

Toward Socialism

Pre-convention Discussion Bulletin
of the BILL HAYWOOD COMMUNIST CLUB
of Illegally Expelled Members of the
C.P.U.S.A

Issue No. 12 - June 15, 1949

Subscription \$1.00 per year. 15¢ each

Editor: Francis Franklin

B. Rosenstein, Sec'y., Box 92
Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
The Present Left-Wing Crisis in the Trade Unions (Part III)...	1
The Marshall Plan and our Communist Party by Max Bedacht.....	9
Material Useful for Building the Peace Movement.....	19
How the Prosecuting Attorney in the Foley Square Inquisition Tries to Hide and Distort the Principles of Marxism.....	20
Another Proof of the Need to Study the History of the C.P.S.U.	21
Communist Morality (Part III).....	22
The Terminiello Decision - A Blow against Freedom of Speech.....	26

THE PRESENT LEFT-WING CRISIS IN THE TRADE UNIONS (Part III)

Resume of Parts I and II:

(Prior to 1919, the American left-wing constantly vacillated between opportunist capitulation to agents of the employers in the unions and sectarian dual unionism. The Communist International in 1919 began to assist the Communist Party of the U.S., on the basis of international experience, to adopt a policy of working correctly for a fighting and united trade union movement. In spite of frequent errors in the application of that policy, our Party adhered to it with sufficient firmness from 1929 to 1937 for this policy to prove its correctness by assisting the American working class to make enormous gains. After posing the problem as to why so many of the gains made by American labor in the 30's have been dissipated in the 40's, at the moment of enormous advances by the international labor movement; we made the general observation that the Party leadership yielded to smug complacency during the formative years of the C.I.O. and failed to indicate how labor should consolidate its recent gains by preparations for further advances which could easily, on the basis of existing gains, have been made by struggle along proper lines.)

5. The Steady Growth of Opportunism in the Trade Union Policy of the Party after 1937, Culminating in Complete Liquidationism during the Anti-Fascist War. (continued)

The formation of the C.I.O. and its early struggles represented partial realization of the program of the Party and of many non-Party workers for industrial unionism, for an energetic drive to organize the unorganized, and to secure the adoption of a policy of militant class struggle against the employers. These successes were only partial, only half-successful, first of all, because the A.F. of L. and R.R. Brotherhoods had not been won to support the new policies of the C.I.O. In the second place, the Party was far from successful in winning support to other aspects of its minimum trade union program. The expulsion of the C.I.O. from the A.F. of L. of course indicated that the Party's program for trade union unity was far from being realized.

A higher degree of trade union democracy was achieved in some of the new C.I.O. unions than in the old A.F. of L. unions. However, certain A.F. of L. unions went into the C.I.O. without altering in the slightest their former system of bureaucratic domination by highly paid officials. Moreover, the new unions which grew up under the C.I.O. were also certainly very far in most cases from repudiating all the old bureaucratic practices of the A.F. of L. The Party comrades within the C.I.O. were not mobilized by the Party leadership to undertake a systematic fight, which could have been successful if systematically and intelligently conducted, to achieve thorough-going trade union democracy throughout the length and breadth of the C.I.O.

The failure to organize a rank and file mass campaign against bureaucracy in the C.I.O. thus left a strong base for the growth of class-collaborationism, which is always bred by bureaucracy. In other words, the perpetuation of bureaucracy in the C.I.O. allowed the employers to retain a convenient base for operation within the new trade union federation. In this, as in other respects, the fight to win the C.I.O. for a policy of class struggle as opposed to class collaboration and for energetic organization of the unorganized as opposed to bureaucratic lethargy was only partially successful.

Enormous steps were made by the C.I.O. toward organizing Negro and white workers for joint struggles and toward arousing white labor to rid itself of its old and violent chauvinist prejudices. Indications of this were the organization of Negro workers, especially in the South, and in the formulation of certain general programmatic demands by the C.I.O. on behalf of the Negro people. However, in spite of paper resolutions, calling for organization of Negro labor, C.I.O. organizers sent into the South were often former A.F. of L. bureaucrats filled with hatred for the Negro people, and the organization of Negro labor in both North and South was often flagrantly neglected. Where organization of Negro workers occurred, it was often due solely to rank and file pressure in the given localities. Furthermore, Jim Crow forms of organization of Negro labor by the C.I.O. in the South (e.g. in the Textile Workers Union) were widespread and not combatted by any systematic campaign of any sort. That the general policy of the C.I.O. toward Negro labor was often sabotaged by C.I.O. officials and that this sabotage was often overcome only by local opposition was never publicized by the Party, which generally glossed over all but the good features of the C.I.O. The result was that a national campaign to carry out the systematic organization of Negro workers and a national campaign to combat white chauvinism within the C.I.O. were never organized.

In the sphere of parliamentary action, C.I.O. locals, Conventions, and Councils were easily mobilized to endorse the New Deal program of liberal bourgeois reform and occasionally to pass resolutions calling for legislative action of a slightly more advanced nature than that of the bourgeois New Deal politicians. However, after 1937, all education for work in the direction of a farmer-labor party was abandoned by the Party, and the C.I.O. was allowed to regard itself as a more or less permanent left-wing within the New Deal section of the Democratic Party. As an indication of how thorough-going was the economism which developed among leading Party comrades in the C.I.O., quite a number of Party comrades in leading posts in C.I.O. unions appealed to "organizational activity" as an excuse for failure even to campaign for the liberal New Deal against its reactionary fascist opponents during the elections of 1938! This was economism with a vengeance.

Various locals, leading committees, and conventions of the C.I.O. frequently adopted resolutions expressing various forms of international labor solidarity in connection with the worldwide struggle against developing war and fascism prior to 1939 and in relation to the various phases of World War II thereafter. However, these generally anti-fascist paper resolutions were not very widely translated into effective actions of international labor solidarity, and were not utilized effectively for conducting genuine anti-fascist education of more than the most superficial variety, if even this, among the rank-and-file membership of the unions. Anti-fascist paper resolutions voicing sentiments of internationalism were often flagrantly and cynically sabotaged by C.I.O. officials in practice. Nevertheless a certain fetishism of paper resolutions and of verbal convention decisions, accompanied by utter disconcern for actual deeds, was allowed to grow and flourish within the Party - a fetishism which may be observed in a crude form in the various "reports" of Williamson, present trade union secretary of the Party.

From the beginning, many C.I.O. bureaucrats actively disseminated the most reactionary views among the rank and file union members, thus flagrantly violating official C.I.O. policy as expressed in many convention decisions and resolutions. As a means of combatting the ideology of the employers, which was thus actively disseminated within the C.I.O., the Party engaged in almost no fight whatsoever to organize well-functioning educational departments within C.I.O. unions. Where more or less sham educational departments were formed, no real effort was made (not even where Party members held leading posts in such departments) to utilize them to give union members genuine enlightenment concerning the nature of capitalism, the real nature of the labor movement, the relations between labor and the different classes of farmers, the relations between labor and the Negro people, or the relations between labor and international economic and political developments.

In a word, some great gains, but of a very definitely limited nature, were made by American labor with the formation of the C.I.O. A number of industrial unions were formed. Millions of hitherto unorganized workers were organized by powerful organizational drives. Many sharp and successful struggles for contracts occurred in major industries. However, the A.F. of L. and R.R. Brotherhoods had not been won over to adopt the progressive policies of the C.I.O. The trade union movement was badly split. Within the C.I.O. itself, trade union bureaucracy still flourished; reactionary views and practices, in the sharpest contradiction to paper resolutions, were widespread and were actively being disseminated; and no systematic educational campaigns were organized to combat them. An enormous step forward had been made, but to consolidate existing gains effectively, it was necessary that even bigger steps be taken. It was necessary to win over the whole A.F. of L. and R.R. Brotherhoods for the new progressive policies of the C.I.O. It was necessary to unify the A.F. of L., C.I.O., and R.R. Brotherhoods. And it was necessary to achieve trade union democracy within the C.I.O. as well as in other federations, i.e. to eliminate all forms of bureaucracy and all expressions of white chauvinism. It was necessary to mobilize the C.I.O. and other federations for a consistent policy of class struggle; for an unceasing drive to organize the unorganized, with especial attention to Negro workers; and for genuine solidarity with the workers of the world that would express itself in continuous actions of international labor solidarity. To secure all these things, it was necessary to conduct a stubborn fight in all local meetings and to organize genuine labor education within the C.I.O. and other federations.

Such a sober estimate of achievements and of next steps required should have been made in 1937. Such a succinct formulation of tasks to be performed would have given every Party member in the C.I.O., A.F. of L. and R.R. Brotherhoods a clear tactical guide for specific, immediate actions within his local. United action by the thousands of Party members in the unions and the hundreds of thousands with whom they were in close contact could have accomplished wonders in securing the actual carrying out of the next steps required.

No such sober estimate as the above and no such clear and succinct formulation of the next steps required were made. Some lip-service and a slight amount of activity were devoted to the general demand for the re-unification of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O., but a stubborn, systematic, nationwide, unceasing campaign for trade union unity was not organized, and many aspects of the general fight to mobilize all of labor against all of capital in the closest solidarity with the workers of the world were utterly neglected. A succinct formulation of tasks, so simple that every worker could grasp them readily, was not made.

The tasks required for taking the next steps forward by American labor in 1937 were such that one would conclude that a sound C.P. would have undertaken to tighten up its own organization as the means for securing the united action of its own membership within the unions. Our Party, however, in 1937 took opposite steps - the steps of relaxing and scrapping the organization of Party members in the unions. The first big step in this direction was the change of shop branches into industrial branches. The second was the dissolution of fractions in 1937. The third and fatal step was the dissolution in 1938 not only of all remaining shop branches, but also of the new industrial branches. These three steps transformed the C.P.U.S.A. organizationally into a Social-Democratic type of Party, based solely upon territorial clubs organized mainly on the basis of electoral districts.

An analysis of the exact procedure whereby shop and industrial Party branches and Party fractions in the unions were dissolved is most instructive.

The present membership of the Party has been given no instruction (except in the classes of a few Party teachers once and a while) concerning shop branches, fractions, and other basic forms of Party organization. For opportunists, the less Party members know about Marxist theory in general or the principles of Party organization in particular the better. Few Party members today know the difference between a shop and an industrial branch. Knowledge of this difference, however, is most important.

It was the shop branch which was the basic form of C.P. organization required by the former C.I. constitution. The shop branch is the organization of all the Party members in a given factory or other place of employment. (Of course if there are enough members in a large factory, there could be a branch for each department). The major sphere of activity of such a branch is of course

the workers in the given place of employment. A shop branch relates the program and activity of the C.P. to the daily lives of the workers in their sphere of work.

An industrial branch is something quite different, and was, we believe, a specifically American innovation. An industrial branch does not organize workers in a given place of employment, but in a given industry. The members of an industrial branch thus come from different shops. An industrial branch may legitimately be formed when there are not enough comrades in individual factories to form shop branches. Obviously its object should be to work in such a fashion as to recruit comrades who can organize separate shop branches. As a relatively permanent organization, an industrial branch would parallel the activity of a fraction operating in the union of a given industry, for all Party members in any industry must be union members. The personnel of an industrial branch for an industrial union is thus identical with the personnel of a fraction in that industrial union. This being the case, it is contrary to correct principles of Party organization to regard industrial branches as more than a temporary form of organization or to regard them as in any sense a substitute for shop branches, which are the basic forms of organization in a Communist Party.

Far from forming industrial branches in 1937 as the prelude to organizing new shop branches, old shop branches were dissolved into the new industrial branches whose role was purely liquidatory. The formation of industrial branches was used, first, as the excuse for dissolving already existing shop branches! Thereafter they were used as the excuse for dissolving fractions! Having performed these liquidationist functions, these industrial branches, temporary forms of organization utilized solely to effect disorganization, were themselves dissolved!

A major argument given for the dissolution of fractions was that reactionary caucuses of Coughlinites, Trotskyites, etc. were functioning in the unions, that workers confused Communist fractions with such reactionary caucuses, and that the dissolution of Communist fractions might make possible the dissolution of these reactionary caucuses! Such liquidationist arguments are always totally erroneous. It was the duty of Communist fractions to demonstrate to the workers the absolute difference between Communist fractions, which represent the total interests of the working class as a whole, and the sinister anti-labor caucuses which serve the interests of the employers in the unions. Such a demonstration was not difficult, because it is a fact, and truth can always be demonstrated. Only a lie is, in the nature of things, incapable of proof. Communists do represent the interests of labor as a class. Coughlinites and Trotskyites cannot help revealing their real anti-labor position by their actions, since they are anti-labor. The fact that such anti-labor organizations were functioning in the unions should have convinced Communists, therefore, to draw the conclusion that Communist organization to combat such anti-labor caucuses must be strengthened whether in the specific form of fractions or in other forms.

Communists of course do not follow rigidly dogmatic and inflexible forms of Party organization, although there are certain basic organizational principles to which real Communists must adhere consistently. One cannot say that under no conditions is it impermissible for the specific organizational form of fractions to be dissolved. However, one can say with absolute certainty that under all conditions there must be a basic organizational form of some sort to secure united action by all Communists in the unions and other mass organizations. If for some reason, it is found advisable to dissolve fractions, some other means of achieving united action must be found.

Another widespread verbal excuse for dissolving fractions used by some functionaries in trying to "clarify" some comrades, was the chauvinistic and false assertion that fractions are "un-American"! - an argument appropriate for the Un-American Committee. On the contrary, the widespread custom of the political caucus (a fraction is a caucus of Communist Party members), dating from the Caucus Club of Colonial Massachusetts, in which Sam Adams functioned, is quite thoroughly American, as one can still see in the institution of Republican and Democratic Party caucuses in Congress and elsewhere. Even if it were not an American custom, the strength of the labor movement anywhere obviously rests upon its ability to learn from international experience. (It is time that comrades grasped the humour of the fact that capitalism itself did not originate in America !)

Another excuse given to obtain acceptance by the membership of the dissolution of fractions in the unions in 1937 was that industrial branches, which had already largely displaced shop branches; could continue to perform the same function as fractions. One would imagine, therefore, if this argument had been seriously put forward, that the dissolution of fractions would have been followed by a strengthening of industrial branches. On the contrary, once this argument had served its purpose, the dissolution of fractions in the unions was followed by the dissolution of industrial branches also! Thereafter, nothing remained whereby the function of the fraction, viz. to secure united action by all Communists in a union or other mass organization, could be secured! Party organization in the unions and factories had been dissolved.

This occurred in 1937-8 - six years before the Party as a whole was dissolved and while Browder's leadership was at the height of its greatest apparent success. All who retain some lingering illusions concerning Browder's former leadership should ponder thoughtfully over these facts.

The dissolution of all forms of Party organization in the unions and factories allowed the unchecked development of a trade union bureaucracy within the ranks of the Party, which is supposed to mobilize the rank and file of the unions to combat all forms of bureaucracy. Deprived of fractions and shop branches, the Party possessed no organizational machinery whereby the growth of trade union bureaucracy within the ranks of the Party could be combatted.

Various guarantees against the demoralization of the ranks of the Party were abolished at the time of the dissolution of fractions and shop branches. It was once the requirement of Communist Parties and still is required in many Parties (if not in all) that any Party member elected to any trade union or government post should surrender to the Party all of his salary over and above a standard trade union wage. This requirement is based on the fact that Party members are elected to posts not for personal self-advancement, but to perform responsibilities on behalf of the working class. Furthermore, it is a guarantee that Party members in well-paying posts in unions and elsewhere shall not become bourgeoisified by a non-proletarian standard of living. It was just such a process of bourgeoisification that originally corrupted A.F. of L. leaders and that also originally corrupted the Social-Democratic trade union leaders all over Europe and America. The Bolshevik Party worked out methods of counteracting all tendencies toward the bourgeoisification of its own members. Such methods afterwards were adopted generally by the Parties of the C.I. At the very beginning of the C.I.O. organizational drive, certain Party members in the American Party who held well-paying C.I.O. posts - at least in certain areas of the U.S. - were required to surrender sometimes as much as half of their salaries to the Party. Whether this was ever a general policy within our Party on a national scale is unknown. However, the practice, wherever it existed, was certainly discontinued at the time of the general abandonment of Party disciplinary measures, which started around 1937.

Another instance of activity which helped to liquidate the Party in the unions was the decision, recently reported in Masses and Mainstream, whereby Gus Hall, organizer for the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, which became the Steelworkers Union, and a known Communist, resigned his important post in a major union in a basic industry to become a Party functionary! Certainly it seems strange for any Communist union leader to resign from a post in which he may give leadership to great masses of non-Party workers. That the agents of the employers in the union should attempt to secure such resignations is understandable, but that Communists should yield to such demands is not understandable.

It has been seen how the developing economism which led to the liquidation of the Party organization in the unions prevented the Party comrades in the unions from following up the achievements of 1934-37 with struggles for the full minimum trade union program of the Party. Not only did this economism prevent the fight for new advances, however. It led Party comrades in the unions to begin to liquidate some of the general organizational gains already achieved by the whole C.I.O. Comrades in each union could give many examples of such retreats in general C.I.O. work. We shall here cite one outstanding example.

Everyone who has any real understanding of Marxist-Leninist theory knows that one of the major requirements for securing the emancipation of labor is to secure the alliance between labor and the toiling poor on the farms. The basic means for effecting such an alliance must obviously be the organization of agricultural wage laborers, i.e. of the rural proletariat. Some of the most heroic mass struggles in the history of the American C.P. consisted of the organization in struggle of such agricultural wage workers as the Salinas lettuce workers of the famous Imperial Valley of California, of the beet workers of Colorado, and of farm workers in southern New Jersey. During this same period, semi-serf Negro sharecroppers of Alabama and other Southern states were organized by Party leaders into the famous Sharecroppers Union.

Under the aegis of the new C.I.O., a new union called the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America was formed. Into this new union, the organizations of agricultural wage workers and the Sharecroppers Union of the South dissolved.

Mistakes were made in the very formation of this union. It would have been preferable to restrict this union only to agricultural wage earners, in order to prevent the dissipation of its energies into other directions. It was a mistake to embrace cannery workers and workers in allied industries in the same union with agricultural wage workers. It was also a mistake to dissolve the Sharecroppers Union (whose members were not wage workers and whose problems as semi-serf tenants, paying rent in kind and often held in debt bondage, were quite different from those of workers for wages) into a union of wage workers. Too many heterogeneous elements were lumped together into one union. Had American Communists studied more deeply the Bolshevik writings on the agrarian question, they would, on the basis of international experience, have opposed these errors. Nevertheless, this union did contain the organizations of agricultural wage earners and sharecroppers and did provide a medium, even though inadequate, for their further organization.

Not only were mistakes made in the very formation of the heterogeneous union which included farm proletarians, cannery and packing workers, sharecroppers, etc. in the same organization; but steps were taken shortly after its formation that led not only to the virtual liquidation of any real drive to organize both rural wage-earners and sharecroppers, but to the dissolution of existing locals. The C.I.O. withdrew funds from this extremely important union with the purely business-like (not class-struggle) excuse that the "returns" (!) were insufficient! The fruits of the heroic organizational work of Communists in the '30s were thereafter dissipated. The organizations of sharecroppers and of many agricultural wage workers were allowed to disintegrate! (With the disappearance of any organization of agrarian toilers in the Black Belt of the South, talk about the Black Belt among Party functionaries in the North, who were very addicted to discussions not based on study of any kind, became thereafter increasingly academic and unrelated to anything in actual existence.) With the actual disintegration of many of the few organizations of wage-earners and sharecroppers which had ever existed, the C.I.O. changed the name of the heterogeneous union of agricultural and cannery workers, sharecroppers, etc. into the ambiguous title of Food and Tobacco Workers Union - ambiguous because it is not clear from the name whether the union is a union of workers in food and tobacco industries or of agricultural workers on farms raising food and tobacco. An account of what ever happened to the organization of sharecroppers in the Southern Black Belt has still not been given to the Party membership. Neither have new members been told of the former struggles on Black Belt farms and plantations, on farms of the Imperial Valley, on the beet farms of Colorado and in other farm areas throughout the huge territory of the U.S. With declining interest in agricultural wage workers, it was not surprising that the C.I.O. neglected any effective efforts to cement an alliance with poor, toiling, land-owning farmers.

Leading Party members in the C.I.O. not only failed to combat the steps taken by the C.I.O. leaders to curtail attention to agricultural workers, steps which led to the disintegration of old organizations, but were active in the execution of those steps. Underestimation of the agrarian question is an invariable accompaniment of opportunism. This has been the case in the American Party, and its effect is visible in the C.I.O.

The dissolution of shop and industrial branches, which made community branches the basic Party organizations and which affected so adversely the C.I.O. as a whole, was accompanied by a general relaxation of Party discipline in all branches, and there occurred a mass influx into the Party of many people who in reality only thought they were Communists but who were really only middle class liberals. One must also assume that along with them a plentiful supply of new professional enemy agents also flocked into the Party to join those already there. Of course many good, honest, and revolutionary people joined the Party during these years - only to be misguided.

Under the guise of a fight against "sectarianism", ugly campaigns against old trusted Party comrades, many of whom were foreign-born, was launched. Thousands of devoted Party members were subjected to ridicule as "1905-ers"! The ill-mannered and brazen audacity of middle class new recruits who dared to ridicule the veterans of one of the great revolutions of modern history who had played a valiant role as refugees from Tzarism in the American labor movement, was never rebuked by the Party leadership. On the contrary, under Browder's leadership, the culmination of this vicious ridicule of "old timers" was the chauvinist decision requiring that all members of the Party be American citizens! Under this ruling, thousands of the best trade union members of the Party were driven out of the Party of the working class, which in the U.S. has always embraced an extremely large proportion of foreign born. (A double standard of some sort was nevertheless followed in deciding who should be forced to leave by this ruling, since recent deportation proceedings have revealed that it was never applied to some of the leading cadres who were active in proposing it!) These procedures helped still farther to weaken the base of the Party in the unions.

To summarize what happened in 1937-8, instead of following up the glorious victories won by American labor in the years from 1934-37 by strenuous efforts for new advances, the Party leadership in 1937 called a halt to the further advance of American labor. It did this by disorganizing and disorientating the vanguard of American labor in the unions. By scrapping Party organization in the unions and factories, the Party leadership abolished the organized proletarian base of the Party, and shifted the Party on to a middle class path of development. Calling a halt to the general advance of labor began to illustrate the principle that in the class struggle one can never stand still. Failure to press for new advances paved the way for the general liquidation by the C.I.O. as a whole of some of the outstanding achievements of previous years.

The complete dissolution of the Party in 1944, was obviously not some sudden act, not the crazy whim of one man, but the inevitable culmination of an unchecked and deep-seated growth of opportunism among the entire leadership of the Party following the victories of 1934-7. This leadership included both Browder and the present leaders, who were all collectively responsible both for yielding to opportunism and for failing to combat it.

The voice of criticism among the rank and file against the growing opportunism among leading cadres was not entirely absent during these years. Critical voices, however, were silenced by a steady growth of bureaucracy, which made a mockery of democratic centralism. The dishonest methods of ridicule, slander, and gross misrepresentation of the real statements of Party comrades voicing criticism were employed to stifle and silence all criticism. It is a rule of genuine debate always to quote accurately even one's worst enemy, and to refute his strongest arguments, not his weak ones. Nothing else really refutes an opponent. Of course one can win in a debate in this way only by always relying on the truth, and that is why the method of reliance on truth, the scientific method, is the polemical method which is required of all genuine Marxists. An increasing number of Party functionaries did not, during the years of the growth of opportunism after 1936 employ scientific methods of polemic against comrades who voiced legitimate criticisms through regular channels. On the contrary, they put words that were never uttered into the mouths of honest comrades, engaged in the evil and repulsive sport of tearing to pieces straw men, spread libelous slanders by means of anonymous rumours and innuendoes, and then mocked at the comrades who had thus been so grossly misrepresented. By such nefarious methods, the practice of genuine political discussion, of criticism and self-criticism, never employed too extensively or deeply in our Party, were virtually completely driven out of the American movement. Party members were brought up indoctrinated with the fantastic

notion of their enemies, viz. that democratic centralism resembles control of an organization by a military police. Such a bureaucratic crystallization occurred within the Party during the days when Browder was the "spoiled darling" of the present leadership.

Meanwhile, the system of education that crystallized in the Party gave to students in even the most advanced training schools only the most superficial smattering of Marxism. Party teachers who took the teaching of Marxism seriously and who tried to give their students thorough-going and systematic courses of study were constantly being told, "you're giving them too much", "Just give them a little bit". (These are word for word quotations of advice received by the present writer over and over again for approximately fifteen years from leading cadres in the field of education.) Contempt of the Party membership, who were systematically treated like children, was deliberately fostered by functionaries, who treated Marxism much as the medieval clergy treated the Bible, i.e. they kept it from the members while simultaneously "venerating" it in a purely ritualistic manner as a dead dogma.

The preconditions for the liquidation of the Party in 1944 were thoroughly established by a general policy of liquidation systematically followed by the entire Party leadership after 1937. The liquidation of the Party thus started in 1937 with the liquidation of the Party organization in the unions and shops. It was assisted by the growth of bureaucracy and the vulgarization of Marxist education. The Party was already fairly thoroughly liquidated when the already accomplished fact was officially recognized in 1944 by the formation of a Communist Political Association immediately after the dissolution of the C.P. If the dissolution of the Party had not been already nearly accomplished in fact, the official liquidation could not have been carried out with so little opposition.

It was immediately after the adoption of the perspective, held by the present leadership when Browder was their mouthpiece, for long-range post-war class-collaboration that the Party began to lose the respect of the rank and file workers in the unions. The workers overwhelmingly saw the necessity for a temporary tactical alliance with the employers for the specific aim of winning the war against the fascist axis. But when such a temporary tactical alliance between enemy classes, whose basic interests are opposite, was misconstrued into a long-range identity of interests, even backward workers raised their eyebrows and spat in disgust at such pretentious naivete. As one Party comrade described his experience upon trying to explain the Teheran policy to his shopmates, he received the shock of his life when a non-Party worker, whom the Party comrade had considered "backward", looked at him quizzically and said scornfully, "What are you? A hundred per cent American?"

Workers are practical people. The cares and worries of their lives and the totality of their experience force them to be so. They are the victims of much deceit, but they do not readily fall for absolutely fantastic theories which completely deny the hard realities of every-day experience. The workers had begun to respect the Communists as the most realistic and practical leaders of the working class in the 1930's. During the War, however, while learning to respect and admire the Soviet Union, they suddenly discovered that American Communists were talking the nonsense one would expect only from such middle-class liberals as are completely ignorant of the real facts of industrial life. The former prestige of Communists in the unions began to dissipate rapidly.

Naturally the former Party members in the enigmatic C.P.A. did much heroic work for the war effort. So did millions of other non-Party people. Naturally they were energetic (though not energetic enough) in the campaign for a second front. But they did not and could not function as a Party, since there was no Communist Party. Because of their erroneous class-collaborationist post-war perspective, they actually assisted the imperialist bourgeoisie in disseminating false and harmful theories concerning the basic relations between labor and capital. To such a state was the American Communist movement brought before 1945 by failure to detect and check the growth of opportunism.

(To be continued)

(In our next issue, we plan to analyze how the liquidation of all Communist work in the unions, which had started in 1937, was accelerated after the verbal repudiation of Browderism in 1945. We urge comrades to read the instructive article in the April 20th New Times entitled "America's Trade Union Barons".)

An Analysis And a Criticism

By Max Bedacht

Lenin has told us that "imperialism is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat". If we want to understand the Marshall Plan, its purposes and effects, we must analyze it from this Marxist premise. If we do, we cannot escape the conclusion that American capitalism has devised that plan for two parallel and inseparable purposes: one, to secure and entrench its own imperialist domination over the capitalist world; two, to mobilize and unify all available forces of the capitalist world for struggle against and defeat of socialism.

The dominant position held in the world today by American capitalism was not a gift from heaven. Nor was it a reward for superior initiative and enterprise. Instead, it was spawned by the hell of two capitalist wars and nursed by historic and geographic advantages enjoyed by American capitalism.

Already from the first World War, 1914-18, the American ruling class emerged as the strongest single national capitalist group. German imperialism had just lost its war for world domination; the British and French imperialisms had been greatly weakened by the war; Italian imperialism seemed to have been knocked out by it altogether.

In addition to these shifts in the line-up of capitalist powers, at the end of the war and partly as a result of it, a new phenomenon had entered world history. The proletariat of Czarist Russia, under the leadership of its bolshevik socialist party, had cut out for itself one-sixth of the earth's surface and had proceeded to organize and construct upon it a socialist world. This sixth of the world, by action of its peoples under the leadership of its working class, was thus subtracted from the capitalist world and its exploitation.

This event had an electrifying effect upon the advanced sections of the working class of all remaining capitalist countries. It provided them with the invaluable experiences of a successful proletarian revolution; it raised their revolutionary self-confidence into an inexhaustible source of additional courage and initiative.

German Imperialists Prepare for World War II

Immediately after the first World War German imperialism again began to rearm and to prepare for a return bout. In this work it found that its imperialist politics could no longer travel the old road on which the mutual rivalries of the various national capitalist groups provided the only handicaps. A new and even more formidable handicap to imperialist aspirations had arisen -- an anti-imperialist, a socialist world. This force was embodied in the revolutionary proletarian movement everywhere, inspired and led by the victorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union. German imperialism therefore realized that to win their return bout they not only had to subjugate their imperialist rivals, but also had to defeat the growing anti-imperialist, the expanding socialist forces of the world.

The Nazis, who managed the come-back efforts for the German imperialists, therefore prepared for a war on two fronts: the front against their imperialist rivals, and the front against anti-imperialism, against socialism. This dual character was the historic peculiarity of the second World War. It was the living proof of the correctness of Lenin's Marxist statement, that imperialism was the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat.

Out of tactical considerations the Nazis, in their propoganda and in their internal policies, put the war against socialism into the foreground. And this tactic paid off. Because of it, they attracted sympathies and aid for their war preparations even from their intended capitalist victims, French, British and other imperialisms. As a matter of historic fact this policy strengthened them against their capitalist rivals, and, in turn, paralyzed these rivals to such an extent that it brought an imperialist victory within their reach. They were able to overrun and defeat the bourgeois war machines of their neighboring capitalist antagonists. They failed only because they could not overcome the courage, the might and power of their intended Socialist victims, the Soviet Union and the communist-led peoples' resistance movements in the countries they had conquered and occupied. It can therefore be said that their capitalist opponents won the fight against German imperialism only because the Socialist forces of the world won their fight against German fascism.

The seeming strength of American imperialism, in contrast to the tottering conditions in which world capitalism was left by the second World War, automatically conferred upon the American capitalists the position of masters of the capitalist world.

Within the limits which simplifications necessarily prescribe, it can be said that American imperialism has now undertaken the job which German imperialism dismally failed to accomplish, the job of subordinating the capitalist world to its own imperialist domination and exploitation, and, at the same time, of saving the whole world for capitalism by defeating and wiping out socialism. The Marshall plan and its working is one of their means toward this end.

They Can and They Cannot

There are self-styled Communist leaders in America who hotly deny this basic line-up in the international class struggle. They insist, instead, that the real and quite simple problem before us is to believe, and to convince the American capitalists, that their social system and the system of socialism can live peacefully side by side, and that, therefore, their war preparations are unjustified and unnecessary. They are so intent upon proving their thesis that they have abandoned all revolutionary mass struggles and are centering their political demands and actions on capitalist reforms. Thus they have abandoned the only means by which the war can be prevented, mass struggles.

When accused of not believing in capitalist democracy they hotly proceed to prove that they believe in it even more than do the capitalists themselves. When denounced as being dangerous revolutionists (dangerous to capitalism) they hasten to prove that in fact they are harmless.

For these self-styled Marxists, dialectic historic materialism represents an impenetrable mystery. Their simple minds cannot grasp the fact that the question of whether capitalism and socialism can live peacefully side by side can and must be answered in the affirmative and negative at the same time. The answer must be yes when we take capitalism and socialism embodied in countries, the United States of America for capitalism and the Soviet Union for socialism. These two countries surely can live side by side without need of serious conflicts. The immediate problems of neither of these two countries find a serious immediate barrier for their solution in the existence of the other.

The answer must be no when we take capitalism and socialism as rival social concepts and aims. These two social concepts cannot live peacefully side by side. One must strive to defeat the other or face defeat by the other. Their conflicts are not embodied in rivalry between any particular countries, but rather in the struggles between the exploiting and the exploited classes in all capitalist countries.

The Class Struggle Will Not Be Denied

To deny the irrepressible character of this conflict is nothing less than a denial of the class struggle itself. It is a denial of the need for the existence and functioning of a revolutionary Communist Party.

Those who deny it play into the hands of our capitalist enemies. They want it denied. They themselves deny the accumulating explosive forces of revolution at home, produced by their ever intensifying exploitation of the working masses.

Despite this denial, however, they know that the class struggle is a fact. It is being fought not because somebody "preaches" it, but because of irreconcilable interests between the capitalists and the workers, between the exploiters and the exploited. The Communist Manifesto tells us that: "The history of all human society, past and present, has been the history of class struggles.

"Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, baron and serf, guild burgess and journeyman -- in a word, oppressor and oppressed -- stood in sharp opposition each to the other. They carried on perpetual warfare, sometimes masked, sometimes open and acknowledged; a warfare that invariably ended either in revolutionary changes in the whole structure of society, or else in the common ruin of the contending classes....

"Modern bourgeois society, rising out of the ruins of feudal society, did not make an end of class antagonisms. It merely set up new classes in place of the old; new conditions of oppression; new embodiments of struggle."

As long as the working class does fight this struggle only for economic improvements, the political power of the capitalists, with which they protect, strengthen and defend their privileges as exploiters, is not threatened. But when the working masses awaken politically and challenge the rule of the capitalists, then their rights and powers as exploiters become endangered. That is why they persecute people who try to give the workers a class understanding and develop in them class consciousness. As long as the workers do not realize their class position and their need of fighting for political power, the capitalists have a monopoly on preparedness for that struggle. They use that monopoly against the workers, exploit them, rule them, oppress them, club them and jail them.

It never seems to occur to the American workers to inquire why their efforts to improve their conditions of work and raise their earning capacity always bring them in conflict with police and law, while their bosses can carry through any measure against the workers without the slightest danger of any such conflict.

As long as they do not even ask the question, the workers naturally cannot find the answer that: the capitalists are never bothered by police and law in their measures against the working masses because they, the capitalists and their interests in the class struggles, are the law which the police protects. Under these conditions the workers suffer and die with the monstrous illusions in their heads that there is no class struggle.

Efforts to prove that the pro-capitalist and anti-capitalist forces can live peacefully side by side are, therefore, nothing but endeavors to keep the workers helpless in the class struggle. It certainly cannot convince our class enemies that they should stop arming and fighting. It only makes it so much easier for them to sharpen their weapons and to intensify their campaigns against socialism in the world and against the working class at home.

The only possible defense the working masses have against the war preparations and attacks of the capitalists is counter-attack; counter-attack, especially, by mass organisation, mass education and mass mobilization against capitalism and for socialism.

Reformist Theories

Those who deny the acuteness of the class struggles today have adopted Karl Kautsky's concept of imperialism. Kautsky insisted that imperialism is not modern capitalism itself, but is only a policy of it. According to this concept, capitalism can adopt and pursue this policy if it so chooses, but it also can leave it alone.

This Kautskyan separation of capitalist aims and policies from capitalism itself is a denial of Marxism. Instead of seeking the motives for imperialist policies and aims in the conditions of functioning of capitalism in the stage of monopoly and finance capital, it looks for them in the ideals of the capitalist. Good capitalists do not like, and bad capitalists adopt imperialist policies.

Here we have the theoretical source from which our American Party leaders to this very day are drawing their belief in good and bad, in progressive and reactionary capitalists. Of course, there are differences in the make-up and concepts of the individual capitalists. But these differences do not determine the basic policies of a capitalist state. These policies are determined by the conditions of functioning of decisive capital. These wrong concepts in the heads of the leaders of our Party have reduced in their minds the proletarian revolution to an abstraction. That is why they consider agitating, propagandizing and organizing the proletariat for that revolution as a crime punishable by expulsion from the Communist Party. Instead they operate on the assumption of a tremendous inherent strength of American capitalism and adapt their policies to improving and reforming it, to cleanse it from such objectionable features as monopolies, imperialism and fascism. Even the reforms advocated by them they do not try to achieve by the independent political actions of the masses, but rather by action of the good, the progressive capitalists encouraged and strengthened by the support of the working masses.

It is this anti-Marxist conception of capitalism which has led the leadership of our Party to its persistent practice of putting democracy, that is peoples' rule, as synonymous with American capitalist democracy. As a result it is blind to the fact that bourgeois democracy no less than fascism is a form of capitalist dictatorship. Preference for the one or the other is not a matter of principle with the capitalists, but one of expediency. As long as lack of working class consciousness makes out of the workers themselves political props of the capitalist system, bourgeois democracy suits the purposes and completely satisfies the capitalists. But as growing class consciousness on the part of the proletariat begins to threaten and challenge their rule, the capitalists will and do prefer fascism.

We Communists, therefore, know that we cannot effectively fight fascism without attacking capitalism itself. Of course, that does not mean that we refuse to fight against fascism together with those anti-fascists who do not yet understand that. But it does mean that even in our common anti-fascist struggles with those non-Communists we never abandon our anti-capitalist premise for that struggle. On the contrary, we do everything in our power to make it understood and accepted also by our non-Communist, anti-fascist allies. By doing exactly that have our Bulgarian, Rumanian, Polish and other fellow Communists succeeded in replacing their capitalist democracies with peoples democracies.

Purposes of the Marshall Plan

Keeping in mind that the conditions of life of American imperialism demand a reconquest and a saving of the world for capitalism, while establishing its own

economic domination over that world, we can divide the purposes of the Marshall Plan into four major aims.

1. American imperialism has designed the Marshall Plan to help it to get hold of the available markets of the world by exploiting the desperate needs of the people in all capitalist countries. As a condition of Marshall Plan aid, American imperialism places virtual mortgages against the political and economic potentialities of these countries and thus subjects them to its will. It actually strips its "Marshall Plan allies" of their sovereign power.

2. With the stranglehold thus secured on the Marshall Plan countries and their peoples, American imperialism forces them, despite their poverty, to spend tremendous sums for rearmament in furtherance of its own war aims.

3. With the stranglehold thus secured, American imperialism also forces these countries to carry through a strictly anti-labor policy as an intended "safeguard" against what they call possible socialist experiments. Any resistance of the people of these countries against these policies is met, again by order from Washington, with fascist measures of suppression.

4. As a by-product, the Marshall Plan was also meant to slow up, if not entirely to forestall, the economic crisis which the drying up of the war markets and the need of reorganizing production from war to peace standards was creating.

Let us now examine the actual successes or failures of the Marshall Plan by considering its effect on its different purposes. While doing that, let us remind ourselves that the "rich uncle act" of the Marshall Plan is also supposed to sell capitalism to the masses of Europe. Altogether too many of them, for the peace of mind of our American imperialists, are showing a readiness to try socialism as a way out of permanent war and misery produced by capitalism. The pretended dollar rain from America is to prove what kind of goose is really able to lay golden eggs.

Americans Grab Capitalist Markets

Since Marshall Plan aid has reached France, the prices of all necessities of life in that country have almost doubled. At the same time, unemployment is very high and still increasing. The Marshall Plan is directly responsible for this growing misery among the French masses. It dictates the conditions of the country's foreign trade. It prevents it from improving its trade relations with Eastern Europe. As a result, for example, cheaper Polish coal is taboo, while the expensive American coal, payable in the all too scarce American dollars, has raised the coal dollar debt alone of the French republic to six hundred millions of that precious valuta. Despite this catastrophic pyramiding of debts on coal imports alone, France, within three and a half years, could import only 75% of the quantities of coal it used in the pre-war period within one single year. Consequently its steel industry can work only up to a maximum of 60% of its capacity.

The American products of Ford, of General Motors Corp., are flooding the country while the extensive French auto industry of pre-war days is choked to death for Marshall Plan fostered scarcity of raw materials.

Other Marshall Plan countries do not fare any better. Belgian industry, for example, is dependent for its functioning on the import of raw materials. But the management of the Marshall Plan is interested not in shipping raw materials into that country, but in dumping in it American commodities almost to the limit of the financial import capacity of the country. Because of that the native Belgian industry is unable to function. Out of a total of 1,800,000 workers, more than 300,000 are unemployed. And this figure is rising.

In Holland, too, the recovery plan is no aid to recovery. General Clay in Germany prevented the export of German coal to Holland. For want of that coal the Dutch industries must keep their functioning below par. Since German coal used to be paid for by the products of Dutch truck gardeners, these products have now no market and are rotting by the thousands of tons. At the same time, with growing unemployment, the prices of the necessities of life have risen and are still going up in that country.

Italian industries are working only part time. Some are closed down altogether. American commodities are flooding the market and undersell the products of native industry. At the same time, Italy is financially unable to pay for importing the raw materials required by the native industry. Because of that, the unemployed in Italy number at least two and a half millions. The government which American imperialism imposed upon the Italian people carries through a policy of systematic intensification of the misery of the masses.

The manoeuvres of the American monopoly capitalists with the help of the Marshall Plan have already given direct control to American capital of many important industrial units in Europe. In France and Italy, General Motors and other mammoth American corporations have already taken over control of world-known concerns like

the Fiat works in Italy, etc. Here we have a manifestation of efforts which are peculiar to imperialism, the export of capital.

This tendency breeds future woes for the American working class. With the growing of their investments and the expansion of their monopolies into European countries, the American capitalists will put out increasing quantities of commodities with labor having living and earning standards considerably below those of the American workers. Thus the "competition" of cheaper European labor will be engineered and manipulated by the American capitalists and corporations against the workers of America. These workers will be forced either to agree to a lowering of their living and earning standards to those of European labor, or they will be made idle, unemployed. It is this future, which Phil Murray's "minister of foreign affairs", James B. Carey, is trying to sell to the American workers by trying to sell them on the Marshall Plan.

A different form of the tendency to export capital is manifested in another phase of the workings of the Marshall Plan. Congress in Washington has worked out a list of materials it requires France to deliver in payment for Marshall Plan aid. From Morocco it wants lead and zinc. From Guiana it wants bauxite. The American aluminum monopoly has acquired not only a monopoly to purchase that material but even the right to prospect for and exploit new bauxite deposits.

In the French colonies where the native people revolt against the unprecedented exploitation by foreign capital and insist on democratic self-rule, there, with the aid of the American government, a colonial reign of terror is maintained. In Cochinchina, in Cameroon, in Madagascar, the imperialist "allies for the defence of democracy", France and America, carry through a merciless war against the native people.

Saving Capitalism

The Marshall Plan was supposed to be, primarily, a plan to aid the economic and social recovery of the nations from the destructive effects of the war. Does it effect that recovery? It does not.

The war, with its colossal destruction of lives, homes and means of production, has left capitalism helplessly bankrupt. This is not the kind of financial bankruptcy which loans and gifts could avert. It is bankruptcy of a social system. That system can no longer feed the people. The cost of the services of capitalism to the people, cost in lives, in misery and exploitation, has grown to such proportions that it is completely out of proportion to their value. As a result, the people rightfully look for a change. They are growing ever more unwilling to suffer the painful efforts of "recovery" when this recovery means nothing but the recovery of the rule of and exploitation by the very class which has created the chaos of war and its aftermath in the first place. Increasing masses of people want their efforts of recovery to benefit themselves.

When we look for the value of the Marshall Plan as an aid to recovery, we must, therefore, keep in mind that what is meant by recovery is not recovery pure and simple. There is a choice between two kinds of recovery -- recovery of capitalist power and exploitation, with its unemployment and resulting misery, with its wars and resulting destruction and death -- and there is an economic recovery under peoples democracies through socialism, with the peoples themselves taking control of their sources of life, security and wealth, a recovery without recurring unemployment and misery, without repeated wars and death.

When we consider the Marshall Plan in this light we can clearly see that it does not work. It cannot succeed in rebuilding capitalism into an acceptable and reasonably functioning social system. It cannot do that even within the limits of its possible success, because the extra special super-profits which American monopoly capital will extract as its reward for recovery aid will negate again all improvements. It can only prevent real recovery which could be effected by peoples democracies and a peoples' economy.

Bootstrap Lifting

That the bankruptcy of capitalism, which the Marshall Plan is to prevent, is not just a temporary financial embarrassment, but a basic social collapse, can be clearly recognized when we contemplate the contradiction in capitalist economy itself, as revealed by the working of the Marshall Plan. The plan, ostensibly, intends to reestablish the economy of the Marshall Plan countries by 1952-53. To determine the actually needed aid in dollars and cents each country had to work out a plan and budget for such recovery.

Since the countries have no dollar valuta to make up for any unfavourable one, their first efforts are centered on "creating" a favorable trade balance. But these efforts lead them into a vicious circle. All the countries involved are impoverished. Britain, for example, is forced to reduce its allowable and possible im-

ports to 80% of its pre-war import figures. To accumulate the needed valuta to pay even for these reduced imports, it raised the sight of its expected exports to 150% of pre-war figures. Similar financial conditions force France to take similar measures.

Now such playing with figures is an easy job -- on paper. But will reality live up to these conveniently juggled figures? It will not -- because it cannot. Why not? Well, increased exports of any country necessarily require increased imports by some others. Now where are the countries that will and can absorb the increased exports of one country or set of countries. There are none -- at least not in Europe -- except, perhaps, the peoples democracies of Eastern Europe. But Marshall Plan pressure works overtime to prevent the satellites of America from trading with Eastern Europe.

Yes, Britain wants less imports and more exports. But so does France, so do the other Marshall Plan countries. Now pre-war Britain supplied a good market for the products of the French luxury industries. But forced to reduce its imports by 20%, and unwilling to take that reduction out of essential necessities, Britain wants to cut its imports of French luxury articles more than 20%. So what happens to the expected increase of French exports? The increase turns into a decrease and upsets the Marshallian apple cart.

Business is Business

But perhaps rich America will be willing and ready to absorb these extra export goods from the Marshall Plan countries and thus supply them with the desperately needed dollar valuta? Will America do that? Most decidedly, it will not. Marshall Plan magnanimity is a very attractive facade; but behind that facade American capitalism does business as usual, business for profits only, loads of profits. If exports can be increased, America will increase them itself. In fact, even its Marshall Plan aid is sent in the form of goods; goods American capital wants to sell, not necessarily goods the Marshall Plan countries need for their economic recovery.

Thus, for example, the Marshall Plan exports American-made spaghetti and macaroni to Italy, the classical country of spaghetti and macaroni manufacture. It is exporting large quantities of American-grown tobacco to France, though France is itself a tobacco producing and exporting country. Yes, it is even exporting American manufactured mal-de-mer medicines to European peoples who never did and never expect to undertake ocean voyages.

An Austrian deputy recently complained bitterly that the Marshall Plan assignments to that poverty-stricken country comprise large quantities of American nitrate for fertilizer, while the native nitrate industry must close down because it cannot market its products. He protests further that instead of needed machinery to put the native industry back on its feet, the Marshall Plan dumps tons and tons of mechanical pencils upon people who do not need them, and, if they needed them, are too poor to buy them.

One recalls that the Marshall Planners insist that their "aid" aims at the economic recovery of the countries it services and at proving the superiority of capitalism over socialism. So one cannot overlook the question of whether these particular shipments represent good politics. But the very principles of capitalism answer back -- "what good are good politics if they are not also good and profitable business?" Getting rid of these goods is good business; therefore, automatically it must also be good politics.

Eat Less So Capitalism Can Live.

Another revealing example of the "services" rendered to the peoples of the various countries by the Marshall Plan can be found in the instructions issued by the directors of the Plan to Sweden. These instructions contain three important points. One, the living standard of the people of Sweden must be lowered. Two, the Swedish valuta must be devalued. Three, the Swedish forests must be exploited more effectively.

Does the required lowering of the living standards of the Swedish people mean that their capitalists will now move into less pretentious homes, will eat less expensive foods and wear more simple clothing. It means nothing of the sort. It simply means that wages will be reduced so that those already burdened with low living standards will be forced to adopt still lower ones.

The devaluation of the kronor is surely not designed to supply more wealth to the Swedish people; instead it is intended to supply more profits to the American exporters at the expense of the Swedish peoples.

The third directive is to make up through increased exports for the losses

sustained by the devaluation of the kroner. At the same time it is to depress the prices of imported Swedish woodworks and lumber still further, again for the benefit of the American importers.

Recovery, indeed. Recovery of fatter profits for the American capitalists at the price of greater impoverization of the "recovering" countries.

It is quite obvious that the result of such "aid" will eventually be that the economic life of the Marshall Plan countries will reach a shaky measure of relative stabilization. But in the process these countries will turn into semi-colonial appendices of American imperialism; whatever resistance they will offer to this process will add sharpening struggles between the imperialist rivals to the sharpening class struggles between exploiters and exploited. Eventually, even the Atlantic Pact will not be able to keep its signatories off each other's throats.

Therefore, instead of strengthening capitalism economically and ideologically against socialism, the Marshall Plan, actually and in the long run, will further weaken and undermine it.

Now let us proceed to a consideration of another major objective of the Marshall Plan.

Marshall Plan Prepares for War

American imperialism, despite the smooth and sweet name it has selected for its plan, is fully aware of its real character. That is why all of its economic measures, undertaken with the pretense of helping the people, are accompanied by political measures designed to suppress and defeat them. One of these measures, and the most important one, is the pressure upon all Marshall Plan countries for rearmament. This rearmament is not alone a preparation for a new world war, for a war against the peoples democracies of the world; it is directed at the same time against the aspirations of the peoples in the Marshall Plan countries themselves, against their endeavors to achieve bearable conditions of life, against their growing desire to throw off the yoke of capitalist exploitation, oppression and wars. The use by the French Marshall Plan government of the army against the French coal miners is an example of that.

The present budget of Britain assigns to so-called national defense purposes eight times as much as had been assigned during the years 1938 and 1939 when Nazi attacks were in preparation against that country.

France, which during the past year benefitted by the Marshall Plan to the tune of 280 billion of francs, is forced by the same Marshall Plan to spend 350 billion of francs for war preparations. And this sum represents only the admitted armament expenditures. In the Chamber of Deputies, it was charged that another 150 billions of francs for military expenditures were hidden under other headings of the proposed budgetary expenditures. Said the New York Herald Tribune on January 8th: "It is interesting to note that fully one-fourth of the expected expenditures of the French budget are assigned to national defense. This amount represents a heavy burden for French economy. Yet," so the Herald Tribune concludes, "even these expenditures must be considered insufficient."

Here we run into one of the many contradictions of capitalism. It takes deliberate, and what it considers effective, measures to make the people accept it to keep it going. But the results of these efforts promise to be the kind achieved by King Frederick William I of Prussia; whenever this king, on the streets of Berlin, got within the reach of a luckless citizen, he would belabor that citizen's back and head with his cane and cry out, "I will make you love me yet!" Needless to say, Frederick William I of Prussia died even more unbeloved by "his" subjects than he had lived.

American Imperialism as "King Maker"

The use of the Marshall Plan as a means of pressure on the internal politics of the Marshall Plan countries is imperialism 'sans phrase'. While formally pretending the maintenance of their sovereign power, these countries have even the composition of their governments imposed upon them. In France, for example, one of the pre-conditions for Marshall Plan aid was the removal of the strongest political party in the land, the Communists, as participant in the government. In Italy, in Greece, in China, the American dollar is trying to dictate, and in the latter countries American soldiers are trying to force upon the people, semi-fascist and fascist governments. The Social Democrats call these Marshall Plan-made governments a "Third force". However, that name represents nothing but a threadbare rag with which they try to cover the stark nakedness of their betrayal of the people.

In France, the Marshall Planners, while having spawned the present so-called "third force" government, are obviously working for the institution of a native fascist dictatorship under DeGaulle.

In Western Germany, the American imperialists demonstrate their true objective by a systematic reintegration of the Nazis into the machinery of government.

In Greece, our American masters make the military personnel and units of the United States Army, who have no business being in Greece in the first place, play the contemptible role of Hessians. As such they help murder the Greek people because these people fight their fascist oppressors. The Marshall Planners on their part prefer the rule of the royal fascists in Greece to a rule of the country by the Greek people. The Marshall Planners and their military forces would like to play a similar role in China.

The American imperialists foster clerical reaction in Italy, although the stench of such a past reactionary rule is still bothering the political nostril of the Italian people today, some 90 years after they overthrew it. Even the Encyclopaedia Britannica, surely above suspicion of radicalism, in describing Popish secular rule, has to report that "Leo XII proved a ferocious reactionary under whom barbarous laws were enacted and tortures frequently applied". That a clerical rule today could be just as ferociously reactionary as it was under Leo XII and Gregory XVI is conclusively proven by the "extreme pleasure" and "deep satisfaction" which strike-breaking afforded our own New York Archbishop, Cardinal Spellman.

In all this "king making" the Marshall Plan so far has been successful. But eventually its successes will defeat its aims. The successes will eventually dissolve for the people the sweet phrases about "democracy" and peoples' "rights" into their stark reality of American imperialist dictatorship and exploitation. Eventually, this will open the eyes of even the blindest of its now willing slaves, and help destroy their confidence in capitalism.

We Communists Must Speak Up

For us here at home, these imperialist maneuvers of our Marshall Planners all over the world also present a most serious task. The actions of strangulating the rights of the peoples for the sake of richer profit chances are designed to make them easier, that is, more helpless victims. The sugary phrases about these actions are designed mostly for home consumption. They are intended to make the American masses sit by inactively, except for applauding the maneuvers of their masters as selfless samaritans to starving peoples somewhere in the world. If we Communists do not try to defeat them in these efforts, we make ourselves accessories to the crimes of the American imperialists against these peoples; in addition, we help our masters slip the noose of fascism and slavery, which they force on the necks of these peoples, also around our own necks, around the necks of the American people.

It is here in place to point to a corollary of the Marshall Plan campaign of the ruling class of our country, their all out offensive against Communism and against our Communist Party.

A Capitalist Offensive Against Socialism

For quite some period now our ruling class has carried on an hysterical offensive against our Communist Party, against its principles and aims, and against its members. The major cause and purposes of this offensive are obvious. At this time every measure of our imperialist government, whether applied to the people at home or to the foreign relations of our country, is designed to serve the paramount plans of preparing for and provoking an imperialist war against all anti-imperialist forces at home and abroad, and to complete the subjugation of all of the nations of the world to their imperialist exploitation. The offensive of our ruling class against Communism, the Communists and their Party, therefore, purposes to aid the Marshall Plan achieve its aims. Their offensive against socialism is designed:

First, to create among the American people an increasingly favorable atmosphere for ever more outrageous provocations against the spearhead of the world anti-imperialist forces, the Soviet Union;

Second, to dull the senses of the American people to the rapidly intensifying fascistisation at home by means of incessantly repeating the hysteric cry of "stop thief";

Third, to weaken and, if possible, to destroy the Communist Party, the only possible organizer and leader of a peoples' opposition to their imperialist policies and efforts;

Fourth, to conceal from the people, as much as this is possible and at their expense, their rapidly deteriorating economy;

Fifth, to discredit in the minds of the American masses Communism and its principles, thereby lessening or eliminating the danger that these masses eventually turn from ever increasing capitalist enslavement, exploitation and wars, to the beckoning freedom, security and peace of a socialist people's economy.

Unfortunately, the roots of our Communist Party in the American masses are neither deep nor strong enough to enable it to initiate and lead an effective and all-out political counter-offensive; fortunately, however, our Party is strong enough (and the position of American capitalism and its economy are weak enough) to promise success to an agitational counter-offensive.

By means of such an agitational counter-offensive, our Party could strengthen and deepen Marxist-Leninist understanding and convictions among its members.

By means of such an agitational counter-offensive, our Party could recruit increasingly greater masses against the imperialist war danger.

By means of such an agitational counter-offensive, our Party could set masses, and ever increasing masses, into motion and thus build up the only force that can end the war danger and give strength to the aims and demands of a politically conscious working class.

By means of such an agitational counter-offensive, our Party could bolshevize itself and develop the subjective forces required for a challenge by the American working class of the political rule by the capitalists of our country, its economy and its people.

Our American Communist Party cannot defend its failure to carry through such an agitational offensive before the international revolutionary movement. It is about time that it again reminds itself of the advice of Karl Marx, given in his famous letter of November 23, 1871, to Bolte in New York: "Where the working class is not yet sufficiently advanced in its organization," says Marx, "for undertaking a decisive campaign against the political power of the ruling classes, it must under all circumstances be trained for this by incessant agitation against the hostile political attitude of the ruling class against us. If we fail in this, it (the working class) remains a plaything in the latter's hands."

Because of its refusal to accept its revolutionary responsibility in the country of leadership of international counter revolution, the American people do not hear the people's side of the Marshall Plan story. They only hear the noises, and nothing but them, over the radio, out of the columns of their newspapers, out of the pages of their magazines, in movies, from the pulpits and from the lecturer's dais in the college class rooms. They only hear the ever droning din of propaganda and of misinformation against the peoples' efforts for freedom and security; they hear the never-ending assurances of sweet intentions and godly deeds on the part of our ruling class; they only hear the propaganda about their god-given mission to save the world. They are not permitted to hear the groans of the victims of these imperialist efforts to coin ever more profits out of ever increased misery of ever more peoples. If we Communists do not open the way to the ears of the American masses for these sounds of pain and agony, of protest and of accusation, we stand convicted as accessories to their tortures, and, in addition, will be doomed to join them and share their full measure of misery.

Here we again meet in real life the identity of imperialism and capitalism. The columns of the newspapers prove it. The radio shouts it hour after hour through the atmosphere; the church expresses it in its prayers and preachings; the colleges prove it by their imperialist teachings; above all, our American government demonstrates it in all of its measures and actions.

To fight the efforts of imperialism we must attack capitalism. To defeat imperialism we must destroy capitalism. To accomplish this gigantic task we must first unite all of its victims, make them conscious of the true character of the beast, teach them uniformly to hate it and organize them so that unitedly they can fight and destroy it, unitedly at home, unitedly with all the other peoples of the world.

The Marshall Plan and Economic Crisis in the U.S.A.

We have left for consideration the progress toward one more objective of the Marshall Plan: The slowing up or stopping of the economic crisis at home. It could, of course, never function as a stopper. Nothing can work as a stopper of crises under capitalism. Capitalist economy cannot slip out of its own skin. Perpetual prosperity dangles before the eyes of capitalism like perpetual motion. The principles for both have long been known; but the practice for both is proven unattainable.

In their efforts of prolonging, and if possible perpetuating, prosperity at the close of the last World War, our capitalist masters have mixed into the Marshall Plan some of these principles. They have added to the organized and prepaid dumping of American produced commodities, by means of the Marshall Plan aid, preparations for a new war.

Considering the comparatively small percentage of the total output of American production which goes into the stock pile of the Marshall Plan, we are justified in

saying that without the continuation of armaments production the Marshall Plan could hardly act even as an effective makeshift brake to the onrushing crisis. Even so it accomplishes little.

During the war, market restrictions demanded the stretching of the time of use of old implements of home and life. As a result, a considerable market was created for the end of the war. Inability to buy many things during the war also helped to accumulate at least part of the funds necessary for that eventually needed buying. Because of that, the immediate so-called post war business prospect did not look bad. Of course this favorable market could not stretch beyond the distance of the money reserves of the people. Therefore, the end of the hoped for post-war prosperity remained in sight. The Marshall Plan, together with new armament expenditures and consequently extra curricular production, were to help push that end further away or, of possible, push it out of sight altogether.

Actually little was accomplished in that respect. What the added market of the Marshall Plan and of new war productions might have accomplished was negated again by the ferocious profit appetites of our rulers. Through inflationary price manipulations, they exhausted the available money reserves of the people with extra speed. So, with the money they had saved, the workers' housewives could only buy one, or at the very most two, utensils for the three or four that were worn out during the war period. The added market of new armaments and of the Marshall Plan helped our capitalists to put over that steal. Thus the market of new armaments and of the Marshall Plan aid, instead of becoming a force to shove the end of prosperity beyond sight, in a manner of speaking, became ropes which tied them down and kept them well within sight. So today the crisis is turning the corner and is already reaching out to snatch the jobs, and with the jobs the soup pots, from under the noses of the masses of the people.

Elusive Prosperity

As stated before, the principles of perpetual prosperity, as of perpetual motion, are known. As for perpetual prosperity under capitalism, these principles can be put into one word: War. While a war is in progress "prosperity" is with us. War produces the most ideal market for capitalist economy. War production is production for destruction; not merely for destruction in general, but in addition for the particular destruction of the very products of war production. The more is produced the more is needed. Therefore, under capitalism, in war and in war alone, the demand rises with the supply. The poverty of the masses is no barrier to profits for the capitalist masters out of war production. Mortgages placed on present and future generations of the nation supply a collateral which the war profiteers can and do turn into immediate legal tender.

There is only one little difficulty in this admirable set up. With the principle of perpetual motion, the difficulty is friction; with the principle of perpetual prosperity under capitalism, it is human life. Where should the future generations come from when the present generations are killed off? Who should honor the IOUs drawn on them when there are no future generations? Who is going to do the work and of whom could be made profit, when the workers are killed off? Who is to do the soldiering in the next war when all the possible cannon fodder is being devoured by the present?

Despite these decided drawbacks of war as a source of its permanent prosperity (prosperity at least while the war lasts) capitalism is drawn to it again and again, as moths are irresistibly drawn to the light. Thus, aside from their use for knocking out imperialist rivals, wars look desirable to capitalists even as an end in themselves. War mongering, so to speak, becomes a method of drumming up new business. So, Marshall Plan and war preparations, combined, supply them not only with immediate sources of satisfactory profits, but their promise for newer and greater wars offers the capitalists definitely happy expectations of even greater profits. To be sure, these profits must be paid for with the labor and blood of the present and of future generations. But what of it? People, their lives and their happiness, mean nothing to the imperialists. To them, the people are only objects of exploitation. If they cannot be exploited, then they are of no earthly use and may just as well be killed off. On the other hand, if their destruction is profitable, well then they die for a good cause, for profits and ever more profits. For the sake of a little more profit for the quarry owners and the contractors, the capitalists will even permit the people, and at the peoples' expense, to erect monuments to the poor victims.

Of course, there actually is a road to perpetual prosperity. But capitalism cannot travel that road. Only the masses can travel it. This road leads over the dead body of capitalism into Socialism. Socialism and Socialism alone embodies for the masses eventual perpetual prosperity.

Conclusions

Some of the people are impressed by the seeming magnanimity of American imper-

ialism. They believe in the propaganda of its own selflessness. Some are enthused about the professed devotion of our imperialists to the peoples' rights. They believe in the words of love about the lamb, uttered by the wolf while he devours that lamb. Some are overwhelmed by the apparent richness and power of American imperialism. They stick to the surface and allow appearances to deceive them.

It is the duty of the Communists to undeceive all of these categories.

American imperialism loudly protests (with some support from unexpected quarters) against the Marxian conclusion that capitalism can no longer serve the people, that its system has become unbearably oppressive and is bankrupt. Our capitalists denounce as treason any peoples' endeavors to effect a revolutionary change and reconstruct their social and economic relationships on a new, on a socialist basis; not treason to anything in particular, but treason pure and simple.

"Look at me," American capitalism shouts, "am I not rich? Am I not strong? Yes, I admit," so it says, "that the capitalists in some spots in the world are in difficulties. But that is not a social ailment. Why -- capitalism itself is society, incarnate. There can be no other society. Outside of capitalism there can be only chaos."

"No, decidedly not," our capitalists assure us, "the spots of capitalist bankruptcy here and there are not social, they are only financial problems. And we, the solvent, the rich, the powerful American capitalists, we declare ourselves able and willing to mend these bankrupt spots -- for a consideration, of course. And what we ask of the peoples of the world for our service is really not for us -- it is for the peoples' own good -- for saving -- not capitalism, but the people and their society. And it is so little to ask for such a tremendous service as we are eager to render. All we ask is that you, the people, yes all the peoples of the whole world, work ever and ever a little harder and a little faster -- (that is if you can find jobs), and that ever and ever you eat a little less (that is if you can find anything to eat at all), so that we, the capitalists, can make ever and ever a little more and ever more profits."

What is our Communist answer to this capitalist planning? Our answer must be incessant efforts to show up every claim of our masters as the lie and deception it is. Thus we must educate and organize the working masses for the defeat and abolishment of capitalism.

However, before we can do that, we must ourselves stop being overawed by the wealth and power of our American capitalist masters. This great strength of our class enemy merely reflects our own extreme political weaknesses, the weaknesses of the American working class. In the degree in which we American Communists help to overcome these political weaknesses, in that degree will the strength of American capitalism ebb away.

Meanwhile we American Communists must keep before our eyes Lenin's teaching that the capitalist chain is not as strong as its strongest, but rather is as weak as its weakest link. American capitalism, in its historic aspects, is no stronger than world capitalism. It cannot be taken out of its connection with the rest of the capitalist world and judged only by itself. It cannot live without that connection. It may be the still comparatively healthy and red cheeked part of a rotting apple; but it is not the healthy portion of the apple which eventually conquers the rotting, but it is the rottenness which inevitably destroys the remaining health.

Yes, imperialism is the eve of the proletarian revolution. Since the time Lenin wrote that, the eve of the old has advanced toward the dawn of a new day. This new day is still a day of struggle, to be sure; it is still a day of hard work and necessary sacrifices -- but it is a day representing on its part the eve of victory -- victory for Socialism in the world.

The question we must constantly ask and answer for ourselves in action is, What are we American Communists going to contribute to that victory?

* * * * *

MATERIAL USEFUL FOR BUILDING THE PEACE MOVEMENT

The New Times, No. 19, of May 4th, 1949, contains a 55 page Supplement containing Materials from the World Congress for Peace held in Paris and Prague, April 20-25, 1949. These Materials contain the entire texts or brief summaries of many important speeches, the Manifesto of the Congress, its Resolution on the Organization and Activities of the Committee of the World Congress for Peace, etc. This Supplement should be carefully studied and widely circulated all over our country. One speaker after another at that Congress warned that the honor of America is at stake. To keep our country from following the shameful path of Nazi Germany, it is necessary that every peace-loving American citizen be aroused. The proceedings of the Paris Peace Congress can be effectively utilized to this end.

HOW THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY IN THE FOLEY SQUARE INQUISTION
AGAINST THE AMERICAN BILL OF RIGHTS TRIES TO HIDE AND DISTORT
THE PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM

A gross caricature of Marxism has been presented by the prosecution and its stool-pigeons in the present Foley Square Inquisition directed against the traditional Constitutional rights of the American people. Of course it was from the beginning a foregone conclusion that a prosecuting Attorney would present a caricature of Marxism. However, it is instructive to analyze how such distortions by prosecutors are concocted.

The worst type of distortion, as is well known, is to jerk certain propositions out of context from a reasoned argument based on factual proof and to present them in disconnected and fragmentary form without the proof, the qualifications, and the explanations which make them valid and intelligible. Such a procedure always hides the basic content of any theory so mutilated. Such an unscientific procedure has always been the method of prosecuting attorneys and the police in their efforts to distort Marxism and every other democratic philosophy, theory, or program.

For one thing, the prosecution and its "witnesses", who brazenly testified that for years they have been liars, hide the Marxist proof of the fact that bourgeois-democracy, such as our own "democracy", is not democracy-in-general, but is in actual fact a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. They hide the fact that Communists are the best defenders of those democratic rights which were originally incorporated into the present Constitution of the U.S. While the prosecution and its stool-pigeons themselves flagrantly violate the democratic rights incorporated in the U.S. Constitution, they try to make it appear that bourgeois-democracy is the only possible form of democracy, and try to create the false impression that Communists are opposed to democracy on principle! They hide the fact that Marxism proves that every state is the dictatorship of some class. Not only do they hide the Marxist proof that the best capitalist democracy is in fact a brutal rule by a handful of exploiters over the immense majority of toiling people, but they also try to hide the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the democratic rule by the immense majority of the people over a handful of exploiters. Moreover, by loudly accusing Communists of advocating violence, they try to hide the fact that it is the capitalists who are disturbing the whole world with their frenzied drive toward a war of monstrous dimensions, who try to bully the whole world with threats of using their hideous atomic bomb, an offensive weapon aimed at civilian populations, while it is Communists all over the world who are most active in work for peace. They hide the fact that the Soviet Union was born out of the struggle for peace and that from the hour of its birth it has striven continuously for peace, while capitalists have not refrained from any crime in their effort to foment wars aimed at destroying the Soviet Union and conquering the world.

In fact, the prosecution attempts to hide the whole of Marxism. Marxism does not consist of mere shouting, "I believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat, I do, I do". Marxism is a scientific demonstration that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary, and the starting point of Marxism is the merciless exposure of the hideous exploitation of the masses by capitalism.

A most instructive example of falsification by the prosecution is afforded by its gross distortion of Stalin's famous History of the C.P.S.U.

By the time-worn devices of false and equivocal indirect quotations and by some direct quotations presented out of context from a scientific and historical work of major world importance, the prosecution seeks to make it appear that Communists are evil conspirators who love violence as such and who seek to overthrow a democratic government by an insurrection on the part of a minority clique! The falsifications of the prosecution can be easily exposed by circulating Stalin's great book, The History of the C.P.S.U., in serial form and in cheap editions all over the U.S.

The world famous History of the C.P.S.U., prepared by an editorial Commission of the C.P.S.U., of which Stalin was a member, and written for the most part by Stalin, reveals graphically how the workers and peasants of Tzarist Russia were literally goaded into revolt by the most savage despotism, which denied the people even the pretense of even the most elementary rights. That this was so is known by almost everyone. That revolutions are always caused by the intolerable oppression of the masses by their exploiters and never by mere

"advocacy" (the notion of philosophical idealists) is a cardinal principle of Marxism, demonstrated by all past history, and proven theoretically by the brilliant pages in Stalin's History which expound the philosophy of dialectical materialism.

The History of the C.P.S.U. reveals that after the overthrow of Tzarist despotism in February, 1917, a Provisional Government was appointed by the former Duma. That Duma consisted only of landlords and capitalists elected before the war by the propertied classes. The Provisional Government was not appointed by a newly elected Congress of the people of Russia and of the other nations that had been oppressed by Tzarist autocracy. The Provisional Government, of which Kerensky became the head in May, 1917, was never elected by anyone. It refused to carry out the will of the people as voiced by innumerable, elected, representative bodies of workers and peasants. It openly flouted the will of the Russian people. It postponed - in the face of continuous demands - the convening of any representative body to establish a representative government of the people. Finally, it fired upon a peaceful demonstration of workers, outlawed the Party of the working class, and tried to suppress its press.

The Bolshevik Party opposed all pseudo-"leftist" proposals that any small minority should undertake to overthrow the Provisional Government, even though that government was non-representative and had been appointed by the Tzarist landlord-capitalist Duma. It went to the masses with its program for establishing an elected, representative government of workers and peasants, a Soviet Government, and sought the approval of the masses in an election. The Bolsheviks formed an electoral coalition with other parties after July, 1917, on the platform "All power to the Soviets". The masses voted on the Bolshevik program in the elections to the Soviets during the months of August and September, 1917. The Bolshevik coalition received a decisive majority of the votes in these elections. The masses in these elections voted for Soviet power. The overthrow of the widely hated, appointed Provisional Government in October 1917, was, therefore, carried out by the masses, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, only after that Party had received a mandate from the workers and peasants. The Soviet Government was, therefore, the first elected, representative government that the people of Russia ever had in their long history. Moreover, it was the first truly representative government that the working people of any country ever had, since it was a government of workers and peasants. The defeated minority of capitalists and landlords and their agents refused to yield to the will of the workers and peasants as expressed in the elections to the Soviets, rebelled against the government chosen by the masses of Russia, thus plunged their country into Civil War, and, as traitors, assisted foreign powers to invade their country in their efforts to destroy the government chosen by the toiling people.

All these facts may be learned from Stalin's great book, one of the world-historical scientific masterpieces of our epoch. These facts should be widely known. They completely expose the prosecution in the present Inquisition against the Constitution of the U.S. as having absolutely no concern whatsoever for the actual contents of a book about which it shouts in the effort to malign a philosophy and a political movement which have been legal in the U.S. for 100 years and which are widely revered with increasing fervor all over the world as the inevitable outgrowth of the whole past history of mankind.

ANOTHER PROOF OF THE NEED TO STUDY THE HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U. IN THE U.S.

In our May 1st bulletin, we warned that comrades should "not allow the version of Marxism presented by government stoolpigeons and also by pseudo-'leftists' to hide the well-known Leninist principle that other than the pathway of democracy there is no pathway to socialism". As if to prove the warning that pseudo-"leftists", whatever their intentions, do often present the same caricature of Marxism as that of prosecuting attorneys and their "witnesses", a bulletin, pretending to be Marxist and anti-opportunist, has since that time brazenly referred to "Marxism presented correctly by McGohey"! ("Turning Point", May, 1949, p.11). On the same page, this bulletin blandly declared "This 'version of Marxism' (McGohey's - eds.) does not 'hide' any 'well-known Leninist principle' ". In reference to an assertion of the well-known fact that the advocacy of socialism is not a crime according to the U.S. Constitution and that, according to the Constitution, it is not a crime for the working class majority in the U.S. actually to change totally the present

form of government, this bulletin asserted on the same page, "Of course it's a crime"! This same bulletin, by distorted accounts and omissions from quoted passages, also accused our bulletin of declaring that capitalists will peacefully allow the establishment of socialism by Constitutional amendment, whereas our main point in the remarks attacked and not quoted fully was that "The trial of men for exercising their Constitutional right to advocate that the people exercise their Constitutional right to change the Constitution proves the Marxist lesson that capitalists employ violence to prevent entirely legal and peaceful democratic changes" ("Toward Socialism", Issue 11, May 1st, 1949). Our article itself is a sufficient reply to the misrepresentation just noted. It is obvious that the general liquidation of Marxist education in our country has resulted in the appearance of many strange versions of "Marxism".

We urge comrades to read, study and circulate the History of the C.P.S.U. itself and to study along with this history the brilliant works of Lenin and Stalin, the historical appearance of which and the role of which in the C.P.S.U. and world Communist movements are so vividly presented in that great masterpiece.

COMMUNIST MORALITY (PART III)

(In Section 3, we made the point that the substance of Communist morality is to be found in the Communist program and in the rules for Party membership. We emphasized that Communist morality differs from all previous forms of morality in that it is based on the scientific analysis of actually existing social conditions. The unifying link between Communist theory and practice (i.e. morality) we declared to be the recognition of necessity. We noted that Lenin summarized the essence of Communist morality by declaring, "Morality serves the purpose of helping human society to rise to a higher level and to abolish the exploitation of labor". - Selected Works, Vol IX, p. 478

4. The Unity of Communist Morality (Communist Practice) with the Viewpoint of Dialectical Materialism (Communist Theory)

Aristotle declared in antiquity that the ends which men seek they call good and likewise the means required for the achievement of those ends. Obviously men seek and have sought many different and conflicting ends, and thus their conceptions of good and bad differ and have differed enormously. The central question of ethical theory, therefore, is the question of the ends to be sought. A purely abstract formula such as "The end justifies the means" (a formula of the Catholic Jesuits) is utterly barren and meaningless. The question is "What end?" How does one determine what is a good end, or can this question be answered?

Every religion has maintained that the end of man lies outside of human life, viz. in the supernatural, and is to be discovered in the will of God or the gods. According to religion, men, dependent entirely upon the supernatural, can find whatever happiness is possible not in themselves or through their own unaided efforts, but solely by doing the will of heaven, by placing themselves completely in dependence upon supernatural powers. Religions thus present their moral codes as emanating from outside human life. Since the moral code of every exploiting class has been contrary to the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people, i.e. of the toiling populations, the ruling classes have found it advantageous to utilize the superstitions of the people (the necessary result of ignorance and oppression) by presenting their own moral codes, which exhort the people to submit humbly to exploitation, as if they emanated from a divine government of the universe.

Materialists of course recognize that supernatural powers are mere figments of the human mind, fantastic reflections, as Marx called them; in the mind of man of the actual conditions of society. Materialists, therefore, reject all morality presented as emanating from heaven and reject all ethics directed toward a goal lying outside human life, i.e. toward a non-existent life beyond the grave. For materialists, the end of man is man, i.e. the actual life of man on earth, in other words, human happiness; and materialists regard happiness as the fullest realization by man of his human potentialities. For this reason, materialists have often been called humanists, i.e. philosophers looking to human welfare rather than to the glory of a non-existent God. This was the ethical theory of the Lokayata (this-world-ism) school of ancient India (sixth century B.C.) and of the materialism of Democritus and Epicurus in ancient Greece. It was also the view of Marx, whose favorite motto was, "Nihil humanum alienum a me puto" ("Nothing human do I consider foreign to myself").

The materialist ethic has of course been caricatured by its religious opponents from the time of the early opposition of the Brahmans of India and of the Platonists and other religious spokesman of ancient Greece. All of these opponents alike have tried to reduce the materialist ethic to the crudest hedonism, the theory that pleasant sensations are the only goods worth seeking and the only happiness. The limited and selfish view of hedonism, enunciated by none of the great materialists, found its correction in antiquity by the equally one-sided view of cynicism. The cynics, emphasizing that one cannot avoid pain altogether and that society condemns men who

seek only personal pleasure and who are absolutely unwilling to bear pain, maintained, therefore, the opposite view, that virtue consists in ability to forego pleasure and endure pain.

The materialism of Democritus and Epicurus as a well-worked out philosophy never fell into either of these one-sided views, but maintained that happiness must include both some pleasures and also ability and readiness to endure pain. In pointing to human happiness as the only rational end of life, the materialists emphasized that happiness as a continuous state, which certainly does not exclude all pleasure but which also necessarily must include considerable pain, is not to be confused with pleasures alone, which are fleeting and may be experienced by the unhappy. Emphasizing that happiness is the fullest realization by man of all of his human capacities, the great materialists of antiquity stressed the importance of mind as a distinctively human characteristic, thus emphasizing that, while the basic necessities of life are material preconditions for happiness, there can be no real happiness without the fullest development of the mind. Hence, they presented the pursuit of philosophy as the highest and only absolute form of happiness.

It was a weakness of ancient materialism that, emanating from men not involved in politics and whose theories were frowned on and persecuted by the state, it had little to say concerning politics or society in general. Recognizing that the overwhelming majority of men had no opportunity to develop the mind, ancient materialism, thoroughly humanitarian in its outlook, was deeply tinged with pessimism. It could conceive of happiness as the achievement of only a few, and warned its followers to stay out of politics. Having no conception of historical progress, it had no hope for more than isolated groups of philosophical friends achieving their isolated form of happiness in little intellectual oases within the bitter wilderness of human life. This pessimism was the inevitable product of actual social conditions in ancient society.

The idealist philosophers, Socrates and Plato, and the theological dualist, Aristotle, had one advantage over the ancient materialists in that it was they who elaborated ethical theory as a political theory and who thus developed political theory to a high degree. This they did of course as representatives of the slaveholding class whose business was politics and who were at that time conspiring as organizers for the formation of just such far-flung monarchies as those actually formed by the Macedonian ruling-class under the leadership of Philip and Alexander the Great. (Misconceptions exist about the role of Plato and Aristotle in this, because of general misconceptions of the role of the ancient city and of misinterpretations of certain misleading passages in their writings, but Plato and Aristotle were definitely not averse to Greek cities ruling over empires - far from it.) At any rate, the philosophic future of Europe for nearly two thousand years belonged not to the materialists, but to the religious and political ethical theories of the aristocratic philosophers Plato and Aristotle, whose conception of virtue was the rule of the few "wise and good" men over the many "inferior" men who were "slaves to appetite" and thus required firm rulers. When Christianity, at first a religious protest of the slaves and downtrodden masses, was by degree converted into a new ruling class religion, the theories of Plato and Aristotle were grafted on to its theology.

Modern materialism, which began to develop during the epoch of the bourgeois revolutions, began to enunciate the conception of the achievement of happiness for all as a result of the establishment of democracy and the equalitarian division of property; but these petty-bourgeois utopias proved to be mere dreams when the bourgeois redivision of property actually occurred and the bourgeois "democratic" states were actually established.

It was Marxist materialism, as the theory of the rising proletariat, destined in fact (and not in dreams only) to abolish the exploitation of man by man, which for the first time demonstrated precisely the pathway to the actual happiness of all mankind, viz. through the abolition of classes by the establishment of working class state power.

Marxist materialism shares with ancient materialism the view that the end of man is man; that, since man is not the creature of any supernatural power, the only worthy goal for which man can strive is the happiness of mankind. However, Marxist materialism has demonstrated how this goal inevitably will in actual fact be achieved by mankind as a whole, not just for a few isolated philosophers, through the continuance of the class struggle of the modern working class to its inevitable conclusion. Marxist materialism is thus full of buoyant confidence in the future, thus reflecting the actual relations of modern society.

As dialectical materialism, Marxism, unlike the old metaphysical materialism, does not conceive of individual men as isolated entities (as social atoms) or of men as being possessed of an unchanging human nature, the same in all ages.

"The essence of man is the totality of social relationships", said Marx in the Theses on Feuerbach, and these social relationships change. Therefore, man cannot be conceived of except in changing social relationships with his fellows.

The distinguishing characteristic of man, according to Marxism, is not simply reason. To define man simply as a rational animal is a partial, one-sided metaphysical definition, for it does not take account of the irrationality in human life and does not reveal the interconnection of reason with the rest of human life. Engels, therefore, declared that the distinguishing characteristic of man is not simply reason, but labor, i.e. production. (Ch. IX of Dialectics of Nature). Now labor, as defined in Ch. VII of Part III of Vol. I of Capital, is an intellectual process (purposeful production of use-values in accordance with a plan - human activity which imprints on matter a new form, the product of intellectual activity). In other words, reason is an inherent, integral part of the essence of man. It is essential, but it does not express the totality of man. Labor (production or creation, i.e. art), which includes reason, is the real distinguishing characteristic of man. It is this which defines him, which constitutes his essence. But labor is a collective activity - not a pursuit carried out by each individual man alone in isolation. Men are not Robinson Crusoes, but the labor of each in every society has always been dependent upon the labor of others. Since labor (the mode of production) is the basic and determining factor in society, all social relations are basically determined by productive relations. To say that the essence of man is labor is exactly the same, therefore, as to say that the essence of man is the totality of social relations. Social relations are productive relations.

If man is primarily a laboring or productive animal, his reason being an essential element of his creative power, it is obvious that the development of man is dependent upon, is determined by, is the development of ^{or} labor production.

Since there is no such thing as an isolated man (apart from society man would not be man), there is no such thing and can be no such thing as a purely personal or individualistic morality. The very effort to enunciate a purely personal ethic is based on illusion. Both Plato and Aristotle, unlike the ancient materialists, recognized this by saying that all virtue is political virtue.

Since Marxists recognize that the state is just one category in the history of man, a category destined to wither away with the emergence of world communism, Marxists would say that all virtue is social virtue. Outside of society man can be neither good nor bad, because the very significance of the terms good and bad depends upon his relations in society.

Since man is a developing animal, it is obvious that what contributes to his development as a species, to the development of mankind as a whole, is for man absolutely good. And this - seeking the fullest development of mankind as a whole - is the basic ethical principle of Marxism. Marxists do not regard socialism, itself only the first stage of communism, as an end in itself, but as only a necessary stage toward the fullest development of man, which will be achieved during the whole long period of the development of communism.

Every good is relative in that man is not a static entity, but a developing entity. Hence, whatever contributes to man's development in the concrete stage of development in which we find him at the given time is good at that time, but not necessarily good at another stage of development. Such a good is obviously relative in that it is not an eternal good. On the other hand, it is not solely relative, because it does absolutely contribute to man's development. Marxists thus accept neither moral absolutism nor moral relativism, but recognize that what contributes to man's development is both relative and absolute.

Obviously what is good for each individual man in the course of his life from birth to death is not always the same. We find certain things pleasing and attractive in children, things which contribute to their development and are good for them. But many of these necessary and attractive traits of childhood, if continued into adult life, become positively loathsome. The same is true of the history of mankind as a whole. Man has had to go through certain necessary historical stages of development. What contributed to his progress or development at one time inevitably became an obstacle to his development, i.e. reactionary, at another. In other words, Marxists repudiate absolutely all moral metaphysics, as well as every other variety of metaphysics. There is no such thing as an isolated, purely individual morality. All morality deals with the social relations of men. Furthermore, moral requirements change from age to age, since man is a developing animal. Dialectical materialism thus recognizes dialectic in the development of moral standards and moral behaviour as in everything else.

The advance from the cannibalism of the primitive communal hunting tribe to slavery was a definite advance, hailed as such even by slaves, in the development of mankind as a whole. However, that advance for mankind as a whole brought only agony to the vast majority. Furthermore, in the course of the development of production under slavery, slavery, presented by slaveholder metaphysics as absolute, eternal good, as the basis of all possible society in fact, definitely became a hindrance to the further development of society. It had to be abolished, and it was abolished, serfdom taking its place. Serf society, in its turn, further developed the progressive forces of society, as slavery could not, but likewise brought agony to the majority of mankind, and, in spite of the metaphysical glorification of feudal

conditions as "eternal", finally became a hindrance that had to be abolished by capitalist society based on wage labor which arose out of the struggles of small producers, held in bondage under feudal relations, for "free" enterprise. Capitalist society, in its turn, in spite of its fabulous development of production, brought agony and absolute worsening of conditions to the toiling masses, as had slavery and serfdom in the past. In spite of the bourgeois protestations that bourgeois conditions are "natural" and inevitable at any and all times, capitalism in its monopoly stage has now in its own turn become an enormous obstacle to human progress and is, therefore, today being abolished by a new and higher society, by socialism as the transition to communism.

Socialism differs absolutely from all previous stages of human history in that it abolishes all exploitation of man by man and, by liberating oppressed nations and bringing them together in voluntary union, ushers in the period of the voluntary amalgamation of all nations into a single classless world society, a society free from all class or national antagonisms. In other words, the new communist society, for which the proletarian revolutions of our age are laying the foundations, will be the first society in which mankind as a whole - the whole human species - will be united in a fully human society. No other animal species is or can be so united. This is what Engels meant by saying that hitherto man has not fully separated himself from the animal kingdom, that with the proletarian revolution mankind will for the first time evolve from the animal kingdom into the kingdom of humanity. (Anti-Duhring, Part III, Ch. II p.309, Int. Pub. ed.) It is what he also meant when he declared that, in this sense, all past history has really been the pre-history of man - the pre-history preceding the history of man as such.

Marx once said that there had never hitherto existed a whole man. There had been fragments of men, but never whole men. There had been slaves, serfs, nobles, priests, yeomen, merchants, weavers, miners, seamen, industrialists, lawyers, doctors, artists, this kind of man, that kind of man, but never a fully developed, well-rounded man. Thus there has never been a fully human good, since man as man has not yet fully evolved. The development of mankind as a whole has hitherto, in class society, been carried out at the expense of the overwhelming majority of men, not for the advantage of all or even any considerable number of men. Thus, there have been tribal morals, slaveholder morals, slave morals, feudal landlord morals, serf morals, artisan morals, peasant morals, bourgeois morals, proletarian morals, but never fully human morals.

The theoreticians of the various classes have of course presented their own morals as absolute, as absolutely human and eternal. But history has always demonstrated that they were the morals of a class and not of mankind as a whole, and just as particular classes themselves have disappeared in the course of time, so have their "eternal" morals.

There will be no fully human morality, as distinct from a tribal or class morality, until mankind is united as a species in communist society.

Today, Marxists consider good whatever contributes to the class-struggle of the workers for socialism, and consider bad whatever opposes, hinders, or obstructs the class struggle of the workers for socialism. Thus, Marxist morality today is proletarian morality.

This subordination by Marxists of everything to the proletarian class struggle for socialism is, in the light of what has been said, clearly not solely in the interests of the proletariat as such. The reason that Marxists recognize the glorious role of the modern working class is because the working class is the bearer of the destiny of all mankind. In emancipating itself, the working class is obligated by necessity to emancipate all other toiling and subjugated classes and peoples, thus emancipating mankind as a whole from exploitation and bondage. This is why the dictatorship of the proletariat is so utterly unlike the rule of any previous class, since it is the temporary rule of the workers, through which all men will be liberated from subjugation and thus through which all rule itself will be abolished. All who seek the liberation of mankind and the fullest development of man must, therefore, throw in their lot with the proletariat, the only class which not only can, but which inevitably must, as a result of the inexorable effects of the absolute worsening of conditions for the proletariat under capitalism, secure through its struggles the liberation of all mankind.

With the establishment of Communist society on an international scale, purely proletarian morality will of course disappear, and a truly human morality will for the first time in history take its place.

The highest goal toward which bourgeois thinkers have generally dared to aspire has been the goal of securing "the greatest good for the greatest number", a number which has always turned out to be very small. Accepting the Biblical statement that, "The poor ye shall always have with you", slaveholder, feudal, and bourgeois philosophers have not generally dared to speak of securing the highest good for each individual in society. Yet such will be the actual achievement of Communist society. The society which for the first time will unite mankind on a world scale

as a species will also secure the fullest development of the human potentialities of each individual member of society.

In the words of the Communist Manifesto, "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all".

Surely this is the highest ethical goal that has ever been sought by any philosophy. The marvelous thing is that this goal is no mere moral goal cherished in the mind alone as a purely intellectual ideal, but is revealed, first, by the thorough-going analysis of the actual movements of capitalist society and, secondly, by the actual emergence of socialism in the Soviet Union, to be in fact the actual state of society which is now emerging through proletarian revolution from our present capitalist society.

(TO BE CONCLUDED)

(In this issue, we have dealt with the basic theoretical concepts of Communist morality in general. In our concluding section, we shall deal with the moral requirements of members of the Communist Party in particular).

THE TERMINIELLO DECISION - A BLOW AGAINST FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The Terminiello Decision is an open invitation to fascist incitation to violence against the mass of the people. Fascists seek to destroy the Constitutional rights of the American people by means of hoodlum attacks against democratic people for exercising their Constitutional rights. Official encouragement to advocates of such attacks is, therefore, most certainly not a defense of freedom of speech, but a blow against it. Freedom of speech is not equivalent to the right to incite lynch terror or pogroms against the people, and has never been interpreted as such by genuine democrats.

The Communist Party has always demanded severe punishment by law of all fomenters of lynch terror. Only provocateurs sent into the Communist Party to discredit it have ever advocated or engaged in individual or mob violence, and the Constitution of every Communist Party in the world has always made immediate expulsion from the Party the penalty for the slightest tendency toward such terrorism. Only by severe punishment for all who by violence seek to deprive the people of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and the right of elections by secret ballot can these traditional Constitutional rights be upheld.

Prosecuting Attorneys for the U.S. Government are now demanding the imprisonment of the National Committee of a Party which has always been the most consistent fighter for Federal action against lynch terror. They are prosecuting the National Committee of the C.P. solely because that Party exercises its Constitutional rights when it advocates that the majority of the people, who are workers and farmers, should establish socialism. That another branch of the U.S. Government should at the same time openly encourage advocacy of violence against those who exercise their legal, Constitutional rights is an indication of how deeply ingrained the movement toward fascism is within the Federal Government itself. The illegal trial of the N.C. of the C.P. and the Terminiello Decision are both parts of the same drive toward fascism. The mass of the American people are definitely in favor of preserving freedom of speech, press, and assembly and the right of elections by secret ballot. Simultaneously they do not favor allowing Ku Klux incitations to violence to pass unpunished. It is necessary that the people, as fighters for consistent democracy, demand both the dismissal of the indictment against the N.C. of the C.P. and the reversal of the Terminiello Decision - both on the same grounds, as violations of the Bill of Rights.

* * *