its spokesmen and slaveowner-minded allies of the South, are attempting to belittle and slander the role of the Negro servicemen. Organized labor, and in the first place our Party, as a foremost democratic task, must undertake the responsibility of refuting all slanders regarding the war role of the Negro soldier and must bring to all sections of the American people a true understanding of that role.

Further issues upon which the labor movement must move into action on behalf of the Negro veterans are the following:

1. To block discrimination against Negro workers in plants where layoffs occur; to ensure that in all branches of industry and plants where new hiring is taking place a just proportion of Negro workers and veterans are hired; to maintain all war-time gains and secure new

advances in the placement of Negro workers and veterans on skilled and semi-skilled jobs; to secure the passage of permanent F.E.P.C. legislation.

2. To break down Jim Crow bars in a host of unions, especially A. F. of L. craft unions, where they still exist; to eliminate discriminatory practices in veteran and all other organizations.

3. To secure full equality for Negro veterans in the application of all veteran legislation.

4. To secure the addition of Negro personnel in all levels of the Veterans Administration.

Housing for veterans. The lack of any semblance of adequate housing for returning veterans is becoming the number one national scandal. Here, among the demands which the labor movement must project are the following:

1. The utilization of all existing army and navy facilities for veterans; these are very extensive in the major cities. (Hotels and apartments requisitioned by the armed services during the war.)

2. The use of prefabricated housing as an emergency means of meeting the crisis.

3. The requisitioning of mansions of the rich which stand vacant for many months of the year.

4. The development in each locality of movements for Federal, state and municipal long range housing projects.

5. The elimination of all restrictive covenants that would impair the

principle of equality in the allotment of housing to Negro veterans on the basis of their needs.

Veterans' legislation. This should center around two issues:

1. The fight for enactment of bonus legislation along the lines of H.R. 127 introduced by Representative Lesinski.

2. An omnibus amendment to the G.I. Bill of Rights including such provisions as: the substance of the Murray Full Employment Bill; the granting of veterans' loans by Government agencies at 2 per cent interest; a 50 per cent raise in educational allotments; immediate and substantial increase of Veterans Administration facilities.

Disabled Veterans. Among the most important issues here are the following: increase of the base pension rate for full disability from \$115 to \$150 per month; waiving of questions of seniority with respect to the placement of seriously disabled veterans on jobs; preventing management from confining disabled veterans to such jobs as janitors and time keepers and securing of equal pay for disabled veterans.

LABOR AND THE ORGANIZATIONS OF VETERANS

In addition to developing its initiative and leading role in the struggle for veterans' demands, the labor movement must move aggressively in the direction of extending its base

and influence in veterans' organizations and movements.

A first prerequisite for this is the solid and effective organization of veterans within the trade unions themselves. This requires among other things the extending and improving of a number of special organizational forms, such as veteran's committees in locals and C.I.O. and A. F. of L. central bodies, veterans' departments and full-time directors in Internationals, etc. It requires the developing of a wide variety of special veterans' activities by unions directly in connection with strikes, picketing, demonstrations, the housing crisis, legislation, political campaigns, etc.

It also requires that labor should not abandon to its enemies the field of initiative and direction in the organizing of veterans into veterans' organizations. Above all, the three and a half million veterans who are members of trade unions must be brought into and activated in the veterans' movement. G.M. and U.S. Steel won't do this job. Labor must.

In developing its policies in relation to veterans' organization the labor movement must set itself the objective of influencing the mass of the veterans; it must set itself the objective of preventing any considerable section of veterans from falling under the domination of reactionary and pro-fascist leadership.

Up to the present the overwhelming majority of the veterans who are joining any veterans' organizations

are joining the major established veterans' organizations. Two of these organizations alone, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, already include in their ranks 1,300,000 veterans of this war. Present trends indicate a continued rapid growth of these two organizations, as well as of other established organizations, such as the Jewish War Veterans, Disabled War Veterans, etc.

It would be suicide for labor to isolate itself from this mass of veterans. Within these organizations, especially within the Legion and V.F.W., there is a developing opposition to the reactionary policies of the present leadership. This opposition stems from three main sources, the newly organized veterans of this war who want to move these organizations into struggle for their demands, the labor posts of the Legion, and Negro veterans within these organizations. Were the most militant and advanced elements of labor to isolate themselves from these organizations, this developing opposition would be doomed to impotence.

In addition to the established veterans' organizations, a number of new organizations have sprung up. In most cases the membership of these groups is very small and in no instance does it run as high as ten thousand. At least 50 per cent of these new veterans' groupings have been organized by Coughlinites and other similar forces and have open

pro-fascist characteristics. It is probable that there will be a move toward the merging of these groupings into one or two more or less open pro-fascist organizations in the near future. In certain of the other new groupings progressive forces are building veterans' organizations. In some, as in the American Veterans Committee, Social-Democratic elements are a strong factor.

In relation to the fascist-inspired veterans groupings, it is clear that labor must attack and fight them. In relation to all new veterans' groups of a progressive character it is necessary that labor should ensure that it is not isolated from them. Labor should participate in and extend its cooperation to all progressive organizations and movements among veterans.

The organization of the mass of Negro veterans presents a special problem of major proportions to the labor movement. It is clear that in addition to the struggle for full equality of Negro veterans within all veterans' organizations, note must be taken of the currents among Negro veterans to form distinctly Negro veterans' organizations, which bid fair to become national in scope. Such special forms of organization must be developed and supported to ensure the organization of the mass of Negro veterans.

In order to establish its initiative and leadership in the field of veterans' organizations, the labor movement must undertake measures

which bear some relationship to the magnitude of the problem. The organization of three and a half million trade union veterans and the assumption of organizational initiative among 14 million veterans in the general field of veterans' organizations, are a matter at least roughly equivalent to the organization of a major mass production industry and demands organizational measures, personnel, and resources of corresponding proportions. Only by approaching the problem in this spirit will labor be able successfully to contest Big Business' drive to establish its leadership over the veterans of this war.

SOME PROBLEMS OF INTEGRATION OF VETERANS INTO OUR PARTY

In addition to its responsibilities of initiative and leadership in the developing of struggle for the immediate interests of veterans, our Party has the fundamental responsibility of developing work especially among working-class veterans along lines which will deepen their loyalty to the working class, heighten their class consciousness, and impart to them Marxist theory and a socialist perspective. New thousands of the most militant and advanced returning veterans must be rapidly recruited into the ranks of our Party. In order for our Party to successfully meet this and our other tasks in the veterans' field, a number of immediate political and organizational problems

in connection with our returning Party and YCL veterans must be effectively tackled.

Among the most important and immediate measures which must be undertaken are the following:

1. In connection with the current annual re-registration of our Party members, it is estimated that nearly 30 percent of our 15,000 Party and YCL members who entered the armed forces are back in civilian life. From reports to date, it is clear that a large percentage of these already discharged Party and YCL veterans, are not being reached in the re-registration drive. It is necessary that every Party organization which has not already done so, compile a full list of members, including former YCL members, who left for the armed forces and a list of every one so far discharged. Special veterans' re-registration committees, in which Party veterans should play a prominent part, must be set up wherever necessary to concentrate on securing the re-registration of every single returned Party and former YCL members.

2. Every State organization of our Party, on a District scale and in most cases on City, County and Club levels, must develop functioning veterans' committees to give specialized and detailed attention to all phases of Party veterans' activities.

3. Educational work at all levels in our Party must be geared to meet the special requirements of our returning veterans.

4. Returning veterans must be rapidly integrated into all levels of Party leadership. In this connection, it is necessary to take note of the fact that among a small proportion of our returning veterans, including a few former leading Party actives, there exist attitudes of reluctance to accept quickly Party responsibilities. In these cases, because such comrades have been for a considerable period detached from the life and problems of the Party, very often underlying such attitudes are doubts about the correctness of the Party's change of line, underestimation of the Party's role, underestimation of the urgency of problems confronting our Party and the labor movement. Extreme patience, coupled with firmness, must be the rule in these instances. Under no circumstances, however, must such attitudes be catered to or justified. Especially harmful in this connection is a feeling on the part of some comrades that our members who have seen active service deserve, after discharge, a more or less prolonged period free from Party responsibility (i.e., a period longer than a few weeks or months for purposes of rest). Except in cases where health is involved, such feelings are groundless. Service during the war in Spain, or in the Red Army, or in the armies of resistance in Europe, is in no instance regarded anywhere as entitling a Communist to a vacation from Party responsibility. Our comrades who are veterans have a special responsibility for putting a quick end to such attitudes in our Party.

HOW SHALL WE FIGHT FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT?

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

It WILL NOT successfully be denied that up to date the monopolistic free enterprisers have had pretty nearly everything their own way in the vital and crucial business of reconversion from a war to a peacetime economy. We may pick any one of the basic elements that went into reconversion—the terms of liquidating war contracts with the government, removal of production controls, taxation, insurance of profits in the postwar period, wages, virtual non-intervention of the government in the processes of reconversion, and even in the matter of price controls—and what do we find?

We find that in all of these basic elements of reconversion, with the partial exception of price controls, the monopolistic free and private enterprisers have in fact had their own way up to the time of this writing. Certainly, one cannot take seriously the claim of the monopolists and their servants that the “fear” of government intervention has interfered with reconversion, or that labor strikes have done it. For the facts are as follows:

Government intervention up to date has all been in favor of the monopolies. The so-called “fearful” proposals of the Truman Administration, such as the unemployment compensation, full employment and social security measures, are still in the legislative mill, being sabotaged, emasculated and destroyed bit by bit. To the extent, therefore, that these developments have had an effect on the reconversion processes, that effect must have been highly encouraging and reassuring to the free enterprisers in the big corporations, instead of depressing and paralyzing, as the advocates of the monopolies would have us believe.

Even more revealing and significant is the fact that the *technical* business of reconversion has been going on at full speed. President Truman's statement of November 29 on reconversion says flatly that “The job of reconverting our plants from war to peace is virtually completed.” Then why have we not full production and employment? What is holding it up? It certainly is not the lack of markets, for it is generally agreed that there is now more purchasing power than there are goods. Then why do not the industrialists produce the goods, since their plants are ready technically to do so and the market is waiting for them?

As to the myth spread by the monopolies about labor strikes interfering with production, it suffices merely to point to the following two facts: Firstly, up until December, 1945, not a single important strike took

place, though large wage movements have been and are afoot in most industries, as well as preparations for strikes. Secondly, the only major strike to take place up until the middle of December has been the auto strike in General Motors. How, therefore, could strikes be responsible for the lack of full production and employment? Besides, as was pointed out by Philip Murray in his historic address on December 5: "people are not getting radios, washing machines, children's underclothing and other much needed goods. Why? It cannot be because of strikes because there are no strikes in these industries."

We shall see in a moment why the monopolies are sabotaging production, why some of them simply refuse to proceed full speed ahead with the making of goods while others do produce but are holding their products off the markets. At this point we must hold on to the fundamental fact that the monopolies had things virtually all their own way in the matter of reconversion and that *the technical* processes of reconversion have been carried out rapidly and successfully. This being the case, how about *the economic and human phases of reconversion?*

More specifically: What is happening to the production of goods? What is happening with the national income generally and with the income of the basic mass of the nation's consumers—the working population of the country? What is happening

to employment—the basic indicator of the nation's economic health—and to wages, the income of labor? What is happening to our war veterans, the demobilized servicemen and servicewomen, in the matter of jobs, housing, income?

The production and distribution of goods has been delayed or held off by the monopolies for two reasons. They were waiting for the repeal of the excess profits tax to take effect on January 1, 1946, so that instead of paying a maximum tax of 85½ per cent, they would be paying 38 per cent. The government has obligingly provided them with this kind of tax law. And they are also waiting for higher prices.

Hence, the first major fact in the economics of reconversion is that the monopolies have been sabotaging the production and distribution of goods, to the serious detriment of the nation, because they wanted higher and larger profits.

What about employment? President Truman asserts in his statement of November 29, 1945, that "Total employment has now returned to the V-J Day level." The facts do not sustain this assertion. According to the reports of the Bureau of the Census, employment between mid-August and mid-October has declined from 53,520,000 to 51,860,000, a drop in employment of 1,660,000 (New York *Herald Tribune*, Nov. 30). This is what happened to employment. But in order to determine what has happened to unemploy-

ment, we must add the number of demobilized servicemen and women during the same period. Here we find, according to the President's statement on reconversion, that during the first 100 days of reconversion, "3,500,000 men and women have been demobilized." And these two figures combined give us an approximate picture of present-day unemployment. *It is over five million.*

One must always keep in mind the peculiarity of the present situation, where the growth of employment goes hand in hand with the growth of unemployment, because reconversion and demobilization are proceeding at the same time.

As to the income of labor and of the working population in general, Henry Wallace signalled the coming danger months ago. In September, 1945, he warned of a coming drop in the payments to individuals of eight billion dollars by the end of 1945. But the reality has turned out much worse than that. In his already quoted address of December 5, President Murray of the C.I.O. declares, on the basis of official government figures, "that since V-J Day approximately 25 billion dollars on an annual basis has been extracted from the pay envelopes of wage earners through wage cuts and unemployment." Further, "wage earners through reduced working time, downgrading to inferior jobs, have suffered direct pay cuts ranging from a minimum of 23 per cent to as much as 50 per cent."

This is what our war veterans find when they come home: an almost catastrophic drop in the income of the working population, drastic wage cuts, mounting unemployment, an unbelievable housing crisis, retarded production and distribution of goods, and totally inadequate provisions for the compensation and rehabilitation of the discharged servicemen and women.

These are the facts of reconversion, *of the economic and human side of reconversion*, as distinct from the technical side. And whose doing is it? It is the doing of the monopolist free enterprisers. It is in a sense a "victory" for the very institution of monopolistic private enterprise, but a very costly victory for the people.

Can it be said that these dangers have not been foreseen? No, that would not be true. For already in the summer and fall of 1944, the labor and progressive forces in the country had projected ideas and proposals for an orderly and planned transition from a war to a peace economy with special reference to its *economic and human side*, i.e., the part dealing with the assurance of full production and employment and providing relatively adequate compensation for the so-called reconversion unemployed as well as for the demobilized war veterans.

Most of these proposals, it will be recalled, became incorporated in draft legislation presented to Congress through the Kilgore-Celler

Bill. That was before the last presidential election. The outcome was that the majorities in both Houses rejected this legislation on the ground that it interfered with "free, private enterprise." The monopolies had their way, despite the demands of the labor and progressive win-the-war coalition supported by the late President Roosevelt and his Administration.

The problems of the economic and human side of reconversion, embodied in a policy of full production and employment, became a major issue in the last presidential election. President Roosevelt had made them a major issue—these and the winning of the war. Henry Wallace, then Vice-President, had paid major attention in his campaigning for Roosevelt and Truman to the human and economic sides of reconversion, popularizing Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights and the slogan of "60 million jobs."

Roosevelt was re-elected. Thus, the people had given the government a *mandate* to protect the nation's economic and human interests of reconversion against the rapacities and exploitation of the monopolistic free enterprisers. The majority of the American people gave the new Administration of Roosevelt and Truman a directive to work and fight for full production and employment, for sixty million jobs, and for all the improvement in the living standards and economic security of our people that this slogan symbolizes.

Harry Truman, now President, received this directive from the American people in the fall of 1944.

What happened since? President Truman did submit to Congress a set of recommendations along the lines of the people's mandate, and bills were framed to give them effect. Among these bills are such measures as the Full Employment Bill, the Fair Labor Standard Act, the Unemployment Compensation Bill, legislation for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee, for a broad housing program, for liberalizing veterans' compensations, for regional development of natural resources. President Truman made a few addresses in defense of these measures.

But monopolistic free enterprise said in effect: "Nothing doing. All these measures, including the business of full employment, are nothing but planning and socialism and, hence, incompatible with our system of free enterprise." Thus, the monopolistic free enterprisers have virtually declared that the protection of the nation's economic and human needs of reconversion was incompatible with their system and the practices of monopoly domination. The majority of Congress took the hint. So apparently did President Truman. The result is no legislation to protect the economic and human needs of the nation in the reconversion from a war to a peace economy.

Monopolistic free enterprise has

had its way again, despite the mandate of the people in the last presidential elections.

In the light of these developments, the appearance of Henry Wallace's book, *Sixty Million Jobs** was naturally much more than just the publication of a book, even though an important one. It was a significant political and social event, pregnant with serious consequences. Here, one of the closest collaborators, if not *the* closest, of the late President, undertakes to present and carry forward one of the three major objectives of the Roosevelt Administration—jobs and economic security—the other two being democracy and peace. In doing so, Wallace gives expression to one of the dearest wishes of the masses of the American people, especially of the war veterans. He gives expression to the demand for jobs and security which is one of the most dynamic forces in present-day American life. But he also gives expression to many popular illusions, creating and perpetuating a few of his own.

These we shall discuss, but only from the standpoint of how best to promote the struggle of the American people for full employment and production, only from the standpoint of how best to realize the employment objectives of Henry Wallace's own book.

Wallace's thesis, briefly stated, is as follows:

* Henry A. Wallace, *Sixty Million Jobs*. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1945; 85 pp., \$1.

Our goal must be "full employment with a 200-billion-dollar national production." This may mean 59 million jobs or 61 million. "However, I think we should keep sixty million jobs as the symbol, if not the arithmetically exact synonym, of the full employment we *can* have—the full employment we *must* have to safeguard our unlimited future as a free people against the enemies of our freedom in our own homeland" (page 1). This goal can be realized "without a planned economy" and within the limits of the capitalist system and by keeping "free enterprise free." The role of the government should be that of supervisor and stimulator in the task of realizing full employment, but the job itself must be done by "private enterprise."

As to the so-called mechanics of the Wallace program, this he states as follows:

The people should direct the government to prepare a national budget . . . covering everything that would be bought and consumed each year by all segments of the nation. . . . To provide for prompt action for situations where this national budget showed that the national market was not going to be big enough to keep people fully employed, the government should be directed to prepare a program that would promote the maximum of private expenditure and the minimum of government expenditure to produce the necessary total national production. For situations where

the national budget showed too much was going to be spent and there was danger of inflation, the government should be directed to take steps to hold down expenditures in line with potentially available supplies of goods and services (pages 58-59).

He summarizes the entire program by a statement of "ten points of essential action" which provide for "responsibility of government" to prepare and keep a current accounting of the nation's budget, as stated above, for "reducing taxes" in a manner "to stimulate private initiative," for "maintaining take-home pay" and "raising minimum wages," for "maintaining farm prices," for "promoting resource development by the use of Federal investment," for "elimination of trade barriers," for "providing a housing program," for "extending social security and health insurance," for "promoting educational equality by Federal grants-in-aid," for "guaranteeing security at home and abroad" (page 83).

The strength and power of this program lie in the demand for full production and full employment. This power is derived from the fact that "the American people will never be satisfied if we produce less and consume less than our possibilities. From now on, the people will ask: are we living up to our possibilities? Are we using all our resources, manpower and knowledge? Are we working as hard to increase the standard of living of our own people as we did to destroy the cruel might

of the master racist aggressors?" (page 7). It is from this attitude of the masses of the American people, to which Wallace's book gives expression, that the demand for full employment will continue to derive its tremendous dynamic possibilities for social progress and economic security. But as already noted, Wallace's book gives expression to many illusions which, if not dissipated, will hamper the struggle of the masses for full employment and sixty million jobs. It is, first of all, the general illusion that permanent and stable full employment can be maintained without a planned economy on a socialist basis, and, secondly, a number of specific illusions with regard to the concrete way in which the struggle for sixty million jobs will have to be waged, economically and politically.

Consequently, we shall have to try to dissipate the illusion, first, that it is possible to win the fight for sixty million jobs merely by persuading the monopolies that this is a desirable and profitable national objective; second, that this objective can be realized without widespread government intervention under democratic control; third, that we can have sixty million jobs without a basic rise in the standard of living of our people; fourth, that we can win the fight for full production and employment without the emergence of a labor-democratic-anti-fascist coalition sufficiently strong to check and defeat the reactionary imperialist of-

fensive of the monopolies both in foreign and domestic policies.

These illusions must be dissipated; and they will be dissipated in the very course of the struggle of the people, headed by labor, for full employment and production. Henry Wallace is destined to play a great role in this struggle, if he can shed his illusions, if he can see his way to becoming an active and leading factor in the developing struggles of our people against the rapacities and arrogance of the monopolistic free enterprisers, if he enters in time the leadership of the people's fight against the Truman Administration and for an American government policy of jobs, security, democracy and peace, in accord with the people's mandate in the presidential elections of 1944 and in accord with the true democratic side of the traditions of the late President Roosevelt.

MONOPOLY POLICIES STAND IN THE WAY OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

If the monopolies should continue to have their way, the outlook would be bad indeed, that is, the outlook for the people.

Forecasts have been made by authoritative government research agencies which deserve the closest attention. We refer particularly to the recent report of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion (O.W.M.R.). What is striking in

that report is the following: it forecasts for 1946 a tremendous rise in profits for manufacturing industries—a rise of \$6,300,000,000 after payment of taxes—*accompanied by* a “decline in earnings for the average worker,” together with “unemployment and a total loss of earnings for about 8,000,000 persons,” the national output dropping “from a wartime rate of \$206,000,000,000 to \$165,000,000,000 or somewhat less” (*New York Times*, October 25, 1945).

The same study, it will be recalled, demonstrated the fact that the capitalists are able to give the workers a 24 per cent increase in average wage rates without raising prices because the wage increase would be offset “by the dropping of overtime payments, ‘upgraded wages’ and the excess profits tax” (*Ibid*).

In other words, we can have, according to this forecast, unprecedentedly good business for the monopolies in 1946 (a rise of net profits of over six billion dollars) *together with* 8 million unemployed and a 30 per cent drop in the income of the employed workers. And these are no idle forecasts. They will surely come true, if the monopolistic free enterprisers have things their own way.

Why is this so? The answer lies in the very nature of monopoly capitalism—the economic base of imperialism—which restricts production, hampers economic and technical progress, intensifies all forms of exploitation and oppression. The answer also lies in some special circum-

stances of the present situation, namely: the tremendous increase in labor productivity in the last several years, which—under capitalism—increases correspondingly the reserve army of unemployed; and the recently enacted tax laws which virtually insure high corporation profits for the next two years at the expense of the mass of the taxpayers. It is because of these considerations that it is possible to forecast a development resulting in *mounting profits and mounting unemployment at the same time*. In fact, this is taking place *at this very moment*.

It is in the very nature of monopoly to live by high prices—monopoly prices—and restricted production. Speaking in February, 1944, before a win-the-war rally in Los Angeles, the then Vice-President, Henry Wallace, gave the following almost classical description of monopolistic free enterprise. He said:

By free enterprise this type of big business means freedom of freebooters. By free enterprise this type of big business means the privilege of charging monopoly prices without interference by the government; the privilege of putting competitors out of business by unfair methods of competition; the privilege of buying up patents and keeping them out of use; the privilege of setting up Pittsburgh-plus price fixing schemes; the privilege of unloading stocks and bonds on the public through insiders who know their way in and out, up and down, backwards and sideways (New York Times, February 5, 1945).

This was truly a great speech, one of the greatest of our time, against monopoly. It was made at a time when under the influence of Browder revisionism, which we later condemned and rejected, Communists were inclined to criticize Wallace for criticizing the monopolies. It is a pity that so little of the great ideas and spirit of this speech are reflected in Wallace's book *Sixty Million Jobs*. Add to this book the above-quoted analysis of monopoly and monopolistic free enterprise, then draw from this the proper political conclusions on the struggle against imperialist reaction, and you have a program of struggle for the American people for full employment and production which is unbeatable.

Restricted production and high monopoly prices spell high profits and high unemployment. Since it is now possible to produce on the average twice as much with the same labor force in certain industries, and since corporation profits for the next two years were recently insured, the forecast of the O.W.M.R. for mounting profits and mounting unemployment in 1946 is bound to materialize, if the monopolies are not checked.

Something else is also bound to materialize. That is an economic crash and catastrophe, within the next three to five years, the likes of which we have never seen before. Even capitalist economists can see that, only this is not spoken of on the front pages of the newspapers.

It is generally agreed that the next economic cyclical crisis is bound to break out sometime between 1948 and 1950. The only question is *the scope and force* of the crisis, to which the answer is: If the monopolies have their way in the next three years—in domestic policy and in foreign policy—as they are having it virtually now, then the economic crisis will break nearer to 1948 than to 1950, and will assume a depth and proportion which will dwarf the economic catastrophe of 1929-33.

The foreign policies of the monopolies, which the Truman Administration is carrying out, are not only profoundly reactionary and imperialist in a political sense. They are also detrimental to the well-being of the country in an economic sense. These imperialist policies are undermining and destroying the possibilities for the development of foreign trade on a really wide scale, on a scale that could insure considerable employment to American workers.

For the development of this kind of foreign trade, two conditions must be fulfilled by American foreign policy. One is to encourage and assist the *democratic* development of the *economic* life of undeveloped and under-developed countries. This means abolition of feudal forms, deep agrarian reforms, the raising of wages, and in general the creation of wide home markets for native as well as foreign products. This requires encouragement and support for the truly democratic and anti-

fascist forces in all of these countries of potential markets for the United States. Another condition is to work for the peace and stability of the world in general and within each country in particular. This requires a world policy based upon the unanimity of the "Big Three"—America, the Soviet Union, England—coupled with a policy for each particular country supporting politically those forces which stand loyally by the unanimous collaboration of the "Big Three."

We are discussing here the political questions from an *economic* standpoint, and the conclusion we arrive at is this: wide foreign markets and political stability can be gotten in the present world only by a *democratic foreign policy*. And, conversely, the reactionary foreign policy of the monopolies carried out by the Truman Administration is bound to obstruct the growth of foreign markets while promoting political instability, that is, it is militating against the development of foreign trade on a really large scale. Hence, it is militating against the development of full production and full employment.

This is amply demonstrated by the policies of the Truman Administration in China and Japan, in Germany, in the Balkans, in the Near East, and in the world at large. Everywhere, American policy today obstructs democratic developments, economic and political, promotes civil conflicts, intensifies political in-

stability, and is thus directly hampering economic world stabilization and the broad opening of foreign markets. These policies of the American monopolies can be checked and defeated by the American people headed by the working class, but only in consistent and energetic daily struggle against every manifestation of these policies. Also from the economic standpoint, the American people must force the Truman Administration to abandon its "atomic bomb diplomacy," which upsets world peace and strains the relations between the "Big Three." Failure to do so means a continuing free hand for the monopolistic free enterprisers and imperialists, and this means an economic perspective of mounting profits with mounting unemployment preparing the ground for a catastrophic economic crash.

A check and reversal of present foreign policy must also be achieved in the matter of foreign loans. The policy pursued today is in effect the Hoover imperialist policy both with regard to foreign loans and relief and rehabilitation (U.N.R.R.A.). It is a policy of using loans and relief to impose reactionary policies and regimes upon foreign countries, to combat democracy, to try to save the remnants of fascism, to promote American imperialist domination in the world. The loan agreement with Britain, while removing certain obstacles to world trade, also paves the way for sharper Anglo-American imperialist rivalries.

The result of these policies up to date has been to intensify world disturbances and to increase economic and political instability. It has *not* produced for America new opportunities for foreign trade. This should be clearly understood. The monopolists and their advocates, who always insist that government measures and expenditures for progressive purposes must justify themselves "in dollars and cents" should be called upon to compute the dollars and cents which justify the present-day reactionary and imperialist loan and relief policy. The fact is that economically, this policy has been a complete failure, though it has brought political profits to American imperialist reaction. *And the main reason is that the democratic and peace-loving peoples of the world are not prepared to sell their national and democratic birthright for American loans and relief.* Chiang Kai-shek in China may be ready for such a sellout, but the Chinese people are obviously not. Ex-King Peter of Yugoslavia and his supporters may also have been ready for some such sellout, but the Yugoslav people very definitely were not.

Clearly, if we allow the Truman Administration to persist in its present reactionary and imperialist loan and relief policy, we shall be working for the moral isolation of the United States, and we shall be undermining world trade and economic stability. We shall not acquire broad opportunities for foreign trade which

are essential, though not absolutely indispensable, for full production and employment.

The present foreign policies of the monopolies are very consistent with their imperialist nature, but these policies are incompatible with the basic economic and political interests of the American people and nation. Hence, these policies must be checked and defeated.

Fundamentally, the American home market is of much more decisive importance to full employment and production than is the foreign market. For no matter how greatly foreign trade may be expanded in the coming period, the overwhelming bulk of American products, anywhere between 75 and 85 per cent on the average, will be consumed in the United States. That is why the struggle against the domestic policies of the monopolies is of such great importance.

Basic here is the question of wages. The monopolies are seeking to perpetuate a wage cut of substantial proportions. Already workers have suffered pay cuts anywhere between 23 and 50 per cent. The trade union movement is fighting for an increase in average wage rates of 30 per cent. To allow the monopolies to enforce and perpetuate the present pay cuts would irrevocably determine a perspective of mounting unemployment, growing economic misery among the masses, and the rapid maturing of a violent and deep cyclical crisis. This would be so because these wage policies of the

monopolies would radically decrease the purchasing power of the masses, thus delivering a fatal blow at the capacities of the home market.

Moreover, to work for full production and full employment it is essential to orientate not alone on maintaining the present living standards of the American masses. This would be totally inadequate for the upkeep, even temporarily, of full production and employment. It will be necessary for that purpose to steer a course of *radically lifting the standard of living of the masses*, which means raising real wages and real income, something which Wallace's book does not fully appreciate.

Another basic issue is the further development and expansion of social security, with special consideration for the needs of the war veterans. Here, too, the masses of the people find themselves in irreconcilable opposition to the monopolies and their political hangers-on.

Finally, and perhaps most important, is the question of government responsibility for assuring full employment and for government economic intervention in this crucial matter. Here the conflict between the monopolistic free enterprisers and the democratic forces of the people, headed by labor, is most profound and far-reaching. This is so, because without government responsibility and intervention full employment can only be dreamed about but not realized. Hence, the masses will be compelled to fight the monopolies most sharply on this is-

sue and to defeat them. And this will necessitate, in the course of the struggle, the curbing of the power of the monopolies, the nationalization of the railroads and certain branches of monopolized industry under democratic controls, and the assumption by government of new economic functions for the assurance of full production and employment.

It would be idle to talk about a struggle for full production and employment without enforcing policies which would prevent, for example, the scrapping and destruction of \$14,000,000,000 worth of government financed plant expansion built during the war. And how can *this* be done without considerable government intervention in the economic processes, in one form or another, under democratic controls of the workers, farmers, and small business? It must be clearly understood that full production and employment requires that we break the monopolistic policies of restricted production under monopoly prices; and this cannot be accomplished without serious government economic intervention.

It should be added that the question of wages is here viewed as a basic means of raising the standard of living and purchasing power of the largest and most progressive class. Hence, associated with the question of wages is naturally the question of raising simultaneously the income of labor's allies—the working farmers, the professionals, the small businessmen. This means raising the standard of life of the

American people.

It is on the point of government intervention that Wallace's book is particularly weak. Inasmuch as this is such a crucial point, it is hard to see how Mr. Wallace can fail to reinforce his position on full employment by a corresponding policy of struggle against the monopolies and for government economic intervention, since Wallace is a leading champion, if not pioneer, of government *responsibility* for full employment.

The struggle for "sixty million jobs" is a major struggle of the American people for progress, economic security, democracy and peace. It is a major battle between the camp of the people headed by labor, and the camp of the monopolies headed by reaction and imperialism. It is, therefore, the fight of the developing labor-democratic-anti-fascist coalition against the coalition of monopolistic and imperialistic reaction, and it is this kind of a fight that has to be waged for a successful struggle for full employment and production, "for sixty million jobs."

From the foregoing it is already amply clear how fantastic and opportunistic was not only the general but also the economic perspective pictured by Browder revisionism. It was a perspective which expected the monopolies to lead the people to full production and employment, whereas the *central* fact of the situation is that the fight for full employment will be won *only* as a fight *against* the monopolies, and not otherwise.

It is, therefore, necessary to emphasize that the struggle against Browder revisionism, against the opportunistic illusions about the monopolies cultivated by this revisionism, is an inseparable part of the ideological and political fight for full employment, along with the struggle against Leftist-sectarian deviations from the Party's line.

CAPITALISM AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

If monopoly policies stand in the way of full production and employment, does that mean that full employment is impossible within the bounds of the capitalist system? The answer to this would be that full employment permanently is incompatible with the capitalist mode of production which rests, among other things, upon the existence and growth of a permanent army of unemployed. It is precisely from this objective fact of the nature of the capitalist mode of production that the present policies of the monopolies arise, namely, the policies seeking to create and perpetuate a permanent army of unemployed with which to cut wages and weaken trade unions.

Mass unemployment under capitalism is no accident, nor is it a passing misfortune. It is the product of the most fundamental contradictions of the capitalist system, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private monopolistic ownership of the means of production, resulting in the private

appropriation by the capitalists of the fruits of production, *i.e.*, resulting in capitalist exploitation and in a continuing contradiction between expanding production and narrowing markets, resulting also in the general planlessness and anarchy of the whole capitalist mode of production. These fundamental contradictions of capitalism, responsible for the existence of a permanent reserve of unemployed, cannot be done away with by simply ignoring them, as Mr. Wallace does. No, these basic contradictions can find their permanent and final solution only under Socialism. Only under a socialist system can full employment be realized *as a permanent and stable institution*. But that does *not* mean that full employment, or sixty million jobs, is altogether impossible in the United States under the capitalist mode of production *in the present world situation*. It is possible; only private capitalist economy alone cannot do it. Government must step in and assume responsibility *and power* for the realization of full production and full employment.

We must begin by saying that full employment *for certain periods* is theoretically not incompatible with the capitalist mode of production; although the practice of capitalism since the beginning of the general crisis of the system, roughly since 1918, has, in contrast to the Socialist Soviet Union, shown nowhere and at no time a state of full employment. The practice of the general crisis of capitalism has shown, on the con-

rary,
econ
rem
empl
has b
acter
capit
Th
nomi
if not
talist
maxi
ment
in its
depre
then
fact,
bigge
why
ployn
talism
serve
to c
boom
cycle
I
econ
since
crisis
first
the
This
norm
tende
boom
length
crisis
the r
ber o
boom
creat
plove

rary, that even in times of relative economic boom and prosperity there remained a serious number of unemployed, and that this fact itself has become one of the major characteristics of the general crisis of the capitalist system.

The boom phase of a *normal* economic cycle generally absorbs most, if not all, the unemployed, and capitalist economy approaches then maximum or almost full employment. We know, however, that this in itself prepares the ground for a depression phase of the cycle and then for cyclical economic crises. In fact, the bigger the boom phase, the bigger the crash, as a rule. That is why *permanently* stable and full employment is impossible under capitalism. What is permanent is a reserve of unemployed which tends to disappear temporarily during boom phases of a *normal* economic cycle.

But we have not had normal economic cycles for a long time, not since the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism, following the first World War and the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia. This general crisis has affected the normal cycle in this respect: it has tended to shorten the revival and boom phases of the cycle, while lengthening the depression and crisis phases; it has further affected the normal cycle by the large number of unemployed which even the boom phase failed to absorb, thus creating a permanent army of unemployed *within* the permanent army

of unemployed which capitalist economists conveniently dubbed "unemployables."

Let us recall that the outbreak of a maturing cyclical economic crisis in the United States in 1939 had been delayed and later arrested altogether, first, by the relief and social security measures adopted by the Roosevelt Administration which supplied an extra measure of purchasing power, and, secondly, by the outbreak of the war in Europe which opened for industry the military market of war preparations and war. On the eve of the war in Europe, American economy had been passing through a prolonged depression phase of the cycle. At that time the unemployed figure stood at 10.2 million, which would have been an unheard of proportion of the total labor force to be unemployed, not during the crisis phase but during the pre-crisis phase of a *normal* cycle. But that was no longer a normal cycle; it was taking place within the general crisis of the capitalist system.

In 1940, when our industries were beginning to produce in volume for the European war and somewhat for American military preparations, unemployment fell to 9 million. But a real drop occurred in 1941, unemployment falling to 5.6 million, and disappearing completely or almost so in 1942.

During the war years, which completely modified the course of the economic cycle, we had full employment of the nation's labor force. But how did we achieve it? In two ways:

one was full employment in the domestic economy—the war economy—which absorbed at its peak about 54,000,000 people and the other was by the building up of the armed services which at their peak absorbed about 13,000,000 people. In other words, it was the *world war* which arrested the outbreak of a cyclical crisis in 1939, which modified the course of the cycle by the creation of a war economy, and which absorbed the total labor force by engaging it in war economy and on the battlefields.

Can we have full employment under capitalism without a world war? To answer the question, we must see the magnitude of the problem. From the figures cited above, it is clear that, as of 1939-1940, the permanent reserve of unemployed was becoming stabilized at a figure between 8 and 10 million. This is the outstanding fact of the situation. Proceeding from this fact, the Department of Commerce, in its "guidepost," made the following estimate: between 1940 and 1946, the labor force will increase by 2,500,000. By adding the approximate number of persons that are being displaced from production by increased efficiency of labor and technological developments, the conclusion is reached, as stated by Secretary Wallace, "that, in 1946, we could produce as much as we did in 1940 and still have 19 million unemployed" (*Sixty Million Jobs*). We are now in danger of the permanent reserve of unemployed becoming stabilized at a much higher figure than in 1939-1940, or somewhere be-

tween 10 and 19 million.

Seeing the magnitude of the problem, we must now find out whether full employment is possible in the United States within the limits of the capitalist mode of production. Theoretically, as pointed out before, full employment for a certain length of time would not be incompatible with the capitalist mode of production, during the boom phase of a normal cycle. But we have also shown that the general crisis of capitalism has introduced certain modifications into the cycle which not only excluded full employment even during the boom phase but were creating a so-called unabsorbable and growing army of unemployed during all times. The question is, what is happening to the course of the economic cycle in the postwar period? It is only upon the result of such an examination that the question of full employment now can be answered.

And here we find the following: as a result of the war, American capitalism has become the center of world capitalism, with two of the strongest capitalist powers—Germany and Japan—ceasing to be major factors also economically, and with British capitalism slipping into a lower position in the economic ladder of capitalism. In other words, American capitalism emerges from the war economically the strongest power within a very much weakened and broken-up capitalist world system which is now in a *very advanced stage of general crisis*.

This does at least two things. One,

it makes it infinitely difficult and complicated for American capitalist economy to begin to function as the center and leading force in a capitalist world economy, because that world economy is broken up, with the old structure gone while the new one is not yet in existence. The difficulty here is the tremendous lack of balance that has arisen in capitalist world economy because of the radical and overwhelming shift of the center of world capitalist economy to the United States. This is creating new and most acute contradictions between the various parts of the world capitalist economy (America and England), because the strength of American capitalism becomes the weakness of world capitalism while the weakness of world capitalism tends to become the weakness, *not the strength*, of American capitalism.

Simultaneously, we have the other side of the process. It is that American capitalist economy does enjoy today unprecedented opportunities at home and abroad for trade, industry and investment. It enjoys these opportunities in large measure because it has become the center of world capitalist economy.

As to the opportunities at home, it should be noted that the 100 billion dollars of private savings and the 40 billion dollars of capital accumulation by the corporations are favorable factors of great importance. The same should be said about the tremendous scope of the accumulated demand for consumer goods and in

part for producers' goods on the home market.

The conclusion to be drawn is the following. In the immediate future, American capitalist economy will manifest two main features—a simultaneous growth of employment and unemployment, continuing the present trend as conditioned by the simultaneous course of reconversion to peace production and of the demobilization of the armed services. That is, there will continue the present lag between the slower rate of absorption of new workers into the peacetime industry and the faster rate of demobilization of the armed services. This means a growth of unemployment.

Yet to the degree to which American capitalist economy succeeds in its efforts to realize its opportunities as the center and leading force of world capitalist economy, *new possibilities will open*, for a certain period of time, for extra large-scale production and for full employment, for the home market as well as for abroad. The question is: *will these opportunities be realized?*

To which the answer is, first, these opportunities can be realized *only* under government leadership, with government active economic participation in various forms, and under democratic controls of labor, the farmers and small business. It cannot and will not be done by private enterprise alone. Second, it requires both a basic and even radical lift in the standard of living of the American people as the fundamental

economic home policy and a truly democratic foreign policy of collaboration with the new democracies of Europe, Asia, Africa and America, and with the Soviet Union. Third, it requires a serious curb of the monopolies, a policy of nationalization of monopolized branches of the economy under democratic controls, and a democratic home policy politically. Fourth, all the foregoing require the checking and defeating of the present offensive of American imperialist reaction, both in its home policies and in its foreign policies.

Obviously, these are the major tasks of the crystallizing labor-democratic-anti-fascist coalition in the present period. It is only the successful struggle and growing power of this coalition, as against the reactionary imperialist coalition, that will enable the American people, headed by labor, to realize the opportunities for full employment—for sixty million jobs—that will arise in the present world situation during a certain period.

We can now see more clearly some of the weaknesses in the position of Henry Wallace on the question of full employment, as shown in his significant book *Sixty Million Jobs*.

First, he seriously underestimates the effect of the reactionary offensive of the monopolies as the major obstacle to full employment and production. He does not show in his book a full awareness of the magnitude of the political task of combating and defeating this reactionary offensive. Secondly, he does not place

in the center of the struggle the fight for government intervention, not only assumption of responsibility, in the economic processes to realize the opportunities for full production and employment. He does, on the contrary, place too much reliance on the ability of private enterprise to do the job. This is a fatal error. Private enterprise alone cannot and will not do the job. Thirdly, monopoly is not, as Henry Wallace seems to think, a mere accident in the system of so-called private free enterprise; it is its culminating and dominating form. That is why its sabotage of full employment and production is such serious business. And that is also why the fight to break that sabotage is a major task of the American people. Fourthly, he does not give proper weight to the radical raising of the standard of living of the American people as a basic requirement for full employment and not only as a consequence of full employment.

Henry Wallace's general orientation should allow him to eliminate these weaknesses, especially in the light of our practical experiences with the monopolies since the end of the war. These experiences should also induce Henry Wallace to draw the political conclusions, the conclusions of struggle against the reactionary and imperialist policies of the Truman Administration, the conclusions for the building of a labor-democratic - anti-fascist coalition which will fight for full employment and "Sixty Million Jobs."

ON THE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE BLACK BELT

(A DISCUSSION ARTICLE)

By CLAUDIA JONES

THE POLITICAL ATTACKS that are being directed against the Negro people by Big Business have once again placed serious questions before the American working class.

These attacks, reminiscent of post-World War I, are all the more serious because today the main danger of fascism to the world comes from the most colossal imperialist forces which are concentrated within the United States. The perpetrators of these attacks are the representatives of the most reactionary section of monopoly capital and of the semi-feudal economy of the Black Belt. This hook-up, expressed in Congress by the reactionary Republicans and the poll-taxers who draw their power from the oppression of the Negro people and the working class, makes it obvious that the two main forces for democracy are the working class allied with the Negro people.

In the short period since the war for national liberation, our nation has witnessed a revival of lynchings—three *known* lynchings in the space of three months. This blot of shame lies in America, while we proclaim

to the world our "championship" of democracy for other nations!

The two-pronged drive of Big Business to decimate the war-time gains of the Negroes in industry and at the same time to destroy the alliance between labor and the Negro people, the fascist-inspired "race strikes" of American students, the recent attacks on Negro veterans in the South, and the closing of F.E.P.C. offices in city after city—all this necessitates the greatest political initiative and action by the trade unions and by our Party.

Coupled with this reactionary drive on the economic and political fronts, are the growing Hitler-like incitements of the Bilbos and Rankins. While popular indignation has been aroused by these events, it is obvious that labor must move more aggressively than it has so far on the vital issues affecting the Negro people.

If the alliance, crucial to progress, between the Negro people and labor is to be reinforced and extended, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between the struggle for national lib-

eration of the Negro people and that of the working class against capitalist exploitation and oppression.

In opening this discussion, it must be made clear that the conclusions here arrived at should in no sense be regarded as a condition for the united struggle of the Negro people and the working class for Negro rights. What differences in outlook may be present as regards the thesis here presented must in no way hinder unity of all progressives in the struggle for the immediate needs of the Negro people.

The basis for this discussion article is the Political Resolution of our National Convention in July, which rejected Browder's revisionist position on the national character of the Negro question. A further basis is the preliminary exchange of opinion registered recently at an enlarged meeting of the newly-established National Negro Commission of our Party. At that meeting it must be stated, the views expressed revealed varying opinions on our fundamental theoretical approach to the political essence and ultimate aim of the Negro liberation movement in the United States. Similar differences of opinion are indicated in communications, club resolutions, and articles submitted to the National Office which discuss the issue of the right of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt.

It is clear that a deep-going discussion of the subject is necessary. While this article will attempt to discuss

some of these views, it is to be hoped that it will be followed by further discussion. The views presented here are my own.

THE NATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO RIGHTS

Even the worst enemies of the Communist Party cannot fail to admit that we have been in the forefront of the struggle for equality of the Negro people. It was the Communist Party which fourteen years ago made the name of Scottsboro ring the world around. It was the Communist Party which was the first, since the overthrow of the Reconstruction governments, to raise in the heart of the South the issue of full Negro freedom.

What galvanized our Party to become the initiator and vanguard of these struggles? It was our understanding of the Negro question in the United States as a *special* question, as an issue whose solution requires *special* demands, in addition to the general demands of the American working class.

It was essentially this understanding that found Communists in the forefront of the struggle to combat the imperialist ideology of "white supremacy" which is today endangering the unity of the labor-democratic coalition and of the working class itself. It was essentially this knowledge that taught white American workers to fight for Negro rights in their own self-interest, to under-

stan
chau
rian
Am
to s
ers.
taug
agai
—a
ogy
whi
unit
It
Neg
tion
tion
rial
is c
and
It v
Len
of
ster
pre
Sou
V
the
feri
ind
iste
for
Ne
Bir
ing
chi
be
cor
Ne
V
the
pro

stand that to fight against white chauvinism is to fight against imperialist ideologies and practices of America's ruling class which serves to separate Negro and white workers. It was this understanding that taught Negro workers to fight against petty-bourgeois nationalism—a result of white chauvinist ideology—and to have both Negro and white workers form strong bonds of unity with each other.

It was our understanding of the Negro question as a *national* question, that is, as the question of a nation oppressed by American imperialism, in the ultimate sense as India is oppressed by British imperialism and Indonesia by Dutch imperialism. It was our knowledge, grounded in Lenin's teachings, that every aspect of Negro oppression in our country stems from the existence of an *oppressed nation*, in the heart of the South, the Black Belt.

We knew that the semi-slavery of the Southern sharecroppers; the inferior status of the Negro people in industry, North and South; the existence of Jim Crow in the armed forces; the Jim Crow practices of New York and Chicago, as well as of Birmingham and Tampa; the shooting two months ago of a Harlem child by a trigger-happy cop—all can be traced back step by step to the continued existence of an oppressed Negro nation within our borders.

Wherein do the Negro people in the Black Belt constitute an oppressed nation? To answer this

question, we must first determine the characteristics of a nation. Marxist-Leninists hold that "a nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture."*

The Black Belt, an area in which the Negro people form a majority, came into existence with the growth of cotton culture and plantation economy. As the area of cotton cultivation moved over Westward in the days before the Civil War, so did the area of the plantation that consisted of a white-master family with its slaves.

The Civil War, which abolished chattel slavery, failed either to break up this area of Negro majority or fully to liberate the Negro people within it. Retaining their plantation lands, the ex-slaveholders soon forced the return to these lands of their former slaves as sharecroppers. A series of laws passed by Southern states—the crop lien laws, the jumping contract laws, and so on—prevented and still prevent the free migration of the Negro people. Scarcely less than before the Civil War, is the Black Belt a prison-house of the Negroes; the chains which hold them now are the invisible chains of poverty, the legal chains of debt-slavery, and, when the landlords deem it necessary, the iron shackles of the chain gang.

The Civil War might have broken

* Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*. International Publishers, New York, p. 8.

the bars of the Black Belt; it did not, for the Northern capitalists, who had gained a united market and field of exploitation throughout the nation as a result of the Civil War, were terrified by the simultaneous rise of Southern democracy, the Northern labor movement, and radical agrarian organizations. They betrayed the Negro people and the Southern white masses, and turned the South back to semi-slavery.

The migrations of the 1870's, of the First World War, and of the Second World War, did not appreciably diminish the proportion by which the Negroes find themselves a majority today in the Black Belt—these are virtually the same. It cannot be said that this majority is accidental, or that the Negro people continue as an oppressed people within the Black Belt by inertia or by choice. They continue so because the sheriff's posse of the twentieth century is carrying on, under new forms, the work of the slave-catchers of the nineteenth. The majority remains a majority by force.

This community in which the Negro people are a majority is neither racial nor tribal; it is composed of a significant minority of whites as well. The territory stretches contiguously westward from the Eastern shore of Maryland, and lies within Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Texas.

Following the Civil War, bound-

ary lines were definitely shaped by the defeated slaveholders to prohibit the full participation of the Negroes and poor whites in political life. If it is true in the North, where certain election districts are "gerrymandered" to prohibit the full expression of the Negro vote (and of the white vote as well), it was no less true of the Black Belt, where the majority of the inhabitants were Negroes and represented its basic core.

As to the other characteristics of nationhood: Have the Negro people, for example, a common language? They have a common language—English. If it be argued that this is the language of the entire country, we say that this is true. A common language is necessary to nationhood; a different language is not. When the American colonies separated from Britain, they had a common language, which was the same as that of their oppressors. Surely no one will argue that our community of language with our British oppressors should have kept us indefinitely in the status of a colonial people.

Is there an American Negro culture? The peculiar oppression of the Negro people and their striving for freedom have been expressed in a native way, in spirituals, work-songs, literature, art, the dance. This does not mean that American Negro culture is not part of American culture generally. Negro culture is part of the general stream of Ameri-

can culture, but it is a distinct current in that stream; it arose out of the special historical development and unique status of the Negro people; no other people in America could have developed this particular culture.

Have the Negro people a stable community of economic life? First, let us discuss what is meant by a common economic life. It is sometimes said that people have a common economic life when they make their living in the same way—they are all sharecroppers, or they are all workers. Actually, a common economic life with reference to a nation or community under capitalism means that the nation or community has within it the class and social relations that characterize society; it has capitalists, workers, farmers, and intellectuals, ranged according to their position in the production relations. In this case it means that a Negro must be able to hire a Negro, buy from a Negro, sell to a Negro, service a Negro.

Such class stratification exists among the Negro people in the Black Belt. There is a Negro bourgeoisie. It is not an industrial bourgeoisie. It is not a big bourgeoisie; the bourgeoisie of an oppressed nation never is; it is one of the results of national oppression that the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations is retarded by the oppressors. The market of the Negro bourgeoisie is founded upon Jim-Crowism; it functions chiefly in life insurance, banking, and real estate. Its lead-

ership among the Negro people is reflected in an ideology—petty-bourgeois nationalism, whose main purpose is to mobilize the Negro masses under its own influence.

By these distinguishing features, therefore, the Negro people in the Black Belt constitute a nation. They are an historically developed community of people, with a common language, a common territory, and a common economic life, all of which are manifest in a common culture.

As far back as 1913, Lenin emphasized that the Negro people constitute an oppressed nation. In an unfinished essay on the national and colonial question he made a *direct* reference to the Negro people as an *oppressed nation*, stating:

In the United States 11.1 per cent of the population consists of Negroes (and also mulattoes and Indians) who must be considered an oppressed nation, inasmuch as the equality, won in the Civil War of 1861-65 and guaranteed by the constitution of the Republic, has in reality been more and more restricted in many respects in the main centers of the Negro population (in the South) with the transition from the progressive, pre-monopolistic capitalism of 1860-1870 to the reactionary monopolistic capitalism (imperialism) of the latest epoch. (V. I. Lenin, *Miscellany*, Collected Works, Vol. XXX, Russian Edition.)

BROWDER'S REVISION OF LENINIST TEACHINGS

In discussing the right of self-determination for Negroes in the Black Belt, we surely cannot ignore the

revisionist position taken by Earl Browder, as set forth in his article in *The Communist* for January, 1944, which was presented as a declaration of policy for American Communists. There Browder wrote:

... It was in view of the gathering world crisis that we Communists at that time—in the early 30's raised the issue of self-determination. At that time, we necessarily faced the possibility that the Negro people, disappointed in their aspirations for full integration into the American nation, might find their only alternative in separation and in the establishment of their own state in the Black Belt, in the territory in which they are a majority. We raised this as one of the rights of the Negro people, in case the Negro people found this was the only way to satisfy their aspirations.

Browder further wrote:

The crisis of history has taken a turn of such character that the Negro people in the United States have found it possible to make their decision once and for all. Their decision is for their complete integration into the American nation as a whole and not for separation.

Browder thus denied that the right of self-determination for Negroes in the Black Belt was any longer an issue, since, according to him, the Negro people had already made their historic choice!

What was the fallacy on which Browder's premise was based?

Browder's fallacy was inherently connected with a false estimate of the relationship of forces in our nation

and the world. Clearly, if a rosy future was to be envisioned in which a "peaceful" capitalism would voluntarily relinquish its exploitations, solve its contradictions, etc., the Leninist program which showed that the very essence of imperialism was the distinction and conflict between oppressed and oppressing nations no longer applied to our country!

Moreover, Browder based his premise, not on evaluating the right of self-determination as it applies to the Negro people in the Black Belt, but on one of its aspects, separation. That he saw fit to discuss the whole question from the standpoint of a "practical political matter," confirms this. His treatment of these two demands as being identical needs examination.

Is separation identical with self-determination? The right to separation is inherent in the right to self-determination, whether that right is eventually exercised or not. It becomes a practical political matter only when the concrete objective conditions for that choice are at hand. Therefore, to identify self-determination with separation, or to substitute one for the other, is tantamount to forcing on the Negro people a choice, which they are clearly not in an objective position to make—which, in other words, though a right, is not necessarily a function of their exercise of self-determination!

It is obvious from this that the right of self-determination is not something one can dangle, withdraw, or put forward again as a

sheerly objective factor. Either the objective historic conditions of nationhood exist, in which such a right remains inviolate, or they do not. Either the objective conditions exist for the choice to be made by the oppressed nation (either for separation, autonomy, amalgamation, etc.), or they do not. Thus, and only thus, can we approach the issue as a practical political matter.

How then, does the question of integration apply? Are the Negro people demanding integration in American political life? Most certainly they are! But this is no new phenomenon insofar as the Negro people are concerned. Negro Americans have been fighting for integration for over two hundred years. Every *partial* fight—whether expressed in the demands of the Reconstruction leaders, together with the white workers and farmers in the South for land, or in the present-day demands of Negroes in Atlanta to enforce the Supreme Court ruling against the "white primary" laws; whether it be the fight against lynching and poll-tax disfranchisement, or the recent successful campaign, conducted in Negro-white unity to re-elect Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., to the New York City Council—is a step towards integration.

But integration cannot be considered a substitute for the right of self-determination. National liberation is not synonymous with integration, neither are the two concepts mutually exclusive.

What does integration really

mean? [Integration, that is, *democratic* integration, means breaking down the fetters which prohibit the full economic, political and social participation of Negroes in all phases of American life. This does not mean that a merger, or an assimilative process necessarily takes place. In a general sense, the struggle for integration waged today by the Negro people is directed toward achieving *equal rights*—economic, political and social.

But the basic difference, in fact the touchstone of programmatic difference, between the liberals (as well as the Social-Democrats) and the Communists hinges on the application of the program of equal rights to the Black Belt, and, therefore, to the *source of Negro oppression* throughout the country—a difference based on diametrically opposed concepts of the nature of the question.

In the North, the struggle for equal rights for the Negro people is chiefly that of heightening the fight to secure equal participation in every sphere of American life. The problems of the Negro people in the North are akin to those of an oppressed national minority. Particularly here, the fight for equal rights as a whole is enhanced by the presence of a large and growing Negro proletariat, in the area of the most highly developed capitalism, as well as by the participation of the advanced workers throughout the country for equal rights for Negroes. In fact, it is the existence of a strong Negro proletariat—represented today

by close to one million organized trade unionists—that provides the intimate link between the American working class as a whole and the struggle for emancipation and land for the oppressed Negro people and white workers in the Black Belt.

In the Black Belt the problem is chiefly that of wiping out the economic, political, and social survivals of slavery, of the *enforcement* of equal rights. Without the necessary *enforcement* of equal rights for the Negro people in the Black Belt, including social equality, it is folly to speak of integration as being equal to the achievement of national liberation. Hence, equal rights for the Negro people in the Black Belt can be achieved only through enforcement, through their exercise of the right of self-determination.

The right of self-determination does not exclude the struggle for partial demands; it pre-supposes an energetic struggle for concrete partial demands, linked up with the daily needs and problems of the wide masses of the Negro people and the white workers in the Black Belt. The fight for such partial demands, moreover, is a struggle for democracy. It does not divert or overshadow the working-class struggle against exploitation, it is an aid to it.

It is only by helping to interconnect the partial demands with the right of self-determination that we Communists, in concert with other progressive forces, can contribute guidance to the struggle for complete equality for the Negro people.

CERTAIN CONTENTIONS EXAMINED

We Communists adhere to the fundamental belief that complete and lasting equality of imperialist oppressed nations and peoples can be guaranteed only with the establishment of Socialism. The aim of Socialism is not only to abolish the present division of mankind into small states, not only to bring nations closer to each other, but ultimately to merge them. But we have never ignored the historical process necessary to the achievement of that goal. Nor can we "postpone" the question of national liberation until Socialism is established or speak solely in general nebulous phrases about national liberation. We must have a clear and precisely formulated political program to guide our work in the achievement of that goal. For we know that "mankind can achieve the inevitable merging of nations, only by passing through the transition period of complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, *i.e.*, their freedom to secede." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V. International Publishers, p. 271.)

As Leninists, we are distinguished from the reactionary Social-Democrats in that we reject, even if it is under the name of "internationalism," any denial of the right of national self-determination to the oppressed peoples. For true internationalism, that is, Marxism-Leninism, places the right of self-determination as a basic programmatic point. The

"internationalism" of the reformists is nothing more or less than the nationalism of their own respective imperialist rulers, while the national program of Lenin is an essential part of internationalism. Any "internationalism" that denies the right of self-determination to the subject peoples is false, is a mere cover for imperialist chauvinism.

Our approach is based on proletarian internationalism, which recognizes that the workers of an oppressing nation best fight against national oppression—especially by their "own" bourgeoisie—once they understand that such is the road to realize their own freedom. It is based on the Marxist proposition that "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations."

Clearly then, those who impute to the Negro people the main responsibility for "accepting" or "rejecting" the principle of self-determination ignore this tenet: they base their conclusions on the subjective factor, instead of the objective and historical conditions of oppression of the Negro people in the Black Belt.

But let us examine some of these arguments. Is it true that the Negro people do not want self-determination, that the Negro people shy away from this concept with abhorrence? Definitely not! It is, of course, quite a different matter if we speak of the Negro people as not being fully conscious of this concept in our terms. But to challenge the deepest desires of the Negro people for freedom and equality as being other than that

of the fullest national self-affirmation is to fail to understand their fundamental aspirations!

What do the Negro people abhor? They abhor the continuation of their *actual* status in the Black Belt—that of forcible segregation. They abhor Jim Crow from which they suffer in many forms today. They abhor the freedom with which the poll-taxers and feudal landowners, by dividing Negro and white, continue their oppression of the Negro people. They abhor the ideology of "white supremacy" which flouts the basic tenets of our Constitution, as the counterpart of Hitler's "aryan supremacy." They abhor any idea which holds out the perspective, not of full freedom and equality, but of something less than these things. And the slogan of self-determination expresses precisely these aspirations in the most complete sense.

To argue that the Negro people "don't want self-determination," is unwittingly to give sanction to the poll-taxers and feudal landowners in the South to continue exploiting the Negro people and poor whites on the basis that "this is what the Negroes want"; it is to argue against a conscious fight by white American workers to help achieve the objective conditions in which the Negro people can freely make their own choice. It is to blunt the struggle for national liberation, to have at best, a bourgeois-liberal approach.

Is it any wonder, then, that the most vehement voices against this principle, are *not the mass* of the

Negro people, but the enemies of the white workers and the Negro people? The Social-Democrats (and the reactionary mouthpieces of monopoly capital and semi-feudal economy), who advance the ridiculous charge that self-determination would "Jim Crow the Negro people," "Create a Black Ghetto," and other such arguments *ad nauseam*, are exposed in their full light when we examine their real motives. They seek to cover up their denial of the double oppression of the Negro people—as wage slaves and as Negroes. They seek to obscure the fundamental character of the status of the Negro people in the Black Belt—which is essentially *national* and rooted in economic and historic conditions of a pre-capitalist nature. Nor can all the piety and wit of Social-Democracy cancel out its real aim—which is to serve imperialism and therefore betray the Negro people and the working class.

Another view holds that the industrialization of the South and new migrations has fundamentally altered the relationship of the Negro people to the land. The proponents of this view maintain that such a development has radically changed the character of the Negro question in the Black Belt from that of oppressed nationhood, if such it was in the past, to that of a class question.

In discussing such views, we should, at the outset, distinguish between the effects of industrialization in the South as a whole and in the

Black Belt. The continued existence of economic slave survivals in the Black Belt is a fundamental distinction that must be made in an examination of the characteristics of nationhood among the Negro people. Unless this is done, we shall not be able to understand the problems either of the South as a whole or of the Black Belt in particular.

There has unquestionably been some increase of industrial expansion in the South. The war requirements for victory necessitated the expansion of a number of basic Southern industries, such as steel, coal, textile, lumber and shipbuilding. In addition, new industries, such as aircraft and munitions, were built. Capital investments, however, came primarily from the Federal government. Over \$7,000,000,000 were thus expended solely as a war necessity. It is obvious that such investment for expansion of existing plants and the building of new industries no longer exists. The reverse is true—that is, the closing down of plants and a drastic curtailment of industrial production. Thus, it is clear that no trend exists at present which would permit one to speak of the industrialization of the South. The trend that was evident during the war was a temporary phenomenon.

By 1944, Mr. D. B. Lasseter of the Atlanta, Georgia, Regional Office of the War Manpower Commission was able to warn us of this trend in summarizing what war orders meant to the South. Taking note of the more than seven billion dollars in prime

contra
Lasse
Octob
At
as bri
cause
prosp
while
have
be gro
gains
ing is
the c
tially,
curtai
show
tion
tivity
camp
muni
much
None
peace
La
Th
ment
prosp
dustr
sourc
It
panst
tries
cour
Neg
lead
class
Inst
char
it we
the
Neg
reali

contracts in six Southern states alone, Lasseter wrote in *Social Forces* for October, 1944:

At first glance, these factors appear as bright prospects, but there is ample cause for anxiety lest this war-inspired prosperity prove only temporary. For while industrial activity and facilities have increased tremendously, there will be great difficulty in maintaining these gains after the war. When the shooting is over the plants responsible for the current boom will shut down entirely, or production will be sharply curtailed. And a glance at the record shows that there is a heavy concentration of this type of industry and activity. The South is packed with Army camps, and shipbuilding, airplane and munitions plants further account for much of our industrial development. None of these offers a rosy future as a peacetime investment.

Lasseter added:

The South faces a grave readjustment. Having had its first taste of prosperity resulting from increased industrial activity, it is slated to lose the source of this prosperity."

It goes without saying that expansion and building of new industries in the Black Belt would, of course, have its influence among the Negro people. Such a process would lead to the extension of the working-class base among the Negro people. Instead of de-limiting the national characteristics of the Negro people, it would help importantly to develop the national consciousness of the Negro people and thus accelerate the realization of the aim of self-determi-

nation. The extension of the working-class base in the oppressed Negro nation is fundamentally the guarantee of the successful forward movement of the national liberation cause of the entire Negro people.

SELF-DETERMINATION— A GUIDING PRINCIPLE

It is my opinion that we again must raise the right of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt, not as a slogan of immediate action, but essentially as a *programmatic demand*. It might perhaps be argued that, raised in this manner, the slogan is academic and should therefore not be raised at all. Such criticism fails to take into account the difference between a slogan advanced as an issue on the order of the day and a *guiding principle*.

We must place the question in terms of historical perspective, taking into account concretely the stage of the Negro liberation movement today and the present practical struggle for full Negro rights, in behalf of which there must be established both the broadest Negro unity and the broadest Negro and white alliance. Between the current struggles and the programmatic slogan here advanced there is no conflict, but a vital interconnection. The goal of national self-determination should serve as a beacon to the day-to-day struggles for Negro rights, and these struggles, in turn, should serve to hasten the realization of the right to self-determination.

THE 79th CONGRESS: AN ESTIMATE TO DATE

By ADAM LAPIN

THE FIRST ACTION of the 79th Congress on the first day of the new session last January was creation of the Rankin Committee on un-American Activities—which in line with the intentions of its sponsor, Rep. John Rankin of Mississippi, has become a spearhead of reaction against the Communists, the labor movement and all anti-fascists. If there were many illusions that this was an isolated, unrelated event, they have long ago disappeared. It was a symptomatic beginning for the 79th Congress.

The high hopes which many progressives entertained that the 79th Congress would show a marked improvement over its predecessors have been thoroughly blasted. It is true that the elections last year resulted in strengthening the Democratic majority in the House and in purging some of the worst die-hards in both parties from the Senate. It is true that the people voted for a Congress which would support the Roosevelt program in domestic and foreign affairs. But by and large the 79th Congress has betrayed the mandate of the voters.

The 79th Congress has been a faithful instrument in the drive of American monopoly capital to solve the problems of reconversion and postwar adjustment at the expense of the living standards of the people, to weaken and if possible destroy the labor movement, and to launch a program of worldwide imperialist expansion and domination. It has mirrored the increasing unity in the ranks of American Big Business behind reactionary policies at home and abroad. It has expressed the abandonment of the Roosevelt program by President Truman.

Far-reaching political and economic changes have taken place in our country since the defeat of German and Japanese imperialism. These changes are reflected in Congress. It would be a misreading of the situation to assume that the current reactionary offensive in Congress is merely a continuation of similar offensives against the people in the past few years. With the end of the war the attack by monopoly capital against the interests of the people has increased in intensity and scope. The problems posed by the 79th Congress must be faced against a background of important political changes and realignments, of new political perspectives for the progressive forces of the people.

From the beginning, the 79th Congress followed the reconversion program of Big Business. Although V-J Day did not come until the first year's session was more than half over, it has not been primarily a

war Congress. Victory was already assured when Congress went into sessions last January. Postwar problems took the center of the stage.

Senator Robert A. Taft (R., Ohio), summed up the prevailing attitude in Congress a few months ago in discussing alleged increases in the costs of manufacturers and the problems of price control. "Personally, I think it should come out of the consuming public," he said. "I think the consuming public is perfectly able to pay it, and I believe very strongly that the prices have been held down too much." Taft also expressed concern for returning servicemen who want to go into business for themselves "if the profits of the industries are held at low figures." Apply this policy a bit more generally and you have the attitude of Congress on reconversion—take it out of the workers and the low-income groups of the population.

Even prior to the end of the war Congress had indicated that it was adopting the Big Business program on reconversion. Indeed, this trend had already been pronounced in the 79th Congress which passed contract termination legislation to protect business and insured it against reconversion losses with tax refunds—but had refused to pass the Murray-Kilgore Bill on the human side of reconversion.

In the months prior to V-J Day Congress failed to act on President Truman's proposal for increasing unemployment compensation pay-

ments to a maximum of \$25 a week for 26 weeks. Then Congress took a two-month recess which was interrupted by the defeat of Japan. The President called Congress back into session, after showing little inclination to press for action, and submitted to it a detailed legislative program which on the whole was based on the late President Roosevelt's economic bill of rights and included many of the items on labor's "must" list. Measures recommended by the President included unemployment compensation, full employment, minimum wage, housing and the F.E.P.C. bills; later he added a health insurance program.

This was a minimum legislative program which would by no means have been sufficient to ward off another disastrous crisis, but would have given labor some protection during the reconversion period. It was a program which did win the support of labor and of many other groups. But the President failed to make any fight for the program which he professed to sponsor. The Democratic leaders in Congress did not lift a finger to secure its enactment.

The tip-off came when the President, through an emissary, transmitted to the Senate Finance Committee a memorandum embodying his position on the unemployment compensation bill. The committee was closely divided. The fight on the bill was only beginning. But the White House memorandum de-

scribed as essential an extension in the duration of payments to the unemployed, while the increase in the amount of payments was described merely as desirable.

The amount of the payments was, of course, the focal point of the fight which had developed around the bill. Representatives of various trade and employers' associations had testified against any increase on the ground that workers would not want jobs at low wages if they could get up to \$25 a week in unemployment compensation. In one form or another, this is the heart of most Big Business opposition to proposed social legislation which would give workers some protection against unemployment and substandard living conditions.

Once the President had made it clear that he was not prepared to stand by the program he had himself recommended, the fate not only of this bill but of other measures as well became certain. The Republicans and reactionary Democrats were convinced, and justifiably so, that they would receive no serious opposition from the White House.

The full employment bill passed the Senate in emasculated form. In the House it was still further amended to eliminate completely any statement of government responsibility for helping to provide full employment. The entire meaning of the bill had been gutted. But instead of fighting to improve the measure, House Democratic leader John W.

McCormack took the position that it should be permitted to pass without change in the hope that the Senate might insist on strengthening amendments when the measure went to conference between the two bodies.

Minimum wage legislation did not get past the stage of hearings. Progress has been slow on the Wagner-Ellender Bill, despite the emergency need for housing throughout the country. Although passed by a 251 to 105 vote in the House, the anti-poll tax bill is stalled in the Senate by the threat of a filibuster. There has been no pressure from the Administration to push the health program recommended by the President.

The Permanent F.E.P.C. Bill is bottled up in the House Rules Committee, while the agency's funds are quickly petering out. The President has failed to back up his recommendation that F.E.P.C. legislation be passed, nor has he used his authority to issue an executive order giving F.E.P.C. a breathing spell. The President's attitude on the problems of the Negro people was most clearly revealed when he blocked an F.E.P.C. directive requiring the Capital Transit Company in Washington to hire Negroes. Previously the President had refused to take any action against the D.A.R., a semi-public institution chartered by Congress, when it kept Hazel Scott from singing in Constitution Hall.

Veterans are in the unhappy situation of having most of their legisla-

tion funnelled through a committee headed by Rep. John Rankin. Veterans did get some improvements in the G.I. Bill of Rights, but there has been no real action by Congress on a number of pressing problems of veterans, such as housing. A survey by Bernard Baruch showed that discharge payments for American veterans were lower than those prevailing in any of five British Empire countries whose standards he examined for comparison. From the vantage point of his committee chairmanship, there has been a persistent drive by Rep. Rankin to pit veterans against workers, to use veterans as a spearhead against the unions and specifically against closed shop conditions.

President Truman did not act decisively and with vigor to promote a single piece of progressive legislation. It became increasingly apparent that he was merely giving lip service to the program he had inherited from his predecessor. But Truman did throw all the prestige and authority of his office behind his bid for anti-labor legislation. He proposed to penalize labor for strikes which had been made inevitable by the refusal of the nation's biggest corporation even to bargain with labor about wage increases. After warning obliquely that anti-labor legislation would follow a breakdown in the labor-management conferences in Washington, he recommended that the cooling-off machinery of the Railway Labor Act be ap-

plied to most basic industries. The legislation introduced on the President's behalf had a definite compulsory impact in curbing labor's right to strike. It threatened workers and trade unionists with the menace of civil suits and injunctions. The President opened up the flood-gates to anti-labor legislation, and the House soon afterward passed the Hobbs Bill aimed primarily at the Teamsters' union.

If Congress as a whole was callous and indeed hostile to the needs of labor and the people as a whole, it was more than generous with the nation's great corporations. The average annual yield of corporate profits after taxation during the war years was \$8,700,000,000. In 1945 the total after taxes is expected to reach \$9,300,000,000. In 1946 corporate profits would have reached \$9,645,000,000 after taxes—if taxes had remained the same. But in the face of these huge profits, as compared with \$4,200,000,000 in 1939, the Treasury recommended repeal of the excess profits tax, which means a reduction in taxes of more than \$2,500,000,000.

Congress eagerly granted this bonanza to Big Business, and in addition reduced other corporate taxes to the tune of more than \$500,000,000. Top income families were given more than recommended by the Treasury in the form of a five per cent tax reduction, and the only window dressing was repeal of the so-called three per cent normal tax

that hit low income groups with particular force. The new tax law is an abandonment of the whole principle of progressive taxation advocated by Roosevelt—and a return to the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover type of regressive taxation.*

Congress did not document its record on foreign policy quite as thoroughly as on domestic policy with definite legislative action and inaction. But the record is nonetheless clear, and it is to be found in all too many jingoistic, anti-Soviet speeches and in the proceedings of Congressional Committees.

The prevailing tone in Congress has been hostile to the foreign policy of Big Three cooperation advocated by Roosevelt. Many expressions of opinion in Congress have been franker and more starkly imperialist than the President's own public utterances. But the President's Navy Day speech and his policy of atomic secrecy made men like Senator Burton K. Wheeler (D., Mont.), who had long advocated war against the Soviet Union, bolder and more outspoken.

There was nothing particularly new in the fact that Wheeler recently made a speech which was clearly a bid for war. There were, however, new overtones in his speech. There was little pretext to an isolationist or non-interventionist position which had always been a cover for aid to

the fascist aggressors. Wheeler was now urging all-out intervention against the Soviet Union, and to a lesser degree against British imperialism. One new aspect of the speech was that Wheeler was no longer in frontal opposition to Administration foreign policy—as a result of the changes in Administration policy. He was attempting to drive Truman still further along the road of aggressive imperialism.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg (R., Mich.) has played a singularly important role in the shaping of American foreign policy. Vandenberg is perhaps the outstanding Congressional spokesman of Herbert Hoover's policy of getting tough with the Soviet Union. Unlike some GOP die-hards such as Senators Henrik Shipstead of Minnesota and Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska, Vandenberg has conceived the strategy of working within the framework of United Nations machinery to destroy genuine international cooperation and to further the aims of American imperialism. Vandenberg was influential at the San Francisco conference in guiding the American delegation in an anti-Soviet direction on such issues as admission of fascist Argentina. Vandenberg has brought his influence to bear, not in opposition to the Truman policies, but rather in molding them and bringing them in line with Hoover's.

Another significant development has been the emergence of several die-hard poll taxers as spokesmen for

* The reader is referred to the article, "The People's Fight for Progressive Taxation," by George Bernstein, in the December issue.—The Editors.

extreme anti-Soviet policies. Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi called openly for the reconstruction of German industry and without subterfuge characterized the Soviet Union as an aggressor nation and a potential military foe. Much the same line has been taken by Rep. William Colmer of Mississippi, chairman of the House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy, in a report which recommended the economic rebuilding of Germany and the imposition of political conditions on any loans to the Soviet Union.

Discovering that their underlying policies are being adopted by the Administration, Republican leaders in Congress have tended to become bolder in their stand on foreign policy. Perhaps their most spectacular bid for public support is the Pearl Harbor investigation which the Republican members have tried to use to make Roosevelt appear as a war criminal and to take the onus for the war off the Axis leaders. The real significance of the Pearl Harbor probe is, however, not only the attack on Roosevelt's war leadership but even more on the foreign policy for which he stood.

In terms of actual legislation, Congressional action has been restricted largely to measures which were a carry-over from the Roosevelt program, such as Bretton Woods, reciprocal trade, and ratification of the United Nations Charter. While there were unsuccessful GOP attempts to force amendments on these bills, the

debates did not go to the heart of American foreign policy. Certainly, Administration spokesmen did not advocate the Roosevelt policies of Big Three unity which alone can give content to the machinery of international cooperation.

A more significant issue has been UNRRA. Here strong Congressional bias against the most minimum form of international cooperation, food and clothing for the destitute people of Europe, has been manifested in disgraceful delay in approval of UNRRA appropriations. To make matters worse, the House passed a Republican-sponsored amendment, by a 188 to 168 vote with 32 Democrats joining 156 Republicans, to make American aid to UNRRA conditional on free access to American reporters. This was admittedly aimed at the Soviet Union and countries friendly to it. While the Administration formally opposed the amendment, the fact is that its entire policy of using economic assistance and loans to other countries as a political weapon strengthened the GOP position on this issue.

It is important to cite the record of a Congress which has on every major issue thwarted the desires of the people as expressed in the last election. But it is even more important to inquire into the reasons for this consistently reactionary Congressional record. Here are some of the decisive factors:

1. The more aggressive position

of monopoly capital on both domestic and foreign policy issues following the end of the war.

With the pressures of war removed and the elimination of a government-guaranteed market that required full employment, Big Business showed no inclination to accept the Roosevelt perspective of full employment accompanied by government guarantees. Certainly the utopia envisioned by Earl Browder of voluntary wage increases as a means of increasing the home market found no supporters among the capitalists. Instead, there was a wholesale return to the classic formula of monopoly price, large profits, and a loose labor market which would make possible the smashing of unions and the cutting of wages.

Similarly in the field of foreign policy, the dominant trend in Big Business circles has been towards extending America's imperialist way rather than towards an economic and political accommodation by the United States to the framework of Big Three cooperation. Capitalist differences in strategy on these policy issues at home and abroad tended to disappear. The reactionary brass-knuckles approach of American imperialism achieved overwhelming support in Big Business circles.

2. The abandonment by the Truman Administration of the Roosevelt program of social legislation and international cooperation in line with the strategy of Big Business.

At first the change in Administration

policy seemed to be expressed in a friendly and more cooperative attitude towards Congress. Newspaper and radio commentators cheered this trend as indicating that Truman, unlike Roosevelt, would not attempt to dictate to Congress. It was said that Truman would restore the legislative branch of government to its rightful place in the scheme of things.

But it soon turned out that there was more involved than a fine point in parliamentary theory. Truman's attitude towards Congress was an immediate, practical-political issue. The new President was conciliating the Southern Democrats, who had achieved the most strategic places in Congress, and their Republican friends. He was not as subject to influence and pressure from the labor movement and its allies. He was giving lip service to the old Roosevelt program, but abandoning any pretext of fighting for it. He was unwilling to clash with the reactionaries in Congress.

Here was a marked and significant difference between Truman and Roosevelt. Roosevelt saved subsidies to keep food prices down by twice vetoing bills which included anti-subsidy amendments. The Truman Administration voluntarily abandoned subsidies. When Congress passed a tax bill which Roosevelt considered regressive, he vetoed it as a bill "for relief not of the needy but of the greedy." But the Truman Administration backed a regressive tax bill

to begin with this year, and then the President approved it after Congress had made the measure considerably worse.

3. A renewed offensive by the powerful coalition of Republicans and poll-tax Democrats which was able to take advantage of these changed circumstances.

The poll-tax system of the South has long weighted Congress on the side of reaction. The seniority system in chairmanship of committees is a further advantage to the hardy perennials who return to Congress from the South election after election. But the elections could have been a major influence in winning Congress for progressive legislation—provided there was substantial pressure from the President and vigorous leadership from his spokesmen in Congress to carry out the mandate of the voters. But Administration leaders in Congress, never too aggressive at best in supporting the Roosevelt policies, willingly fell in line with Truman's shift to the Right and virtually abdicated to the reactionary Democrats.

4. The inability of the more forward-looking Democrats in Congress, elected with labor and progressive support, to furnish alternative leadership when Truman deserted the program to which he was committed or advocated reactionary proposals such as anti-labor legislation.

They were for the most part torn with indecision on the vital issue of whether or not to break with Tru-

man, or even to criticise him. And they did not receive sufficient pressure from labor and the loose democratic coalition outside Congress to impel them towards a more independent position.

There was not formed any inclusive coalition in Congress encompassing both liberal Democrats and Republicans to fight on issues. But there has been some beginning towards group action by more forward-looking members of Congress. A group of six West Coast Congressmen led by Rep. Hugh De Lacy (D., Wash.) made an effective protest against American intervention in China. A steering committee of Congressmen led by Reps. Mary Norton (D., N.J.) and Vito Marcantonio (ALP., N.Y.) was formed to fight for enactment of the Permanent F.E.P.C. Bill. There was also a large but not very effective full employment bloc in the House led by Rep. George Outland (D., Calif.). In the Senate there was a trend during the past few years for liberal Senators like Harley Kilgore (D., W. Va.), Claude Pepper (D., Fla.) and James E. Murray (D., Mont.) to work together. But there has been little group action of this sort in the Senate in recent months. This whole problem of united and independent action by the more progressive members of Congress has assumed a new importance in view of the obvious dangers of relying on the Truman Administration to furnish any kind of democratic, anti-fascist leadership.

5. The continued existence of illusions among the democratic and progressive forces about the character of the Truman Administration.

This is one of the important factors explaining the absence of sufficient pressure on labor-supported members of Congress to fight more aggressively and assert their independence of the Truman Administration.

There still lingered on for some time the belief that Truman was carrying out the Roosevelt policies. There was not a sufficient grasp of the underlying demagoguery of many of Truman's speeches containing progressive promises unaccompanied by action or in some cases accompanied by reactionary deeds.

For example, many trade union leaders, perhaps for tactical reasons, seized on the positive aspects of the President's wage-price message to Congress, particularly his recognition of the need of labor for wage increases. But there was largely missing sharp criticism of the President's failure to offer anything specific which would have forewarned the workers of his later advocacy of anti-labor legislation.

These illusions about Truman are rapidly being overcome, but they were a retarding factor in the development of mass movements on pending political issues.

6. The absence of any organizational form for the loose democratic coalition which could be rallied to

support progressive domestic and foreign policies.

As the Democratic Party in its national leadership, and in most but not all state leadership, became increasingly reactionary, there was missing any organization on a national scale which would unite the labor movement, the Negro people, veterans, farm groups, white collar and middle class groups. It was not only a question of a third party. Even a non-partisan group uniting the anti-fascist forces on legislative issues would have been an immense step forward. The failure of many years standing to consolidate the independent political forces of the people was bearing fruit.

Illusions about Truman account in part for the slowness of the labor movement and its allies to join forces. But another major factor was the lack of unity in the labor movement. The reactionaries in Congress have enjoyed no greater boon than the split between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. It is an inescapable fact that a united labor movement is able to slow up the reactionaries in Congress. But when labor is split or when part of the leadership of labor in the A. F. of L. is indifferent or passive, the die-hards in Congress have a green light.

* * *

It is true that the record of the 79th Congress in its first year has been overwhelmingly reactionary.

But it would not be true to say that the democratic forces have exerted no influence at all. The courageous stand of the nation's scientists against the Truman Administration's atomic secrecy, against use of atomic energy as a weapon in international diplomacy, and against its control at home by monopoly, was a major factor in blocking the May-Johnson Bill.

Labor's united fight against anti-strike legislation has had a definite impact on Congress. The May-Arends Bill, banning all political action by labor and outlawing collective bargaining rights of unions which go out on strike in alleged violation of contracts, was stopped in the House by a vote of 200 to 192. The Hobbs anti-labor bill was subsequently passed, but labor has generally succeeded in slowing up the drive for anti-labor legislation, including the Administration's Norton-Ellender Bill.

There have been several positive developments in the direction of uniting the progressive forces around legislative issues. In the latter stages of the fight on tax legislation there was formed a Coordinating Committee for a Progressive Tax including such organizations as the C.I.O., Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, National Lawyers Guild, National Citizens Political Action Committee, National Farmers Union, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and United Christian Council for Democracy. The Com-

mittee took shape too late to be effective in terms of the pending tax bill, but it is a hopeful sign for the future.

Many of the same groups, plus a number of others, called a national emergency conference on December 7 in Washington on the problems of jobs and security. Some 200 organizations were represented, and went on record for Big Three unity and for a legislative program of economic security. These developments are only beginnings, but important beginnings.

They take place against the background of widespread mass disillusionment with the Truman Administration. C.I.O. President Philip Murray, summed up the attitude of millions of workers with his slashing attack on the Truman Administration's increasingly reactionary course. The resignation of Charles Houston, the prominent Negro leader, from F.E.P.C. was a protest against Truman's failure to make any real fight against discrimination. Influential Negro publications like the *Chicago Defender* have joined in criticism against the Administration. The National Farmers Union charged the Administration with "a bitter betrayal of the millions of small farmers" in the appointment of a Farm Security Administrator which ignored the advice of all liberal farm organizations.

It would be premature to say that these stirrings of protest against the Truman Administration can already

be channelized in the organization of a third party. But certainly these developments do point to the great potentialities of independent political action on a broad and unified basis by the democratic forces. This can be a major factor in the 1946 elections and in influencing the situation in Congress during the months ahead.

In a report to the National Committee of the Communist Party, Eugene Dennis said that the main objective of the progressive forces in the 1946 elections "will be to defeat the camp and the candidates of reaction and

fascism, of imperialist aggrandizement and war, as well as to rout all conciliators of this imperialist combination." Dennis added that this "will require the organization of the widest anti-fascist and democratic coalition."

There can be no doubt that the speedy formation of such a coalition, fighting expression both inside and outside the Democratic Party, will be a decisive influence on the 1946 elections. It will also have much to do in determining what happens in the second half of the 79th Congress.

TH
RO
IM

(S
of
Com
ber

If r
Com
Stat
Part
ling
all
the
Bro
Com
how
tical
cont
theo
der.
expe
Can
fina
visi
carr
of C
The
carr

THE POSTWAR ROLE OF CANADIAN IMPERIALISM

By **TIM BUCK**

*General Secretary, Labor-
Progressive Party of Canada*

*(Speech delivered at the meeting
of the National Committee of the
Communist Party, U.S.A., Novem-
ber 17, 1945.)*

IF THERE ARE any members of the Communist Party in the United States or of the Labor-Progressive Party in Canada who still nurse lingering ideas that perhaps after all there was something correct in the revisionist policies of Comrade Browder, they have only to read Comrade Dennis' report to recognize how that report corresponds to political reality and how marked is the contrast between the reality and the theory developed by Comrade Browder. Furthermore, as a result of the experience we have had so far in Canada, I am convinced that the final stage of the liquidation of revisionism within the Party will be carried through by carrying the logic of Comrade Dennis' report into life. The fight against revisionism can be carried through to completion only

by active mass struggle guided by a correct policy. Such a policy, today, must look to the mobilization of the broad masses against the policies now being developed by imperialism against the progressive democratic strivings of the peoples in various parts of the world.

We in Canada have had a somewhat different experience from that of the C.P.U.S.A. in the struggle against revisionism. On the basis of our documents, it appeared that revisionism was not very much of a problem in Canada. It is a fact that, on the basis of our official documents alone, our report on the Teheran Conference, our Party decisions and our program for the national elections, one can say that the main mistakes made in the U.S. under Comrade Browder's leadership were avoided in Canada. But once we started to discuss revisionism, and investigate the work of our Party, we found a marked divergence between our documents and Party practice. I was forced to point out during the recent meeting of our National Committee that there had evidently been a tendency merely to read a pamphlet written by Tim Buck while studying the books written by Earl Browder. In certain parts of the country, the prestige of Comrade Browder had more authority than the official documents of our own Party. As a result, we found that, contrary to what appeared on the basis of our political documents, tendencies toward revisionism were very strong.

We dealt with it in much the same way as did the C.P.U.S.A.; by a national conference, resolution, discussion in the press, public discussion in mass meetings and in every Party club. Every club was urged to re-study the entire question and, while there was not complete unanimity in every club, the entire Party repudiated the revisionist line and practices developed by Comrade Earl Browder. In spite of that, however, we find persistent tendencies to minimize the vital importance of the issue. It is only when the members are actually mobilized and brought into action in struggles that they recognize concretely how utterly wrong Browder's revisionist line was.

Down in Windsor, Ontario, where the Ford workers are now in the third month of a strike, there are no illusions about the decisive aims of monopoly capital. It is reported that young Henry Ford the second, in a meeting with representatives of the U.A.W., made a statement something like this: "There can be no such thing as a closed shop in the Ford Company of Canada plants. It's true that my grandfather, in a moment of weakness, agreed to a closed shop on the American side, but this must not be considered as a precedent or a policy of the Ford Motor Company." That story typifies the public attitude of the Ford Company during the Windsor strike and any action taken by the Dominion and Ontario provincial governments

to date have been actions to protect the interests and facilitate the anti-labor strategy of the Ford company. This is rapidly dissolving any lingering illusions that maybe Browder was right.

* * *

In this connection, I would like to add my voice to the report of Comrade Dennis in emphasizing what I consider to be a vital need at the present time, namely, the need for special emphasis on the new role of American imperialism. Sometimes, because we live in North America and are subject to its multifarious pressures, we tend to miss the fact that basic changes are taking place in the immediate objectives and the role of American imperialism. There is no doubt that the present policies of American imperialism are oriented upon the aim proclaimed by Luce and others—of making this the country of American imperialistic domination of the world. There is no doubt that the Truman Administration is seeking to place itself at the head of this drive for imperialist domination. I think the Communist movement must stand forward as the leader of the opposite, the democratic interest, in America. Without in any way weakening the struggle for the immediate needs of the workers: for 60,000,000 jobs and democratic reconversion policies, we should give first rank to the struggle to mobilize the people of North America for a democratic

world policy. We have no need to make any apologies for emphasis upon international issues. President Truman's Navy Day speech was obviously more than simply a break with the Roosevelt policy, it was a bid for a new world alignment. The so-called Atom-Bomb Conference now in progress in Washington is, in fact, only in a secondary way an atom-bomb conference; it is the beginning of a systematic effort to establish a United States and British bloc supported by Canada and other middle powers to replace the Anglo-Soviet-U. S. coalition as the core of the United Nations Organization.

A year ago, in his speech of November 6, 1944, Comrade Stalin put his finger upon one condition as indispensable for lasting peace. That condition is that the great powers continue "to act in a spirit of unanimity and accord." That unanimity and accord is now in danger of being broken. It has not been formally disrupted until now because of the extreme patience of the Soviet Government and the lengths to which it is showing itself willing to go to maintain unity and accord, if it can be maintained.

* * *

In this connection I think it is worthy of note that Canadian imperialism is also playing a new role in world politics. Canadian imperialism is a product of the latest period of imperialism itself. Its strength should not be underestimated. As a

result of the Second World War, the monopolies and their ruling finance-capitalist oligarchy have become completely dominant in domestic affairs in Canada and they are becoming increasingly aggressive in foreign affairs. The imperialist policy of the Canadian Government expresses the peculiar mutuality of interests that exists between Canadian finance capital and sections of both United States and British finance capital, as well as mirroring their insoluble contradictions. There is a definite and intimate tie-up between Canadian finance-capital and both American and British finance-capital, and the finance-capitalist oligarchy has risen and achieved domination in Canada largely through its opportunities to profit simultaneously from the capital resources of the United States and the colonial monopoly of the British Empire. Thus, Canadian finance-capital tends always to emphasize those policies which encourage or strengthen any coincidence of interest, even temporary, between Britain and the United States.

While it is irrefutable that the fundamental imperialist contradictions between British and American imperialism cannot be solved, it would be a serious mistake to assume that cooperation between these two states, even exclusive cooperation aimed against other states, is unlikely. The fact is that, unless tremendous democratic pressure can be brought to bear against it, British imperialists will probably seek to pre-

serve their empire by allowing American imperialism to feed upon it. The reason for this is clear. Victory over the Axis found the United States the greatest imperialist power that history has ever known, but found British imperialism in a dangerous position with its territorial possessions extended far beyond its material power and its financial strength.

British imperialism *alone* cannot keep India as a colony. British imperialism *alone* cannot continue to control the middle-east. British imperialism *alone* cannot maintain its hegemony over the colonial possessions, sea routes, markets and resources of the Empire. It can do that only with the help of American imperialism. American imperialism can establish its new role in the world only by absorbing a certain amount of the opportunity and interest of British imperialism in its colonial empire. American imperialism is seeking to achieve that by taking in British imperialism as its junior partner in world domination.

In striving to achieve these aims, American imperialism is not only striving to line up Britain, as well as Canada and other middle powers, behind its drive for imperialist world domination; as part of that drive it is seeking also to disrupt the U. S.-Soviet-British coalition and replace it with a United States-dominated imperialist bloc as the dominant force in the world.

It is the duty of the Marxists of the Americans to come forward be-

fore all the peoples and warn them that in the situation created by the war the policy now being developed by American imperialism is fraught with terrible danger for all the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. The two greatest states in the world of today are the rich and powerful imperialist United States and the vibrant union of Socialist nations, the U.S.S.R. These two greatest powers, the Socialist power and the imperialist power, can maintain firm, long-lasting peace by maintaining co-operation between themselves and thus promote the Big Three unity and leadership in the common interest of all the United Nations. But any policy which aims at changing this relationship so as to produce a dominant coalition of purely imperialist states can only lead to a course directed at isolating the Soviet Union, to the common detriment of the United Nations. All such a policy can do is to recreate hostilities, friction and rival policies, encouraging fascism in the countries which are under the leadership of such a British-American bloc. The Soviet Union cannot be isolated today; but continued pursuit of the present policy of American imperialism would render firm enduring peace impossible. It is a policy which could lead only to eventual war.

This is vitally important because everything flows from it. The question of withdrawing American troops from China takes on a qualitatively different character when it is

emphasized that American troops would not even be in China if there were complete accord between the United States and the Soviet Union. American troops are in China, not in a zone of American security but in a zone of Soviet security. They are in China to help a non-elected anti-democratic government against the democratic institutions established in the liberated areas under the leadership of the Communist Party. They are in China engaged in an effort to put into power in Manchuria and other provinces contiguous to the Soviet Union, an anti-Soviet government. These matters are of vital concern to all democratic, peace-loving people. It is vital that democratic opinion be aroused against American intervention in China because, in addition to our democratic responsibility to prevent imperialist intervention against the democratic forces in China, the division of public opinion in the United States is going to be very largely a division between those who are for maintaining Big Three unity and international cooperation and those who are for the policy of the Truman Administration and a redivision of the powers in preparation for an attempt once again to isolate the Soviet Union and those countries which prefer its friendship to renewed imperialist exploitation.

* * *

Does this great concern with the question of international cooperation mean, however, that we should

neglect the fight for jobs? Of course not! On the contrary, it is the one means by which jobs will be fought for effectively. There is no possibility of 60 million jobs in the United States except on the basis of international cooperation and very large-scale aid to the peoples of Europe and the Far East in economic reconstruction and development. There will be no large-scale aid to those countries if hostility to the Soviet Union dominates foreign policy, and even less if a new division of the world powers into two rival blocs is allowed to take place.

One of the tasks that must be placed in the foreground of the fight for jobs is the struggle to organize the still unorganized industries. This must be done in the period ahead. Millions of workers are going to change jobs. Millions of men and women are going to be demobilized from the armed forces. Millions of people who have experienced for the first time in their lives the advantage of trade-union organization and decent wages, are going to be forced into lower-paid industries. In Canada we actually have examples of adult workers being laid off from wartime jobs of 70 cents an hour and sent to peacetime jobs at 35 cents and even 29 cents an hour. I believe that our policy should be definitely to urge the workers to go into the civilian goods industries with determination to organize them as the war industries were organized and maintain peacetime earnings at wartime levels.

Many workers are unemployed, and the policies of the governments and the big corporations in both Canada and the United States are calculated to increase unemployment tremendously. But it would be a great mistake to orientate our activities on the idea that the sole problem is unemployment. On the contrary, we should orientate ourselves on the idea that millions of workers will be going into new jobs. Communists are in the forefront in the fight for jobs: A Job for Every Veteran through Jobs and Prosperity for All! But there is no good job except at fair wages, and the fight for sixty million jobs in the United States and full employment in Canada includes the task of organizing the unorganized industries, developing new high levels of wages and conditions in a good many of them which are still operating at or near pre-war levels.

* * *

There are plenty of problems ahead. One of the problems that must be solved is that of cooperation between the labor movement and the ex-servicemen's organizations in the struggle for complete veteran civil re-establishment. Returning servicemen want—and all democratic people want them to get—a generous bonus (gratuity in Canada), complete civil re-establishment in jobs, profession, business or farming, for every physically able veteran, generous pensions and other provisions for those who have suffered partial or

total disability and the dependents of those who gave their lives in the war against the fascist Axis. United in democratic action to secure such measures, the veterans will be a tremendous political force. United with the labor movement in democratic struggle for such measures as part of national policies aimed at the goal of sixty million jobs proclaimed by the late president Roosevelt, the combined forces of the veterans' organization and the labor movement could be decisive in the shaping of national policies.

One of the dangers confronting the veterans is that of the rise of a multiplicity of organizations competing with one another and thus largely cancelling one another's efforts and rendering the veterans' efforts futile. In Canada there was such division after the First World War, and as part of that division progressive elements among the veterans tried to establish a progressive national ex-servicemen's organization. Experience has shown, however, that (a) the highest possible degree of unity among the veterans themselves is indispensable to effective veteran action, and (b) Communist and other Left-wing veterans can contribute most to the direct struggle for veterans' needs, and to the struggle for good relations between the veterans' organizations and the labor movement, when they are in the organization to which the great mass of the veterans belong.

In Canada this organization is the

Canadian Legion. It is not a progressive organization, and its day-to-day policies and activities are mainly determined at the top; but it embraces the great majority of the organized veterans and there is scope for constructive activity in its local branches. The hundreds of members of the Labor-Progressive Party who are returning from active service are joining the Canadian Legion.

The Labor-Progressive Party is urging the setting up of joint labor-veteran committees—locally and nationally—upon which the veterans will be represented by representatives of the local organizations of the Legion, to help solve the problem of reconversion, jobs and veteran re-establishment. The A.L.P. is proposing also that the Dominion Government allow the Legion to appoint one of the members of each board of referees which passes upon applications for pensions. It is our conviction that the most effective contribution that progressive veterans can make to the struggle for veteran unity in democratic action and to veteran-labor cooperation is by fighting for correct policies in the Legion.

* * *

Finally, I want to add a comment concerning the fight against Social-Democracy. I think we should give this top priority in the fight for a democratic world policy and against the line now being developed by the Truman Administration. It must be emphasized that Social-Democracy

today is in the service of imperialism in an even more blatant manner than it was during the 20 years between the two wars.

Before the anti-Axis war it was possible for a man to assume that it was accidental that wherever Social-Democracy got into power fascism was likely to follow. Today, however, it is clear that such a consequence was not an accident but the logical aftermath of Social-Democratic betrayals.

Today the leaders of Social-Democracy are striving to get more firmly established in the service of imperialism; against the Soviet Union, against the spread of anti-capitalist peoples' governments, against the independence movements of the colonial peoples, against the struggle for Socialism.

It does not matter whether you read the *New Leader*, the *New York Call*, the *Jewish Daily Forward*, or the *C.C.F. News* in Canada, or whether you study the domestic legislation and foreign policy of the Labor Government in Britain, you see this policy being pursued in the most systematic way. It is no accident that Prime Minister Attlee of the British Labor Government came to Washington and helped President Truman to develop a more subtle technique for carrying through his atom bomb diplomacy. It was not an accident that it was Attlee who shared with President Truman the show of willingness to make the essential scientific know-how of atomic

energy available to all the world while actually taking the first step in the setting up of a new grouping of imperialist powers against the Soviet Union. In this connection it is important to note the role of Canada's Prime Minister also. Mr. King is well known as a master of ambiguity. He can make the most profound statement about simple questions, statements so ambiguous that while people are trying to figure out what he means they are likely to forget what he says. If you read the three-power statement on the atom bomb you will see that he must have had a hand in writing it.

The clearest example of the role that Social-Democracy is playing in the present stage of affairs is to be seen in the extreme efforts being made by the British Labor Government to place itself on the side of American imperialism—and against the Soviet Union. It is sending British troops to Indonesia, shooting down the people who are engaged in an obviously popular struggle for national independence. Thus, ruthless use of planes and tanks against the people of the Dutch East Indies is to maintain the iniquitous colonial

monopoly of the Dutch for the profit of British, Dutch and American investors in the Royal Dutch Shell and the Standard Oil in Indonesia. It is clear that the British Labor Government would not resort to such barbaric ruthlessness if it really intended to free India from imperial domination. In its striving to win the approbation of U.S. finance capital, Social-Democracy, through the British Labor Government, has gone beyond simple acquiescence in U.S. foreign policy; it strives to distinguish itself—particularly by pointing up the development of an anti-Soviet policy.

The false role of Social-Democracy will not be exposed in the struggle for wages alone. The role of Social-Democracy will be exposed clearly only if we help, I think quite sharply, to force the re-division between those who are for following the line of striving to make this the century of American imperialist world domination with the dominant imperialist powers aligned against the Soviet Union and democratic world reconstruction, and those who are for world cooperation with the Soviet Union and the transitional states in the post-war reconstruction.

e profit
can in-
ell and
a. It is
Govern-
ch bar-
tended
omina-
appro-
Social-
ish La-
beyond
foreign
h itself
up the
policy.
mocracy
struggle
Social-
clearly
sharply,
en those
line of
ntury of
domina-
perialist
Soviet
recons-
or world
Union
the post-