

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

A magazine devoted

to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, HENRY WINSTON

VOLUME XXVI, NO. 3

Contents

MARCH, 1947

The Progressives Can and Must Unite	Eugene Dennis	195
The German Problem and Big Three Unity	Joseph Clark	204
International Women's Day, 1947	Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	216
A Communist Wage Policy	Alexander Bittelman	221
The Postwar International Situation	Lu Ting-Yi	239
Spotlight on the A.C.T.U.	George Morris	252
The Approach of an Economic Crisis in the Capitalist World	Eugene Varga	264
The Brazilian National Elections	Joseph Starobin	269
Industrial Health and Safety	Al Loew	279

Registered 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

NEW PUBLICATIONS

THE PEOPLE AGAINST THE TRUSTS, by Eugene Dennis	\$.10
WORKERS, DEFEND YOUR UNIONS!, by William Z. Foster01
TAX RELIEF FOR WHOM—THE NEEDY OR THE GREEDY?, by Donald Freeman.....	.03
HOLD THAT RENT CEILING!, by Louise Mitchell.....	.03
PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL, THE COMMUNIST POSITION ON THE JEWISH QUESTION, by Alexander Bittelman15
HOW'S YOUR HEALTH?—THE FIGHT FOR A NA- TIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM, by Robert Fried- man10
WHAT PRICE PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE?, by George Phillips10
MEAT—A NATIONAL SCANDAL, by Lem Harris.....	.05
LYNCHING AND FRAME-UP IN TENNESSEE, by Robert Minor25
HOW WALL STREET PICKS YOUR POCKET, by George Morris03
THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND YOU, by Betty Gannett10
THE SOVIET UNION AND WORLD PEACE, by Joseph Stalin and V. M. Molotov.....	.10
THE CASE AGAINST DAVID DUBINSKY, by William Weinstone30
ENEMIES OF THE PEACE: PROFILE OF THE "HATE- RUSSIA" GANG, by Sender Garlin.....	.10

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

**THE
CAN
MUST**

COMRADE
America
deeply d
America.

All wh
cy of an
and of l
Three un
at the be
Administ

The A
out being
5 million
They kn
security,
stantial v
program.

Jim Crow
know th
racy and

We C
of these
these are
should l
America
is one p
preceden
the need

* Abridge
ment in

THE PROGRESSIVES CAN AND MUST UNITE*

By EUGENE DENNIS

COMRADES AND FRIENDS:

America's common people are deeply disturbed about our postwar America.

All who uphold the Roosevelt policy of an Economic Bill of Rights, and of lasting peace based on Big Three unity, are gravely concerned at the betrayals of that policy by the Administration and Congress.

The American people know, without being told, that today they need 25 million homes and apartments. They know that they need economic security, a stronger Wagner Act, substantial wage increases, a people's tax program, and an end to lynching, Jim Crow, and anti-Semitism. They know that they need more democracy and a durable peace.

We Communists are fully aware of these needs of our people. For these are our needs too. But we should like to say to our fellow Americans that in our opinion there is one paramount need which takes precedence over all others. *That is the need for unity: for unity of ac-*

tion by all sections of organized labor; for the common action of labor and all progressives, of all the democratic forces and elements in American life. Without unity, all of us will stand helpless before those who ignore and flaunt our other needs.

This anti-fascist and progressive unity has become the crying need of the hour. And the hour is later than most think. Such an hour of opportunity came once to pre-war Germany. But the minutes ticked away while the German anti-fascists debated and split hairs. When the precious hour had passed, the Nazis were already entrenched in power.

Opportunity knocked again for the democratic and peace-loving peoples and nations of the world, prior to Munich, calling them to quarantine the Axis aggressors. But the Western democracies let this opportunity go by. They rejected the policy of collective security which could have prevented, or quickly ended, World War II.

We Americans are peculiarly fortunate. Our land escaped invasion. Our people were spared the horrors of the concentration camp. To us has been given the rare privilege of learning from the tragic experience of others.

All the more terrible, therefore, would be our fate if we were not to avail ourselves of this privilege. All the more shameful would be our collective guilt if we were to fail in wisdom and courage when life put us to the test.

* Abridged text of a speech delivered at a mass meeting in Chicago, February 4, 1947.

Comrades! Fellow Americans!
*The testing time for the American
 people is here, is now.*

All over liberated Europe, the lessons learned in the tortured years of Nazi bondage are now being applied. New democracies are rising in Eastern Europe. They find their strength in a united people, in broad national fronts—embracing *all* anti-fascists. People's congresses, democratically elected, meet to serve labor and the people's needs.

But here, in our America, the picture is quite different. Our 80th Congress takes the offensive against labor and the people. The Republican Party legislators and their Southern Bourbon colleagues debate only whether to destroy labor's rights at one fell swoop or piecemeal. They propose to bring back those iniquities of the past—the open shop and the anti-labor injunction. They demand that labor get out of politics. They seek to hound from public life, and to drive into second-class citizenship, the Communists, the Negro people, the Jewish people, and all progressives.

We Americans are a proud people. We are proud, not only of our industrial efficiency, but especially of our democratic know-how, of our glorious revolutionary past. We are proud that our War of Independence brought forth a "nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We are proud that in Lincoln's time the star-spangled banner carried the

destiny of the world's working class. And we are proud that under Franklin Delano Roosevelt's leadership our country became the arsenal of democracy and sent the star-spangled banner to fly beside the flags of our great wartime allies, sharing with them the honor of carrying the Four Freedoms into battle against fascist slavery.

Yes, we have reason to be proud. More than once in the course of our history, our country has been the center of world progress. But we cannot live forever on the glory of our past. If we are to hold our head high among the nations, we must face the postwar reality and meet the challenge of today.

Today the hard fact is that our country has become the center of world reaction. The giant American monopolies, grown fat on the people's war effort and victory, now seek to continue their wartime profiteering and strive to dominate the world. What Lincoln warned against in 1861 has come to pass again. The effort to place capital above labor has been advanced, especially by the G.O.P.'s electoral triumph last November.

Today the men of the American trusts challenge us as never before. The unholy trinity of aggressive reaction, militarism, and imperialism tightens its hold on Congress, and on the Truman Administration as well. It places a heavy tax burden on the common people in order to finance its huge armaments program, to

maintain
 and to s
 The m
 full and
 affairs, a
 mand of
 dustry.
 On the
 ference t
 Germany
 John Fos
 of the G
 imperiali
 incorpora
 basin int
 aim of es
 viet base
 fascist A
 their jum
 All thi
 trayal of
 long-term
 unity. It
 scuttle th
 to torped
 After t
 ernment
 generously
 can econ
 democrati
 Out of th
 icts of
 people of
 of the I
 coalition,
 sign.
 History
 it does no
 ive of re
 tion is di

maintain its far-flung military bases, and to stock-pile its atom bombs.

The military now takes over the full and direct conduct of our foreign affairs, and assumes increasing command of science, education, and industry.

On the eve of the Moscow conference to draft a peace treaty for Germany, Arthur Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles reveal the aims of the G.O.P. and the most extreme imperialists. Those aims include the incorporation of the Ruhr-Rhine basin into a Western bloc, with the aim of establishing there an anti-Soviet base to be controlled by the pro-fascist American monopolists and their junior partners in Britain.

All this is a repudiation and betrayal of the Roosevelt policy for a long-term peace based on Big Three unity. It is a desperate attempt to scuttle the Potsdam agreement and to torpedo the United Nations.

* * *

After the first World War, government by Big Business came dangerously close to wrecking the American economy and destroying the democratic American way of life.

Out of the trials, suffering, and conflicts of that period, the common people of America forged the unity of the Roosevelt labor-progressive coalition, and thwarted that evil design.

History is rich in parallels, but it does not repeat itself. The offensive of reaction in this postwar period is different in kind, as well as

in intensity, from that launched after World War I. A bigger economic bust will tread fast upon the heels of a smaller boom. This time, reaction—hell-bent for a new orgy of monopoly profiteering, exploitation, and world domination—will not stop at Hooverism. It is out to prepare for labor and the American people the fate Hitler foisted on Germany.

But America is *not* Germany in 1933. And the American people have no cause to despair, *if only they act quickly and act in unison.*

All men of good will agree that it is desirable, and necessary, that America's progressives unite. But still the debate rages on two key questions: *can* the progressives unite, and *how* can they unite?

This discussion has already been going on too long, without resolution. The reactionaries have closed their ranks. But still the camp of labor and progress is torn with division.

There are 212 anti-labor bills scrambling for first place on the Congressional calendar—*bills designed to shackle the trade unions and nullify the Bill of Rights.* But still the national leadership of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O., and the Railway Brotherhoods continues to act separately, and often at cross-purposes. *This disunity of labor is the Achilles heel of the democratic camp.* It emboldens the Tafts and Hoovers, and all the ultra-reactionaries inside and outside of Congress.

In view of this, all progressives should welcome the initiative of Philip Murray, who on December 5 of last year proposed that the A. F. of L., the C.I.O., and the Railroad Brotherhoods establish united action to defend their common interests. Despite the motives of Green, Woll, Hutcheson & Co., most progressives will also take a positive attitude toward the recent proposal of the A. F. of L. Executive Council to establish organic unity in the labor movement. However, the re-unification of the labor movement into one national center, and around a progressive program, can be achieved only with patience, effort—and considerable time.

But time is now of the essence. United action of labor and all progressives is required *immediately*, if the anti-labor drive and monopoly program of Big Business are to be checked and defeated. Therefore, the endeavor to achieve organic unity in the trade union movement *must not and cannot become a substitute for establishing unity of action now*. On the contrary, *the forging of united labor action, today, will in itself promote the eventual realization of organic labor unity*.

In addition to the existing dangerous divisions in labor's ranks, partisan and tactical differences remain unresolved between many progressives seeking a common objective. For instance, in preparing for the 1948 elections, some progressives hold that the candidates and program of reaction can be defeated *only* by

forming a third party, a new, people's, anti-monopoly and anti-war party. Others insist that this common aim can be realized *only* through the progressives winning control of the Democratic Party. This disagreement as to *means* still impedes *the coordinated action* of all progressive elements who share common immediate objectives and who desire to ensure the election of a pro-Roosevelt president and Congress in 1948.

Moreover, many liberals are confused and disoriented by the differences between the two new organizations that claim to speak for progressives—Progressive Citizens of America, and Americans for Democratic Action. While there are honest and well-meaning progressives in both organizations, the anti-Communist policy of some of the leaders of A.D.A. does a disservice to the whole progressive cause. The avowed purpose of this policy is "merely" to divide Communists and Communist sympathizers from the mass of non-Communist progressives. But, in fact, this policy is setting non-Communist liberals against other non-Communist liberals, pro-Roosevelt Democrats against other pro-Roosevelt Democrats, trade unionists and independent voters against other trade unionists and independent voters. And it is paralyzing and repulsing many who seek the road to unity and progress, keeping them away from any form of organized or coordinated action.

Then, is torn a position Communists whether used by to divisive.

On the state quiet to fund ward lo are not of America warn the between munists tionaries aggravated progressi In the divisive furtherin sives, we our posit ions.

We C workers range ob tem of war, of faction by n goal tow working Because better A league w future, w of its glor Precisel

Then, too, the democratic camp is torn asunder today by the diverse position of progressives toward the Communists. The question of whether Communists and non-Communists can cooperate is still being used by the Red-baiters, by reaction, to divide labor and the progressives.

On this question, we Communists state quite frankly that we subscribe to fundamental aims, and work toward long-range objectives, which are not today shared by the majority of American progressives. But we warn that this difference of opinion between Communists and non-Communists is being used by the reactionaries everywhere to foster and aggravate *all* divisions in the labor-progressive camp.

In the interest of defeating the divisive tactics of reaction and of furthering the unity of all progressives, we Communists wish to make our position crystal clear on all questions.

We Communists are Americans, workers and Marxists. Our long-range objective is socialism—a system of society free of crises and war, of fascism and of man's exploitation by man. Historically, this is the goal toward which the American working class also strives.

Because we are Marxists, we are *better* Americans. For we are in league with America's progressive future, which will fulfill the promise of its glorious revolutionary part.

Precisely because we are Commu-

nists, we are patriots. We are true to the democratic traditions of our country, and give *our only allegiance to the sovereign power that resides in the American people*—to whose democratic will we submit. As American Marxists, we take the American road to socialism — understanding that it need not necessarily prove to be identical with that travelled by other nations.

While our ultimate goal is the eventual socialist reorganization of society, we Communists live very much in the present. Our Party's policy and position today *is based on the realities of today*, on the needs and aspirations of all progressives, and on the possibilities for progress that exist in the present period of our country's history.

That is why we state that the supreme task of this period—for Communists and non-Communists alike—is to curb the monopolies and check and defeat pro-fascist reaction.

That is our position. That is our policy. We, on our part, will subordinate everything to realize this limited, though indispensable, objective, without which there can be no social progress in these United States.

* * *

Your liberal newspaper, the *Chicago Sun*, agrees with us that the real danger in America is that of reaction and that "the function of a progressive movement is to fight reaction." But, unfortunately, it also voices the opinion of many liberals

that differences on fundamental and long-range aims must prevent the cooperation of non-Communist progressives with Communists. In a recent editorial, the *Sun* said:

There have been notable instances of progressive cooperation with Communists when the two movements had a common objective, such as winning the war. But the objectives are not common when it comes to long-range political action in the United States.

Tonight, as we honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, we recall that the problem of taking joint action, despite differences over long-range objectives, is not altogether new to American progressives.

In the 1850's, the progressives of our country were an oddly assorted company, gathered, Lincoln said, "from the four winds," and divided by many differences of interest and opinion. The reactionary offensive of their time threw down its own challenge, and the progressives sought the road to joint action in order to curb the feudal slave power of the South and check and defeat its aggressive ambitions.

The vast majority of progressives, Lincoln among them, subscribed only to the limited aim of curbing the slave oligarchy and checking the spread of slavery. But there were some with more advanced, long-range objectives. Among these were the Abolitionists, who proclaimed

their goal to be the abolition of slavery. In addition, there were the early Socialists, the followers of Karl Marx and the historic advance guard of our American Communist Party, who stood four square, not only for the abolition of chattel slavery, but also for the abolition of capitalist wage slavery.

A group of troubled progressive leaders, unable to decide if those opposed only to the expansion of slavery could act jointly with the Abolitionists and the Socialists, went one day to put this question to an elder statesman, Martin Van Buren. The old ex-President, no flaming radical, gave them this sage reply:

You must be very strong if you are already picking and choosing. I had supposed we wanted *every* man who is opposed to the expansion of slavery.

We Communists cherish no illusions about the strength of the labor and progressive camp today. We are quite certain that it needs *every* man and woman who is opposed to the offensive of the trusts, to reaction and fascism.

We cannot agree with the *Sun* that the end of the anti-Axis war put an end to either the possibility or the urgent necessity for cooperation between Communists and non-Communists. We cannot agree that the end of the war has narrowed the ground on which all progressives can and must take a common stand. On the contrary, we are certain that

the con-
can and
daily gro-

Victor
moved
abroad,
Greece,
victory
diminish
fascism
coup d'
madge
versive
Cormick
Chicago
labor d
Congres

Thus,

which t
a comm
continue
zation o

Now,
who sa
Commun
your an
we can
we disa

We C
with all
our im

jectives,
ness, or
means
common
weapon
tory tru
men. A
full reli
action o
forces.

the community of interests which can and must unite progressives is daily growing wider.

Victory over the Axis has not removed the remnants of fascism abroad, either in Western Germany, Greece, Spain, or Japan. Nor has victory over Hitler and the Mikado diminished the menacing threat of fascism at home. The pro-fascist coup d'état of the K.K.K. and Talmadge in Georgia, the sinister subversive activities of Colonel McCormick and American Action in Chicago, and the reactionary anti-labor drive of the N.A.M. cabal in Congress, suffice to make this clear.

Thus, the anti-fascist aims for which the war was fought are still a common bond uniting all who continue the struggle for the realization of those aims.

Now, there are some progressives who say—yes, we agree with you Communists; we are in accord with your anti-fascist objectives; however, we cannot work with you because we disagree with your "tactics."

We Communists desire to discuss with all other progressives, not only our immediate and long-range objectives, but, and with equal frankness, our strategy and tactics, the means we employ to achieve the common end. We boast no "secret weapon" to mount against the predatory trusts and their political henchmen. *As Communists, we place our full reliance in the open, public, mass action of labor and all democratic forces.*

We say that the common defense of democracy cannot be plotted in a smoke-filled room. It must be publicly organized in every shop and factory, every ward and precinct, every block in every neighborhood, throughout our country. *Our watchword is unity—unity of purpose, of action, of struggle.*

We agree with the Chicago Sun that unity must be based on *principle*. That is why we Communists insist upon one basic principle, and why we place *only one* condition for establishing joint anti-fascist action and the broadest democratic coalition of all progressives: namely, that unity of action, that the common effort of all progressives shall be directed *against* the fascist-minded trusts. And we propose, further, that *all* who oppose reaction and fascism and are willing to struggle against the common enemy be accepted into the labor-progressive camp, irrespective of political affiliation, race, or creed.

But we do not even propose that others subscribe to, or help advance, our long-range objectives, much less make this a condition for entering into alliance with them. We do not even insist that they agree with us on all the burning issues of the immediate present.

For instance, we believe it so vital to block the pending vicious anti-labor legislation in Congress that we call for the joint action of all who oppose its passage—even those who do not support the American work-

ers' just demand for substantial wage increases. We call for the joint action of all who support the workers' wage demands—even if some of these do not understand the need for defending the Wagner Act. We call for a united defense of the inalienable, democratic rights of the Negro people—welcoming to it all defenders of democracy, even if some of these do not grasp the threat to democracy inherent in monopoly's anti-labor and tax program. We fight for peace, for fulfillment of the Potsdam agreement on Germany, for universal disarmament, for outlawing the atomic bomb, for cooperation with all who uphold the Roosevelt peace policy, regardless of their partisan ties or their domestic policies.

We work, but do not wait, for agreement to be arrived at in the top echelons of the labor and progressive movement. We understand that *now, as never before, the forging of common action is the business of the common man.* We therefore call upon the common man in the factory and on the farm, in ward and precinct, to initiate that grass-roots unity of action which is and must be the life-blood of united labor action and the foundation on which an effective democratic coalition can be built.

At the same time, we seek to bring into joint labor and citizens' action every progressive force on a city, state, and national scale. We hold that what *must* be done, *can* be done. We hold that each and every reac-

tionary assault against the people and democracy can be resisted and defeated by the unity of all progressives and their leaders. We hold that each and every reactionary attack inside or outside of Congress must be resisted and defeated in time. Only thus can the deep desire of the American people to save our country from the hell of fascism be fulfilled.

We Communists ask no special favors for ourselves from those who gather in the camp of labor and progress. We ask to be judged only by the loyalty, devotion, and ability we display in upholding and carrying out a common program and the democratic will of the majority in any united front or coalition, or in any trade union and other mass organization.

But we will not accept second-class citizenship in the ranks of the anti-fascists. In all modesty, we think we have earned our right to live and work among all who oppose the reactionaries and fascists. Our Party, led by Foster and Johnstone, sparked the drive to organize the unorganized in industrial unions. From Scottsboro to Monroe, Georgia, we have been the tireless champions of the rights of the Negro people. We are proud to be known as the "pre-mature" anti-fascists who have fought fascism, resolutely, everywhere—who called for united resistance to fascism and aggression in China, Ethiopia, Spain, and elsewhere. We are proud to be in the vanguard of those who demand that the agreements of

Teheran
faithful
velt's E
enacted

We h
champion
and dem
abroad.
the pion
ginnes, v
ever the
the Com

Comra
wind of
blow str
city than
Septemb
tional, p
Progressi

Decembe
million a
widely d
jects, fo
democrat
tant secti
taken the
tion and
united r
drive of

Obviou
steps—an
Stronger
must sw
up all th
ave, and
life. The
of the pe
the peopl

Teheran, Moscow, and Potsdam be faithfully carried out and that Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights be enacted and realized.

We have been and we are the champions of unity, of anti-fascist and democratic unity, at home and abroad. We have been and are both the pioneers and the Jimmy Higginses, who do unity's work wherever there is even one member of the Communist Party.

* * *

Comrades! Friends! The good wind of democratic unity seems to blow stronger here in your windy city than in some other places. Last September, you were host to the national, pro-Roosevelt Conference of Progressives. Here in Chicago, in December, the representatives of a million and a half students, holding widely differing views on many subjects, found common ground for democratic action. Here, too, important sections of organized labor have taken the first steps toward joint action and are beginning to organize united resistance to the anti-labor drive of the open-shoppers.

Obviously, these are only the first steps—and very inadequate at that. Stronger winds of democratic unity must sweep our country, gathering up all that is wholesome, progressive, and anti-fascist in American life. The advocates of government of the people, by the people, and for the people must not yield ground to

the proponents of government of the trusts, by the trusts, and for the trusts.

The blitz which pro-fascist reaction prepares against the American people and their democratic institutions can and must be averted. It must be averted by united action now, while there is still time to act. Those who hope to escape the consequences of a blitz today, dare not waste time debating over where they want to go tomorrow.

The good and tested American axiom that *in union there is strength* has become the categorical imperative for labor and all progressives today. A powerful labor and democratic coalition is within our grasp. We have only to reach out our hands, seize it and shape it, before the opportunity to do so is snatched from us.

The hour for common action—*of, by, and for the common man*—is here for all progressives, non-Communists and Communists alike.

Let us meet its challenge boldly, and seize its opportunities with determination.

Let us act together—now—with all the strength of our unity, to stem the rise of reaction and fascism, to protect our trade unions, our democratic heritage, our common interests.

Let us act together to ensure a progressive and peaceful future for our people, for America, our own, our native land.

THE GERMAN PROBLEM AND BIG THREE UNITY

By JOSEPH CLARK

IT WOULD NOT be accurate to say that Standard Oil and General Motors, Ford and du Pont, Chase National and Alcoa, and all the best names of American industry sold out their country for thirty pieces of silver. Their price was much higher. U. S. corporation investments and loans in pre-war Germany totaled \$1,421,000,000.* Nor was the haul from this investment all the profit derived by the men who gave Hitler weapons which killed American boys. There was patent control and there was world domination which meant millions over and beyond the one and a half billion dollars invested in Germany.

All this would just be history—the ordinary history of a class which betrayed its country for private gain. It would be the history of America without the rubber for guns and trucks—because Standard Oil had an

* *Rulers of America*, Anna Rochester. (International Publishers) New York.

agreement with its German blood money brothers barring the synthetic rubber patent from this country.

It would be the history of converting American industry to war production, only for a price—a price which finally came to \$51,000,000,000 in corporation profits, after taxes.

It is the history of the terrible war just fought, and the record of what is happening today. The names of the American corporations are the same—the names of their German buddies are often similar. The Germans who financed and armed the German military machine are persona grata in the western occupation zones. And those Americans who sold out their country for the millions they could get through connections with German industry are being invited back to Germany.

If relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are the key to world peace and security today, the settlement of the German question is the key to Soviet-American relations.

Writing a satisfactory peace treaty with Germany is the primary political issue of 1947. Before anything else, America's security demands a proper solution of this problem.

We have blamed and even prosecuted Germans for creating those conditions which produced Hitler and war. What then must we say about Americans in Germany who repeat what those same Germans did? Of what value our condemna-

tion of
Hitler
German
ready tr
who sup

INDUST

What
which g
tance in
trate in
tial giar
infinite
evil for
and for
are pro
outstrip
industri
fifty ye
only ca
that cou
levels of
the war
basis of
nology—
tradition
ace such
world b
Exper
in Germ
dous in
destroyed.
is much
In a v
We Do
gar Snc
Feb. 15,
factor,
meaning

tion of the Germans who supported Hitler if American authorities in Germany speed down the path already tramped upon by the legions who supported Hitler?

INDUSTRIAL GIANT

What is there about Germany which gives it such unique importance in world affairs? Though prostrate in defeat, Germany is a potential giant of industry, science and infinite capacity for either good or evil for its own 67,000,000 people and for the rest of the world. People are prone to forget that Germany outstripped Britain as the foremost industrial power in Europe nearly fifty years ago. Germany was the only capitalist power in the world that could compete with American levels of industrial achievement. And the war machine built up on the basis of such vast industry and technology—not to speak of its military tradition and caste—created a menace such as had never confronted the world before.

Expert examination of the damage in Germany reveals that its tremendous industrial capacity was not destroyed. And of course the potential is much greater.

In a very interesting article, "Why We Don't Understand Russia," Edgar Snow (*Saturday Evening Post*, Feb. 15, 1947) says that the semantic factor, failing to understand the meaning of words, has a lot to do

with Soviet-American misunderstandings. Snow writes:

Consider Molotov's precondition for a treaty with Germany, his reiteration that we must first clean up "remnants of German fascism." To Americans that may be just a phrase which has become a nauseous cliché. But to any Russian Marxist it means in brief: liquidation of the Prussian Junkers and the landlord system throughout Germany, distribution of land to the peasants, an end to the economic power of large and middle capitalists, state ownership of important industry, suppression of anti-Soviet elements, and a German regime observing policies of economic, political and military friendship and collaboration with the U.S.S.R.

Whether or not Snow is defining correctly what a Russian Marxist means by "eradication of the remnants of German fascism," he is not being fair to Americans when he says that it is just a "nauseous cliché" to them. And we suspect that such liberals as Joseph Barnes of the *New York Herald Tribune* would object to the statement that only Russian Marxists favor individual farm ownership as against feudal ownership of landed estates by barons, counts and dukes. Barnes wrote recently that there is too much of a tendency to ascribe to the Russians any reform at all, even if that reform is directly traceable to Thomas Jefferson.

We agree with Snow that it is a good idea to know what Stalin and Molotov mean by fascism. It is also worth finding out how Marshall and Truman would define it. But the issue today is what has to be eliminated in Germany to insure American and world security. And the question is, how can it be eliminated? It was no more a matter of something in the German blood, than what ran in British veins was responsible for British tyranny in 1776 and 1812.

ROLE OF THE JUNKERS

The task then is to discover what there was and is in Germany which created the threat to us and to every other independent nation in the world. Let us start with the Junkers. No differences about the meaning of words should obscure the fact that the German military caste was a threat to peace. The Kaiser went, but the Generals remained after World War I. And the names of the men describe their class origin: von Brauchitsch, von Reichenau, von Rundstedt, von Mannstein, von Bock, von Stuelpnagel, Ritter von Leeb, von Arnim, von Kleist.

Those are the Junkers—the men of the feudal landed estates of Germany. They are the men who built and officered Germany's army from Frederick to Bismarck, from Kaiser Wilhelm to the Weimar Republic, and finally under Hitler.

Fit punishment of the German High Command, which planned Hitler's conquests and atrocities to the smallest detail, is a necessary consequence of victory. That members of Hitler's High Command have been freed on parole, along with 300 leading Nazis, by U. S. military authorities, is an insult to the Americans who fought on every battlefield of the war.

Punishment of these officer criminals is, however, only one phase of the task, which demands removing the caste which militarized Germany and used the Wehrmacht for aggressive warfare. That caste and that military force will never be eliminated so long as Junkers remain in Germany. Remnants of Germany's feudal past, the Junkers found a home under capitalism. The unholy alliance of feudal landlords and imperialist capitalists in Germany formed the basis for Junker-imperialist aggressions from Bismarck to Hitler.

Most of the Junker estates were located in the eastern part of Germany, now in the Soviet occupation zone. By uprooting this class and dividing up its land among the farmers, the Soviet occupation authorities and the German administration in that zone have dealt a deadly blow against the breeding ground of Prussian militarism. It devolves upon Americans, in our national interest, to work for the eradication of Junkerdom and all feudal remnants in Germany.

NAZI BUSINESS DICTATORS

Alongside the Junkers is that class which financed Hitler, brought him to power and benefited most directly from the conquest of foreign lands — the big businessmen, bankers and industrialists. As foreign loans poured into Germany after 1924, German monopolies concentrated greater and greater capital into their firms. I. G. Farben combined most of the chemical industry. Vereinigte Stahlwerke joined together the coal, iron and steel empires of Thyssen, Kirdorf and Hugo Stinnes.

The dictators of Germany's banks, mines and factories—Krupp, Thyssen, Schacht, Flick, Voss, Rocchling, Steinbrink — cast the die which brought Hitler to power on January 30, 1933. They financed the Nazi party long before they were ready to put it in power. Fritz Thyssen and Emil Kirdorf made financial contributions from the late 1920s. Those industrialists who had backed the Zentrum (Catholic) party and the German Nationalists were ready to cast their lot with Hitler by 1933.

Under Hitler there was a rapid acceleration of the concentration and centralization of capital into the hands of the big trusts. Between 1933 and 1940 the number of joint stock companies in Germany fell from 11,488 to 5,397. But shares rose from 20.64 billion marks to 21.49 billion. The Nazi publication *Wirtschaft und Statistik* showed that the num-

ber of small joint companies fell from 5,453 in 1933 to 2,128 in 1940; medium-sized companies declined from 3,016 to 2,576, while the large companies increased from 679 to 693. Those large companies controlled 17,000,000,000 marks of capital in 1940 while the small and medium-sized firms together had but 4,500,000,000. By 1942 the Hermann Goering Works alone controlled 1,300,000,000 marks and I. G. Farben 1,400,000,000.

Meanwhile the Prussian Junkers strengthened their direct ties with capitalist enterprise under Hitler. Thus, General Thomas was a member of the Defense Council of State Economy and was also one of the directors of the Rheinmetallwerke. Admiral Heusinger von Waldegg was a director of Krupp's shipyards at Kiel. General Ritter von Leeb was a director of the Goering Works. General Joachim von Stuelpnagel owned the *Berliner Boersenzeitung* (Berlin's *Wall Street Journal*).

When Hitler came to power he also had a wide social base among the middle classes, peasants and lumpenproletarians. But the class essence of his power and his policy was reactionary, chauvinist, war-driving *finance capital*.

We can abolish the German Army. We can arrest millions of Nazis. We can police the German soil for years. And then we could still be faced with a resurgent German militarism as long as the Junkers

controlled their estates and the monopolists controlled their firms. An essential element of denazification therefore is economic disarmament of Germany, in the sense of the complete dismantling of machines which produce war material and through the deep-going elimination of cartels and monopolies—the economic roots of fascism.

The danger that America and the world will again be endangered by German militarism stems from the class betrayal of America's national interests by the trusts and monopolies of the United States. Just as the Standard Oil-Farben deals helped Hitler's war against America, so the efforts of G.M. and Kodak, Voighth and every other big firm to pick up where it left off in Germany creates threats of future aggression.

America stands committed to the elimination of militarism and fascism in Germany not because of abstract ideological considerations. We joined with the Soviet Union and Britain at Yalta and Potsdam because our country's security required the elimination of the roots of German fascism, militarism and aggression.

To understand the sources of that militarism and aggression is to know the futility of abstract debates about whether we should be "soft" or "tough" with Germany. It also helps us understand what lies at the bottom of the debate concerning a united Germany versus a loose German federation. And it helps us decide what

principles should pertain to level for German industry and what should be done about the Ruhr.

THE ANSWER IN GERMANY

Europe and the world, as well as the 67,000,000 Germans, require a healthy, democratic Germany. If history teaches us anything, it is that a nation must develop within itself those forces which will shape its destinies. Without the military defeat of Germany we should never have been able to discuss a democratized Germany. But now it is within Germany itself that we must seek the answer to Germany's future.

Can anyone deny that German big businessmen who made millions out of the murder and rape of Belgium, Holland, France, Norway, Denmark, Yugoslavia, Greece, Poland, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic Soviet republics and the murder of 6,000,000 Jews—cannot possibly build a demilitarized, denazified, democratic Germany?

Nationalization of Big Business and of business owned by participants in the Nazi crimes is a democratic reform. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany supports land reforms and nationalization, which are not socialist measures. Capitalist enterprises in industry as well as agriculture can and will exist in a Germany where the Junker estates are divided among the peasants, and monopolies and Nazi-owned industries

are taken over by the city and state administrations and whatever form of central government will be established. How else, today, except through such land reforms and nationalization will the Nazis be eliminated from controlling Germany's economic destiny?

If his American Big Business interests had "attorneys" working for them before the guns ceased firing nearly two years ago. Businessmen whose factories turned out the weapons which murdered American soldiers were among those assigned the job of "restoring" German economy. German capitalists, as a result of these pressures, have received the right to enter into business deals with foreign capitalists. A special Berlin dispatch to the *New York Times*, dated Feb. 13, reports:

The Department of Commerce is studying a series of recommendations for relaxing controls over German business. . . . A personal emissary of Secretary W. Averell Harriman spent three days here last November to learn how the Commerce Department would help to rebuild German foreign trade.

The emissary was Philip D. Reed of the General Electric Co., who flew here from Paris at the suggestion of Mr. Harriman and General Clay.

Among the recommendations of the General Electric representative was "the scrapping of the decartelization law." Also "the abolition of laws and prohibitions for German

business men to which business men of Allied countries are not subjected." G.E.'s man recommended "permission for more German commercial and technical representatives to travel abroad in behalf of German manufacturers."

Gen. Clay and Secretary Harriman could not have picked a more fitting representative to recommend pro-Nazi policies for Germany than a spokesman for General Electric. A year after Hitler came to power, the *Handbuch der deutschen Aktiengesellschaften* reported that General Electric had acquired 16 per cent of A.E.G. (the German electrical trust) stock.

TRUE DENAZIFICATION

German economy needs reviving in keeping with the need for the destruction of Germany's military potential. A starving Germany is not a fit subject for democracy. A poor Germany could not help repair the damage it wrought all over the world. But a reconstructed Germany must once and for all time be built on the foundations of a democracy which Germany never had before.

The obvious aspects of demilitarization and denazification are relatively easy to carry out. But even these are not being carried out uniformly in all four occupation zones. Thus, a joint, four-power investigation team which examined the progress of demilitarization of industry

found that the Soviet zone was far advanced compared with the others. Then came the American, then the British, and least progress has been made in the French zone. This commission found that only in the Soviet zone were the war plants eliminated root and branch.

Similarly with regard to removal of Nazis from official posts, the western zones are lagging. Most disgraceful was the parole given by U. S. military authorities to 300 top-flight Nazis. These members of German High Command, leaders of the SS (Hitler's Elite Guard) and other Nazi leaders were paroled so that the German denazification courts should not be able to prosecute them the way they did Fritzsche, von Papen and Schacht, after the western members of the Nuernberg court had released them.

Even the most conservative newsmen who toured the Soviet occupation zone found that the secret of denazification and demilitarization there was not just the formal removal of Nazis. They found nazism was removed because the twin sources of German fascism were removed—the Junker estates and the monopolists.

By the same token it is notorious that Nazi ideology is rampant in the western zones. The conservative parties there are an open haven for the Nazis. Despite any figures that can be cited about removals of Nazis, until their breeding ground is elimi-

nated—the Junker estates and the business interests which supported Hitler—nazism cannot be wiped out.

The Four Power military occupation of Germany is an essential part of the denazification and demilitarization of Germany. It cannot be a permanent feature of the relations between Germany and the rest of the world. To the degree that a new and truly democratic Germany develops to that extent it will be possible for the Big Four to reduce their military occupation commitments.

The rise of a new Germany which can take its place as a peaceful member of the family of nations and make possible the complete withdrawal of military occupation forces depends in the last analysis on cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union—along with Big Power unity as the bulwark of the United Nations.

THE GERMAN WORKING CLASS

There are many who think the gigantic task of creating a democratic Germany is merely a matter of good education. If we can only get good teachers, fine pedagogy will do the trick. Anyone who has been to Germany since the war will testify that this gigantic "re-education" task is a much bigger thing than can be encompassed in a formal concept of education.

The
which
and al
in the
which
kind—
even t
power
whethe
ported
festo a
munist
recogn
Germa
ing cla
regime

Its
the G
opposit
breed
littical
society
movem
cratic
worker
ests.

It w
which
numbe
tims a
was f
ranks
was fo
arms i
Spain.
many
was ba
nist an
The
many

There is one class in Germany which has the greatest responsibility and also the best opportunity to lead in the reconstruction of a Germany which will no longer menace mankind—the working class. This is so, even though after Hitler came to power the majority of the workers whether actively or passively supported the fascist regime. In its manifesto after Hitler's defeat the Communist Party of Germany registered recognition of the share which the German people, including the working class, has in the guilt of the Nazi regime.

Its historic role in society places the German working class in basic opposition to those class forces which breed fascism. It is socially and politically the most progressive class in society. The rise of a free trade union movement and of a free and democratic Germany will advance the worker's class and individual interests.

It was the German working class which contributed by far the largest number of concentration camp victims and fighters against Hitler. It was from German working-class ranks that the Thaelmann column was formed which fought the Nazis, arms in hand, when they invaded Spain. The underground in Germany after Hitler came to power was based primarily on the Communist and Socialist workers.

The working-class party of Germany does not advance the slogan

of socialism for Germany today. In a report on the program of the Socialist Unity Party, Gen. Joseph McNarney, former commander of U. S. forces in Germany, announced, with all the amazed indignation of a Dies Committee investigator, that the ultimate program of the Socialist Unity Party was socialism. That is about as astonishing as the fact that General Electric wants the old cartel system back in Germany.

However, the Socialist Unity Party, whose objective is socialism, fights for a bourgeois-democratic Germany today because it knows that the democratic revolution was never carried to a successful conclusion in Germany. Thus, in the Soviet zone, where the Socialist Unity Party has emerged as the leading party, there are also other parties, representing bourgeois and middle class groups. Private capitalism has not been abolished. But what has been eliminated is the economic source of fascism—Junker landlordism and the monopolists.

Consequently, the draft constitution proposed for discussion for a united Germany by the Socialist Unity Party, provides for an advanced parliamentary democracy. It affords a possibility for private non-monopoly capitalist, as well as nationalized industry. And as long as nationalized industry exists within the framework of bourgeois democracy, it is a bourgeois-democratic reform, not socialism.

The bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany was repeatedly betrayed by the bourgeoisie from the 16th century to the Revolution of 1848. Its consummation would mean the complete destruction of the old Nazi state apparatus. Obviously, the struggle includes the removal of Nazi officials in all walks of life. It is a basic struggle against the sources of German fascism. It is completed only when Germany is denazified and demilitarized and popular democracy established. Such an achievement, and such destruction of the old reactionary state apparatus, will have great significance in the peaceful, progressive development of democracy in Germany.

An important reason for the progress made by the Socialist Unity Party in re-educating and reconstructing the eastern part of Germany has been the signal advance toward the political unification of the German working class. This party was formed as the result of the merger of the Social-Democratic and Communist parties. It has 1,500,000 members in Eastern Germany. To the degree that the breach is also healed in the rest of Germany, the working class will be able to play its leading role in the true denazification of the country. The obstacles placed in the way of that unity by the U. S. and British military occupation officials as well as by the die-hard Social-Democratic leaders, bring up the specter of 1933, when a divided work-

ing class proved fatal for German democracy.

A UNITED GERMANY

When the controversial issue of a centralized or federalized Germany is on the agenda—what is America's interest? If the German working class is to play its part on a national scale in the democratization of the country, it can do so far better under conditions of a unified country. A divided, loosely federated Germany is no more desirable from the democratic point of view than a divided America or Britain.

Germany's historic tragedy is that it was unified from above under the blood and iron policy of the Junkers and big capitalists. That was the national unity forged under Bismarck. The bourgeois democratic revolution failed in 1848—it failed on the basic issue of national unity against the feudal ruling class. So when Germany achieved unity, it came not from a people's struggle and revolution. It came as the foisting of reactionary Prussian dominance over the German states by those classes who brought such sorrow and tragedy to Germany and the world.

To create a divided Germany, a loosely federated Germany, is to create conditions for future trouble as well and makes the national struggle for democracy now more difficult. It would give reaction the slo-

gan of
tion has
in the d

As for
solution
tain. Th
be appro
ing to
omy, esp
suffered
as well a
cratic de
Ruhr n
more to
tionary
Europe a

an instr
monopo
against
rope and
like oth
must be
principle
in a ma
unity as
the Ger
lishment
durable

Not la
of Euro
tion by
done by
destruct
would b
its Alli
reparati
sulting
a bargai
ference!
If Ger

gan of "national unity" which reaction has again and again dragged in the dust.

As for the Ruhr, whatever the final solution may be, one thing is certain. The problem of the Ruhr must be approached on the basis of helping to reconstruct European economy, especially those countries that suffered most from Nazi aggression, as well as to promote a really democratic development of Germany. The Ruhr must not be allowed once more to become the basis for a reactionary militarist Germany against Europe and the world, nor to become an instrument of the reactionary monopolies in the U. S. and Britain against the democratic forces of Europe and the world. This question, like others relating to Germany, must be solved on the basis of the principles laid down at Potsdam and in a manner to promote Big Three unity as essential to the solution of the German question and the establishment of a just, democratic, and durable peace.

Not least important for the welfare of Europe and the world is reparation by Germany for the damage done by invasion, occupation and destruction. What a sorry role it would be for America to come before its Allies and use their need for reparations, their terrible want resulting from the Nazi occupation, as a bargaining point at a peace conference!

If Germany finally eradicates mili-

tarism, if its people are finally re-educated, if it is firmly founded on a popular democracy—the strength of that Germany will be the strength of its neighbors, of all Europe, of the whole world. German unity is essential for that goal.

PAWN AGAINST THE U.S.S.R.

Those western monopolists and their spokesmen who argue against German national unity do so, not in fear of a reactionary, militaristic, united Germany. They argue from the point of view of combating the Soviet Union through and with Germany.

The most outspoken declaration in this country in favor of such a policy was John Foster Dulles' demand for a western alliance in Europe, including the British and American zones of Germany, including the Ruhr, and directing it against the Soviet Union. This matches Churchill's infamous Fulton, Mo., call for an Anglo-American war against the Soviet Union.

No greater weapon can be given to the Nazis who remain in Germany than the hope of a future crusade against the Soviet Union. During the war-scare last year hundreds of former Wehrmacht officers came to U. S. and British military authorities and offered their services for the "war against Russia." Obviously, if Germany or sections of Germany are to be considered as pawns in imperialist power blocs and preparations

for war, all hope of eliminating the danger of future aggression in and from Germany must be abandoned. When Lippmann becomes ecstatic about the prospects of a duel with the Soviet Union over Germany he forgets that America's national interests demand a Germany which is no pawn-nation and lends itself to no alliances for aggression now or in the future.

When the Big Four Council of Foreign Ministers meets in Moscow to discuss the German treaty it will have the outlines of a solution in the decisions of the Potsdam Conference. The main principles of denazification and demilitarization are contained in those decisions. So is the basic principle of German unity. It also provides for reparations, and the outlines of German frontiers were indicated.

Nevertheless, the details of a German treaty will be worked out in long and doubtlessly difficult discussions. These discussions will be aided by the principle that emerged, not only at Potsdam, but in the other Big Three meetings held during the war. The experience of the struggle against fascism taught that Big Power collaboration and agreement was the only basis for victory over the Axis and for laying the foundations of the postwar peace.

The difficult but finally successful deliberations resulting in peace treaties with Germany's five former European satellites reaffirmed this

lesson. They showed that concessions, compromise, and the spirit of cooperation must be a two-way thoroughfare. They showed, above all, that there could be no peace and agreement among all the United Nations unless the Big Powers were united. A German peace treaty can result in the building of a firm cornerstone of the peace providing this principle of Big Power collaboration and unity dominates the Moscow conference.

In view of these lessons, the economic merger of the U. S. and British zones in Germany becomes an obstacle to Anglo-Soviet-American unity as well as to the economic and political unity of Germany. It has already served as a means of intense penetration of American capital into Germany and the re-establishment of cartel relationships with German industrialists which proved so dangerous to world peace before.

Above all, the Anglo-American merger is part of the attempt to split up Germany in order to use its tremendous western (Ruhr) resources as part of an anti-Soviet bloc. The Dulles-Churchill plan for a crusade against the Soviet Union is the real basis for the economic merger of the two zones. Together with the merger came the amnesty for Nazis and the shameful parole of top Nazi leaders in the U. S. zone.

Thus, the success of the Moscow conference depends on the cooperation of all four occupying powers, in

treating
the spiri
So too
German
consider
of the U
which w
the Axis
which
jeopardiz
It shoul
between
omy and
tions. U
democra
levels of
not just
for the w
Despit
in which
responsil

treating with a united Germany in the spirit of the Potsdam decisions.

So too, on the issue of the level of German industry, the paramount consideration is the national security of the U.S. and all other countries which were united in the war against the Axis. The level should be that which can be attained without jeopardizing the peace of the world. It should represent a proper balance between the needs of German economy and the needs of the United Nations. Ultimately, with a completely democratized Germany the highest levels of production will be beneficial not just for German democracy but for the well-being of world economy.

Despite all the crimes of Nazism, in which the German people share responsibility, security for all nations

can be achieved, not by the destruction of Germany, but by removing what is dangerous and building what is progressive. We cannot take over Nazi aims and seek a nation's destruction. Nor can we repeat the mistakes of the past and be tolerant of those reactionary forces which can rise again and menace the world with even more terrible threats than those brought on by Hitler.

With those evil forces which caused so much sorrow to the world we must be ruthless in victory as we were in war. But to win the campaign against the remnants of fascism is to help the German people build a nation which never existed before—a progressive, democratic Germany. That is also America's interest.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY, 1947

By ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

TWO HOLIDAYS, of world-wide significance, have an American origin—*May Day* and *International Women's Day*. These days, upon which millions of people celebrate past achievements, signalize struggles ahead, and express international bonds of solidarity, were born in great struggles in the United States. *May Day* grew out of labor's epic struggles in the '80's for the eight-hour day. *International Women's Day* grew out of the determined demands of women at the turn of the century for the right to vote. The East Side Socialist women of New York City held many conferences from 1904 on, when the plan for such a day was first proposed. By 1908 it was adopted as a day for mass demonstrations by American working class women for suffrage. Socialist women were not too welcome in bourgeois suffrage organizations, which did not deal with the pressing needs of working women for the right to vote. On the East Side, toiling women, from factories and sweatshops, and anxious mothers, from the slum tenements, gathered in the squares to listen to fiery women agitators who talked

about the way women lived and worked, about their poverty and misery, and the need of laws to clean up the slums, and child labor, shorten working hours, and fix a minimum wage. These militant demonstrations evoked great enthusiasm and were publicized in Europe.

At the International Socialist Congress held at Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1910, *Clara Zetkin*, a delegate from Germany, proposed the adoption of March 8 as *International Women's Day*, as a day on which to demonstrate simultaneously in all countries for the rights of women. The resolution was adopted unanimously. Among the delegates present, who voted enthusiastically for it, were Lenin, who headed the Russian delegation, and Alexandra Kollontay, later Soviet Ambassador to Mexico and to Sweden. August Bebel, author of *Women Under Socialism*, and Clara Zetkin had fought for clarity on the rights of women at the 1891 International Socialist Congress, where Vandervelde from Belgium argued against Socialists concerning themselves with the issue, and opposed woman's working in industry. In 1907, Clara Zetkin and Lenin had fought for a Congress resolution on the struggle for equal rights of women. Lenin insisted that women be mentioned specifically because of their many special problems. Others in the German delegation at Copenhagen were Rosa Luxemburg, Polish-born woman Socialist leader, and Karl Liebknecht, both of whom

were murdered in 1919, with Social-Democratic complicity by the fore-runners of the Nazis. Among the American delegates was Bill Haywood, militant leader of the Western Federation of Miners. Clara Zetkin died in the Soviet Union in 1933, an internationally honored Communist leader, at the age of 75. The year before she had returned to Germany at the risk of her life, to exercise her right, as its oldest member, to open the Reichstag session, where she denounced the Nazis and called for united action against them.

Thirty-nine years have passed since International Women's Day was adopted. It is celebrated today all over the world by all progressive women regardless of political affiliations. In many countries there are mass organizations of women such as "The Union of French Women" and "The Union of Italian Women." They grew out of the liberation movement, and today they sponsor International Women's Day. Even in fascist and colonial countries, there will be manifestations in prisons and secretly among the people. It will be a day of rejoicing in the Soviet Union and all liberated countries, that they are free from fascist-Axis occupation and the tortures, imprisonment and humiliation inflicted particularly on women by the Nazis.

In Great Britain a permanent committee continues throughout the year to prepare adequately for this day. In the United States, its birthplace, the Women's Committee of the

Council for American-Soviet Friendship and the Congress of American Women are planning broad gatherings of a non-partisan character on March 8. The latter is the American affiliate of the Women's International Democratic Federation, which was organized in Paris in November, 1945, and which represents 41 countries and some eighty-one million women. The W.I.D.F. is pledged to a three-point program for women, which will be advanced in every country on March 8. Briefly, the program advances the demands:

1. For the annihilation of fascism, the strengthening of democracy and a lasting peace.
2. For equal rights for women in all spheres—cultural, political, economic, legal, social, etc.
3. For the safeguarding of the welfare of mothers and the well-being, health and education of children.

Communist women are joining with all other anti-fascist, progressive women in support of this program, which is flexible enough to be applied in each country as the needs of women and the political situation require.

THE COMMUNIST POSITION

It is appropriate for us American Communists to reaffirm our position on the rights of women, in celebrating a day which so many of our famous comrades, as Socialists, helped to found before the modern Com-

munist Parties came into existence. There is much misrepresentation on the position Communists take on such subjects, as was evident in Clare Luce's distortions on the Soviet Union's "moral and religious policy," which were so ably refuted by Comrade V. J. Jerome in the New York *Herald Tribune* of December 1, 1946. For example, the struggle for the right of women to vote was won in our country in 1920, through a constitutional amendment. But let us not forget that today *ten million men and women are disfranchised* by the poll tax in Southern states. Even where no poll tax exists Negro men and women citizens are excluded from voting by fraud, violence, and intimidations. Where poll taxes are paid, the male members of poor white families are usually the ones to vote. There can be no full and equal suffrage in our country until this disgraceful situation is ended. Many other forms of discrimination against women exist. We Communists must be as alert to recognize them and must be as determined in our struggle against them as we are against racial, religious, and political discrimination. All are included in the Nazi pattern—Red-baiting, labor-baiting, anti-Semitism, racial and male superiority.

Fascist ideology has many adherents and advocates in our country. It has many expressions with regard to the position of women in society. There is a constant stream of propaganda in periodicals and books, in

radio and screen programs derogatory to the modern woman. An outright fascist book *Modern Women—the Lost Sex*, by Ferdinand Lundberg and Maryna F. Farnham (which I will review in the April issue of *Political Affairs*), advocates the return of women to the home. Recently a male doctor attacked "Mom" in the *Saturday Evening Post* as responsible for emotional disturbances which afflicted American soldiers in the army, especially in battle. She had "spoiled" them in childhood. They were not brought up "tough" like the Nazis. All the hackneyed arguments used against the suffragists are revived, streamlined with pseudo-scientific patter, and hurled at American women today. This also happened in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, followed by the outlawing of all women's organizations and all public activities, except hard labor during the war.

Powerful reactionary forces, such as the Republican Party and the National Association of Manufacturers, are keenly aware of the 46 million voting strength of American women. They are making every attempt to influence the thinking and activities of women on all public questions. It is imperative that our Party increase its work among women workers and the families of workers and farmers. A Communist can never be indifferent to conditions that oppress women nor ignore the enemies' attempts to prejudice them against the labor movement and progressive po-

political action as a weapon to divide and conquer the people. It is also necessary for every Party member to know the Marxist-Leninist position on the emancipation of women. In honor of International Women's Day, let us read or re-read *Lenin on the Woman Question*, his famous interview with Clara Zetkin in 1920, and *Woman and Society*, a collection of speeches made by Lenin after the October Revolution. He had great understanding and sympathy for the problems of women, which we should emulate. As Communists we advocate all the immediate demands for women which will guarantee them full rights as citizens, as workers, as members of society, and adequate provisions for their health and well-being as workers and as mothers. We strive for the ultimate goal of Socialism which will end all forms of exploitation and oppression and alone will make possible the full emancipation of women.

As Communists, men and women, it is our duty to fight in the trade unions for the right to work, equal pay for equal work, equal seniority with men, and for the training, upgrading and placement of women, and to dispel the false assumption that women are a temporary, unorganizable group in industry. As Communists it is our duty to fight for equality of women in the professions, in educational institutions and in appointive government posts. As Communists it is our duty to encourage and set an example for the

nomination and election of capable progressive women to office in city, state and nation. As Communists it is our duty in the trade unions and all organizations to which we belong, to help place women on committees, help elect them to office, help train them, and give them our support and encouragement in their new responsibilities. In our own Party it is our duty fully to utilize the capabilities of our women members in every capacity and to assist them in solving problems which develop during pregnancy and after childbirth, so that they will not become isolated and embittered by enforced political inactivity.

In the Soviet Union—the only socialist state as yet in existence—the tremendous progress that women have made there, in the past thirty years is evidence not only of their abilities, but of the unique opportunity they have enjoyed to cultivate them in all fields of human endeavor. We should use this example of the country of Socialism to demonstrate to American women that Communists actively champion the rights of women, which fascists deny to them and which bourgeois-democracies grant them only piecemeal after tremendous struggles. If any particular aspects could show beyond all doubt the vast gulf between fascism and Communism, which Red-baiters are monstrosly trying to couple, it is the freedom of nationalities and women under Socialism and the complete enslavement of both under

fascism. In this country, those who most bitterly oppose all Communists, and the Soviet Union in particular, usually advocate fascist concepts of women and the Negro people. "Back to the home" is a favorite dictum of the Nazis and of American reactionaries as well.

International Women's Day, 1947, comes in the midst of great struggles—for disarmament and peace on

a world scale; for protection of the rights of labor and the standards of living of our people on the domestic front. To lose either or both—and they are two parts of one whole—would spell victory for the exploiters and enslavers of the people. Let us utilize all gatherings on March 8 this year to organize American women for united action on both fronts.

A C
WAC

THE SE
rent w
is deri
cumsta
cember
tional
Party.
the ma
in the
Z. Fos
William

First
the mo
action.
against
democ
people
peace,
of oth
that la
tion a
fensiv
major
tack o
basic o
ple, a
creasin
worki
inflate
greatly
victory
Seco

A COMMUNIST WAGE POLICY

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

THE SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE of the current wage movements and struggles is derived from the following circumstances, as analyzed by the December, 1946, meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party. This analysis is contained in the main report of Eugene Dennis, in the extended remarks of William Z. Foster, and in the report of John Williamson.

First, is the general offensive of the monopolies and of imperialist reaction. This offensive is directed against the economic standards and democratic liberties of labor and the people at home, and against the peace, freedom and independence of other peoples abroad. This means that labor now faces the wage question as a result of this general offensive of imperialist reaction. A major part of this offensive is the attack of the monopolies upon the basic economic standards of the people, a two-pronged attack by decreasing wages and all income of working people while maintaining inflated monopoly prices, an attack greatly intensified by the Republican victory in the last elections.

Second, is the maturing cyclical

economic crisis, whose outbreak is hastened and accelerated by the reactionary offensive, by the sabotage of the monopolies in the sphere of production and distribution. This means that labor now faces the wage question as an immediate necessity of maintaining its economic standards and as a longer range, but equally urgent, necessity, of counteracting the economic sabotage of the monopolies, of retarding the outbreak of the inevitable cyclical economic crisis, of softening its impact upon the masses of the people.

Third, is the dastardly conspiracy to paralyze and destroy the trade union movement. This conspiracy is inspired by the monopolies and led by the Republican Party reactionaries, a conspiracy which is supported by the Rankins and Coxes of the Democratic Party and to which the Truman Administration is steadily capitulating by so-called "cooperation." The reactionary attack upon the trade union movement is motivated by two considerations. It aims to paralyze labor's resistance to the monopoly attack upon the economic standards of the people. It also seeks to prevent the American working class from becoming what it is destined to become—the vanguard and leader of the united struggles of the American people's coalition against Wall Street's imperialist drive for world domination and its atom-bomb diplomacy of intimidation and frightfulness, and for a democratic foreign policy of peace, for friendship and collaboration with the Soviet

Union, Great Britain, and all the United Nations. This means that labor now faces the wage question as a double task of resisting the monopoly offensive upon both labor's economic standards and its trade unions and democratic liberties.

Fourth, is the split in the trade union movement and the reactionary, pro-capitalist wage policy of the top national leadership of the A. F. of L. This is a serious danger and a great obstacle to the most effective resistance of labor to the offensive of the monopolies—a danger not alone to the workers organized in the C.I.O. but, even more so, to the membership of the A. F. of L. This means that labor's current wage movements must include as a basic element the struggle for labor unity and united labor action. For the situation is truly, as Comrade Foster stated it to be: "United Labor Action—Or Else."

Fifth, is the process of political realignment now under way. It is the process, greatly hastened by the Republican victory, whereby a great people's coalition is becoming crystallized, consisting of the independent political movements of labor and its nearest allies toward the organization of a third party, and of the progressive pro-Roosevelt forces in the Democratic Party, as well as in the Republican Party. It is the coalition whose historic task is to consolidate the resistance of the people to the imperialist offensive and to prevent a victory of reaction in 1948 by bringing forth a united progres-

sive ticket for President and Congress.

This realignment requires the further development and consolidation of labor's collaboration and alliance with the farmers, the middle classes of the cities, the professionals and especially with the Negro people. It requires labor's alliance with those social groups that find their political expression in the pro-Roosevelt forces in the old parties.

Knowing all this, the monopolies are seeking to drive wedges between labor and its present and potential allies. The monopolies seek particularly to drive a wedge between labor and the middle classes, on the farms and in the cities. And this is one of the major objectives—political objectives—of the monopoly attack upon the wages and income of labor, as well as upon labor's trade union organizations.

This means that labor now faces the wage question in a special way. Labor has to develop its resistance to the economic attack of the monopolies in such a way as to counteract the monopoly efforts to create rifts between labor and the farmers, or between labor and the city middle classes. Labor has to seek, on the contrary, to establish collaboration with the middle classes against the monopolies on the economic field—against monopoly prices, against monopoly sabotage of production and distribution, against monopoly taxation and fiscal policies, etc.—and to advance labor's political alliance with

the m
labor
power
Here
of the
From
of the
sive.

of Com
meeting
of the

The
ment,
as mil
have ev
spirit i
struggle
tack of
eralship
counter
the Tr
p. 18.)

THE

Due
circum
wage r
Nathar
Policy
ing de
hands
of the
standa

And s
labor,
tal ane

Ther
sitions
the Na
particu
cause.

the middle classes. In other words, labor has to use both its economic power and its political power.

Herein lies the special significance of the current wage movements. From them is arising a resistance of the masses and a counter-offensive. As formulated in the report of Comrade Dennis to the December meeting of the National Committee of the C.P.U.S.A.:

The great progressive labor movement, headed by the C.I.O., as well as millions of A.F.L. workers, who have evidenced a new militant fighting spirit in two rounds of postwar strike struggles, will resist the mounting attack of Big Capital and its G.O.P. generalship, and will develop its own counter-offensive. (*The People Against the Trusts*, New Century Publishers, p. 18.)

THE NATHAN REPORT

Due to the foregoing objective circumstances in which the current wage movements are developing, the Nathan Report—*A National Wage Policy for 1947*—has become a fighting document and weapon in the hands of labor against the offensive of the monopolies upon the economic standards of the working people. And so it was received by both—by labor, on the one hand, and by capital and its servants, on the other.

There are three elementary propositions demonstrated statistically in the Nathan Report which give it its particular fighting quality in labor's cause.

One: Taking into account the increase in living costs during the past two years, the decline in the real weekly earnings of almost all classes of workers has been very great. On the average, in all manufacturing, an increase of about 21 percent in weekly earnings—without any increase in prices—would have been required in October 1946 to bring real weekly earnings back to the January 1945 level. By the end of 1946, with the present trend or prices, an increase of about 23 percent will be required. (P. 6.)

Two: At full employment, the present price and wage structure of American industry yields a level of corporate profits before taxes as high as the lush period of war prosperity. It yields a level of corporate profits after taxes about 50 percent higher than the war peak and utterly without earlier precedent in our national experience. (P. 8.)

Three: Even manufacturing corporations, whose profit position has not improved nearly so much as that of all other corporations, can afford to grant their production workers an increase of 21 percent in total earnings at the present time without reducing the corporate rate of return on net worth to a level below the 1936-39 average of 6.9 percent. (P. 11.)

The Report shows that capitalist exploitation is increasing, that labor's standards of living are falling, while the volume, as well as rate of profits is increasing. This has been the course of the distribution of income between capital and labor in the corporation-controlled sectors of the economy for the past two years—favorable to monopoly capital, un-

favorable to labor. The Report is thus a most powerful indictment of capitalist exploitation, a sharp weapon in the hands of labor in the struggle for wage increases and for the maintenance of labor standards, a means of winning sympathy and support of the middle classes for common economic and political action against the monopolies.

In connection with labor's relations with the middle classes, the Nathan Report also demonstrates statistically another proposition. It says:

The facts all lead to the conclusion that not only from the worker's point of view but also for the benefit of the whole economy a further substantial wage increase without a general price increase is possible, justifiable and essential. (P. 13.)

This is a major conclusion of the Report. It bears directly upon the outlook that the next cyclical economic crisis may break out in 1948, if not sooner, which the middle classes contemplate with almost as much anxiety as labor. Says the Report:

It would not do labor or the public or business any good for labor to forego the needed wage increases. Rather, raising wages without increasing prices appears to offer the only currently possible means of bringing about the kind of relationship which will avoid a serious decline in business activity. Such a policy would step up buying power and bring back into the market for many categories of goods those millions

of working families who have been removed from the market because of rising prices. (P. 14.)

As is known, this Report was sharply challenged by the spokesmen of the monopolies and by the National Association of Manufacturers. It was also attacked by the reactionary leaders in the A. F. of L. Four main lines of argument are advanced against the Report by the monopolies and their lieutenants in the A. F. of L. top leadership.

1. Corporation profits are not as high as claimed by Nathan. Here the corporation spokesmen are employing all sorts of tricks to obscure the plain meaning of Nathan's statistics. His estimate of approximate annual profits for 1946 is so close that it can safely be taken as established. No serious challenge of his figures has been made thus far either by Ralph Robey of the N.A.M. or by the "economists" of the corporations, or by Stassen who works very hard to earn the Republican nomination for President, or by the reactionaries in the A. F. of L. Nathan's estimate says:

In December, 1946, the economy has not yet reached the high level of production and profits that is in prospect in several fields, particularly in consumers durable goods. Yet we are already at approximately a \$25 billion level of total corporate profits before taxes. . . . This volume of profits equals that of the best war year; it is more than 2½ times the 1929 volume of profits and nearly 5 times the average 1936-39 profit volume. The total Gross National Product is now 2 1/3 times

as great
of corp
ly. (P.

2. N
compa
show
false
self po
its ave
gotiate
into a
practic
tain in
just as
of fore

3. L
be con
as is
but wi
aries n
are sti
per cen
the m
ing th
ments
to that
ures ar
day so
but by
by the
the ra
lower
higher
sive ar
and n
of the
yond
duce
The

as great as it was in 1939 . . . *the share of corporate profits has increased greatly.* (P. 8. Our emphasis—A.B.)

2. Not all industries, or all the companies in the same industry, show the same profits. But this is a false issue. The Nathan Report itself points to this fact, but insists that its *averages* are correct. Union negotiators obviously take such matters into account when considering the practical possibilities of gaining certain immediate increases in wages, just as they consider the relationship of forces in all other respects.

3. Labor's present standards should be compared not with January, 1945, as is done in the Nathan Report, but with 1939; and this, the reactionaries maintain, will show that wages are still ahead of prices by about 20 per cent. This argument, by the way, the monopolies also advanced during the first round of wage movements in 1945-46. But what is there to that? Two things. First, the figures are wrong. Real earnings are today somewhat higher than in 1939, but by no means as high as is claimed by the monopoly spokesmen. Besides, the rate of exploitation today is no lower than in 1939, but is probably higher, because labor is more intensive and speed-up is higher. Second, and most important, this argument of the monopolies demonstrates beyond doubt their real designs—to *reduce labor's standards.*

The argument is reduced to this:

Labor says that its present position should be compared with January, 1945, when its weekly earnings were *highest*, the point being that *labor does not want to go back to lower standards*, but wants to maintain and raise the higher standards. The monopolies say that labor's present position should be compared with 1939, when weekly earnings were *low*, the point being that *the monopolies want to drive labor back to lower standards.* That is the real content of this economic argument.

4. Prices are bound to come down; increased labor productivity is what is necessary; the Nathan Report involves the adoption of "totalitarian" forms of government control. To which the answer is as follows: while certain prices may come down a little, the general trend of prices will undergo no serious change before the approach of the first phase of the coming economic crisis, unless the people's anti-monopoly movements become strong enough to force a change by political means before the crisis arrives. And this will take time. In other words, labor is compelled *now and today* to gain wage increases in order to live, *at the same time* joining and leading the general anti-monopoly movements of the people *against high monopoly prices and sabotage.*

As to labor productivity, what the monopolies have mainly in mind is *increased speed-up* rather than higher labor efficiency through technological advances. Despite all the tall

talk about new large-scale investments in new machinery and methods, not much along these lines has taken place as yet. One of the main reasons is the already existing great "surplus" of excess productive capacity, that is, surplus as compared with what the monopolies think they can exploit "profitably." We should note here that the reactionary leadership of the A. F. of L., Green-Woll-Dubinsky-Lewis, adopted at its last convention a position on labor "productivity" which differs little from that of the monopolies.

As to the argument against "totalitarianism," this is obviously a false issue. The Nathan Report recommendation for a general average wage increase of about 23 per cent without increasing prices is, first of all, an economic demand to protect labor's economic standards and the interests of the people as a whole. The question of the wage increases is a matter of collective bargaining between unions and employers, and it is the unions themselves that enforce the economic gains made by them in these negotiations. On the other hand, the struggle against monopoly prices and for the enforcement of the wage demand "without increase in prices" is a *political* struggle. This means that all labor and all the people have to fight jointly for certain *legislative and government measures* calculated to bring down monopoly prices and to prevent their rise following wage increases. Monopoly calls such meas-

ures and government action "totalitarian" while seeking to impose upon the people legislation and government action of a pro-fascist nature, such as the projected anti-union and anti-strike laws. In reality, the legislation and government action required to bring down monopoly prices and keep them down are of a genuinely democratic and anti-monopoly nature. They are measures in the interests of the people, that will be won only by the united struggles of the people, and enforced only by the vigilance and democratic strength of the people. That is why the monopolies are fearful of these measures and call them "totalitarian."

Very important is the position of the Truman Administration. Its economic analysis (President's Economic Report to Congress, *New York Times*, January 9, 1947) substantiates many of the basic contentions of the Nathan Report. For example, the President finds a "marked decline in real purchasing power of great numbers of consumers"; also, that "if price and wage adjustments are not made—and made soon enough—there is danger that consumer buying will falter, orders to manufacturers will decline, production will drop and unemployment will grow."

But when it comes to recommendations, the President begins to maneuver for some sort of a "middle" position. He advises business and farmers to reduce prices but leaves it entirely to their own free will. He advises "management" (read mo-

monopoly need lagged govern increase few y standa way o ation m m m age of to all If he and h public will l But t wage stand labor again bor sh excess requir vent essary the p man as tak wage sition and u pecial anti-u of th manc to gi and while of th It Tru

nopolies) "that wages and salaries need to be raised where they have lagged substantially behind the increase in the living costs in the past few years or where they are sub-standard." But all he proposes by way of enforcement is a recommendation to Congress to raise the minimum wage and to extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all workers in interstate commerce. If he will fight for these measures and help get them through the Republican Congress—a big "if"—he will have accomplished something. But this is only a fraction of the wage problem. Where does Truman stand on the big wage issue between labor and the monopolies? Here again he has a word of advice: "Labor should refrain from demands for excessive wage increases that would require price increases or would prevent price reductions that are necessary to sell the capacity output of the product." This proves that Truman wants very badly to be known as taking a "middle" position on the wage issue; but in reality it is a position favorable to the monopolies and unfavorable to labor. This is especially so, since on the question of anti-union legislation, which is part of the wage issue, Truman is again maneuvering, and in such a way as to give comfort to the monopolies and their Republican spokesmen while placing obstacles in the path of the trade unions.

It should be added, however, that Truman's anxiety to retain political

contact with labor offers tactical possibilities for labor in the great struggle for its living standards and democratic rights. But these tactical possibilities for successful pressure upon the Administration can be taken advantage of only if their limitations are fully recognized, if the main concentration is directed towards unfolding the strength and influence of labor and its allies—farmers, middle classes, professionals and the Negro people—in common independent struggle against the monopolies and the offensive of imperialist reaction, and if united labor action becomes an ever more decisive factor in these struggles, and a systematic exposure is carried on of the reactionary and imperialist course of the Truman Administration.

SOME POINTS OF THEORY AND POLICY

The Nathan report suffers from a number of basic theoretical defects as well as weak points of policy which, if accepted uncritically by the labor movement, may invalidate to a large extent the proved practical value of the Report as a weapon in the struggle for wage increases and for the maintenance of labor's and the people's economic standards. The task, therefore, is to formulate and adopt a critical attitude toward these defects of the Nathan Report, to supply a statement of the correct position, and to make the maximum practical use of this fighting docu-

ment and weapon to promote labor's cause in the current wage movements.

Furthermore, it is already obvious that the reactionary reformist elements in the A. F. of L. and their friends in the C.I.O. are exploiting precisely *the defects* of theory and policy of the Nathan Report in order to weaken the entire wage movement of labor.

What are these defects of theory and weaknesses in policy?

1. The Nathan Report bases the case for wage increases not only on the needs of the workers and the general economic interests of the American people, but also on so-called employer's "ability to pay." This last point is false in theory and dangerous in practice. It weakens labor's case instead of strengthening it.

The theoretical fallacy underlying the proposition of "ability to pay" arises from the totally unwarranted assumption that there exists some sort of economic law of capitalism which says that profits must not fall below a certain point and that wages must not go higher than a certain point. From this it is concluded that if a corporation can prove with its "books" that a certain wage increase will push profits down to the "danger" point, then the union has no right to demand so much of a wage increase.

But this is entirely false. Marx demonstrated already in his time that "as to profits, there exists no law which determines their *minimum*,"

and this for the same reason that "although we can fix the *minimum* of wages, we cannot fix their *maximum*." (*Value, Price and Profit*, International Publishers, p. 58.) In other words, there is no such economic law of capitalism which says that profits must not fall lower than this given level, or that wages must not rise higher than that. This so-called "law" is a figment of capitalist imagination and a very convenient means of deceiving the masses and cheating them of justified wage increases.

There are, indeed, limits to the maximum of profits and minimum of wages, but not to the minimum of profits and maximum of wages. The former is governed by basic economic laws of capitalism according to which, if the limits of the working day are given, "the *maximum* of profit corresponds to the *physical minimum of wages*; and that wages being given, the maximum of profit corresponds to such a prolongation of the working day as is compatible with the physical forces of the laborer." (*Ibid.*)

Then how are the limits of minimum profits and maximum wages determined in practice at any given time? To this Marx answers:

The fixation of its actual degree is only settled by the continuous struggle between capital and labor, the capitalist constantly tending to reduce wages to their physical minimum, and to extend the working day to its physical

maximum
stantly
tion.

The
question
the co

God
sists,
the a
possib
comb
elem
tive st
ability
other
amon
opini
streng
mom
ted in
the M
large,
eyes
and
fects

Bu
that
portu
mak-
ness
unne
plove
fight
and
of th
false
there
of p
beco
icy.
portu

maximum, while the workingman constantly presses in the opposite direction.

The question resolves itself into a question of the respective powers of the combatants. (*Ibid.*)

Good trade union leadership consists, therefore, precisely in this: in the ability to estimate as closely as possible "the respective powers of the combatants," taking into account all elements that make up the respective strength of both sides. Here, the ability or inability of one side or the other to win support for its position among the middle classes—"public opinion"—is a major element of strength or weakness at any given moment. This is amply demonstrated in the present "debate" around the Nathan Report which, by and large, gives labor a strong case in the eyes of the middle classes of farm and city, despite its theoretical defects and weaknesses in policy.

But *bad* trade union leadership, that is, reactionary reformist and opportunist leadership, can and does make use of the "ability to pay" business to weaken labor's case, to make unnecessary concessions to the employers, to avoid a fight when a fight is necessary and advantageous, and actually to betray the interests of the workers. Here is where the false theoretical assumption that there exists a limit to the minimum of profits and maximum of wages becomes wrong and dangerous policy. Here is where trade union opportunist leaders find "justification"

for weakening and then betraying labor's and the people's case.

This is precisely what the reactionaries in the A. F. of L. are doing, followed by certain reactionaries in the C.I.O. The dastardly attack of the A. F. of L. reactionary leadership upon the Nathan Report and the C.I.O. wage policies is almost indistinguishable from that of the monopolies and the N.A.M. In fact, the spokesmen of monopoly reaction use the A. F. of L. "arguments" to beat the Nathan Report and the C.I.O. And what is the main "argument" of the A. F. of L. reactionaries? It is the business of "ability to pay." Says the A. F. of L. *Monthly Labor Survey*:

It is not true that industry can afford a 25 per cent general wage increase in 1947.

Unions negotiate with thousands of companies, each faced with different conditions affecting their ability to pay higher wages.

This is the theoretical and practical position of the employers, of the corporations and monopolies, but even more brazenly dishonest coming from a "labor" source. For honest and loyal trade union leaders will always take full account of all the different conditions of various companies, as well as of all other conditions surrounding a wage movement. But for what purpose? Not for the purpose of breaking the policy of industry-wide agreements, as the A. F. of L. reactionaries may wish to do in order to please the monopolies;

not for the purpose of cheating the workers of justified and practical wage increases, as the A. F. of L. reactionaries are trying to do, but, on the contrary, for the purpose of extending and strengthening industry-wide agreements and to secure *the maximum wage increase possible in the given relationship of forces.*

To achieve this end, trade union leaders can and should make the greatest and widest use of the Nathan Report findings and recommendations for a general average wage increase of from 23 to 25 per cent. It is a powerful weapon for this purpose, precisely *because its findings are objective and scientific.* But trade unionists and all progressives should not accept the "ability to pay" proposition which forms part (only part) of the basis of the Report's recommendations.

2. Implicit in the Nathan Report, and explicit in Nathan's public defense of it, is the acceptance and justification of the capitalist mode of production and class exploitation. While challenging very sharply and effectively the excesses and abuses of capitalist exploitation—the disparity between growing profits and decreasing real labor earnings—the Report accepts and justifies the profit system as such and bases itself on the proposition that capitalists must make profits. The Report defends in effect the need of business "profitability" but insists that profits are too high and that wages are too low at the present time and that this is not good

either for labor or for the national economy as a whole.

The theoretical fallacy here would seem to be the assumption that in order to defend the interests of labor, wage improvements and other betterments, *now and here*, that is, within the limits of the existing capitalist mode of production, one has to accept and even justify the capitalist system of class exploitation itself. This is "the theory" underlying the reformist, opportunist trade union practices and the "justification" for all sorts of opportunist betrayals of the most immediate and elementary interests of the workers and of the people.

Again we find this freshly demonstrated in the attack of the A. F. of L. reactionaries upon the Nathan Report and upon the C.I.O. wage policies, as a whole. The cited A. F. of L. *Monthly Labor Survey* rushes immediately to a defense of the profit system of class exploitation in the best style of Bilbo, Rankin, the N.A.M., the Chamber of Commerce, etc. It says:

The C.I.O. formula is clearly not intended to promote genuine collective bargaining. . . . Is it to cause industrial strife, chaos and unemployment? Or does it seek to stir up workers to demand government control and regimentation?

And if that is not enough, we are given the following cant:

Communist policies would explain such tactics. Russia wants to see un-

employ
States
chaos a

The
outbur
ined. I
upon A
corpora
industr
ployme
from t
fied ec
ers. Th
the pos
worker
based
bor's r
must l
enterpr
system
the A.
to defe
trade
"free e
credite
oppose
if you
ments
F. of I
moral:
this att
tuge o
Union-
ent his
peace a
nations
distort
nists in
and di
'It is

employment increased in the United States; Communists want to create chaos and discredit free enterprise.

The real meaning of this particular outburst should be closely examined. First, this attack seeks to place upon labor the responsibility of the corporations and monopolies for "the industrial strife, chaos and unemployment" which results recurrently from their refusal to meet the justified economic demands of the workers. The A. F. of L. leaders here take the position of the bosses against the workers. Secondly, this attack is based upon the assumption that labor's movements for higher wages must lead to the "discredit of free enterprise," that is, of the capitalist system of class exploitation, which the A. F. of L. reactionaries are out to defend. This means, in practical trade union policy, that to defend "free enterprise" from becoming discredited, one must discourage and oppose labor's wage movements; or, if you cannot prevent these movements from rising, then, say the A. F. of L. reactionaries, you must demoralize and weaken them. Thirdly, this attack aims to weaken the prestige of that country—the Soviet Union—which is leading in the present historic struggle for a democratic peace and for true friendship between nations. Fourthly, it slanders and distorts the position of the Communists in order to confuse the masses and disorganize their fighting ranks. It is not true, of course, that Com-

munist wage policies aim "to create chaos and discredit free enterprise." The greatest creator of economic chaos is the system of so-called "free" enterprise itself—capitalism—and its high priests, the monopolies, together with their flunkies among the reactionary A.F. of L. leadership. That is why the ultimate Communist program calls for the total abolition of this system of exploitation, crises, and imperialist wars and the establishment of socialism in its place. That is why Communists carry on education and enlightenment among the masses of labor and the people in favor of socialism and against capitalism, thus preparing labor to lead the American people to the eventual socialist transformation of our society. But as long as capitalist exploitation prevails, Communist policy calls for and supports every demand of labor and the people to improve the condition of the masses, to maintain and raise their economic standards, to protect and extend their democratic liberties, to resist capitalist exploitation and protect the masses from the rapacity of the monopolies, to strengthen the organization and consciousness of labor as the vanguard and leader of the people against the monopolies, for democracy, for socialism.

This brings us back to the theoretical assumption underlying the Nathan Report, that in order to defend a wage increase within the limits of the existing capitalist system, it is necessary to accept and justify

the system itself. The contrary is true. The wage movements themselves, even though an elementary expression of the class struggle, exposes clearly the basic fact that the existing wage-and-profit system is one of capitalist exploitation and oppression, that there is a fundamental irreconcilability of class interests between labor and the people, on the one hand and the monopolies and their hangers-on, on the other, and that a constant struggle is required to protect labor and the people from the daily consequences of capitalist exploitation. This struggle has to go on and will go on as long as capitalism exists, that is, the struggle for the improvement of the conditions of labor and the people within the limits of the existing capitalist system. American labor, as well as labor in other capitalist countries, must carry on this fight as a matter of struggle for existence. But the more conscious labor and the unions become of the basic limitations of the economic struggles; the more they understand that all improvements of the conditions of the masses under capitalism are temporary, unstable, and partial; the closer they come to the realization that the existing system itself has to be abolished and Socialism established; then—the *more effective* will be their economic and other partial struggles themselves. This will be true because their organizations, general understanding and militancy will be so much greater; the greater

will be labor's influence in the affairs of the nation; the more strength will labor and the people enjoy in the struggles against the monopolies today and tomorrow and until such time as the American people become ready to follow the leadership of labor in the socialist transformation of society.

It thus becomes evident that the Nathan Report's acceptance of capitalism is not only fatally defective theoretically but dangerous for the immediate wage movements. The monopolies and their spokesmen are using the theoretical base of the Nathan Report to discredit its practical recommendations for wage increases. They make the "argument" that the 25 per cent general wage increase "threatens" the profit system of "free" enterprise, while the Report's answer is to adopt a defensive position, to tend to modify the original recommendations and to seek to appear as an even better defender of the profit system than the monopolies. This obviously tends to weaken the wage movements. It also plays into the hands of the A.F. of L. reactionaries who have made the defense of the profit system of "free" enterprise their main weapon in the struggle against labor's wage movements and against the wage policies of the C.I.O.

3. The Nathan Report assumes that the adoption of its recommendation for immediate sizeable wage increases will prevent the coming of an economic crisis and will eventu-

ally bring not true outbreak of economic crisis, and prosperity for the masses is possible. The labor to live even increases.

What the Report is the for increase in conditions of substantial home market, retarding international, the mass economic cushion the mass objective fight for winning the sym circles in But it Nathan's abolish e ishing c

We s the Nat report, a number The R fiscal an governn "curbs t

ally bring stable prosperity. This is not true. Nothing can prevent the outbreak of the next cyclical economic crisis as long as capitalism prevails, and no lasting and stable prosperity for the masses of the people is possible within the limits of capitalism. This understanding will help labor to fight better and more effectively even for the present wage increases.

What is true in connection with the Report's wage recommendations is the following: a sizable wage increase *immediately* will improve the condition of the masses, increase substantially the capacities of the home market, and thus may have a *retarding effect*, barring unfavorable international developments, *upon the maturing rate* of the coming economic crisis and will certainly cushion the impact of the crisis upon the masses. This is great enough an objective for the American people to fight for. This will win, is already winning, for labor's wage demands the sympathy of wide middle-class circles in the cities and on the farms. But it is altogether different from Nathan's assumption that we can abolish economic crises without abolishing capitalism.

We should, of course, note that the Nathan Report, which is a wage report, also indicates the need for a number of measures in other fields. The Report advocates appropriate fiscal and tax policies, various direct government economic controls, "curbs to monopoly and concentra-

tion of wealth," higher minimum wages, "public responsibility for the maintenance of full employment," expansion of the social security system, etc. It says that "Major wage increases at this time are but one element in such a well-rounded program for sustained economic growth and wider diffusion of the benefits of such growth among all our people." (P. 14.)

All such measures must form part of a rounded-out program to protect the standards and rights of the people. The struggle for wage increases and against price increases forms at present *the major* element of such a program, with which Communist policy is in substantial accord. The question here under discussion is—What is this program designed to accomplish? The Nathan Report assumes that it will abolish crises and lead eventually to stable prosperity within the confines of capitalism. Our answer is that this program is designed to protect and improve the economic standards of labor and the people, to defend their democratic liberties, to combat the offensive of monopoly reaction, and to strengthen the democratic forces of the nation. To be really effective even for these partial objectives, such a rounded-out program must include as a basic plank the struggle for a democratic and anti-imperialist peace and against the drive of Wall Street imperialism for world domination. But such a program is not designed to abolish crises and insure stable

and permanent prosperity for the people within the limits of capitalism. All theoretical assumptions that these objectives can be realized without abolishing capitalism and establishing socialism are basically false. They generally form the theoretical foundations for reformism and reformist opportunism in the labor movement and for capitalist influence within it. The full practical consequences of reformist opportunism are demonstrated today very clearly by the general as well as wage policies of Green-Woll-Dubinsky-Hutcheson-Lewis — policies of service to the monopolies and of opposition to labor's wage movements and the C.I.O.'s wage policies.

RIGHT AND LEFTIST OPPORTUNISM

This reformist opportunism and reformism is the chief obstacle in the labor movement to the successful development and victory of labor's wage movements. But the theoretical and practical struggle against this obstacle demands a *thoroughly differentiated approach* to the various currents and tendencies in the labor movement—the approach which rests upon the Communist party policy of *supporting the Left-Center progressive unity in the trade unions* as a major phase in the struggle for labor unity. This means that *the main danger* of reformism and reformist opportunism in this period lies in the *anti-unity reactionaries of the A.F. of L. (Green-Woll-Lewis-*

Dubinsky-Hutcheson) and their friends in the C.I.O. Against these the main struggle must be waged in order to attain united labor action and labor unity, because these reactionaries are the chief enemies of united labor action and of labor unity, and because united labor action and labor unity are the very foundation of labor's and the people's main strategic aims in the fight to check and defeat Wall Street's imperialist offensive.

It is from the standpoint of united labor action and labor unity that all questions of policy within the labor movement must be considered. This is the Communist Party approach; and from this follows the Communist policy of supporting the alliance and unity of all the Left and so-called Center tendencies in the unions, tendencies which favor labor unity with greater or lesser consistency. This policy does not mean agreement with, or approval of, the many and various reformist ideologies to which basic elements in this unity adhere, for example, the reformist theoretical assumptions of the Nathan Report. Nor does it mean passive acceptance of the many and serious inconsistencies of basic elements of the Left-Center unity in the matter of struggle for united labor action and labor unity or of certain capitulations on their part to the Red-baiting of the reactionaries. On the contrary, it means a systematic defense of the correct Marxist positions against all brands of reformism, as well as a

frank criticism and wear and tear that all theoretical discussions aim at, in order to bring the labor movement to the point where it will be able to elect a leader of the working class who will become the main force in the American people's offensive against imperialism. This means that the labor movement must be organized against the spearheads of imperialism—Hutcheson-Lewis. The entire line in the labor movement depends on the independence of the labor movement—against the remnants of the old labor party and the Communist Party. Rightist and logical reformist alliances, in fact, the labor movement is a system of capitalist control over the part of the population that is understood as the income of some forces in the international struggle.

frank criticism of all inconsistencies and weaknesses. But it also means that all these criticisms and ideological discussions are carried on *with the aim of strengthening and extending the Left-Center unity*, of making it eventually *the backbone and leader of the unity of the American working class*, of helping labor to become the real leader of the American people against the reactionary offensive of the monopolies. It means that the main fire in the labor movement must be directed against the reactionaries and their spearhead — Green-Woll-Dubinsky-Hutcheson-Lewis.

The effectiveness of the Party's line in this as in all other fields will depend a good deal upon the effectiveness of our struggle on two fronts — against Right opportunism and remnants of Browder revisionism, on the one hand, and against Leftist opportunism, on the other.

Right opportunism wants no ideological discussions with the non-Marxist forces in the Left-Center alliance in the unions. It opposes, in fact, the advocacy of socialism and a systematic Marxist criticism of the capitalist system in connection with the partial struggles of the workers in the trade unions. It completely underestimates the crucial importance of systematic criticism of the inconsistencies and weaknesses of some of the basic non-Marxist forces in the Left-Center trade union alliance—inconsistencies in the struggle for labor unity and against

the divisive maneuvers of the Red-baiters. Right opportunism does not fight for the major strategic aim of labor and the people—for labor's leadership in the anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist coalition. Consequently, it is necessary to keep up concentrated fire against all Right-opportunist tendencies in order to promote the Party's general line and, in particular, the Communist position on the issues and problems of the wage movements.

The struggle against Leftist opportunism demands much more attention from us than is given to it. This becomes very clear especially in the promotion of the Party's position with regard to the wage movements. The anti-Party and renegade elements grouped around the N.C.P., including Darcy, Dunne, etc., are spreading a defeatist, anti-labor and anti-union program on the wage movements which can do serious damage to the workers if not combated effectively. The danger lies especially in its "Left" phrases, for the N.C.P. program on wages discourages the fight for wage increases in the name of socialism, thus tending to confuse and demoralize precisely the immature and untrained but militant and Left-minded workers. It is also evident that there is a certain affinity between the anti-labor and anti-union activities of the N.C.P., patronized by Dunne and Darcy, and the fraudulent Trotskyite line for an immediate socialist revolution in the United States. *It*

is the old trick of all opportunists, traitors, and renegades to blind the workers with promises of "immediate" Socialism, in order to divert them from struggle for the real immediate tasks.

Leftist opportunism underestimates completely the vital importance of the current wage movements from the standpoint both of protecting the economic standards of labor and the people and of building the power of the people's coalition headed by labor to check and defeat the reactionary and imperialist offensive of the monopolies. Because all labor's gains under capitalism are only partial, temporary, and unstable, Leftist opportunism discourages the struggle for higher wages and other partial demands, proposing to substitute for these struggles a "general" fight for Socialism. Under the prevailing objective conditions in the U.S., which impose upon labor the strategic aim of rallying around itself all democratic forces of the American people to defeat the offensive of reaction, *as the next historic stage on the road to Socialism*, the proposals of Leftist opportunism amount in practice to abandoning the fight against capitalist exploitation, to labor's surrender to the bosses, to labor's accepting the reduced standard of living imposed by the monopolies. Leftist opportunism advocates *in fact* the same position on the wage movements as that occupied by the reactionary A.F. of L. leaders.

We must especially expose the fake "theories" peddled by the N.C.P. and other renegades as "Marxism," such as, that there is not much use fighting for higher wages under capitalism because the bosses must seek to reduce wages, especially on the eve of a crisis due to the falling rate of profit, etc. Suffice it to say here the following: Marx never said that the rate of profit must fall under all conditions. He discovered a law governing the tendency toward a falling rate of profit which capitalists seek to counteract. As to results, the general rate of profit of American corporations has risen during the war years and there are no trends yet toward a decline. As to the theoretical angle, the renegades have taken over the bourgeois vulgarization of Marxism which makes Marx say that capitalism will automatically disappear when the rate of profit falls below the point of "profitability," because then capitalists will cease doing business. Partly based on this capitalist version of "Marxism" is the position of the N.C.P. renegades that instead of fighting for higher wages, labor had better get ready for socialism—a position which is very good for the bosses. Leftist opportunism also takes from the renegades another "theory," which the latter have taken from capitalist economists, that profits must not fall below a certain "minimum" and wages must not rise above a certain "maximum" as long as capitalism exists. This we have

discuss
this sh
emphas
against
though
tial and

... th
tic prod
the aver
push the
its *mini*
Profit, p

Then

Such
in this
working
resistan
of capit
at mak
chances
ment?

And

If the
to one
wretche
ardly gi
flict wit
disquali
of any

This
munist
wage r
retical
teachin
against
lighten
the ne
for soc
Lefti

discussed in the foregoing. Only this should be added: Marx always emphasized the need of struggle against capitalist exploitation even though labor's gains can only be partial and temporary. He said:

... the general tendency of capitalistic production is not to raise but to sink the average standard of wages, or to push the *value of labor* more or less to its *minimum limit*. (*Value, Price and Profit*, p. 61.)

Then he asked this question:

Such being the tendency of *things* in this system, is this to say that the working class ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital and abandon their attempts at making the best of the occasional chances for their temporary improvement? (*Ibid.*)

And what did Marx answer?

If they did, they would be degraded to one level mass of broken-down wretches past salvation. . . . By cowardly giving way in their everyday conflict with capital, they would certainly disqualify themselves for the initiating of any larger movement. (*Ibid.*)

This is the basis for the Communist policies with respect to the wage movements. This is the theoretical basis for the Lenin-Stalin teachings that in the daily struggle against capitalist exploitation, *enlightened by Marxism*, labor learns the need and the ways of struggle for socialism.

Leftist opportunism also takes

from the renegades the hostile approach to the building of the Left-Center alliance in the unions. The renegades seek to disrupt this alliance, thus serving the needs of the bosses and of the reactionary trade union leaders, just as they serve the bosses by discouraging the struggle for wage increases. The answer to the Right-opportunist tendency to neglect ideological and political education in the building of the Left-Center alliance is not the Leftist-opportunist tendency of underestimating the importance of the alliance itself. It is the Party's answer of strengthening and expanding this alliance on the basis of the general struggle for labor unity and of labor's leadership in the people's coalition, reinforced by systematic Marxist ideological and political enlightenment.

Finally, it is necessary to expose the attempt of the renegades to discredit one of labor's most effective approaches to the middle classes in the present wage movements. It is the idea that a sizable wage increase immediately would substantially enlarge the capacities of the home market and thus tend to *retard* the rate of maturing of the inevitable cyclical economic crisis, barring a worsening of the international situation, and would soften the impact of the crisis upon the masses of the people. Leftist opportunism lets itself be influenced by the renegades also on this question. The reasoning is that because cyclical crises are inevitable

under capitalism, as established scientifically by Marx, "therefore" nothing can intervene to hasten, modify, or retard the course of the maturing of such crises. This is obvious nonsense. The last world war has seriously—and temporarily—modified the course of the economic cycle in the capitalist world. At the present time, the sabotage of the monopolies is *hastening* the maturing of the crisis and so is the general offensive of reaction upon the economic standards and political rights of the masses of the people. Labor's developing resistance and counter-offensive will definitely tend to have a contrary effect upon the rate of maturing of the crisis. It will be a retarding effect and will thus benefit, not only labor, but also the farmers, the city middle classes, the Negro people. It will help build the people's coalition and labor's leader-

ship in it. Hence, we must combat both the Left-opportunist tendency to negate this approach of labor to the middle classes as well as the Right-opportunist tendency to capitulate to the bourgeois "theory" that substantial wage increases, and other partial measures, will do away with economic crises under capitalism.

In conclusion, it is essential that the Party makes widely known its position—theoretical and practical—on the wage movements, on the Nathan Report, on the wage policies of the C.I.O. and related questions, as analyzed and formulated by the National Committee meeting and subsequent actions. It is most important to strengthen the Communist understanding of the Party membership on all these major issues in the life of the American working class and of the American people as a whole.

THE INTE SITU

It is no
wish to
internat
in order
tions in

For t
right up
the con
uation
propaga
widely
reaction
people i
China v
eral bas
political
not whe
state of
some C
critics,
tics. TH
offer a
eral of

* Chief
the Chine
tion of a
Emancipat

THE POSTWAR INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

By LU TING-YI*

IT IS NOW THE NEW YEAR 1947. We wish to make a survey of the entire international situation from all sides in order to dispel certain misconceptions in this field.

For the past year and more and right up to the present, because of the complicated changes in the situation and because of demagogic propaganda spread intentionally and widely by both Chinese and foreign reactionaries, there are still some people in the camp of democracy in China whose understanding of several basic questions of the postwar political situation is not in accord, or not wholly in accord, with the actual state of affairs. These people include some Communists, some Left-wing critics, some middle-of-the-road critics. The purpose of this article is to offer a general interpretation of several of these basic questions.

I. MAO TSE-TUNG'S PREDICTION

Sixteen months have elapsed since the victory in the anti-fascist war. These sixteen months have been a period of extremely complicated changes in the international political situation. The course of changing affairs has taken many twists and turns. One set of conditions prevailed at the Foreign Ministers' Conference in London in September, 1945; there was a change at the time of the Moscow Foreign Ministers' Conference in December of the same year; another change took place in February and March of last year; while from September of last year onward still another change occurred.

After the many changes of the past sixteen months we have ample assurance in saying: the development of the international situation accords entirely with the prediction of Mao Tse-tung.

In "On Coalition Government," the political report of Comrade Mao Tse-tung to the Seventh National Convention of the Chinese Communist Party in April, 1945, he made the following prediction as to the new world situation that would follow World War II:

This new situation differs greatly from that of the First World War and the so-called "peaceful" period that followed. At that time there was no Soviet Union, such as the present one, nor was there such a degree of consciousness as is now shown by the

* Chief of the Department of Information of the Chinese Communist Party. This is a translation of an article which appeared in the *Yenan Emancipation Daily* in January, 1947.

people of Great Britain, the United States, China, France and the other anti-fascist Allies, and naturally there could not be such a world unity as the present, headed by three great powers or five great powers. We are now living in an entirely new situation. In the world there now exist peoples and their organized forces who have been awakened and united and who are in the process of becoming more so. This determines the goal to which the wheels of world history are turning and the path that should be followed to reach it.

The defeat of the fascist aggressor countries and the emergence of a general situation of peace will not mean that there will be no more struggle. The widely scattered remnant forces of fascism will certainly continue to make trouble. The anti-democratic forces remaining in the camp of the anti-fascist war against aggression will continue to oppress the people. Therefore, after the realization of international peace, the struggle between the anti-fascist masses of the people and the remnant forces of the fascists, between democracy and anti-democracy, will continue to occupy a major part of the world. The broadest peoples' victory can only arrive through a long period of energetic efforts to overcome the remnant fascist forces and the anti-democratic forces. The attainment of this victory will certainly be neither very quick nor very easy, but it will nonetheless certainly come. The victory in the anti-fascist war—the just World War II—has opened the road to victory in the peoples' struggle in the postwar period, and it is only after such a victory that a stable and lasting peace can be guaranteed. This is the bright future lying before the peoples of the world.

I hope that all my readers will read carefully these words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung several times. This will help to a comprehension of the basic questions of the present international scene.

II. TWO BASIC POINTS

These words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung bring out two basic points:

The first basic point: victory in the anti-fascist war has opened the way to progress for the democratic forces in all nations. The extent of the progress of these democratic forces will be incomparably greater than after the First World War. An attack by the anti-democratic forces on the peoples of all nations must of necessity come. But the democratic forces will in the necessity of things be able to overcome the anti-democratic forces, secure their own victory, and win firm and lasting international peace. There are two necessities involved here: one, that the anti-democratic forces will of necessity attack, and, two, that the democratic forces will of necessity be victorious.

Thus all erroneous pessimistic contentions are swept clean away. These pessimistic contentions are: alleging that the extent of the progress of the democratic forces after World War II will be less than after World War I; statements about the "super-colossal" reactionary strength of American imperialism and Chiang Kai-shek and about how they will oppress the people of China and

of the
be unat
that W
that it v
lasting
etc. A
clearly
these e
people
and o
might
mestic
blinded
and t
strengt
derestin
ple.

The
gle bet
and an
greater
in the
viet U
been n
therefo
tween
cy. O
sides t
whole
filled
racy an
lowing
contra
world
and a
the cap
capital
ion, an
Union
be mor
tradict

of the whole world until they will be unable to draw breath; statements that World War III is inevitable or that it will soon arrive, that firm and lasting peace cannot be attained, etc. etc. All these points of view are clearly in error. The reason that these errors are made is that some people are misled by the temporary and outward appearance of the might of the international and domestic reactionary forces, or are blinded by reactionary propaganda and thereby overestimate the strength of the reactionaries and underestimate the strength of the people.

The second basic point: the struggle between the forces of democracy and anti-democracy will cover the greater part of the world. That is, in the world there is a Socialist Soviet Union in which there have long been no anti-democratic forces and therefore no internal struggle between democracy and anti-democracy. Other places in the world besides the Soviet Union—that is, the whole of the capitalist world—are filled with struggle between democracy and anti-democracy. Thus, following World War II, the dominant contradiction in the actual political world is between the democratic and anti-democratic forces within the capitalist world, not between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union, and also not between the Soviet Union and the United States. To be more concrete, the dominant contradictions in the world at present

are those between the American people and the American reactionaries, the Anglo-American contradiction, and the Sino-American contradiction.

The demagogic propaganda by reactionaries in China and abroad is thus thoroughly swept away, so that all good-hearted people will not be misled by it. Such dogmatic propaganda is: that the present dominant contradiction in the present world is that between capitalist and socialist countries, that the Soviet-American contradiction is dominant while Anglo-American and Sino-American contradictions are secondary; that socialist and capitalist countries cannot peacefully cooperate, that Soviet-American war is inevitable; etc., etc.

We shall elucidate below: 1) Who are the anti-democratic forces? What is their present and what will be their future role? 2) Who are the democratic forces? What is their present and what will be their future role?

III. WORLD REACTIONARIES: THEIR SMOKE-SCREEN AND THEIR REAL ACTIVITIES

After World War II, American imperialism took the place of fascist Germany, Italy, and Japan as the fortress of the world reactionary forces. The reactionary forces of the world are precisely the American imperialists with the addition of the reactionaries in various countries—China's Chiang Kai-shek, Great

Britain's Churchill, France's de Gaulle, etc., and the fascist remnants—Spain's Franco government, Japan's Yoshida cabinet, Germany's Von Papen, Schacht, etc. The reactionaries of all countries and the fascist remnants have now all become traitors, directly or indirectly supported by American imperialism, selling out the peoples of all their respective countries.

America's wartime industrial production more than doubled in comparison with the pre-war period. American monopoly capital experienced tremendous growth during the war. At the same time, a gang of warlords arose in America. After the close of the war this gang of monopoly capitalists and militarists, this bloc of an extremely small handful of fanatical aggressors, advocated a policy of imperialist aggression to expand markets, wrest the markets, colonies, and semi-colonies of other capitalist countries, oppressing primarily the great colonial-imperial countries, Great Britain and France, and oppressing China, while at the same time exercising sole domination over Japan and Latin America. The American imperialists are carrying out this aggression under the slogans of "Open Door Policy," "Equal Opportunity," etc. Because American productive technique is very high and American monopoly capital tremendous, the U.S. imperialists, no matter where they penetrate, need only have the conditions of "Open Door" and "Equal Op-

portunity" to be in an overwhelming position to drive others out and monopolize the market. Besides this, the American imperialists are undertaking large-scale military preparations against all other capitalist countries, colonies, and semi-colonial countries under all sorts of pretexts. Their military bases are spread over many countries outside the Soviet Union. American imperialism has through "peaceful" means occupied many "Pearl Harbors" in various countries while saying that this is "to prevent another Pearl Harbor."

In February and March of 1946, world reactionaries schemed to incite war against the Soviet Union. This was typified by the reactionary speeches of Churchill. That this aroused alertness in everyone was as it should be. Churchill's agitation met with opposition and the cold shoulder from people all over the world, and the schemes of the reactionaries met with sorry defeat.

But the "Anti-Soviet War" propaganda begun by Churchill was treasured and continued by the American imperialists. The reason they cherish this kind of propaganda is not that they intend to launch an anti-Soviet war at the present time, but that the propaganda may be used as a smoke-screen behind which to carry on their great world-wide aggression and their domestic oppression.

"Anti-Soviet"—what does this mean? Hitler's anti-Sovietism was another name for enslaving the German people and trampling on the

peoples
anti-Sov
enslavin
invadin
of the l
the An
but be
Americ
gression

There
similar
ent ant
can rea
man a
the pas
the Sov
other
could a
and th
tiguous
strengt
as great
only a
areas a
could
Americ
Union
separat
territor
countri
Africa.
tions it
States
The re
can an
war pe
pressin
invadin
Soviet
Of c

peoples of all Europe. Fascist Japan's anti-Sovietism was another word for enslaving the Japanese people and invading all countries on both sides of the Pacific. The anti-Sovietism of the American reactionaries cannot but be a word for enslaving the American people and launching aggression against the whole world.

There are, however, points of dissimilarity in the meaning of the present anti-Soviet slogan of the American reactionaries and that of the German and Japanese reactionaries in the past. Germany is very close to the Soviet Union and, granted the other conditions, German fascists could attack the Soviet Union. Japan and the Soviet Union were contiguous, but because the national strength of Japanese fascism was not as great as that of Hitler, Japan could only attack China and the Pacific areas and was defeated before she could invade the Soviet Union. America is very far from the Soviet Union and there are vast territories separating them. These in-between territories comprise all the capitalist countries, colonies and semi-colonial countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Under these and other conditions it is very difficult for the United States to attack the Soviet Union. The real significance of the American anti-Soviet slogan in the post-war period is its usefulness in oppressing the American people and in invading all countries outside the Soviet Union by "peaceful means."

Of course, there are contradictions

between American monopoly capital and warlords on the one hand and the Socialist Soviet Union on the other. In nature, it can be said to constitute the contradiction between the new world and the old world, and it is one of the basic contradictions in the world. The social and state system of the Soviet Union is much stronger and more stable than that of American capitalism. The Soviet Union is the protector of world peace; with a Soviet Union in existence, the greed and ambitions of American and world reaction are fundamentally difficult to realize. Therefore the American and world reactionaries hate the Soviet Union bitterly and want, moreover, to carry on an anti-Soviet struggle. But anti-Sovietism is one thing and anti-Soviet war is quite another. We are certainly not claiming that American imperialists do not wish to attack the Soviet Union. But until American imperialists have brought into submission the people of the U. S., the peoples of the various capitalist countries, colonies, and semi-colonies, they are unable to attack the Soviet Union. But to bring these into submission is impossible. Therefore, although the Soviet-American contradiction is one of the basic contradictions in the world, it is not the urgent contradiction, it is not the dominant contradiction in the present political situation. The development of events in the past sixteen months has already proved this point.

The real policy of the American imperialists is to attack the American people and to oppress the people of the various other capitalist countries, colonies, and semi-colonies through "peaceful means." But the American imperialists conceal their real activities and are silent about them. They have no way of attacking the Soviet Union, but they make big talk about "anti-Soviet war." This is clearly setting up a smoke-screen.

Why must the American imperialists set up this smoke-screen? If this smoke-screen is not swept away what harm will it do?

The purpose of American imperialists in setting up this smoke-screen is to make the American people and the broad masses of peoples of various countries, colonies, and semi-colonies lose their vigilance with regard to the real policies of the American imperialists and therefore lose or lessen their power of resistance to attacks and aggression by American imperialism. In this way American imperialists can take advantage of the unpreparedness of the American people and the peoples of various countries and can, with comparative ease, fascize America and transform all other countries into American colonies or dependencies. If we do not sweep away their smoke-screen, or if we do not consider this sweeping away as an important task, we shall to a greater or lesser extent fall into the trap set by American imperialism, or even, to a greater or less extent, act as megaphones for

the public enemy—the imperialistic elements of the United States.

We should therefore not be misled by the smoke-screen of the American imperialists so that we lose our power of judgment and fall prey to the demagogic propaganda that the so-called "Soviet-American contradiction" is the dominant contradiction in the world," that the "third world war is inevitable," etc., etc. The only correct path and the duty for every person in our camp of democracy is resolutely to sweep away the smoke-screen and to call upon every one—among the American people and the peoples of the various capitalist countries, colonies, and semi-colonies—to rise and recognize clearly the enemy, to save themselves from destruction, and to oppose the attack and the aggression by the American imperialists.

IV. THE WORLD DEMOCRATIC MIGHT

Standing against the world reactionaries—the imperialists of the U. S. and their running dogs in various countries—is the world democratic might.

Besides the Soviet Union, which is the main pillar, the world democratic forces are made up of three sections: the broad masses of the people of all capitalist countries, in addition to the U.S., and the broad masses of the peoples of all colonial and semi-colonial countries. In terms of class make-up they include everyone, from

workers
patriotic
peace a
The a
contribu
The a
struggle
peace a
life for
of the
people
situatio
reaction
loomed
monop
war fat
gotten
policy
talis
men in
prices
ing st
crackin
to can
are en
divert
people
against
capital
In
Ameri
thems
"intern
nation
sors a
cooper
ments
Demo
The v
tionar
utatio

workers and farmers right up to the patriotic elements and advocates of peace among the bourgeoisie.

The American people made heroic contributions to the anti-fascist war. The aim of their self-sacrificing struggle was the winning of world peace and democracy and a happy life for themselves. After the close of the war, however, the American people were faced with the following situation: after the defeat of foreign reactionaries, domestic reactionaries loomed. These were precisely those monopoly capitalists who during the war fattened on speculations and ill-gotten riches. In the field of domestic policy this gang of reactionary capitalists and their reactionary spokesmen in government are raising the prices of goods to press down the living standards of the people, are cracking down on strikes in order to cancel the people's liberties, and are encouraging anti-Sovietism to divert the attention of the American people so that they will be off guard against attacks by the monopoly capitalists.

In the field of foreign policy American reactionaries do not call themselves "isolationists" but rather "internationalists." But these "internationalists" are international aggressors and not democratic international cooperators. These reactionary elements have their men in both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The world aggression of these reactionaries has seriously soiled the reputation of America, ruined interna-

tional friendship, and is brewing the danger of war.

This is why the American people, including enlightened members of the American bourgeoisie represented by Wallace, will certainly rise for determined struggle with the reactionaries.

The capitalist countries outside of America, chiefly Great Britain and France, suffered great wounds from the war, and, compared to the U.S., they are second or third class countries. They are objects of aggression by American imperialism. The law of the uneven development of capitalism forces them resolutely to resist American oppression.

These capitalist countries are now struggling for economic recovery from the wounds of war and are simultaneously in the following situation. The democratic movement of the peoples of their own countries and the demand of independence and autonomy by the colonies and semi-colonial countries stand on the one side, and the savage aggression of American imperialism on the other.

The line taken by reactionaries like Churchill and de Gaulle within these countries is to rely on the U.S. against the democratic movement of the people of their own country and against the independence movements of the peoples of the colonies and the semi-colonies. The price paid for this reactionary line is that it inevitably leads to these countries sinking to the position of American dependencies.

The peoples in these capitalist countries have another line: to win democratic and social reform for their own country, to grant independence and autonomy to colonial and semi-colonial countries, and to cooperate with the Soviet Union in order to resist the aggression of American imperialism and maintain their national independence.

Beyond all shadow of doubt the peoples' line will be victorious. This line will obtain endorsement from all classes of people, including enlightened members of the bourgeoisie. The line of the reactionaries, on the contrary, must certainly fail because it will meet with the opposition of the entire nation.

Take, for instance, the most important of these capitalist countries—Great Britain. She is exerting her efforts in the postwar period to effect economic recovery. Her exports are gradually rising, something about which the American imperialist elements are not happy. American imperialism seeks to break the sterling bloc by exploiting Great Britain's need for loans and, in the name of so-called "defense against the Soviet Union's attacks," wants Great Britain to enter into military alliance with her. These are all serious steps preparatory to swallowing up Great Britain. The British empire has its colonies and dependencies scattered all over the world. Under the policy of sole world domination of the American imperialists, the British Empire is experiencing attacks by

American imperialism in Canada, Australia, South America, the Atlantic Islands, the Middle East, Palestine and Arabia, Egypt and the Mediterranean, and finally in India, Burma, and elsewhere. In certain places these clashes have already become, or are brewing, armed struggles. In the future there is the possibility of the U.S. inciting aggressive wars against other capitalist countries (first of all, Great Britain).

The Attlee-Bevin cabinet, which continues in Great Britain the Conservative Parties foreign policy, has done many evil deeds in concert with American imperialism and has expressed mutual sympathy and understanding or engaged in common action with American imperialism on many questions. The policy of American imperialism, however, cannot but force the British people gradually into consciousness. The steady increase of votes against Bevin's foreign policy in the British Lower House is proof of this. As the consciousness of the British people grows daily, it will be very difficult for Great Britain to continue her present foreign policy, and the time when she will change her present foreign policy is not too distant.

Thus it is with Great Britain; it will be even more so with France. In face of the daily growing consciousness of the French people, France will certainly not follow in the wake of American imperialism.

The American imperialists' policy of aggression against all other capi-

talist c
arouse
tries. T
fore, af
what h
talist e
Union."
the Sov
cratic i
policies
friendly
and be
and of
Americ
blows o
thermor
these c
trade w
fore, "
longer
Amer
ward a
nations
Americ
The Ar
ward C
There
tween
perialis
icy of
China,
in form
Americ
pass th
trickery
of Jap
support
reaction
the Cl
support
aries in

alist countries must of necessity arouse the opposition of these countries. This makes impossible, therefore, after the Second World War, what has been called the "capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union." On the contrary, because of the Soviet Union's peaceful, democratic international policies and her policies of peaceful competition and friendly commerce with all countries, and because Great Britain, France and other countries must resist American oppression to escape the blows of the economic crisis and furthermore restore their economies, these countries must cooperate and trade with the Soviet Union. Therefore, "capitalist encirclement" no longer exists.

American imperialism's policy toward all colonial and semi-colonial nations is to transform them into American colonies or dependencies. The American imperialists' policy toward China is a typical example. There is no difference in nature between the policy of American imperialism toward China and the policy of the Japanese fascists toward China, although there are differences in form. The means employed by American imperialism, however, surpass that of Japanese imperialism in trickery and malice. After the defeat of Japanese imperialism, the U.S. supports Chiang Kai-shek and other reactionaries in their oppression of the Chinese people. In Japan she supports Yoshida and other reactionaries in their oppression of the Jap-

anese people, and helps them revive the policy of aggression toward China.

At present the reactionaries of both China and Japan occupy the same position as running dogs of American imperialism, while the peoples of both China and Japan are in the position of suffering oppression by American imperialism. The war of self-defense now being waged by the Chinese people against the American-supported Chiang Kai-shek is in its nature a war for the homeland. It is a national war supported by the entire nation. This kind of war for the fatherland has been taking place in many colonies and semi-colonial countries, *i.e.*, the Philippines, Indo-China, India, Iran, Greece, etc. These wars are all fought against American imperialism and its running dogs in various countries. They are directly or indirectly waged against American imperialism to win world peace and democracy.

The contradiction between American imperialism and the democratic forces in the capitalist world is not being mitigated, but is, on the contrary, developing and growing. When the American economic crisis comes, the American imperialists will, because of it, tighten their attacks, and the three contradictions mentioned above will become sharper. Such a period is not far off, for the American economic crisis will arrive this year or next.

V. UNITED FRONT ON A WORLD SCALE

The world anti-democratic forces are the American imperialists and the reactionaries in various countries. Since the world anti-democratic forces are attacking the American people and the peoples of the other capitalist countries, colonies, and semi-colonial countries in unison, the peoples of the U.S. and of the various capitalist countries, colonies, and semi-colonial countries must also act in unison to form a world-wide united front against American imperialism and the reactionaries in all countries. This world-wide united front, this colossal army comprising well over one billion people, is precisely the world democratic might.

This world-wide united front cannot possibly be of any other character than that of a united front, fighting for world peace and democracy and the independence of all nations against American imperialism and its running dogs in various countries. This united front will undoubtedly have the sympathy and the moral support of the Socialist Soviet Union.

This united front on a world scale will characterize a new page in world history, the history of the world from the end of the Second World War down to the day when stable and lasting peace is ensured. The Chinese movement for independence, peace, and democracy is an important part of this chapter of

world history.

Within each capitalist country, colony, and semi-colonial country, there will also be extremely broad united fronts, as in China, against the American imperialists and against the reactionaries within China. The immediate central task before the peoples and the democratic forces of all countries is to struggle for the realization of this world-wide united front and the united front within each country.

VI. RELATIVE STRENGTH OF FORCES

The facts, in this period of more than a year following the victory in the anti-fascist war, prove that the rate of world progress is very fast and that some events have developed faster than we had expected. The scope of development of the democratic forces in all countries of the world is far greater than that after World War I.

The progress of the peoples in the capitalist world during the past year and more is manifested in:

1. The firm establishment of new democratic regimes in various countries of eastern and southeastern Europe.

2. The progress of the peoples of Great Britain and France by leaps and bounds.

3. The flourishing development of the struggles of the peoples of colonial and semi-colonial countries, with China at their head, for independence and autonomy.

4. The
the peo
Japan.

5. The
strike r
of the
inciden
the Am
British
Englan
the Bri

6. The
democr
of Lati

The
the pe
the der
world

The

most
world-
has ris
devotin
peacef

new fi
of the
tion pl
ule sh

for th
over-fa
structi
Union

icy, fo
protec
nation

the re
ferenc
Assem
and I
the S
chill's

4. The rapid Leftward trend of the peoples of Germany, Italy and Japan.

5. The high tide of the American strike movement and the occurrence of the Wallace incident (the Wallace incident expresses the split among the American bourgeoisie just as the British Labor Party opposition in England expressed the split among the British bourgeoisie).

6. The broad development of the democratic forces in all the countries of Latin America.

The scope, speed, and progress of the peoples and the development of the democratic forces in the capitalist world are truly startling!

The international position of the most progressive country in the world—the Socialist Soviet Union—has risen greatly. At present she is devoting all her strength to the peaceful constructive work of the new five-year plan. The completion of the first year's industrial production plan one month ahead of schedule shows that it is entirely possible for the U.S.S.R. to complete and over-fulfill this new plan for construction. The struggle of the Soviet Union, in the realm of foreign policy, for international peace and the protection of the interests of small nations, achieved great victories in the recent Foreign Ministers' Conference and in the United Nations Assembly. The plot of the American and British reactionaries to isolate the Soviet Union, following Churchill's reactionary utterances of

March last year, has been smashed. The victories of the Soviet Union in economic construction and in foreign policy will greatly influence the history of world development, and will be beneficial to the peoples of all countries.

The world reactionary forces are outwardly strong but hollow inside. Moreover, they are becoming daily more isolated. American imperialism is the highest peak of capitalist development, but precisely because of this it is weaker than the capitalism of any earlier period. The higher they climb the harder they fall! And the American economic crisis which will arrive this year or next cannot but be extremely turbulent in nature. The reactionary foreign and domestic policies of the American imperialists will necessarily lead, and have led, to the opposition of the broadest masses of people both within and without the country. This will increasingly result in the masses turning against them and in their allies deserting them. All the running dogs of the American imperialists in various countries, as for instance China's Chiang Kai-shek, cannot but become traitors and meet in their countries with the opposition of the entire nation. Therefore they cannot but rapidly isolate themselves, turned against by the masses and deserted by their allies. It is thus with China's Chiang Kai-shek and with the reactionaries of all countries.

The reactionary forces will collapse in the long run. They really

appear very ferocious for a time and can frighten weak-willed people out of their wits so that they express pessimism and disappointment, lose their self-confidence, and even give in and surrender to the reactionaries. But the broad masses of the people and the men of strong will cannot be frightened. The peoples, in the course of their own practical experience, will recognize, not only the reactionary nature of the reactionaries, but also their feebleness. They will recognize that the attacks of the reactionaries on the people can be smashed.

To sum up: world progress, the successes of the Soviet Union, and the American economic crisis are the three factors of decisive significance in the history of the future development of the world.

VII. THE ROAD TO VICTORY

The present time is still a period when world reaction can be cocky, baring its fangs and extending its talons. This is primarily because the struggles of the peoples in the various countries have not entered the higher stage, and at the same time it is also because the American economic crisis has not yet arrived. But even in this kind of period, the reactionary forces have already revealed their corrupt impotence. They have already revealed that they are hollow within and only outwardly strong. When the struggles of the peoples of all countries has reached a higher level of development and

the American economic crisis has broken out, that will be the time when the great arrogance of the reactionaries will collapse. This is already not far distant. Before this time comes the people of each country will meet with difficulties, and in individual countries and regions may even meet with very serious difficulties. Difficulties of this kind, however, can and must be conquered. The present task is for everyone to exert every effort and surmount these difficulties.

Following the development of these three factors—world progress, Soviet successes, and the American crisis—the democratic forces will become even more powerful and the relative strength of the democratic and anti-democratic forces will become more favorable to the people. But it is not to be imagined that the reactionary forces will voluntarily abdicate to the democratic forces. Therefore, before we have attained what Comrade Mao Tse-tung calls “the broadest victory of the people” and “the guarantee of stable and lasting peace,” there is still a long and tortuous struggle ahead. The Chinese Communists and the Chinese people will fear no difficulties. They will fight on till the complete victory of the democratic cause and the winning of peace and independence of the nation. We have the strongest confidence in this brilliant future; but the world bourgeoisie, on the contrary, has completely lost confidence in its future. The terrorism

whipped
the war
against
terror a
Union,
the peo
their co
a living
of their
It is ce
the new
geoisie
mism
gard to
In ge
after th

whipped up in various countries after the war by the anti-democratic forces against the forces of the people, their terror at the strength of the Soviet Union, their fanatical oppression of the people, their horror of the truth, their complete reliance on lies for a living—these are all manifestations of their complete loss of confidence. It is certainly not accidental that all the newspapers of the Chinese bourgeoisie express unprecedented pessimism and disappointment with regard to their future.

In general, everything has changed after the Second World War and is

still continuing to change. How strong the people have become—how conscious, how organized, determined and full of confidence! How maniacally savage the reactionaries have become, outwardly strong yet inwardly feeble, turned on by the masses and deserted by their allies, devoid of all confidence in the future! It may be categorically forecast that the face of China and of the world will be vastly different after three to five more years. All comrades of our Party and all the people of China must resolutely fight for a new China and a new world.

SPOTLIGHT ON THE A.C.T.U.

By GEORGE MORRIS

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC hierarchy has in recent years taken an active interest in the American trade unions. Much of its resources are given to development of special schools for indoctrination of union members. The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, its organized force for direct infiltration of the unions, is in evidence in a number of important organizations.

Not much is publicly known of the actual program of the Vatican's agents in the labor movement. In their factional union politics they exploit far more strongly the discipline of their church than anything tangible they profess to offer to the workers.

Reverend William J. Smith, Jesuit priest, and director of the Crown Heights Associated Activities, a training school in New York City for Roman Catholics in the labor movement, has at last given us a rounded-out program of these elements in his book, *Spotlight on Labor Unions* (Duell, Sloan and Pierce, New York, 1946).

Reverend Smith sets out to give American labor "a code." He regrets

that while most labor leaders have "no defined and unified code of action" the "Communists brought a 'code' of action into the labor movement all right." And with that Smith develops the "Red menace" with a language, falsehoods, and distortions comparable only to Hearst editorials.

"America's greatest problem is to save our economic system and our political form of government from slipping into socialism," writes Smith. "The free enterprise system must be saved and protected."

Point one in Smith's "code" is liquidation of the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class. The alternative for the workers is "fuller participation with their capitalist partners in the management of an industry."

A "NEW ORDER"

Smith hastens to assure industrialists that this proposal, far from being "socialism," is an "antidote" to Marxism. Throughout the book the author pleads with the capitalist class to see the "light," or Communism is the alternative. He writes:

Industry and management have not too much to lose by a serious acceptance of the new order of things. . . . We are convinced an enlightened policy on the part of management will be followed by a cooperative reaction from the better class of labor leaders.

Smith further assures the employers that "conservative trade unionism

develops in direct ratio" to employ-er show of "partnership" to labor.

How is the "substitution of the principle of cooperation for that of conflict" to be instituted? After the evaporation of the class struggle by the mere expression of willingness by capitalists and workers to be "equal partners" it is equally simple to liquidate the very foundation of capitalist exploitation. Management and unions form an "industrial council" in each plant. Through it all matters are settled to mutual satisfaction. Ultimately, it is visioned, a nation-wide network based on such councils would take care of all matters concerning industry. But, Smith conceded, "much spade work" is still needed. He set the goal within a "long-term, fifty-year plan," to be achieved "or we perish."

He sees a shining example of his "new order" in the production speed-up and profit-sharing scheme introduced in the plants of former Chamber of Commerce President Eric Johnston. The plan is essentially a bonus which is higher for those with longest service and still higher for those employed in a supervisory capacity. Johnston's plan is only one of many that were common especially in the postwar 'twenties when company unionism was in flower.

The Lincoln Electric Company incentive plan is another cited by Smith as a sample of his "new order," as is Henry Kaiser's bonus of \$5 on a car.

"The best way of keeping American workers from becoming Socialists or revolutionists is to make American capitalists out of them," he writes.

Profit-sharing, employee stock ownership, and other like forms have long ago been exposed as capitalist schemes designed to squeeze more sweat and energy out of workers *for no extra compensation*. They were most prevalent during the roaring 'twenties when the open-shoppers, having smashed labor's resistance, reigned supreme. With the A. F. of L. then too weak to offer much opposition or with its leaders willingly accepting "partnership," the employers literally went wild with their profit-sharing schemes.

The effect was simply this: in exchange for this submission to them by the A. F. of L. and, therefore, low wage scales, employers gratuitously offered workers a chance for extra compensation in the form of a "share" of the profits, if productivity were driven higher. To the employer this meant a substantial rise in profits. To the workers it meant having part of his wages called "dividends." But his regular wages and share of "profits" together did not measure up to a decent wage. The best proof of that is the fact that never was the contrast between low purchasing power among the workers and high productivity and profits so great as in the "prosperity" 'twenties.

The "experts" on profit-sharing

view the worker as a donkey to be induced to go forward by dangling an ear of corn in front of him. Reverend Smith and the A.C.T.U. by their blessing to profit-sharing are helping reaction to put it over again on the American workers.

Of course, labor has to "produce the necessary talent or can hire such talent" as would be fit to sit down with management as "partners." And Reverend Smith sees some talent emerging.

"Walter Reuther, President of the United Automobile Workers, is as capable a representative as you will find on either side of the industrial table." In the A. F. of L. it is David Dubinsky of the I.L.G.W.U. who is singled out for high praise.

Reverend Smith is literally carried away with enthusiasm as he calls attention to various schemes like the "multiple management plan" of a Baltimore company and concludes that the kind of cooperation he wants is "more widespread than is generally known." It certainly will be if some of the pro-company union measures pending before the 80th Congress are enacted.

Perhaps the best indication of the hollowness of Smith's contention is his effort to draw support from "5,000 successful union-management committees" during the war. Were he interested in facts he would have had to admit that the wartime committees, far from bolstering his view, demonstrated its bankruptcy. The

great majority of those committees were actually fictitious because employers refused to let them take up anything but inconsequential matters. The employer's class interest and resentment that workers should "meddle" in his managerial prerogatives superseded the temporary common interest in the war effort. Far from advancing the concept of class conciliation, the experience during the war proved that even the pressure of war necessity and government encouragement could not bridge the chasm between exploited and exploiters.

When will Reverend Smith's millennium of "antidote" to Communism and "substitute" for capitalism come?

He is hard pressed to meet the analysis of the Marxists that the trend of developments, through the struggle between the monopolists and the mass of people led by the working class, leads to replacement of private ownership of the means of production by social ownership and operation.

But he cannot escape the problem. He is writing in a day when doubts on capitalism are prevalent even among Americans. Many people have lived through two wars, and two crises and are living in fear of another crisis which even capitalist economists confidently and fearfully predict will hit us soon.

Reverend Smith has a very simple answer to meet the questions in the

skeptic
writes
our in
others,
simple
have l
Maker
He wa
sermon
our eco
"new o
way of
world"
preme
all-incl

Reve
the spi
employ
ens, it
groups
for the
would
worker
an her
its." T
course,
age an
miracle

Then
in Rev
represe
U. S.
chief s
the pat
They c
those v
the lig
could b
natural
ities in

skeptical minds of his readers. He writes that "there is no solution of our industrial problems, or any others, until we get back to the simple and fundamental fact that we have been created by an All-Wise Maker to live as one human family." He wanders off into a chapter-long sermon in which the answer to all our economic ills and the dream of a "new order" depends on finding "our way out of the jungle of the godless world" and return to faith in a supreme being. This is offered as the all-inclusive substitute for struggle.

Reverend Smith promises that if the spirit of God enters among the employers and unemployment threatens, it will be possible to organize groups of wealthy capitalists "who for the sake of saving society itself would be willing to employ as many workers as possible at cost and with an heroic disregard of possible profits." That would be beautiful, of course, but people in this modern age are not inclined to believe in miracles.

There is more method than religion in Reverend Smith's sermon. The representatives of the Vatican in the U. S. do not expect to draw their chief support from those who are on the path toward a scientific solution. They count principally on attracting those who have not yet begun to see the light—whose bewildered minds could be turned to comfort in a supernatural force and away from the realities in which they live.

Roman Catholics are assured by Reverend Smith that the "code" he outlines is the official line of the Vatican for the entire world. He quotes Pope Pius XI as favoring capital-labor "partnership" and profit-sharing "of some sort." He notes two "diametrically opposed documents" challenging capitalism: "the encyclicals of a supernatural institution—the Catholic Church; the other the materialistic, Godless Manifesto of Marx." He puts the issue in the trade union movement as a struggle between these two concepts.

On the basis of the theses outlined by Reverend Smith, it may seem ironical but nevertheless true, that it is in those lands where the Church of Rome is predominant that employers show less inclination to give even a living wage, not to speak of offering "partnership" to their employees.

A PROGRAM OF SURRENDER

How does the Vatican "code" for labor view some of the immediate problems affecting the trade unions? A.C.T.U. spokesmen, devoting the bulk of their steam against Communism, are usually vague or very demagogic about those problems. But Reverend Smith is quite frank and explicit. His book, appearing in the midst of an atmosphere of anti-labor hysteria, advises unions:

The handwriting is on the wall. Legislation is coming . . . Labor must be prepared to accept a small dose of remedial medicine now or perhaps be

prepared to undergo a painful major operation a little later.

He suggests that labor leaders get together with some "progressive industrialists" to themselves initiate the "remedial" legislation. Echoing the N.A.M.'s propaganda against "labor monopolies," Reverend Smith warns that "management got it in the neck after a spree of wild liberty" and labor too must expect some "regulation and restriction."

The yarn that "management got it in the neck" is the big lie Big Business is peddling to justify repressive, or "remedial" legislation against labor. An annual profit of ten billion during the war and the far higher profit level after the war, isn't "getting it in the neck." If Reverend Smith refers to the Anti-Trust Act of 1890, it should be pointed out that the trusts far from being restrained, have since grown to a size and power that makes the trusts of old look like pigmies.

Reverend Smith both blesses the big lie of capital and suggests appeasement of the union-busters—an appeasement which he must know cannot stop until unions are smashed or rendered ineffective.

A chapter on strikes is cautiously written, but advocates of laws to ban mass picketing, or otherwise to restrict strikers, will find the support they want from Reverend Smith.

The closed shop is all right "if a willing employer recognizes the value of working with a united, sat-

isfied and well-disciplined union." But if the employer is unwilling and the "advantage of the closed shop is gained by force, threats, intimidation or other methods of repulsive pressure," then "it is a distinct detriment," says Reverend Smith.

This argument hardly differs from the N.A.M.'s propaganda, since a closed shop, to be valid, must rest on an employer's willingness. After a lengthy discourse on the closed shop that is only less blunt than N.A.M. propaganda, Reverend Smith endorses the current move to restrain unions as "monopolies."

He writes:

The day is not far distant, we surmise, when it will be definitely established that trade unionism has reached a stage of power, influence and importance that the unions must be declared public or semi-public bodies and they will come under some kind of regulation similar to that which now controls the monopolistic tendencies of public utilities.

The employers' line of propaganda against labor is echoed in several other respects. "Company security"—penalties upon unions for so-called "unauthorized" strikes, or the right to sue them for damages—is endorsed. Repeated stress on management's right to a "reasonable profit" (whatever that is) is equaled by reminders that wages are "too high" in some fields.

We also get a little more insight into Reverend Smith's "new order":

The w
ing to s
terprise
vantages
cuts from
voidable.

Rever
but nev
gram of
forces, r
"code."
arrogant
only bec
workers
appeared
teria is
very "re
need ha
the effe
mon.

The
abandon
place th
will of
are aske
employe
blood o
by Reve
not req
by labor
states,
cils wo
relation
vention
ica's in
peacefu
ceding
printed
sued by

The workers must be ready and willing to share some of the risks of enterprise if they are to enjoy the advantages of social-partnership. Wage cuts from time to time may be unavoidable.

Reverend Smith's gently-worded, but nevertheless definitely put, program of surrender to the anti-labor forces, reveals the real nature of his "code." If his words do not carry the arrogant ring of the N.A.M.'s, it is only because he is trying to persuade workers to accept it. Since the book appeared at a moment when an hysteria is being whipped up for the very "reforms" he is suggesting, there need hardly be any speculation on the effect of Reverend Smith's sermon.

The workers are counseled to abandon the weapon of struggle and place their confidence on the goodwill of corporation executives. They are asked to do so at a moment when employers are screaming for the blood of labor. The utopia visioned by Reverend Smith, apparently, does not require the legal protection won by labor in recent years. As he often states, the labor-management councils would bring about so happy a relationship that government intervention would not be needed. America's industrial centers were quite peaceful for a number of years preceding the 1929 crash. Beautifully-printed and illustrated pamphlets issued by corporations described what

a happy family they and their employees made up through the shop representation and other "Golden Rule" plans. No unions, no "agitators," no strikes, no Wagner Acts, nothing of the kind. Just "partners" with only the laws of God to rely upon.

On political action, Reverend Smith goes the whole hog against the C.I.O.'s Political Action Committee. He claims to favor political action by labor, but finds his pattern in the A. F. of L. which he says has been in the "thick of politics" for many years "but it has not stirred up the fears and resentments that the C.I.O. did."

"We had no sympathy for either of the P.A.C.'s nor do we favor them now," writes Reverend Smith. Thereby we have the explanation for sabotage of the 1946 election work of the C.I.O. by those in unions guided by Reverend Smith and the A.C.T.U. Smith takes up the cry of the labor-baiters that an investigation of P.A.C.-C.I.O. finances "was a white-wash."

He also echoes the Vatican's ire against the World Federation of Trade Unions. He is sharply critical of the C.I.O. for being affiliated with it. Like the A. F. of L.'s leaders, he denounces inclusion of the "Soviet serf-trade unions." Smith has the audacity to slander the 27,000,000-strong U.S.S.R. labor movement, when, in his Vatican-approved paradise, Franco Spain, labor leaders are

executed for trying to revive the suppressed unions.

How does Smith's "code" apply to the A. F. of L., C.I.O., or independent unions? The A. F. of L., he writes, "is now a staid and stable institution." He goes into some criticism of racketeering in the A. F. of L. and leaves an impression that his groups are interested in democratic reforms in the Federation. But it is far more important to take note of the fact that those loyal to Smith's "code," particularly the A.C.T.U., are practically non-existent as organized groups in the A. F. of L. They are only in several locals as an opposition where progressives are in the leadership. The "activists" do not believe in wasting their time on anything but fighting "Communists." It costs nothing to have it on record in a book that racketeering and bureaucracy are not favored.

AN ATTACK ON THE C.I.O.

But the A.C.T.U.'s forces *are* concentrated in the C.I.O. Reverend Smith's chapter on that organization is far more significant. Yes, he justifies the formation of the C.I.O. It was a progressive step and spurred the organization of millions of workers. The very progressiveness of the C.I.O., however, is "an evidence of very dangerous trends." The danger, of course, is "Communism." Reverend Smith turns into a Hearst editor-

ial writer for a while, and complains that no influential unionist or prominent Communist "has been openly repudiated by the national C.I.O. office."

Smith is bitter against Philip Murray for not matching denunciation of Communists with his frequent statements against fascism and praise for the Soviet Union and Soviet trade unions. He is bitter against John L. Lewis because he "brought them in" and against Murray who "has kept them in."

Because the C.I.O. and its leader followed a policy of maintaining the unity of the organization and refused to expel what he calls the "Communists," Smith writes that "*for this reason it is our opinion that the C.I.O. contains the seeds of its own dissolution.*" But Smith does not give the C.I.O. a chance for survival even if the "Left" were to be expelled. "Without them C.I.O. sails would sag," he warns, and adds:

No one who knows the score denies for a minute that the C.I.O. owes a good deal of its progressiveness to the Communist sparkplugs in its midst. If zip, zeal and go were the only criterion of trade unionism, objection to Communist leadership and influence would be stupid.

After thus praising Communists as good trade unionists he still wants them out because of their "doctrine." As though their exemplary record

as trad
their

But
involve
He th
sugges

Anyt
spotted
go bac
the Co
and on
the me
us to l
the on
satisfac

The
in a r
streng
C.I.O.
All hi
one p
and g
You k
It is t
the d
C.I.O.
paigns
Smith

Sm
union
patter
depend
know
camo
that t
the "
the "
He j
depend

as trade unionists were unrelated to their doctrine!

But to be rid of the Communists involves "civil war," writes Smith. He thereupon offers the following suggestion to some C.I.O. leaders:

Anytime the sound, constructive, unspotted unions in the C.I.O. decide to go back to the A. F. of L. and leave the Communist aggregations isolated and on their own, we would welcome the move. Personally, that appears to us to be the most logical and perhaps the only solution of a thoroughly unsatisfactory situation.

There you have Smith's book in a nutshell: fear of the growing strength and progressivism of the C.I.O., and a desire to liquidate it. All his pleas and sermons add up to one proposal: "Listen to Bill Green and go back to the 'House of Labor.' You have no future as the C.I.O." It is this main aim that accounts for the disruptive activity within the C.I.O. and sabotage of its main campaigns by the A.C.T.U.-Reverend Smith forces.

Smith's advice on independent unions is another piece of the same pattern. His major stress on the independent unions is not the well-known fact that most of them are camouflaged company unions but that they are based on opposition to the "communism" of the C.I.O. or the "racketeering" of the A. F. of L. He justifies the preference for "independence" that is so marked these

days with the prospect of legislation favoring company unionism. Reverend Smith cunningly advises "independents" that they are "always in a position to bargain with the bigger national groups and become affiliated on terms that are not detrimental."

We have had a recent example of what Smith means. The Brotherhood of Consolidated-Edison Employees, in New York City, has been officered by Reverend Smith's pupils and close associates since the days when it was ordered dis-established by the N.L.R.B. as a company union. It had a short A. F. of L. existence for a while under a "sweetheart" agreement and then it became "independent" again. It gained C.I.O. affiliation on an assurance of autonomy and did so through a convention which decided to bar Communists from membership or to bar from office anyone who ever has been a Communist. The same men who ran the union when it was company-dominated still run it.

THE A.C.T.U.

The character of the A.C.T.U. forces is colored by still another factor—Coughlinism. The fascist radio priest, Charles E. Coughlin, whose publication was banned shortly after Pearl Harbor, had built up a considerable network of trade union connections during his open activity. His final efforts were concentrated on building confidence in John

L. Lewis. Father Coughlin's anti-Semitic and pro-fascist sermons on the radio and in his magazine, *Social Justice*, tutored a whole chain of union groups before the A.C.T.U. was born. What happened to all these Coughlin faithfuls when the radio priest was silenced? *Many took cover inside the A.C.T.U.* This explains why the A.C.T.U. blossomed out so suddenly in Detroit.

Duplicity is another characteristic of A.C.T.U. activities. A one-paragraph characterization by this writer of Reverend Smith as the principal ideologist of the A.C.T.U. (*Daily Worker*, December 24, 1946) and reference to his advice to secede from the C.I.O., evoked a howl from the *Labor Leader*, A.C.T.U. organ. An editorial claimed that we wrongly linked the Jesuit Labor Schools with the A.C.T.U. and that Reverend Smith's views were his own.

In the following issue, this A.C.T.U. organ ran a lengthy letter from Smith himself, ostensibly in support of its contention that the A.C.T.U. and the schools are "two separate movements." But in essence the letter upheld the contention of this writer. Smith refers to the two as "our" organizations and agrees that for "clarity's sake" the A.C.T.U. was correct in emphasizing the separate character. But he defined the A.C.T.U. as "direct action" while for his Jesuit school movement he said "we prefer at present to confine our efforts to indirect action, educa-

tion technique, labor school organization and over-all indoctrination."

"There is plenty of work and plenty of room for both movements and both methods in the field," he added.

Thus, we have it from Smith himself that the two are merely a division of work in the same field: the actual members organized for "direct" factional work in unions and the schools for "indirect" work through indoctrination and like means prepare members for the A.C.T.U. The A.C.T.U. leaders, in their efforts to win allies for their policy, naturally find it embarrassing when their real program, as revealed by Smith, is brought into the light of day. Furthermore, one need do no more than glance through several issues of their New York or Detroit papers to see that their views do not differ from Smith's on a single issue. Their protest at being associated with Smith's advice to split the C.I.O. is ridiculous in face of what they have already done along that line. In Connecticut their forces took "direct" action (although blocked) to withdraw the brass workers' locals from the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union. They have tried, although their "coup" was unsuccessful, to withdraw the post-office locals of the United Public Workers. They announced their support of John L. Lewis' District 50 drive to raid the subway workers of New York organized by the

Transp
similar
raid the
New Y
C.I.O.'s
Associa
tion cur
secession
United
chine V
ing, or
U.E.R.J.
another
port.

CONCI

Then
Smith's
brew in
can pr
its for
affairs
need
into C
low
Church
tunate
in Car
Church
Reve
"new
source
co's f
Social
manag
Musso
ery. T
was st

Transport Workers Union and a similar drive by the A. F. of L. to raid the Western Union workers of New York under contract with the C.I.O.'s American Communications Association. Their main concentration currently is upon building up a secession movement within the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union. At this writing, one New Jersey local of the U.E.R.M.W.A. was pulled out, and another took the same step in Bridgeport.

CONCLUSIONS

There is nothing new in Reverend Smith's program. It is just an old brew in a new bottle. It is the Vatican program in all countries where its forces are able to interfere in the affairs of the labor movement. One need only look across the border, into Quebec Province to see what low standards Roman Catholic Church sponsored unions bring. Fortunately for most Catholic workers in Canada, they do not belong to Church Syndicates.

Reverend Smith's blue-print for a "new order" is taken from two main sources—from Mussolini's and Franco's fascism and from Right-wing Social-Democracy. His joint labor-management scheme is essentially Mussolini's corporative state machinery. The Italian fascist scheme, too, was supposed to be based on concil-

iation of classes. Representatives of both employers and workers were supposed to be represented as "partners." Through it, the Italian workers were held down to unbelievably low standards.

The Vatican often had some friction with Mussolini, but that was mainly because of the dictator's hostility to a rival power. Franco brought the scheme to perfection—*clerical fascism*. Vatican blessing for his "new order" establishes Franco's Spain as a model for Reverend Smith's pupils to study.

The general idea of "liquidating" the class struggle, as envisioned by Reverend Smith, was long ago developed by the Social-Democrats of pre-Hitler days. They too spun fine patterns of Socialism evolving through collaboration with capitalists. They even rationalized that the trusts are a welcome and democratic development in this painless evolution into socialism. Incidentally, Reverend Smith who has so much to say about our economy, has not one harsh word to say against the big trusts.

The millions of lives lost in the war, and the ruin in Europe and Asia, taught a great section of the world what the logic of Social-Democracy's program is. The consequence has also been that the capitalist class and its imperialists *lost their main social base*. In most parts of Europe they are no longer able to keep mass confidence in capitalism

through strong, old-line Social-Democratic parties.

In the United States, where confidence in capitalism is beginning to weaken, there never was a strong Social-Democracy among the workers. The A. F. of L.'s bureaucratic leadership, and like leaders of other unions, filled that role. The A.C.T.U. and Catholic labor schools are an attempt to bolster confidence in capitalism where Social-Democracy or the old-line reactionary union leaders have lost their hold. *Hence, a concentration of their forces where progressives win leadership.* A quick glance over America's trade union map and an analysis of the relation of forces and groupings, and the distribution of the A.C.T.U.'s groups, will prove this with mathematical precision.

For the same reason, the A.C.T.U. and Reverend Smith are so delighted with Reuther and Dubinsky, whose leadership they view as exemplary. They are fully sensitive to their affinity with this country's Social-Democrats. And the Social-Democrats, of late, have been most cordial to the Vatican.

But American workers do not have to consult European history to see the consequences of labor-management "partnership," profit-sharing schemes, labor banking, stock ownership among workers, production incentives and bonus plans. They lived through all that in the "prosperous" 'twenties. The A. F. of L.'s leadership went all out for the "partner-

ship" and cast labor's traditions of struggle into the ash can as "belonging in the age of the jungle."

The workers discovered the grand swindle, but did so when mass starvation and unemployment stalked the land and when millions of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish "partners" lived in Hoovervilles, dug into garbage cans for food, or begged for relief baskets. Reverend Smith would restore confidence in the bankrupt system that led to the 1929 disaster.

Finally, it should be pointed out, despite the great power of the Vatican, its policy of interfering in trade unions and attempting to expand its scope, is not getting very far among workers. For every case of A.C.T.U. success among Catholic workers, there are many to show repudiation of Red-baiting.

It is noteworthy that opposition to A.C.T.U. activities is often most pronounced among devout Catholics—among those who *resent the use of their faith as a camouflage for factional and disruptive activities in labor organizations.* They resent having their church mixed up in matters beyond its realm in the same sense that liberal democrats stress the separation of church from state.

The injection of religion into union affairs is seen by many as a curse that may prove most harmful to the trade unions. In a land like the United States, where every union is a melting pot of almost every known religious denomination, as well as non-

religious
nationalism
prove th
tion. W
a genera
Red-bait

religious workers, the injection of factionalism based on faith, can well prove the undoing of an organization. When this effort dovetails into a general drive against unions, with Red-baiting as the chief weapon to

disrupt and split labor organizations, most distinguished for progressiveness, then policies like those of the A.C.T.U. are indeed dangerous, and should be opposed and fought by workers of all faiths.

THE APPROACH OF AN ECONOMIC CRISIS IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD*

By EUGENE VARGA

AT THE VERY height of what is perhaps the greatest "boom" that the United States has ever known, the fear of a new approaching economic crisis is beginning to be felt in the capitalist world.

This fear is very well founded. The history of capitalism shows that every "boom" ends in a crisis, and that these crises repeat themselves regularly every 7-10 years. Marx proved that the inner laws of capitalism must inevitably lead to a cyclical course of industrial production and to periodically recurring crises. The general crisis of the capitalist system, as demonstrated by Comrade Stalin, has changed the cyclical process of capitalist production in the sense that the phases of crises and depressions have become longer, and that a depression is followed only by a phase of revival, but not

by a phase of full prosperity. In this connection, it should be noted that the present cycle, under the influence of the world war, is not "normal." In the U.S. it has led to a "boom," while in the majority of the other countries of the world, production is still considerably behind the pre-war period, and is at a low level, a crisis level.

The "abnormality" of the postwar cycle lies essentially in the fact that the world war interrupted the preceding cycle. Modern capitalist economy *in a period of war* knows no cyclical movement of production. The war creates a demand for commodities considerably surpassing the volume of production. In wartime it is not the capitalist who seeks a buyer; on the contrary, the buyers vie with each other for the insufficient quantity of goods available.

Another feature of war economy is the special character of consumption of materials needed for war. As we know, Marxian theory divides all commodities into two basic categories: means of production, which are used for further production of commodities, and means of consumption, which (with the exception of those branches producing luxury articles for the bourgeoisie) serve the reproduction of the labor power of the workers. Realized values of means of production, as well as those of means of consumption, again enter the process of circulation of social capital: means of production as part of *constant capital*, and

* Translated from *Pravda*, November 27, 1946.

means of consumption as part of *variable capital*.

In war production, this is not so. Tanks, planes, mines, bombs, etc., are completely consumed by the war. They are not returned, either as constant or as variable capital, into the general circulation of social capital. Their value is completely lost for the entire economy; at best it is only possible to salvage the scrap from the battlefields. (Of course, the individual capitalist receives money from the state for the materials sold to it by him.)

This means that the modern war economy of the capitalist countries contains a tendency toward the impoverishment of these countries. This tendency is strengthened by the destruction wrought by military actions in the air, on land, and on the sea.

Indeed, all the capitalist countries which fought in the war, with the exception of the United States (and Canada), emerged from the war greatly impoverished. England lost altogether about one-fourth of its national wealth in the country as well as abroad. Germany lost about one-half of its national wealth. The volume of production in other European countries, depending upon the extent of the destruction caused by the war, is between 30 per cent to 80 per cent of the pre-war level i.e., it is today at a level lower than during the worst period of crisis.

In contrast with the devastated European continent, the United

States emerged from the war richer than ever. Its industrial production in 1946 is about 50 per cent above the 1938 level. In other words, it is at the level of a period of favorable economic situation.

How is to be explained that the United States became so much richer during the war?

In the United States, the richest capitalist country, the general crisis of capitalism before the war was felt most strongly of all in the economic field. 8,000,000 workers were unemployed. On the whole, factories worked only up to 65 per cent of their capacity (considering "full" capacity at 300 working shifts a year). A considerable part of the fertile land was not cultivated, as the Government paid the farmers a fairly large cash subsidy for every acre not planted with wheat or corn, and for every acre not used for cotton or tobacco raising. Thus, before the war the U.S. used only a part of the available productive forces, since there was no market for a greater quantity of commodities.

Only the world war with its unlimited demand for commodities made possible the utilization of these productive forces which could not be used in peacetime. During the war, American production was more than doubled in comparison with 1939. Because of such greatly augmented production, the U.S. was able to meet, not only the demands of the war, but also those of the civilian population (with the excep-

tion of housing, passenger automobiles, and temporarily, certain food-stuffs not vitally necessary). Besides, the United States was able to amass considerable wealth in the form of newly built factories and ships.

Of great importance, in this connection, is the fact that the United States entered the war late. Up to 1944, she had not thrown any large numbers of troops into action. American territory did not suffer at all from military operations.

These differences in the effect of the war upon the United States (and Canada) on the one hand, and the capitalist countries of Europe and the Far East on the other, led to the present situation in which, just as after the First World War, capitalism is not experiencing a uniform economic cycle. In the United States, there is a "boom," while in the other countries which participated in the war there is only a slow improvement, while they are still at a low, crisis level.

But the American "boom" is not normal either. To a considerable extent it is the outgrowth of the preceding period of war economy. Notwithstanding the fact that industrial production was doubled during the war, the population of the United States could not completely spend their money incomes on commodities, since a considerable part of production went for war needs. As a result, enormous sums have accumulated in the hands of the population in the form of banknotes, savings ac-

counts, and bank deposits. Currency circulation at the end of 1939 was 7.8 billion dollars, while at the end of 1945 it was 28.5 billion dollars. Bank deposits grew from 45 billion in 1939 to 106 billions at the end of 1945. Savings deposits grew from 14 billion in 1939 to 66 billions in 1946. The total increase in all three categories was over 130 billion dollars.

The economic character of these sums varies. A part of this money is undoubtedly not intended for the purchase of commodities, but to serve as a source of annuities and, in the case of white-collar workers and better paid workers, as savings in case of unemployment. (Official statistics show that lower paid workers could not save anything even during the war.) However, a very considerable part of these sums was set aside for the purchase of commodities. These are the sums which the capitalists figured on as an amortization fund to be used to replace the constant capital consumed during the war. These sums reflected decreased stocks in warehouses, sums which the capitalists, under ordinary conditions, would have used for the construction of homes and the purchase of automobiles. This purchasing power, accumulated during the war, added to the "normal" purchasing power of Americans, gives the present "boom" in the United States a partially inflationary character.

The American magazine *Fortune* states in its June issue:

APPROX

So the American is a powerful everything joy, burn, paint, drink made is b appears . . . wrist watch

The Boz mality, a peaceful th the sudden amount of

And ye United St tered une million e still live o the govern dustrial p creased b with 1943 a result (the offic ing jum tween Ju and also of overti which th er pay. controls rise in p ing reduc er of wo in other America up the e coming

Three approach

So the Boom is on, the biggest in American economic history. . . . There is a powerful, a consuming demand for everything that one can eat, wear, enjoy, burn, read, patch, dye, repair, paint, drink. . . . Everything that is made is bought up as fast as it appears . . . mink coats at \$15,000, men's wrist watches at \$1,000. . . .

The Boom under way is an abnormality, a thing far beyond such a peaceful thing as "prosperity." It is the sudden release of an unprecedented amount of money. . . ."

And yet, despite the "boom," the United States has 2½ million registered unemployed and there are 1½ million demobilized soldiers who still live on allotments received from the government. The volume of industrial production in 1946 has decreased by one-third as compared with 1943. Real wages are falling as a result of the rapid rise of prices (the official index of the cost of living jumped over 10 per cent between June and September alone) and also as a result of the abolition of overtime and Sunday work, for which the workers used to get higher pay. The abolition of all price controls will lead to an even greater rise in prices and to a corresponding reduction of the purchasing power of workers, employees, and clerks, in other words, the main mass of American buyers. This will speed up the end of the "boom" and the coming of the new economic crisis.

Three facts already indicate the approach of this crisis.

First of all, there is the increase in commodity reserves. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, commodity reserves in factories, and of wholesale and retail trade, rose one billion dollars in August, and their total value is now 31 billion dollars. The Department of Commerce has stated that this record growth of reserves bears within itself a definite danger for further economic development.

Secondly, stock exchange prices for raw materials subject to delivery show a considerable fall during October. The Dow-Jones index of raw material prices suffered within one week a price drop unprecedented since 1933.

Thirdly, since May of this year there has been a sharp fall in the prices of industrial shares. In the period from the middle of May to the middle of September the total value of shares registered at the New York Stock Exchange dropped from 84 to 65 billion dollars. Experience shows that such a fall usually takes place about one or one and a half years before the outbreak of an economic crisis. This sharp fall takes place because the best-informed representatives of the financial oligarchy begin to unload their industrial shares.

All this indicates that in the near future, probably not later than in 1948 and perhaps even sooner, the outbreak of a new economic crisis can be expected in the United States. Definite, although quite different,

factors, such as large expenditures on armaments, considerable loans extended to certain countries, wide and prolonged strikes, can only slightly delay the crisis.

The coming economic crisis in the United States will inevitably have a tremendous effect upon the situation in other capitalist countries. The crisis in the U.S. will be a grave blow to the process of postwar reconstruction in these countries. The destructive effect of the crisis will hardly allow these countries to reach a state of even moderate economic prosperity.

* * *

In capitalist countries the transition from war to peace is always bound up with narrowing markets,

decline of production, closing down of industrial enterprises, and growth of unemployment.

Only the Soviet Union does not know such phenomena. In the Soviet Union there is no anarchy of production, characteristic of capitalism, which leads to the rotation of periods of boom and crisis, which shake the very foundation of the economic system and create a constant uncertainty among the working masses as to their future.

"The Soviet people are moving forward with great assurance, without fear either of an economic crisis or unemployment, since they live under conditions of a higher socialist system, of an organized economy which knows neither crises nor unemployment" (Zhdanov).

THE
NATI
ELEC

THERE A
ern her
enced
changes
zil. Fo
America
concrete

Brazil
forward
domina
the ent
try wh
most co
on our

Its la
is large
States;
gives i
souther
advance
the vic
ment:
has alw
rate Sc

Toda
of a br
which
heroic
and its
Prestes
Our

THE BRAZILIAN NATIONAL ELECTIONS

By JOSEPH STAROBIN

THERE ARE FEW COUNTRIES in the western hemisphere which have experienced such profound democratic changes since the war's end as Brazil. For no other people in the Americas was the war so visibly and concretely a war of liberation.

Brazil has made a tremendous leap forward from the country that was dominated by dictatorship during the entire Axis decade to the country which is now one of the foremost countries of democratic advance on our side of the Atlantic.

Its language is Portuguese; its size is larger than that of the United States; its population of 44,000,000 gives it a third of the people of the southern continent; it is a relatively advanced semi-colonial country from the viewpoint of economic development: for all these reasons, Brazil has always been a unique and separate South American nation.

Today it is unique also by virtue of a broad democratic forward march which is being brilliantly led by the heroic Communist Party of Brazil, and its legendary hero, Luiz Carlos Prestes.

Our American public has not yet

felt the worry and alarm which is today sweeping the State Department and the War Department as they watch what is happening in Brazil. The articles about the so-called "Communist menace in Latin America" by William H. Lawrence of the *New York Times* were in the nature of an "air-conditioning" for our people. But even these did not focus fully the importance which Brazil has for American imperialism.

It would be a great illusion to think that the United States will sit idly by as a new democratic power of the size, strategic position, and potentialities of Brazil consolidates itself. Brazil has long been an arena for imperialist influences, especially from the United States. Thus, while imperialism and the oligarchy within Brazil is today on the defensive, it is certain that vigorous efforts will be made by the most reactionary circles in the United States to impede the Brazilian people as they strive to determine their own affairs.

The American working class—to whom the Brazilian people look with wonder and considerable impatience—has the responsibility of learning rapidly what has happened in Brazil. The entire hemisphere needs to be alerted to the new battles now maturing. In these battles the role of Brazil will be fundamental.

* * *

When I visited Brazil in the last ten days of December, the campaign for the elections of January 19 was already under way. Every square in Rio de Janeiro had hundreds of

posters and placards strung from the trees. Banners moved in the wind across the side streets, both in the workers' quarters and across Avenida Rio Branco, the main business area.

The Communist leaders were going out into the countryside to speak at huge mass meetings in virtually every major center. Luiz Carlos Prestes himself toured the backlands of the major industrialized state of Sao Paulo, then flew almost 2,000 miles to the northeast to speak in Recife, and was then scheduled to fly down to the far south, where he would speak at his home city of Porto Alegre. His campaign concluded with two enormous meetings in the two largest cities, Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro on January 15 and 16. In these last two meetings, Prestes spoke to perhaps a million people.

On January 19, Brazil elected the governors of her 21 states, the state legislatures, several national deputies, and additional senators to the Upper House of the federal parliament. In Rio de Janeiro, the new City Council of 50 members was elected, too.

These were the first elections since the new Constitution was promulgated in September, 1946. A year ago on December 2, 1945, Brazil had elected her Constituent Assembly and her president.

Thus, the January 19 election was a vital phase in consolidating the newly-won democratic institutions. For the first time since before the dictatorship, the local organs of power were being elected by the people.

The campaign was doubly important because it came after a year of growing attacks from reaction against the Communists and the democratic movement generally; reaction had been frightened by the rapid advance of the Communists in 1945, and their tremendous showing of some 650,000 votes out of about five million in the December 2, 1945 elections. Thus, the January balloting was an important test of strength. It was also, as we shall see, a test of Communist strategy and tactics.

To understand the January 19 results, however, we must go back a bit into Brazil's complex history. It will be remembered that Getulio Vargas began his career as the leader of the democratic revolution of 1930; Vargas came up out of the same state in which Luiz Carlos Prestes was born—Rio Grande Do Sul.

The 1930 uprising took place under democratic banners. In those years Vargas was very keen to have Prestes, with his tremendous popular reputation, join in. The young veteran of the famous Column,* who was then studying Marxism in earnest, refused to do so.

The Vargas uprising, which carried the hopes of large masses of people with it, was also a reflection of the American imperialist struggle with Britain. Two years later, the

* Prestes led a famous guerrilla column through 30,000 miles of the interior of Brazil from the fall of 1924 to the spring of 1927. This was a phase of a series of democratic upheavals, arising mainly in the army, against the successive pro-imperialist regimes. Brazil's leading writer, Jorge Amado, has written a famous *Life of Luiz Carlos Prestes* about the days of the Column, which a really enterprising American publisher will some day bring to our public.

British came and agriculture 1935, w from E Allianc Left an to halt by an u cessful 1935.

By n idly tou increas and app Novem the pre self u through coward for his came a

The and the and we agents invited zilian rode on gogy, as well of tho promis

Varg of the that ti then d lations gas ap that U sphere By :

British replied with an upheaval that came out of the richest industrial and agricultural state, Sao Paulo. In 1935, with Prestes having returned from Europe, the National Liberation Alliance—a broad coalition of the Left and popular forces—attempted to halt the fascization of the country by an uprising of its own, the unsuccessful attempt of November 27, 1935.

By now, Vargas was moving rapidly toward fascist methods, and was increasingly influenced by the rise and apparent success of the Axis. On November 10, 1937, Vargas erased the previous constitution, gave himself unlimited emergency powers through a new constitution, got the cowardly consent of the parliament for his *Estado Novo* and Brazil became a fellow-traveller of the Axis.

The heroic leaders of the Alliance and the 1935 movement were in jail and were being brutally tortured by agents of the Gestapo whom Vargas invited into all sections of the Brazilian state apparatus. He himself rode on the waves of his own demagoguery, his apparent anti-imperialism, as well as on the brutal terrorization of those patriots who exposed his promises as empty ones.

Vargas was able to get the support of the U. S. State Department at that time. U. S. imperialism was then deep in the illusions and calculations of the appeasement era. Vargas appeared to be the strong man that U. S. policy needed in the hemisphere.

By 1940, Vargas and most of his

generals were convinced that the Axis would win the war. The fall of France, in particular, made an enormous impression in Brazil, whose culture is traditionally influenced by France. Reaction and fascism were riding high.

But after Pearl Harbor and after the Red Army clearly showed its superiority over the Reichswehr, Vargas had to make new calculations. The democratic movement began to make itself felt in support for the Allies and the Soviet Union, as a movement for the defense of Brazil against Nazi and Japanese aggression. The illegal Communist Party played a great role in developing the pressure which forced Vargas in August 1942, to declare war on Germany. The Communists also stimulated the formation of the Brazilian Expeditionary Force, which fought so well in Italy.

The Communists were prepared to support every measure of the dictator which would in any way favor victory, defense of the nation, and, inevitably, the weakening of the dictatorship.

By 1944, Vargas was compelled to pledge new presidential elections after the war's end; he had held the presidency without any legal basis after 1941.

By April of 1945, Vargas was compelled to grant amnesty to political prisoners. And now Prestes emerged from 9 years of solitary confinement. One month later, the Communists—illegal since their inception in 1923—began to function as a legal party.

Under the impact of all these developments, the dictator and the oligarchy which he had represented and defended, began to move apart. The calculation was that it would be possible to dismantle the dictatorship and give it the veneer of democratic forms while retaining control of the people and appeasing their demands.

The dictator counted on his considerable prestige among the more backward masses. The dominant classes formed two main parties: the Partido Social-Democratico (P.S.D.), headed by the former chief of the army, Gen. Eurico Gaspar Dutra; and the Uniao Democratica Nacional (U.D.N.), which rallied around the personality of the former head of the air force and the hero of the 1922 uprising, Brigadeiro Eduardo Gomes.

But all of this reckoned without Prestes. The Communists pursued a double course: on the one hand, they gave support to Vargas to the extent that he was increasingly at loggerheads with his former backers; on the other hand, they rejected all military candidates for the forthcoming Constituent Assembly, and built their own independent strength rapidly behind the candidacy of a noted engineer, Yeddo Fiuza.

The Communists hammered home a "minimum program" reflecting the immediate needs of the people: agrarian reforms, defense of the economy against imperialist inroads, a really democratic Constitution, national union "from below" to end inflation, the raising of national pro-

duction, the improvement of the living conditions of the broad masses.

In those months, Prestes spoke for the first time in nine years. In Rio, in Sao Paulo, in Recife, hundreds of thousands of people came to hear him, in some cases, practically the entire adult population.

It would be difficult to describe the awe, the enthusiasm, the sense of tragedy, and the feeling of love which these appearances by Prestes evoked in those first five months as he came back to his people out of the dark night of limitless suffering.

The first phase of this complicated process of democratization came to a close on October 29-30, 1945, when Vargas was unseated by a military movement from the Right. The oligarchy had now lost their confidence in his ability; they attempted to seize full power and perhaps prevent the Constituent Assembly entirely. At the same time they sought to crush the Communists, too.

By standing firm and defending their legality as well as the necessity of going forward to the Constituent Assembly, the Communists pushed the whole process to a new stage.

Vargas left the scene as the ruler, and now tried to return as the head of a party of his own, the Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro (P.T.B.), introducing still a third bourgeois party, and attempting through it to offset the advances of the Communists.

From this point onwards, the Communists were relieved of the onus of any relationship with the dictator. Since leaders of both the P.S.D.

and the
the Octo
partially
advanced
fenders o

The ne
to the Ja
Commun
mittee w
for the
formulat

The C
separate
elections
Constitu

a new o
that ther
the relat
in favor
dent, a
deputies
were un
interven
ambassa
famous
on this
ference

The l
large m
U.D.N.
and the
rolled u
tes a ser

The
speakin
enormo
1945. T
democr
was w
union
interfer
Negra

and the U.D.N. were implicated in the October 29-30 putsch, they were partially exposed among the more advanced masses as unreliable defenders of democracy.

The net result, as Prestes reported to the January, 1946, meeting of the Communist Party's National Committee was "a clearing of the ground" for the Assembly elections and the formulation of the Constitution.

The Communists had tried to separate the question of new national elections from the question of the Constitution. They had tried to get a new constitution written first so that there would be time to change the relationship of forces still further in favor of democracy before a president, a senate, and a chamber of deputies were elected. In this they were unsuccessful, partly due to the intervention of the then-American ambassador, Adolf Berle, Jr. His famous speech of September 29, 1945 on this subject was a direct interference in Brazilian affairs.

The December 2 elections gave a large majority to Dutra's party. The U.D.N. came second, Vargas third, and the Communists fourth. They rolled up 650,000 votes, elected Prestes a senator, and elected 14 deputies.

The year 1946 was, properly speaking, a year of defense of the enormous forward strides made in 1945. The new constitution, not as democratic as it should have been, was written; the Brazilian trade union movement took form, despite interference by the Minister of Labor, Negrao de Lima, a Vargas man; the

Communists grew in strength from a few thousand after their legalization to 150,000 members.

At the same time, the remnants of fascism continued to menace the Party, especially in the localities. All during 1946 there were assassinations of Communist leaders; in Rio itself on the anniversary of legalization, May 23, the police fired at a great mass meeting, killing two and wounding over 50. The stevedores of Santos—the largest port of the hemisphere—who gave the Communists an overwhelming majority in that city, were bitterly persecuted for their refusal to load ships for Franco Spain.

* * *

At their July, 1946, Third National Conference and at their December 6-7, 1946, national plenum, the Brazilian Communists outlined their perspectives and aims as follows:

1. The outlook at home and abroad, despite all provocations and setbacks, is favorable to democracy, favorable to the consolidation of a long period of peace.

2. The main strategic aim in Brazil for the party of the working-class, the party of Socialism, is the bourgeois-democratic revolution developing the national economy on the basis of practical agrarian reform, increasing the internal market, boosting productivity, and in this way overcoming the ravaging economic crisis and the current inflation.

Through an immediate and practical reform of the land system, and by the defense and expansion of the

national economy, the main blow can be dealt against the alliance of the feudal oligarchy with the foreign-owned corporations—the main source of fascist influences in Brazil.

By imperialism, the Brazilian Communists have in mind British, Canadian, and American imperialism—though they consider the latter the most aggressive and most dangerous. And by this struggle against the feudal land system and imperialist pressure on the national economy, the Communists envisage a coalition, led by the working class, of the peasantry, the middle classes, and sectors of the bourgeoisie.

3. In the Brazilian Communist view, the parties of the ruling classes are not stable and homogeneous formations. At the December 6 plenum, Prestes spoke of the "ridiculous dance of the letters—UDN, TR, PSD, PTB—which says all and says nothing, for today there are udenistas who are better pessedistas and pessedistas who are really tralbalhistas and tralbalhistas who are pessedistas. They are the same grouping, all more or less equal to each other, and distinguished only by the fact that some are the 'ins' and some are the 'outs'."

Prestes urged that the Communists must take "different attitudes toward each different leader of the other parties." It is evident, he continued, "that there cannot be any great political understanding between an employer who must yield 42 per cent of his annual profits to the banks and insurance companies and the finan-

ciars who direct these institutions. The proletariat must seek to bring the national bourgeoisie to the progressive side and march with it in joint struggle against the great landowners, and their allies in national and imperialist finance."

4. The Communists must avoid the "terrible malady of sectarianism," the lack of confidence in a peaceful solution of the present crisis, the tendency to think in terms of putsches, the lack of faith in the people. The Communists must overcome all reliance on spontaneity. They must tighten their ties with the masses, learn to organize their campaigns scientifically and systematically, making plans and living up to them in a business-like way.

The Communists are striving to build a great mass party, not only of the workers, but of the whole working population in all its sectors. As they do this, they will inevitably face an even more desperate reaction; but the way to vanquish this reaction is by even more audacious, systematic, national politics in the interests of the rapid reconstruction of Brazil.

This is not a complete outline of the entire Communist program, but with the above introduction and background, the January 19 elections can be better understood.

The Communist Party of Brazil issued a most detailed electoral plan at the end of November, assigning each state and local organization a specific quota of votes to be won, deputies to be elected, and members

to be recruited. The campaign was being waged against this ambitious program.

The Communist Party has a million members—in the cover-all of their general program advertisement confusion to consolidate elements especially doing de-ian people under the orderly or fraud.

The Communist Party for Pernambuco put forward candidates support to either by reporting disavowed.

In most conditional they con-ships. In of the 50

Not available following

i. All short of pected, and the than in

to be recruited. The entire campaign was to be conducted according to this plan, and it was the most ambitious effort to stabilize and systematize its Party work yet seen.

The Communists campaigned for a million votes and 125 representatives—in the state legislatures. Their over-all objective was to advance their general program, to take maximum advantage of the division and confusion among the other parties, to consolidate alliances with the best elements of the other parties, especially on a local scale, and in so doing demonstrate that the Brazilian people can carry out an election under the new Constitution in an orderly fashion, without putsches or fraud.

The Communists did not, except for Pernambuco in the northeast, put forward their own gubernatorial candidates; they sought instead to support the best men of other parties, either by formal alliances or by supporting candidates even when they disavowed the Communists.

In most places they fought for additional senatorships. In Sao Paulo, they contested several vacant deputyships. In Rio, they strove to get 20 of the 50 councilmanic seats.

* * *

Not all of the election returns are available at this writing. But the following results are known:

1. All in all, the Communists fell short of the million votes they expected, getting more than 800,000, and therefore perhaps 200,000 more than in December, 1945.

2. In Rio de Janeiro, they elected 18 councilmen out of 50, only two less than what they expected. The Party of Vargas got nine seats, as did the U.D.N. The government party of Dutra running behind a more attractive "labor front," gathered six seats, and the Integralistas, concealed behind a fine-sounding facade, got one seat.

The Communists thus emerged as the largest single party in the capital, whereas a year ago they were in third place. Rio de Janeiro now takes its place with Paris, Prague, Sofia, Milan, and the other great metropolitan centers where Communists have been elected in large numbers to public office.

Among their winning candidates are such popular figures as Agildo Barata, veteran of the war in Spain, leader of the Third Regiment in 1935, and manager of the Party newspaper, *Tribuna Popular*; Pedro de Carvalho Braga, outstanding Negro union leader in the Canadian-owned Light and Traction Co.; Aparicio Torelly, the famous humorist and editor of the satirical weekly, *A Manha*; Otavio Brandao, a veteran Communist, and one of the Party's first elected public figures in the '20's.

Two women are on the Communist bench—an important step for Brazil—Arcelina Mochel, an attorney and Odilia Schmidt, a telephone operator for the power company.

In Sao Paulo, the largest single state in population and industry, with the most active sectors of the

bourgeoisie, as well as a veteran working class, the Communists scored very important results.

Two of their leaders—now becoming better known among the people—national educational secretary, Pedro Pomar, and national organizational secretary, Diogenes Arruda, were elected to the chamber of deputies. Candido Portinari, the famous painter, won the senatorship and thus becomes the second Communist senator, alongside of Prestes.

Most important in Sao Paulo, however, was the nature of the coalition, for here the whole structure of Brazilian politics was shaken. The Communists declined, despite many invitations, to support candidates of the government, Vargas, or the U.D.N. At the last moment, they made a formal alliance with a well-known democratic figure and devout Catholic, Adhemar de Barros, whose own small party (the Social Progressives) had polled about 45,000 votes the previous December.

The Cardinal of Sao Paulo rebuked de Barros for this pact with the Communists. He replied that he was happy to work with the Communists because they stood for constitutionality, for the rights of all other democratic parties and for the immediate economic relief of the masses.

On January 15, he and Prestes shared a meeting of half a million Paulistas, and the most respected bourgeois paper, *Estado do Sao Paulo*, commented that "such a

meeting has never before been seen in Brazil."

Practically complete results gave de Barros the governorship by 377,000 votes, which means that the Communists contributed perhaps 325,000. The strength of this coalition is almost equally divided in the city of Sao Paulo and the hinterland, which indicates that sections of the bourgeoisie as well as the small townspeople and the peasants backed it.

de Barros visited President Dutra as the returns were coming in. Dutra, who had previously appealed to the people not to vote for the Communists and had criticized all the parties for making local electoral alliances, was nevertheless compelled to promise that de Barros will be installed without federal intervention as the legally-elected candidate.

This Sao Paulo victory is therefore of decisive significance as:

a) A smashing confirmation of Communist coalition strategy, a symbol of the growing unity between the working class, the peasantry, and the progressive sectors of the bourgeoisie in Brazil's single most important state.

b) A decisive rebuke to the hierarchy of the Catholic Church which formed its own Electoral League and campaigned everywhere against the Communists.

c) A rebuke to the most reactionary forces in the Dutra government, especially the Minister of Justice, who attempted at the last moment to frighten the electorate by saying that

the consid
legal.
neither th
nists wou
"a war of
d) A s
ialism, v
through
forces, an
with a p
Brazil's r
Tentati
the north
ernor wa
with the
forces; if
very narr
several a
elected,
representa
will be a
Another
tions wa
tulio Va
failed to
This is
the deep
ruling c
united a
On th
be reme
tains gre
a real f
real dan
Vargas v
military
in the p
tempt o
control
seem to
possibili
dermine
As fa

he considered the Communists illegal. To this Prestes replied that neither the people nor the Communists would be frightened by such "a war of nerves."

d) A smashing defeat for imperialism, which had been working through all the anti-Communist forces, and which must now reckon with a progressive government in Brazil's most important state.

Tentative results also show that in the northeast the Communist governor was elected for Pernambuco, with the support of other democratic forces; if not elected, he lost by a very narrow score. In all probability, several additional senators will be elected, and the figure of 125 representatives in the state legislatures will be achieved.

Another consequence of the elections was the general defeat for Getulio Vargas's Labor Party, which failed to name a single governor.

This is important as a reflection of the deepening cleavages within the ruling classes who were formerly united around Vargas.

On the other hand, it should also be remembered that Vargas still retains great personal prestige and has a real following. There is a very real danger that, as his strength ebbs, Vargas will attempt a comeback by a military movement. This would, as in the past, reflect the desperate attempt of U.S. imperialism to regain control of Brazil. The Communists seem to be very aware of such a possibility, and the struggle to undermine Vargas further continues.

As far as the electoral plan of the

Party is concerned, there is every evidence of a tremendous activation of the Party membership. On the other hand, the theses for the Feb. 22 session of the National Committee speak very sharply about the "sectarianism in our ranks which is still substantial and impedes a good understanding of our politics of national union." The theses also note a failure to utilize properly the strategy of alliances with the good elements of other parties; in general, the theses sharply criticize lack of *planned work*, the low level of local leadership, insufficient ties with the masses even though the Party membership increased by 50,000 during the campaign.

It is clear from these victories that the January 19 elections have raised the process of democratization to a new level in Brazil. It has greatly enhanced the strength and skill of the Brazilian Communists. After two short years, they are well on their way to building a "party of a new type," the party of hope, the party of reconstruction, the party of democracy, through which Brazil will in the future be able to achieve Socialism.

It is also clear that reaction is desperate in Brazil. It fears the "rosy cheeks" which the Communists are getting in the present democratic and constitutional phase. The struggle in Brazil is growing more intense. Americans may well be on their guard lest the good name of our country be further besmirched by open imperialist intervention against this great people to the south of us.

INDUSTRIAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

By AL LOEW

SIX TIMES AS MANY workers were killed and injured by industrial accidents in the United States during the war as on the battlefield. These facts were revealed in a speech in May, 1946, by Miss Mary Donlon, Chairman of the N.Y. State Workmen's Compensation Board.

From December 7, 1941 to June 1, 1945 war casualties were slightly more than one million, whereas in this same period occupational accidents killed or injured 6,200,000 American workers. In this period, 6,561 miners were killed in accidents as compared to 3,644 killed in service; over 300,000 injured in the mines as compared to 10,625 wounded in battle.

In 1943, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, almost 2½ million persons were injured so that they were unable to work for one or more days. In that same year 18,400 were killed, and 108,000 suffered permanent partial disabilities. So sharply has this problem developed that a key demand for which the railroad workers held out (until Truman's strikebreaking act) was the elimination of speedup, deteriorated equipment, and late working hours,

which had been responsible for an increase in disabling road injuries and deaths. Half of the contracts obtained by the miners last May dealt with working conditions in the mines and sanitary conditions in the mining towns themselves.

Two major strikes in 1946 were due to problems of industrial health and safety. The shutdown of Ford's Rouge auto plant was due to the health hazards caused by the use of poisonous sodium fluoride. And the C.I.O. longshoremen have as one of their chief demands a safety code to reduce their appalling death and injury rates.

Just as price control is needed to protect real wages, so is a safe and healthy place to work needed to protect the worker himself. When a worker is hurt, his earnings decrease while he is recovering. In many cases the injury or disease prevents him from using his full skill thereafter, thus limiting his future earnings. It would therefore be to the workers' interests if a trade union program were developed whereby occupational injuries and diseases would be markedly reduced. The C.I.O. has shown recognition of this fact, as indicated by the good resolution it passed on this subject at its 1944 convention. Unfortunately, it remains just a resolution. The contract obtained by the miners deals with this question, but John L. Lewis has done nothing to implement it.

To date, with but few exceptions, labor has done little in the field of industrial health and safety commen-

urate with the needs and possibilities.

THEORETICAL APPROACH

The direct aim and determining incentive of capitalist production is the obtaining of a maximum of surplus value. This is accomplished through several means: 1) prolongation of the work day; 2) intensification of labor (speedup); 3) increase of productivity (new machinery).

All these methods have a direct bearing upon industrial health and safety.

1) Increasing the workday causes the deterioration of the worker's general health and decreases his resistance to disease. Marx in Volume I of *Capital* tells of men, women, and children working 15-16 hours a day until some were literally overworked to death (pottery, lace, and match workers and bakers). He points a parallel between the Negro slaves, who often had their lives used up in 7 years, and the workers in England dying at a very early age.

2) Speedup systems not only exhaust the worker but cause mental diseases and nervous breakdowns. A 1930 report by the Association of Physicians in Germany stated that "the most important cause of the deterioration of health is the disposition to sickness caused by the more intense utilization of the labor power of the person. The rationalization of economy primarily affects the ner-

vous system and the mental state of the person."

Both the speedup system and the longer workday increase the number of accidents. A tired or worn-out person is less alert in avoiding dangerous conditions or machinery. In the U.S., from 1941 to 1942, the frequency of accidents rose 10 per cent; from 1942 to 1943 it rose an additional 5.5 per cent. A worker on piecework will often remove a guard to increase production. In mining, wetting down after blasting and checking of gases and timbers are often neglected to get more tonnage. The figures on railroad accidents already indicated are further proof of the effect of fatigue on safety. This is one of the reasons why the workers must reject William Green's and the N.A.M.'s theory of "greater productivity," for not only will it mean less wages and a sharper economic crash but also the worsening of the workers' health and safety.

3) The introduction of new machinery and methods of production frequently affect adversely the health and safety of workers. The introduction of spray painting magnified the danger of a painter's job manifold. Another dangerous job, welding the interior of huge ships, did not exist 20 years ago. To quote the U.S. Public Health Service: "Synthetic rubber, plastics, new chemicals and metals have added tremendously to the number of hazards from which the worker must be protected."

Sir Thomas Oliver, English indus-

trial health pioneer, wrote, "While labour saving machinery is supposed to lighten toil, it imposes burdens upon the physical powers and endurance of the workers."

The question may arise, "Is it not to the benefit of the capitalist to maintain the health and well-being of his employees?" Marx answers,

Capital cares nothing for the length of life of labour power. All that concerns it is simply and solely the maximum of labour power, that can be rendered fluent in a working day. It attains this end by shortening the extent of the labourer's life, as a greedy farmer snatches increased produce from the soil by robbing it of its fertility.

Because of the reserve army of unemployed, it is cheaper to replace sick or crippled workers than to spend capital in improving working conditions (this is not so true for skilled workers). Examples proving this point are numerous in *Capital* (Chapter X, Section 5), and in Sir Thomas Oliver's *Diseases of Occupation, from Legislative, Social, and Medical Points of View*.

American examples can be obtained from Alexander Trachtenberg's *History of Legislation for the Protection of Coal Miners in Pennsylvania*.

In the 1870's a judge, in commenting on conditions in the mines, said, "When the question is brought to a practical issue, is capital or human life to be sacrificed, can the answer be doubtful?" Dr. Alice Hamilton,

an outstanding American authority on industrial health, in her *Dangerous Trades*, relates an incident in which the workers were treated worse than the horses of their boss. In another incident she tells of how employers (in 1913) made no attempt to protect immigrants from dust and fumes, for if any were sick all the manager of the plant did was pick out any number he needed from an eagerly waiting crowd, using the company doctor to pick the healthiest. Mother Bloor has other graphic examples in her *We Are Many*. And Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* shows that the big meat-packing corporations that deprive our nation of meat for bigger profits, were no different in committing mass murder of their workers for profits.

During World War II there were definite improvements in working conditions (although the workday increased to as much as 12 hours). In addition to the efforts of labor, a major factor, these improvements were due to two main factors. First, because of the shortage of labor, working conditions had to be good to keep labor (in the chromate and logging industries, conditions were so bad in 1944 that men refused to work and a labor shortage developed). Secondly, many companies were on a "cost plus" basis, and did not care if capital was expended on improving the working conditions since it did not come out of their pockets. But this period is now over

and the no-
ism are b
As Marx
Capital t
or denying
regions of wo
practice me
by the sigh
and final c
pace, as b
earth into
s reckless
of the labo
tion from
this does n
or ill will
Free comp
ent laws of
shape of e
power ove
Neverth
cy under
health ar
working
not affor
ing class,
one to p
the othe
"iron law
higher r
false one
that the
prove w
health of
ism. Lif
dred yea
ments c
were ob
efforts a
class, w
minded

and the normal tendencies of capitalism are back in full effect.

As Marx put it:

Capital that has such good reasons for denying the sufferings of the legions of workers that surround it, is in practice moved as much and as little by the sight of the coming degradation and final depopulation of the human race, as by the probable fall of the earth into the sun. . . . Hence, Capital is reckless of the health or length of life of the labourer, *unless under compulsion from society* [my emphasis] . . . this does not . . . depend on the good or ill will of the individual capitalist. Free competition brings out the inherent laws of capitalist production, in the shape of external coercive laws having power over every individual capitalist.

Nevertheless, although the tendency under capitalism is to ruin the health and physical being of the working class, the bourgeoisie cannot afford to kill off the whole working class, for then there would be no one to produce surplus value. On the other hand, just as LaSalle's "iron law of wages" (the struggle for higher real wages is hopeless) is a false one, so would it be false to say that there is no possibility to improve working conditions and the health of the workers under capitalism. Life itself, during the past hundred years, has shown that improvements can be obtained. *But they were obtained primarily through the efforts and struggles of the working class*, with the aid of some socially minded individuals of other classes,

by economic (direct negotiations with the bosses) and political (legislative) means. These improvements were *not* obtained through "enlightened" capitalists, *but in spite of the capitalist class*. In 1941, only 400 requests were made by management to governmental agencies for studies of plant conditions, requests involving but 200,000 workers out of 53 millions.

ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS TODAY

During the past few years, the trade union movement showed a much greater interest in industrial health and safety. Part of this was due to the fact that wage increases were limited, but partial benefits could be obtained through improvement of working conditions; and part was due to a greater consciousness by labor of the value of a health and safety program.

The Boiler Makers Union's interest in welding hazards, the Metal Trades Council's (Portland Ore.) interest in fume hazards in shipbuilding, protests by local unions in the synthetic rubber industry, all led to corrections in these respective industries. In 1942, 2,500 out of 7,000 contracts had some provisions dealing with health and safety. Free mass X-rays were obtained by many unions. This service was made available primarily because the shortage of labor made it imperative that the workers remain healthy.

However, until now, no interna-

tional union has taken up the question of industrial health and safety in an organized manner, with a broad program, directed and assisted by staff members of the union. Such a program must be based upon the attitude that the principal tasks of the unions in this field must not necessarily be that of effecting mechanisms to provide themselves with medical needs, etc., but rather with instruments of organization to compel the state and industry to provide the means, finances, etc.

The efforts of those unions or local councils which have done something have been, in the main, haphazard, and not consistent and based upon a broad program. Some of the work done is based upon self-insurance plans, so that all the benefits obtained by the workers is paid by the workers themselves. The U.A.W. in Detroit depends upon the services of its own medical staff and safety men, paid by its own treasury, instead of using most of this effort and money to expand and make full use of the facilities of the local health and labor departments. However, in the case of a few unions, agreements have been signed with the employers wherein, through allocating a percentage of the total payroll, the employer is the only contributor to the union's insurance and health system.

The best approach to this question of industrial and general health and safety was shown by the Northern California Health Committee,

but the weakness here was that the union locals were not made to realize the value of such a program. That is why the Committee had to depend upon the Rosenwald Fund for its main source of income, and why it finally had to dissolve.

Just as with political activity, we face problems, and other such issues which are important to the trade unions, so will the success of a health and safety program depend upon the degree to which the individual locals of the different unions become aware of, and act upon, the broad scope of this problem of industrial health and safety. In the same light only if such activities are properly coordinated and developed through a central agency will there be a maximum of results. The various International Unions should place on their staffs professionally trained and experienced people, who have a knowledge of trade unions and their functioning, to direct an industrial health and safety program.

HEALTH AND SAFETY PROGRAM

Primarily, the function of a health and safety director would be to stimulate and guide the organization and activities of health and safety committees in union locals. These committees would function, in the same manner as legislative committees, in all locals and districts. The director would also act as a clearing house of activities dealing with health and safety that originated through the

initiative of local committees. If there were two plants having similar hazards, and certain safety precautions were known to have been obtained in one of them, it would then be easier for the workers in the other plant to have similar protection. If a local union obtained results from an investigation made by a governmental agency, it would be less difficult to do likewise in other plants in the state. Other examples are cases where unions obtain free health insurance, vitamins, and food most as part of their contract.

Most officials of state and local health and labor departments would like to see conditions in factories up to the standards set by professional groups and societies or by the law. Unfortunately, the laws in many states do not give too specific powers to the health or labor departments for the improvement of working conditions. In fact, in many states, management can refuse health department representatives access into their plant. But once a request is made by a worker, or better still by his local, entrance is available to the government agency.

With health and safety committees knowing what official agencies existed and the respective services available, they could do a great deal to improve the industrial environmental conditions and welfare facilities having an influence upon the health and safety of the workers in the plant. Among the items that the committee would ask to be checked

in a survey by a government agency would be medical and nursing services (where the plant was large enough), and proper administration of first aid. The need for this is shown by Bernard J. Stern in his *Medicine in Industry* when he says that management tries to get the cheapest kind of industrial physician. This is corroborated by the findings of the American College of Surgeons which surveyed 1,600 plants in 1937, covering 5½ million workers, and found that only half of them had approved medical services. Other items the health and safety committees would ask to be checked are sufficient and well maintained sanitary facilities, satisfactorily illuminated and ventilated workrooms, adequately guarded machinery, and a sufficient supply of *correct and effective* protective equipment for the workers (goggles, respirators, gloves, etc.). The availability of such protective devices is not enough. Since their use oftentimes reduces productivity, the unions should fight against speedup which forces the worker to discard such equipment in order to keep up with production schedules. Such complete studies would be made if specific requests for all the above-mentioned items were made by a union local.

In a number of states the government agencies have insufficient authority to enforce recommendations for the maintenance of safe working conditions. Even where such laws exist, there is usually insufficient gov-

ernment personnel to see that the recommendations are carried out if the workers do not press management strongly enough. But where pressure would be applied by unions through their health and safety committees, as with any other type of governmental agency (N.L.R.B., Veterans Administration), the government personnel would show a greater fighting spirit in improving conditions. This is especially true where the union would know the results of a study of a factory and the recommended improvements. Such knowledge would be a constant stimulus to the official inspectors and would give the workers themselves an opportunity to check up without waiting a long period of time before the inspectors returned. For example, if a suggestion were made by a government agency, after tests were taken, that welders working inside steel tanks need ventilation with air blowers, the workers concerned could easily determine whether the recommendation was being carried out.

In addition, health and safety committees could take up the problem of clean cafeterias or eating places in the plant or nearby the plant, health education, and general health work. In the last category would be included free X-rays for tuberculosis (T.B.), free tests for venereal diseases (and treatment where necessary)—all to be done through union facilities so that there would be no danger of company discrimination against those who were temporarily

ill. Other phases of a health program could include the obtaining of free courses in nutrition, child care, etc. for the women in the union auxiliaries (and for the union itself, if a significant number of women were members).

Of course, all this could be done effectively only if these committees would have a general knowledge of the subject of safety and health, just as it is necessary for members of a union legislative committee to know the "wheres" and "hows" about ward organization, primaries, techniques in getting out the vote, watchers, etc. A non-technical pamphlet, to be used as a guide on general good practices and conditions in industrial establishments, on what free health benefits and services exist, and how they could be obtained, would be compiled by the director or staff members of the International Union. Such a pamphlet could be used similarly to the way the P.A.C. guide, put out for the '44 elections, was used.

Afterwards, a series of pamphlets could be published, each one dealing with things to be looked for by union members in the particular industries to assure safe working conditions.

Of course, the information in such pamphlets would not make technical experts of the workers, but it would make them aware of what to look for, so that, for example, when a study by an agency would be requested it would not be of a general nature, but one which specified cer-

tain oper
Such an i
the part o
and safet
effect in
the govern
tion, it sh
as consci
he can
needs atte
In larg
be possib
ment-spor
courses g
just as in
courses v
plant saf
would he
ing the co
and sever
accidents
towards
bers a b
health p
in bargai
ter work
On ce
might b
and safe
bers) per
and saf
union t
agency I
have be
mendati
were no
director
lem.
It sho
many p
the past

tain operations and items as well. Such an indication of knowledge on the part of the workers about health and safety would have its positive effect in more thorough studies by the government personnel. In addition, it should not be forgotten that, as conscientious as an inspector may be, he can never see everything that needs attention.

In large industrial centers it may be possible to have special government-sponsored, non-technical short courses given free to union people, just as in the past few years such courses were given to foremen and plant safety men. This education would help the union members taking the course to lessen the incidence and severity of industrial diseases and accidents. It would also give shop stewards and other such union members a broader knowledge of better health practices in industry for use in bargaining and fighting for better working conditions.

On certain technical questions it might be necessary for the health and safety director (or staff members) personally to assist these health and safety committees. Where a union felt that the government agency had not done all that could have been done, or that the recommendations made to management were not as complete as possible, the director would check on this problem.

It should also be noted that in many places, shop stewards, during the past few years, have begun to

seek out the health hazards on the job and open negotiations with the employer's representatives for their elimination. The health and safety directors might very usefully organize classes for shop stewards which would teach them to detect the general and less obvious health hazards, and work for their elimination.

LEGISLATION, STANDARDS, AND CODES

Another function of the health and safety director and staff members would be to secure data and information to help workers in occupational disease or injury compensation cases. No one who has witnessed testimony of the company's "experts" can realize how easily it could have been riddled. The value of a technical consultant for unions on industrial disease compensation cases alone would prove itself many times over. The history of compensation payments in England during the 1920's shows clearly that workers received much more when they were represented by their union. The greatest benefit in this field would be obtained if, similar to N.L.R.B. cases, the unions used the same lawyers in each area to handle compensation cases for the workers.

Still another function of the director would be to work with the union legislative committees on improving laws and codes relating to working conditions and compensation for disease and injury. The need

for such improvement is very clearly shown in Bulletin No. 70, published by the U. S. Department of Labor in December, 1944, by Horowitz' *Workmen's Compensation*, and Stern's *Medicine in Industry*.

Efforts must be made by unions to expand the funds and personnel for government agencies doing work in the field of safety and industrial hygiene. In 1940, less than one cent per worker was spent for industrial health services in Tennessee, Mississippi and Louisiana; five cents for each worker in New Jersey; and only 15 cents per worker in Ohio and New York. There are only 175 coal mine inspectors. In many states, due to insufficient personnel and low salaries, the safety inspectors of the Labor Department become little more than glorified fee collectors. Although the preliminary survey made by the U. S. Public Health Service in 1940 showed the great need for detailed studies (which has been corroborated by subsequent studies in various states), in 1943 there were only 300 technically trained persons in industrial hygiene. Compare this with 290 doctors, nurses, and safety engineers at the Stalin Auto Plant in Moscow in 1945 or the 140 scientific workers of the staff in Leningrad's Institute for Hygiene and Labour in 1937!

At the last session of Congress about one million dollars was appropriated for grants-in-aid to the states for use in industrial hygiene. Yet there is reluctance by some state

agencies to use the money because of the absence (on the part of agency heads) of a real desire to improve conditions in the factories. An increase in state personnel and services could be obtained if the trade unions were more alert and aggressive in requesting the various health services which they need and have available.

There is also the problem of raising the industrial health and safety standards set up by state and federal agencies. Maximum permissible limits have been set up for toxic dusts, gases, and vapors, as well as for other exposures like X-rays and those from radium. More and more, instances occur where technical workers report that the present limits in certain cases are too high (standards are too low!) Yet little is being done to change the standards. This means that where workers are exposed to harmful conditions, the government inspector is often limited as to what he can do, using the existing codes. This is also true, but to a lesser extent, of mechanical safety codes and standards. If labor groups were made more aware of this situation and shown what could be done through legislation and professional groups, such a condition would be eliminated. In some states, open hearings are held before legal standards are set. With labor representatives voicing their opinions, there would be a positive effect upon the final standards set. More vocal protests at professional meetings, where standards are discussed and formulated for optional

use by sta
the backb
and univ
are cove
ance repr
actionary-
are so-cal
deny tha
definite e
would be
workers
disease b
correctly
tion, the
would be
and rules
working
stringent
Proble
question:
Dingell
water s
smaller,
could al
union h
Last yea
vania m
beth Ha

use by state agencies, would stiffen the backbone of government persons and university research men who are cowed by industrial and insurance representatives as well as by reactionary-minded "scientists." There are so-called "scientists" who even deny that occupational diseases are definite entities. Thus, management would be unable to avoid paying workers affected by an occupational disease by taking advantage of incorrectly set, low standards. In addition, the possible harm to workers would be reduced because the codes and rules for determining dangerous working conditions would be more stringent.

Problems of general public health questions like the Murray-Wagner, Dingell Bill, housing, sewage and water supply (especially in the smaller, one- or two-industry towns) could also be taken up by the trade union health and safety committees. Last year's incident in the Pennsylvania mining town, where Dr. Elizabeth Hayes resigned as company doc-

tor because the company refused to do anything to correct the sewage system which was flowing right into the water system, is an example of the work that should be done in such areas. In addition, such health and safety committees could take up the question of disabled veterans' and workers' rehabilitation. (There are 228,000 disabled veterans without work, according to the U.S.E.S.)

The carrying out of such a program will not be easy. Big Business, in its offensive against the people, will do its utmost to prevent the success of such a program. But the trade unions can realize this industrial health and safety program by making it part of their general counter-offensive (second round of wage increases) against monopoly capitalism—and not by waiting until *forced to*, as with the Ford and C.I.O. longshoremen strikes. It is only through mass struggle and independent political activity in its various forms that such programs can achieve success.

CURRENT PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- OUT OF YOUR POCKET: THE STORY OF CARTELS. Darel McConkey. (Pamphlet Press), New York, 1947. 120 pp. \$1.00.
- A GUIDE TO THE SOVIET UNION. William Mandel. (The Dial Press), New York, 1946. 511 pp. \$5.00.
- THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN AMERICA: A CRITIQUE OF GUNNAR MYRDAL'S "AN AMERICAN DILEMMA." (International Publishers), New York, 1946. 80 pp. 35¢.
- THE PEOPLE AGAINST THE TRUSTS. Eugene Dennis. (New Century Publishers), New York, 1946. 64 pp. 10¢.
- EISLER HITS BACK. Gerhart Eisler. (*The German-American*), New York, 1947. 16 pp. 10¢.
- FRANCE FACES HER DESTINY. Jacques Duclos. (International Publishers), 1946. 32 pp. 10¢.
- PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL: THE COMMUNIST POSITION ON THE JEWISH QUESTION. Alexander Bittelman. (New Century Publishers), 1947. 64 pp. 15¢.
- NEW WAR OR NEW ORDER. Sid Scott. (Communist Party of New Zealand). 24 pp.
- A WORLD "CHRISTIAN FRONT" and ANTI-SOCIAL ETHICS OF RED-BAITERS—ANSWERING CLARE BOOTH LUCE. V. J. Jerome. (*New Masses*), New York, 1947. 16 pp. 5¢.
- HERE'S HOW WE SEE IT, MR. PERKINS. I. Taigin. (New Century Publishers), 1946. 16 pp. 5¢.
- UN PROGRAM NACIONAL. (Ediciones Del Partido Socialista Popular), Havana, 1946. 8 pp.
- A WORLD TO WIN. Stanley B. Ryerson. (Progress Books), Toronto, 1946. 96 pp. \$35.
- THE STRUGGLE OF THE BULGARIAN PEOPLE AGAINST FASCISM. Sofia, 1946. 116 pp.
- DEFENSA DEL TRIUNFO Y CUMPLIMIENTO DEL PROGRAMA. Ricardo Foa-seca. (Communist Party of Chile), 1946. 61 pp.
- THE COMMUNIST POSITION ON THE NEGRO QUESTION. (New Century Publishers), 1947. 64 pp. 25¢.
- AN AMERICAN CHURCHMAN IN THE SOVIET UNION. Reverend Louie D. Newton. (American Russian Institute), New York. 49 pp. 10¢.
- HURRY UP, PLEASE, IT'S TIME. Elizabeth Hawes. (Reynal & Hitchcock), New York, 1946. 245 pp. \$2.50.
- IN SPITE OF TEARS. Sam Liptzin. (Amcho Publishers), New York, 1946. 304 pp. \$3.00.
- HOW'S YOUR HEALTH?: THE FIGHT FOR A NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM. Robert Friedman. (New Century Publishers), 1947. 32 pp. 10¢.
- TAX RELIEF FOR WHOM—THE NEEDEY OR THE GREEDY? Donald Freeman. (New Century Publishers), New York, 1947. 24 pp. 3¢.

Conkey,

Press),

's "An
York,

ry Pub-

, New

Publish-

JEWELL

), 1947.

ew Zea-

-BAITEN

Masses),

Century

popular),

Toronto,

ia, 1946.

lo Fon-

Century

ouie D.

. 10¢.

Hitch-

York,

ROGRAM.

. 10¢.

reeman.