

political affairs

FEBRUARY 1949 • 25 CENTS

NATIONAL COMMITTEE, C.P.U.S.A.	[1]	Labor Must Take the Offensive to Win Substantial Wage Increases!
	[5]	The Defense Prosecutes
JOSEPH CLARK	[20]	The Peace Can Be Won!
GEORGE SISKIND	[28]	How "Historicus" Caricatures History
ABNER W. BERRY	[37]	The Struggle for the Lincoln Heritage
I. LAPTEV	[47]	The Triumph of Mitchurin Biological Science
HILARY MINC	[62]	What Is National Income?
JAMES W. FORD	[70]	The 1948 Elections in Bedford- Stuyvesant
HOWARD SELSAM & HARRY K. WELLS	[82]	The Philosophy of John Maynard Keynes
J. MARTIN	[93]	Communication

TOMORROW'S CHINA

by Anna Louise Strong

Anna Louise Strong is the only foreign correspondent to have penetrated the Liberated Areas of China, including Manchuria, shortly after its liberation by the Communists. Tomorrow's China is based on a year's stay, from July, 1946, to July, 1947, in these newly liberated areas.

By jeep, donkey and airplane, this indomitable reporter has visited places hardly to be found on maps. She has interviewed not only leaders like Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, but spoken to workers, peasants, factory managers, doctors, intellectuals, and hundreds of others. Her on-the-spot description of the agrarian reform, how Mao-Tse-tung's military principles are applied in the fighting against Chiang Kai-shek's armies, Chinese attitudes to the Marshall Pan and U.S. intervention, and the developments leading to the establishment of a new democratic all-China government, throws a brilliant searchlight on the China of today. Published by Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

price: 65 cents

National Distributors

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

209

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

VOL. XXVIII, NO. 2 FEBRUARY 1949

political affairs

A Magazine Devoted to the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Editorial Board: V. J. JEROME, Editor, ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, JACK STACHEL, MAX WEISS

Labor Must Take the Offensive to Win Substantial Wage Increases!*

Fellow Workers!

American workers urgently need wage increases today, to meet the needs of their families. They need protection from unemployment.

Now, as always, Big Business' first answer to wage demands is, NO.

The majority of top trade union officials in a whole number of unions are preparing to oblige the N.A.M. They are starting off the fourth round by implying that "This time we'd better take 'no' for an answer."

But the \$21 billion net profit raked in by the big monopolies in 1948 came out of a cut in your real wages. That is why your purchasing power has gone down since 1945, while your productivity has been increased through speed-up.

* Statement issued by the National Committee of the Communist Party on January 5, 1949.

If you work in steel, your pay check is worth an average of \$10.94 less a week. But you've been speeded up to produce more in 40 hours today than you did in 48 hours during the war.

If you work in auto, your purchasing power has dropped \$13.56 a week. But now you're turning out 40 cars an hour, instead of 32.

That's the picture in two of the big monopoly-controlled industries. The woman worker, the Negro worker, and the other lowest paid workers are even worse off.

But, in addition to concern for their take-home pay—most workers are now worried also about jobs and social security. They feel in their bones that the so-called postwar boom is about to go bust. For the first time in many years sharp in-

creases in unemployment and the short work week are hitting industry after industry.

The "cold war," of which the Marshall Plan is a part, has taken around \$50 billion out of the national income, and a good chunk out of your pay envelope. Many workers believed the lie that the Marshall Plan would help European economic recovery—and so beat the old cycle of boom and bust at home. But, instead, a "normal" crisis of overproduction is developing while war preparations increase.

Instead of helping, the Marshall Plan has hurt European recovery as well as threatening the independence of other nations and world peace. It has contributed to a 24 percent decline in America's foreign trade, and is directly responsible for mounting unemployment at home.

While the projected \$15 to \$20 billion war budget will help the Wall Street profiteers—it won't raise your wages, or give you jobs and social security. By stepping up their war preparations, the bipartisan monopolists are making the economic situation worse.

The N.A.M. repeats the Billion Dollar Lie that wage increases are responsible for inflation. To cool off labor's wage demands, it is staging a sit-down against excess profits taxes and threatening more lay-offs. And those trade union leaders who play the part of Wall Street's labor lieutenants are also trying to use the threat of mass unemployment to

head off the growing rank-and-file demand for wage increases. They are trying to dodge a real wage fight in order not to embarrass the big trusts and the Truman Administration. That is why they are trying to split labor's ranks by outdoing the N.A.M. Red-baiters.

These reactionary trade union officials argue that if the workers give up the fight for higher wages they *may* get lower prices; and that the way to check the developing bust is by supporting Wall Street's armament program and "get tough" policy. They don't deny that the workers need a substantial wage increase—yet they argue that "this is not the time" to fight for one.

The Communist Party, the Party of the working class, the Party of socialism, at all times defends the immediate as well as the long-range interests of the American workers and people. We declare that today the workers can raise their living standards and defend their economic security. We declare that this can only be done at the expense of monopoly profits and Wall Street's armament program—and by united, militant struggle against the trusts and warmongers.

Even a return to the living standards of 1945 would require a wage increase of 25 percent. But workers don't join unions only to hold their own. Progressive unions constantly strive to *improve* living standards. That is one reason against tying wages to escalator clauses such as

those put over on G.M. workers by Walter Reuther last year. It's a reason for rejecting all proposals for wage-freezing, or for raising prices to "keep up" with wages.

Substantial wage increases aren't handed out as a "gift" by Wall Street. But they can be won by militant and united trade union struggle, real independent labor political action, and joint action of labor and all democratic forces. In the last few months we have seen what *can* be done, for example, in the successful wage struggles of the west coast longshore workers.

Growing unemployment is no argument against wage struggle. It's an argument for *combining* the struggle for wages with the struggle for jobs and social security.

In addition to a determined struggle for wage increases, unions entering new contract negotiations should also fight for genuine measures to reduce speed-up; removal of all clauses in any way limiting the right to strike; and introduction of the 30-hour week without any pay-cuts. Labor should also press its demands for a guaranteed annual wage.

Of course, the workers will have to carry this fight into the 81st Congress and state legislatures—in the first place to secure repeal of the Taft-Hartley slave law and reenactment, without compromise, of the Wagner Labor Relations and Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Acts. In addition, they should demand unemployment insurance for a 40-week period,

and coverage for the maritime, agricultural, professional, domestic, and young workers—as well as the doubling of all social security benefits and adequate state appropriations to assure speedy handling of applicants.

Additional measures to defend the economic interests of the workers include a Federal minimum wage of \$1 an hour; strict curbs on speculation and hoarding by the food trusts; and an extensive public works program to provide low-rent housing, expanded school and hospital facilities, new roads, etc. The cost of such a Federally financed program should be met through a steep tax on high incomes and corporate profits, by ending the "cold war" and sharply reducing armament appropriations.

As an elementary measure of self-defense, every union should maintain its unemployed members in good standing, and advance the trade union organization of the unemployed. The Southern organizing drives should be stepped up, the present anti-Communist and Jim-Crow practices wiped out, and real Negro-white unity established.

Concern for the rights of the Negro workers is vital to the whole struggle for wage increases and economic security. The Negro worker is still first to be fired last to be hired, and lowest paid. Whole industries, for example, textile and electrical, are still virtually "lily white." In some industries, Negro workers are being denied jobs, fired, or downgraded because the employers fear

their splendid record as militant trade unionists and organizers.

Negro and white workers should struggle together for enactment and rigid enforcement of national and state F.E.P.C. laws; the opening of all industries to equal opportunities in employment, job training for skilled trades and promotion for the Negro workers. New moves to exclude Negro workers from the basic industries must be stopped. The right of Negro trade unionists to hold any office in any union must be recognized, and their representation in all levels of leadership increased.

The Communist Party rejects the phony argument that "when the economic situation is getting worse—it's no time for labor to fight."

Methods of struggle naturally vary with circumstances—but without a fight the workers never get anything. There were never fewer than 7 million unemployed in 1936-38. But, because in those years most of the C.I.O. leaders were guided by a policy that rejected Red-baiting, they were able to make substantial gains in the great united struggle that cracked the openshop mass production industries.

Successful struggle depends above all on the fighting policy of labor, and on united trade union and other popular mass action against the trusts. It depends on the initiative of the rank and file, especially the most progressive workers and leaders. It is their job to keep their unions on the beam, and to promote the united

struggle of all their shop-mates in defense of labor's interests—regardless of political differences.

Rank-and-file initiative, leading to united mass action against the big corporations, can win the most immediate wage and security demands of the workers. It can stimulate independent labor political action and so help create conditions favorable to the establishment of a real people's government, led by labor. Such a government, capable of curbing the giant monopolists, would make it possible for the workers to save themselves from the full misery of the developing economic crisis. Of special importance is the united action of the key unions in the mass production industries, such as steel, auto, electrical and mining, around one common fighting wage and security program.

For united labor action to win substantial wage increases!

More for the workers, nothing for the "cold war"!

Equal rights for the Negro workers—Negro-white unity in struggle against the trusts!

Organize now to make 1949 a year of advance for economic security, democracy and peace!

EUGENE DENNIS,

General Secretary

JOHN WILLIAMSON,

Labor Secretary

for the National Committee,
C.P.U.S.A.

January 5, 1949.

The Defense Prosecutes

[Before two weeks have expired since the date set for trial of the twelve indicted members of the National Committee of the Communist Party, the prosecution's case is beginning to burst at the seams. And what is being revealed is not any conspiracy against the government, with which the accused were falsely charged, but rather a sordid conspiracy by the agents of the government themselves.

[The accused have become the accusers in the New York District Federal courtroom. The Communist defendants now stand forth as defenders, not alone of themselves and the Communist Party, but of the constitutional rights of the whole American people. That is the meaning of the current legal challenge of the corrupt, discriminatory method by which juries are selected in the courts of the Southern District of New York.

[The following is an excerpt from the brief submitted in support of the petition asking the Supreme Court to exercise its supervisory authority over the District Court for the Southern District of New York to void the indictments against the twelve Communist leaders.

[The Communist leaders have produced evidence in court showing

that the Supreme Court, in denying this petition, acted on the assumption that the lower court would hear their evidence on the corrupt jury system put into operation by Chief Judge John Clark Knox of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. As we go to press, that evidence is being presented over the objection of the prosecution.—*The Editors.*]

* * *

PETITIONERS were indicted by a grand jury which was constituted, and face trials before a petit jury to be selected from a venire which was drawn, under a system planned and operated by the Judges, Jury Commissioner and Jury Clerk of the District Court for the Southern District of New York, whereby the rich, the propertied and the well-to-do are deliberately, purposefully and systematically included in, and other classes or groups—including the unemployed, the economically depressed, manual workers, persons who work by the day or hour, Negroes and members of other racial and national minorities, and members of minority political parties—are deliberately, purposefully and systematically excluded from the Jury List, hereinafter described, from which both grand and petit juries are regularly drawn.

As a result, such grand jury and the venire of petit jurors are the organ of a particular group or class, the rich, the propertied and the well-to-do, and do not represent an impartial cross-section of the community.

This petition involves a vital matter as to which this Court has ultimate discretionary jurisdiction by certiorari. Because of the extraordinary circumstances herein described, the imminent threat of irreparable injury to petitioners, and the public importance of maintaining the integrity of the jury system and the proper administration of justice, petitioners aver that the immediate exercise of the supervisory authority of this Court is peculiarly appropriate and necessary.

In view of the importance and urgency of the matters herein contained the petitioners respectfully request the immediate consideration of the Court thereon.

In support of their position, petitioners respectfully allege:

A. The Indictments and Impending Trials.

1. At the time of the indictments referred to, petitioners comprised the National Board of the Communist Party of the United States of America, a political party in existence since 1919, and presently are members of the National Committee thereof.

2. On July 20, 1948, petitioners were indicated by a Grand Jury in the Southern District of New York under the Smith Act (Title 18, Sections 10, 11, 13, U. S. C. A.), charged with

a conspiracy to organize the Communist Party of the United States, an organization alleged to "teach and advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence," and to advocate and teach "the duty and necessity" of such overthrow. On the same day each of petitioners was separately indicted under the aforementioned Smith Act, charged with membership in the Communist Party of the United States. The essential basis of the indictments against petitioners is that the Communist Party of the United States is based upon the principles of Marxism-Leninism and teaches and advocates the same. . . .

B. The Unlawful, Discriminatory and Unconstitutional Method of Selection of the Grand Jury and the Venire of Petit Jurors Involved.

1. The Grand Jury which handed up the aforementioned indictments, and the panel of veniremen from which the petit jury or juries will be selected for the trials of petitioners, were illegally selected, designated and constituted in the unlawful, discriminatory and unconstitutional manner hereinafter set forth.

2. Shortly before 1940, the Judges of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, by mutual agreement and upon the initiative of the Hon. John Clark Knox, Chief Judge thereof, devised a plan for the ostensible—and unlawful—purpose of obtaining "superior," "very high type" citizens of

"better" and "more select" "quality," to serve "regularly" as jurors, grand and petit, in said court. . . . This plan was executed by the Jury Commissioner and Jury Clerk of said Court.*

3. This plan was intended to result in, and has resulted in, the creation by the Jury Commissioner and the Jury Clerk of the Jury List herein described. This Jury List consists of such persons that the arrays, venires and panels of grand and

* The plan was the culmination of a campaign by Senior Judge Knox extending over many years to fill the federal jury boxes with "men of substance" and "men of responsibility from the Wall Street district or from a mercantile district, or a man of affairs from uptown." The *Federal Juror*, March 1931, reports an address by Judge Knox to the Federal Grand Jurors Association as follows: "BUSINESS MEN NEED INTELLIGENT JURORS."

"I should like also to have your help, if you can, to make Petit Jury service as attractive as Grand Jury service seems to be to the intelligent and responsible business man. We have no difficulty in getting Grand Jurors, men of substance, men of experience, men of integrity. * * * We do, however, have great difficulty in filling our Petit Jury boxes with people who are qualified to pass upon the intricacies and the complications that frequently present themselves in the modern-day lawsuit. * * *

"Now, you men, and your associates in business, have a big stake in seeing to it that the litigations in which you may be interested are at least intelligently considered. * * *

"I should like to have your assistance. You may say: 'Why not summon men of responsibility from the Wall Street District, or from a mercantile district, or a man of affairs from uptown to do jury service in the box?' We do that very thing, but those jurors, in all too many cases, come into court and ask to be excused. * * *

In June, 1945, Judge Knox testified before the House Judiciary Committee that he intended to continue the present system "unless restrained by an authority to which I must yield." He said:

"I am told from time to time, that the selection of jurors should be a democratic process and that persons who serve in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York are hand-picked. In answer to this indictment, I cannot do otherwise than admit my guilt. Nevertheless, unless restrained by an authority to which I must yield, jurors in my district will continue to be hand-picked, and it will be done with care." (Hearings before the House Committee on the Judiciary, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., June 12 and 13, 1945. H. R. 3379, H. R. 3380, H. R. 3381 (Govt. Printing Office, 74316, Serial No. 3).)

Petitioners respectfully refer this Court to Judge Knox's testimony in such hearings at pages 4 to 21,

petit jurors, who are regularly drawn therefrom, constitute the organ of an economic class or group consisting of the rich, the propertied and the well-to-do. This is achieved by the deliberate, purposeful and systematic inclusion on the Jury List of members and representatives of the group or class consisting of the rich, the propertied and the well-to-do, including the economically powerful, executives, proprietors and salaried officers, directors and supervising agents of corporations; and, concomitantly, by the deliberate, purposeful and systematic exclusion, in whole or in substantial part, from the Jury Lists of persons qualified to serve as jurors who are among the following classes or groups in the community, to wit:

(a) The unemployed, the poor, the economically depressed;

(b) persons of humble station in life;

(c) laborers, mechanics, craftsmen and other manual workers;

(d) persons who work by the day or hour;

(e) persons who, by reason of lack of means, are compelled to, and do, reside in definite and defined geographical areas of the community where rentals are low and housing inadequate and inferior;

(f) Negroes and other racial and national minorities;

(g) women;

(h) persons who are not members of, or closely allied with, the upper strata of social life in the community;

(i) persons who are affiliated to the minority political parties, particularly

the American Labor Party and the Communist Party, resulting thereby in deliberate, purposeful and systematic discrimination against said excluded classes and groups, in favor of the rich, the propertied and the well-to-do.

4. The Jury List consists of the names of between approximately 10,000 to 14,000 persons selected by the Jury Commissioner and the Jury Clerk of the District Court in pursuance of the plan or system described. Service on the juries in the said Court is limited to and rotated among persons on said list.

5. The plan and system under which the Jury List was established and is now maintained, is essentially described in a memorandum dated January 2, 1941, which Leland L. Tolman, Assistant Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, prepared for Henry P. Chandler, the Director of the Administrative Office. Copies of this memorandum were circulated under date of February 5, 1941, to all United States Circuit and District Judges by the said Henry P. Chandler under the authority of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges. . . .

6. Pursuant to said plan, the Judges of the said Court placed in charge of the selection of juries a Jury Commissioner with so-called "good business and social connections," and a Jury Clerk with "a thoroughly practical knowledge of the social, racial and economic groups of New York

City and their geographical distribution." The purpose of such appointments was to exploit such knowledge and connections to accomplish the discriminatory, illegal and unconstitutional inclusions and exclusions referred to in paragraph 3. . . .

7. Under the immediate direction of the Chief Judge, and with the knowledge and acquiescence of the other Judges, the Jury Commissioner and Jury Clerk effected such inclusions and exclusions with the aid of the following steps:

(a) They obtained names for consideration for inclusion on the Jury List:

(1) By extensive use of such "selective" and "suitable" lists as *Who's Who in New York*, *Poor's Directory of Directors*, the *Engineers Directory*, the *Social Register*, and various college and university alumni directories.

(2) By extensive resort to the subscription edition of the New York Telephone Directory, a directory arranged by street numbers and location, to enable the selection of residents from neighborhoods occupied by the rich, the propertied and the well-to-do, such as Park Avenue, Fifth Avenue, Sutton Place, Gracie Square and the like; and to avoid the selection of residents in neighborhoods occupied by the groups and classes who were and are the victims of such exclusion and discrimination, such as Harlem (the Negro ghetto), the lower East Side, the West Side below 72nd Street, and the like, as more specifically described below.

(3) By adding to the list persons personally known or introduced to them as "good material," including persons recommended by the office of the United States Attorney in said district, and by the Federal Grand Jury Association of said district.

(4) By arranging with "personnel directors of large corporations" to make employees of such large corporations available for jury service.*

(5) By accepting volunteers who met the "personality and intelligence" standards of the Jury Clerk, provided, however, that they were not unemployed or women. Women were accepted if they were in business or were housewives with previous business experience.

(b) They then sifted the names drawn for preliminary consideration by questionnaires and personal interviews as follows:

(1) The Jury Clerk obtained from the potential jurors preliminary written data concerning themselves, including information concerning their education, employment and property holdings. He simultaneously interviewed them in order to "judge generally" their "intelligence and personality."

(2) On the basis of such interviews and questionnaires, the Jury Clerk then divided the names of all

legally qualified and eligible persons into two classes: The names of those who were "suitable material" were put on a "qualified list," which is the Jury List herein referred to. The names of those who were "inferior" or "not likely material" were placed on a "deferred" list. Arrays, venires and panels were and are drawn only from those on the Jury List, and the "deferred" list is not used at all. Inquiries from persons not called, including those on the "deferred" list, as to why they have not been summoned for jury service, were uniformly and deceitfully answered to the effect that it is "entirely a matter of chance" as to when they might be called.

(c) The Jury Commissioner and Jury Clerk instituted a method of "requalifying" persons who had previously served as jurors in order to "weed out the unfit jurors." In connection with such "requalification" the prospective juror's record "is particularly scrutinized as to his present residence and age." The real purpose of such requalification was to eliminate persons who, though legally and properly qualified to serve, were not compatible with the deliberate, purposeful and systematic plan of discrimination described herein.

8. The plan and system provided for apportionment of potential jurors among three of the eight counties within the Southern District of New York. It contemplated, however, that there be no apportionment within the said counties as shown below.

* As shown below, the representation on the Jury List of manual workers is insignificant. Even such representation, as well as the representation of white-collar workers, is limited, in the main and systematically, to those employed by giant corporations, such as the Consolidated Edison Company, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, New York Telephone Company, and banks, whose employees, when drawn, are paid their salaries by their employers during their jury service.

9. The Jury List was further refined in the assembly of a main body of names to be used as grand jurors in the said Court. First, and generally, only those who have "satisfactorily" served on petit juries are considered for service on the grand juries.

Second, a dominant role in this refinement was played by a certain association known as The Federal Grand Jury Association for the Southern District of New York, composed of persons who meet its standards for membership.

The Association meets in the United States Court House and includes as honorary members the Judges of the Court and the United States Attorney.

Members of this Association served on the grand jury which returned the indictments herein.

The Association publishes *The Federal Juror*, which is distributed to all federal grand jurors in the Court, judges, United States attorneys and others. Although nominally devoted to the improvement of the efficiency of the Grand Jury system, the Association has gone far afield into political and economic matters.

The Federal Juror has actively campaigned:

- a) For universal fingerprinting of citizens and aliens;
- b) Against slum clearance and low-rental housing;
- c) Against President Roosevelt's court reform plan;
- d) For exclusion and expulsion of aliens;

e) Against trade unions;

f) Against the Communist Party.

The principal speaker invited to address the Association's annual dinner meeting in 1947 was J. Parnell Thomas, then Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and presently under indictment and awaiting trial for defrauding the Government of the United States. Mr. Thomas has notoriously misused his official position to spread anti-Communist hysteria, without basis in fact, and to persecute the Communist Party and the defendants.

Furthermore, the "impartiality" of the membership of said Association may be inferred from the fact that it purports to have forwarded to the Department of Justice "confidential information on Communistic propaganda."

The Association has exerted great influence upon the composition of grand jury panels in the District. It has supplied to the Jury Commissioner names of "good" jurors, who were added to the Jury List.

Reporting on the "improvement" in the caliber of the panels, the Association's Executive Committee reported (*The Federal Juror*, May 1941):

. . . Your Executive Committee is very, very glad indeed that our relations with them rest on such foundations of reciprocal confidence, *that we have been permitted to cooperate with them to a material degree in their perennial task of making the Grand Jury Panel ever better and better.* (Italics supplied.)

Indeed, for many years this Association has sought to mold the character and composition of the grand jury system in New York. As early as 1932, it was reported to have expended substantial sums of money to obtain a "better" list of grand jurors (*The Federal Juror*, March, 1932).

The political, social and economic attitudes and prejudices of the Association may be inferred from the status of its officers, as follows: President, A. Vere Shaw, investment counsel, A. Vere Shaw & Company, 4 Irving Place, New York City (at the offices of the Consolidated Edison Company); First Vice-President, Robert Bragonier Grove, vice-president of Consolidated Edison Company and director and executive member of several other public utilities in the Southern District; Second Vice-President, James F. Lafferty, labor relations director, Western Electric Company; Secretary, Coleman B. McGovern, stock broker and member of the New York Stock Exchange. The executive committee is composed of officers, directors and executives of manufacturing, banking, insurance, radio broadcasting, securities and railroad corporations, stock brokers, chain stores and other giant corporations. Officers in previous years have been persons of similar status and position.

10. By reason of the foregoing, the system of jury selection in the said District Court, and the composition of juries therein, both petit and grand, and of the grand jury which returned the indictments herein as

well as the venire of petit juries drawn for the trials herein, were and are in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and particularly the Fifth and Sixth Amendments thereof, and of the standards for the proper administration of federal justice, in that they deprive the defendants of due process of law, and of the right not to be required to stand trial except upon an indictment returned by an impartial grand jury, and of the right to a fair trial at the hands of an impartial petit jury.

C. *The Results in Actual Operation of the Unlawful Method of Selecting Juries.*

1. The necessary and inevitable result of putting into operation the system of selecting juries described above has been the creation of an undemocratic jury system under which there has been, on grand and petit juries, gross over-representation of, and domination by, an economic class consisting of the rich, the propertied, and the well-to-do, as hereinbefore described, and a gross under-representation of the excluded groups described in paragraph B3 hereof. This vice has tainted the Grand Jury which indicted petitioners and taints the panel selected for their trials.

In order to ascertain the extent to which the actual composition of juries in the above court reflects the systematic effectuation of the discriminatory and illegal methods and techniques embraced within the above described plan of jury selection, petitioners undertook an examination and analysis of the composi-

tion of juries in said Court. Petit jury panels are drawn on the average of twice each month in said Court, and each list so drawn usually contains between 200 and 400 names.

2. During the time available since November 1, 1948, when the probable existence of this system first came to the attention of petitioners, it has been impossible and prohibitively expensive to examine and analyze all the jury panel lists drawn during the period of approximately ten years in which the above described system of jury selection has been in operation.

Hence, petitioners caused to be conducted an examination and analysis of representative panels in each year, commencing with 1940. To this end, copies of panel lists were purchased from the Clerk of the Court. A total of 28 panels was subjected to detailed study. . . .

These 28 panels included 7,487 names, which constitute more than 50 per cent of the total number of names in the basic Jury List, as described in paragraph 4 hereof.

4. This study, embracing in number more than 50 per cent of the names on the basic Jury List, extending over a nine-year period, and covering all seasons of the year without special selection, accurately reflects the composition of the entire basic Jury List. Thus, the conclusions of fact established on the basis of these 28 panels has equal validity for the entire Jury List. . . .

5. . . . d. The composite evidence obtained from study and analysis of the occupations of the 7,487 names of jurors establishes the following facts:

	Approximate percentage of population	Approximate average percentage of jury panel
Executives (including proprietors and officials) . . .	9%	45%
Professionals (including semi-professionals)	11%	20%
Clerical and sales	25%	30%
Manual workers	55%	5%

e. Our study and analysis establish that the economic status of the four groups referred to above is as follows:

	Approximate percentage of population	Approximate percentage of money income received from gainful activity	Approximate percentage within each group that owns income-producing securities
Executives and Professionals	20%	40%	25%
Clerical and sales	25%	30%	10%
Manual workers	55%	30%	3%

f. There are not more than 200,000 executives in the Counties of Bronx, Manhattan and Westchester. Some of these are not eligible for jury duty. Executives number about 10 per cent of all gainfully occupied eligible for jury duty. Nevertheless, in each of the 28 panels studied, executives comprised more than 38 per cent of the total number of employed persons, and for the 28 panels combined, executives comprised 46.1 per cent of the total.

g. There are 935,000 manual workers in the Counties of Manhattan, Bronx and Westchester in the Southern District of New York. There are at least 600,000 among these manual workers who are fully qualified to serve as jurors. Although these 600,000 manual workers constitute more than 50 per cent of the total number of persons in said three counties who are qualified for jury service, less than 10 per cent of said Jury List, and less than 10 per cent of any one of the 28 panels aforementioned, consist of manual workers. Indeed, for the total of the 28 panels, only 5.0 per cent are manual workers.

h. Legal requirements for voting in New York State are, in their objective aspects, largely co-extensive with those for jury service, notably those pertaining to citizenship, age and literacy in English. Consequently, those who are registered must, with relatively minor adjustments for over-age and property qualifications, be regarded as qualified for jury ser-

vice; and the continuous exclusion in whole or substantial part of voters residing in particular geographical areas demonstrates systematic illegal selection of jurors. . . .

A total of 148,403 votes were cast in the 17th Congressional District in the elections of 1948, less than 20% of the voters in Manhattan alone. Of the total of 1,155 Manhattan jurors on the six panels for November and December, 1948, and January, 1949, 649, or 56 per cent, were drawn from the 17th Congressional District. In this Congressional District, generally known in New York as the "silk-stocking" district, resides perhaps the greatest concentration of extremely wealthy persons found in any locality in the United States.

i. There were 582,836 voters in the 1948 Congressional elections in the 18th, 19th, 22nd, 23rd and 24th Congressional Districts. This number comprised 42 per cent of all voters from Manhattan and the Bronx in the 1948 elections. Of the total of 1,695 jurors on the six aforementioned panels from the Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, only 173, or 10.2 per cent, were drawn from these five Congressional Districts. These districts are in the main co-extensive with the sections known as Harlem, the Lower East Side, and East Bronx. They are overwhelmingly working-class in composition, they include the great majority of the Negro citizens of the Southern District, and large numbers of Jewish citizens, of citizens of Italian descent, and of Puerto

Ricans. These are the districts of crowded, inadequate housing and low incomes, areas economically depressed.

The contrast between the treatment of the rich and privileged, and those in the excluded classes, is sharply illustrated by a single fact. Those in the 19th Congressional District (Lower East Side) who voted in the 1948 elections equalled 75 per cent of the total number of voters in the 17th Congressional District (silk-stocking). But the number of jurors chosen from the 19th Congressional District equal four per cent of the number chosen from the 17th Congressional District. . . . Expressed in ratio terms, these are the figures:

	19th Cong. Dist.	:	17th Cong. Dist.
Voters	3	:	4
Jurors	1	:	25

. . . k. Of 288 jurors from Westchester County on the six panels for the months of November and December 1948, and January 1949, 116 or 40.3 percent are from the localities of Scarsdale, Bronxville and Larchmont, which are residential areas occupied by persons of substantial means and incomes. Taken together, these three areas contain only 4.6 percent of the total population of 21 years and over of the the County of Westchester. In contrast, only 23 jurors or 8.0 percent of the total were drawn from Yonkers, the largest city of Westchester, which is well populated by workers and contains 24.8

percent of the population of 21 years and over of the entire county.

l. The 649 jurors from the 17th Congressional District appearing on the six panels for November and December 1948, and January 1949, amounted to 43.7 jurors for every 10,000 voters in the 1948 congressional elections. Of the total vote for congressional candidates in that district, 53.2 percent was Republican and only 9.6 percent American Labor Party.

m. The 13 jurors from the 24th Congressional District appearing on the same six panels amounted to only 1.0 jurors per 10,000 voters. Of the total vote for congressional candidates in this congressional district, 11.7 percent was Republican and 36.9 percent American Labor Party.

n. Approximately 1,300,000 Manhattan, Bronx and Westchester voters enrolled in political parties in the year 1946, the latest year of congressional elections for which detailed enrollment records are available. Out of these, 34.6 percent enrolled in the Republican Party, 55.2 percent in the Democratic Party, and 10.2 percent in the American Labor Party. 190 persons listed on the jury panel for January 17, 1949, are recorded as party enrollees for the year 1946. Of these 50.5 percent were enrolled in the Republican Party, 45.7 percent in the Democratic Party, and only 3.7 percent in the American Labor Party. . . .

r. The Grand Jury, consisting of 23 persons, which returned the indictments against the petitioners

herein on July 20, 1948, presents the following occupational picture:

	No.	%	of Gainfully Occupied
Executives	11	52%	
Professionals	3	14%	
Clerical and sales persons	7	34%	
Manual workers	0	0%	
Total with gainful occupations	21	100%	
Housewives	1		
Retired	1		
Grand Total	23		

s. The same Grand Jury, when subjected to analysis for geographical distribution, presents the following picture [see table below]:

The exclusive village of Bronxville, in Westchester, with fewer than 5,000 voters in the 1948 elections, is represented by 3 jurors. The County

of Bronx, with more than 600,000 voters, is represented by 1 juror. . . .

7. Despite a certain unavoidable degree of incompleteness of the facts and evidence submitted herewith, the analyses referred to above amply establish the following demonstrable conclusions:

a. That all panels are closely and consistently unrepresentative of the major occupational groupings within the eligible population;

b. That the occupational patterns of the jury panels are so nearly identical as to refute any possibility that jurors are chosen at random or in accordance with methods of chance;

c. That the outstanding feature of the jury panels is its gross overrepresentation of the economic class of executives, proprietors and managers, and gross underrepresentation of the class of manual workers;

Manhattan	11
16 Cong. Dist. (Lower West Side)	0
17 Cong. Dist. ("silk stocking" district)	6
18 Cong. Dist. (Marcantonio district)	1
19 Cong. Dist. (Lower East Side)	0
20 Cong. Dist. (West Side-Riverside Drive)	3
21 Cong. Dist. (Wash. Heights)	1
22 Cong. Dist. (Harlem)	0
Bronx	1
23 Cong. Dist.	0
24 Cong. Dist.	0
25 Cong. Dist.	1 (Riverdale)
26 Cong. Dist.	0
Westchester County	10
Rockland County	1
Grand Total	23

d. That these features are not peculiar to any particular panel, series of panels, season of year, or portion of the period subjected to study;

e. That the panels demonstrate the existence of a persistent method, system and scheme of jury selection and composition, with only minor, slight and insignificant variations which in no instance constitute a substantial departure from the all-permeating design;

f. That within the framework of the system of jury selection in use in said court, room exists for the play of manipulation and the application of subtle methods of achieving pre-conceived objectives.

g. That the petit jury panel for January 17, 1949, before which the petitioners are scheduled to be tried, indisputably reflects in its composition the full contaminating influences of the illegal, discriminatory and undemocratic system of jury selection employed in the said court since about the year 1940, brought about by the deliberate, purposeful, and systematic inclusions and exclusions described in paragraph B3 hereof.

h. That the Grand Jury which returned the indictments against the petitioners indisputably reflects in its composition the full contaminating influences of the illegal, discriminatory and undemocratic system of jury selection employed in the said Court since about the year 1940, brought about as aforesaid.

8. No system of jury selection which operates in the manner here-

inbefore described, for the purposes hereinbefore set forth, and with the results herein referred to, can qualify in the minds of disinterested and democratic persons as a fair system of dispensing justice, or as a system in which justice can be obtained at all.

9. The methods of jury selection aforesaid have made it impossible for the juries in said Court to be, and said juries are not, impartial bodies truly representative of the community and drawn from a cross section thereof. Said methods and the results thereof are incompatible with the requirements of the law of the land, and have served to, and did, destroy in the said Court the foundations of an impartial democratic jury system as guaranteed under the Federal Constitution, the laws otherwise applicable thereto, the public policy of the United States, the due and proper administration of justice in said Court, and the appropriate supervision thereof.

D. The Extraordinary Circumstances in This Case.

1. By reason of the discriminatory practices described above, the jury system in the District Court for the Southern District of New York is invalid, illegal, unconstitutional and contrary to public policy. Petit and grand juries constituted thereunder are illegal and void and the indictments issued against petitioners by the grand jury are void and of no effect and convictions thereunder by petit juries constituted under this sys-

tem would be void. Thus the District Court lacks jurisdiction to proceed further against the defendants on the indictments, and the trials now scheduled for January 17, 1949, would be a nullity.

2. Petitioners have been indicted and face trial because of their advocacy and teaching of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and their participation in the Communist Party of the United States based upon such principles. For many years petitioners have devoted themselves to the welfare and interest of the working class, the unemployed, the poor, the oppressed and the victims of economic, racial, national and political discrimination, all of whom are within the excluded groups described herein. In so doing petitioners personally and as members and officers of the Communist Party of the United States did for many years and now do espouse, advocate and teach social, political and economic views which are antagonistic to the interests of the class or group comprising the rich, the propertied and the well-to-do as herein described, of which the juries in said court are the organ.

3. The constitution of the Communist Party of the United States referred to in the indictments provides in part as follows:

The Communist Party of the United States is a political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism. It champions the immediate and fundamental interests of

the workers, farmers, and all who labor by hand and brain, against capitalist exploitation and oppression. As the advanced party of the working class, it stands in the forefront of this struggle. (Preamble.)

* * *

The Communist Party recognizes that the final abolition of exploitation and oppression, of economic crises and unemployment, of reaction and war, will be achieved only by the socialist reorganization of society—by the common ownership and operation of the national economy under a government of the people led by the working class. (Preamble.)

* * *

The purposes of this organization are to promote the best interests and welfare of the working class and the people of the United States, to defend and extend the democracy of our country, to prevent the rise of fascism, and to advance the cause of progress and peace with the ultimate aim of ridding our country of the scourge of economic crises, unemployment, insecurity, poverty and war, through the realization of the historic aim of the working class—the establishment of Socialism by the free choice of the majority of the American people. (Article II, Sec. 1.)

Thus the interests of the group or class favored by the illegal discriminatory system of jury selection are most directly affected by the advocacy of the principles and purposes of the Communist Party of the United States above enunciated.

4. Petitioners and each of them fall within one or more of the classes:

or groups of persons discriminated against by the systematic inclusions and exclusions described. Petitioners Henry Winston and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr.,* are Negroes, the former a carpenter by trade. The trades of the other petitioners are as follows: Petitioner Potash, furrier and officer of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union; petitioner Thompson, machinist; petitioner Hall, lumberjack and steel worker; petitioner Foster, sailor, construction worker, railroad worker and labor organizer; petitioner Dennis, teamster, electrical worker, lumberjack; petitioner Gates, construction laborer; petitioner Williamson, pattern maker; petitioner Green, metal worker; petitioner Winter, draftsman; petitioner Stachel, capmaker.

5. The issues raised by the indictments are of profound and unprecedented constitutional, legal and political significance and of vital public importance. The indictments, which in effect seek to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States, affect not merely the petitioners, but the lives and liberty of the tens of thousands of American citizens who belong to or who may be labelled as belonging to the Communist Party, and the right of all persons to freedom of speech, press and assembly and to create political parties of their own choice.

6. Irreparable prejudice would exist in any case, but particularly exists in

* Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., holds an elective office in the City of New York as a member of the City Council.

the present case, in which the defendants are on trial for the teaching and advocacy of their said social, economic and political views based on Marxism-Leninism, and for alleged participation in the organization of the Communist Party. To require the defendants to stand trial upon the said charges before a jury whose composition is determined in accordance with the aforementioned system of exclusion, limitation and discrimination, makes a fair trial impossible, makes a mockery of due process, and commits the defendants to trial before a veritable conviction machine, with the cards stacked from the beginning against the defendants.

7. The trials on the thirteen indictments herein have every promise of being of extended duration, requiring the testimony of hundreds of witnesses and the introduction into evidence of innumerable, voluminous exhibits, thus imposing a staggering burden upon all concerned and particularly upon petitioners, none of whom is rich, propertied or well-to-do. Further, in the event of an appeal, a staggering load of time and expense will be imposed, all of which are unnecessary and improper by reason of the patent and transparent illegality of the Jury List in the said District Court. In any case, an appeal could not repair the injury which would flow from a conviction on indictments returned by a grand jury following trials before a petit jury drawn and selected as herein described in view of the considera-

tions referred to in paragraph 5. . . .

8. The disclosure of the discriminatory class nature of the jury system of the said District Court, the busiest in the country, resulting from the examination and analysis made by petitioners hereinabove referred to, presents a question of obviously great importance requiring the immediate and close attention of this Court. . . .

10. By reason of the immediate direction over and supervision of the establishment, maintenance and refinement of said system by the Chief

Judge, and the knowledge thereof and the acquiescence therein of all the Judges of said District Court, and the substantial interest of the said Judges, therefore, in maintaining and perpetuating the same, and their bias in favor thereof, as well as the necessity that such Judges testify with respect to the operation of the system, no Judge of said District Court can sit or preside over a proceeding to determine the facts here alleged and the validity of the method of jury selection. . . .

The Peace Can Be Won!

by Joseph Clark

It is **VERY** easy to dismiss the United Nations as a good idea gone wrong and to write it off completely on the basis of the recent Paris session of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Unfortunately, it is easy to do this because—using the charter of the U.N. as a criterion for what is right or wrong with that organization—so much did go wrong at Paris. “Harmonizing the actions of nations” goes one phrase in the charter. But how could you even hope for harmony when the U.N. met to the tune of—

—an Arab invasion of Palestine—sanctioned when the Assembly voted down the Soviet proposal for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Palestine;

—the continued military intervention and instigation of civil war in Greece by American troops—sanctified by an Assembly majority;

—introduction of the German issue into the Security Council in direct contradiction to article 107 of the charter which endorses the settlement of the peace treaties by the Big Four.

Before deciding whether the goings-on in the Palais De Chaillot wrecked the U.N. or whether that organization can still hope to “maintain peace and security,” let’s see

exactly why the Paris meetings left such a hangover among peoples thirsting for peace.

Every newspaper, movie newsreel, radio receiver, and school in the country exerted itself through the summer and fall to misinform Americans about what was happening at the U.N. The idea hammered home with the ruthless repetition worthy of Goebbels’ propaganda was that a great trial was taking place in Paris. Russia was the criminal in the dock. In some mysterious manner, fighting and troubles on the fabulous islands of Indonesia, on the hot sands of Palestine, in the cold plains of Manchuria, in the craggy peaks of Greece were all the fault of Russia. And a great Assembly of Nations was meeting as a tribunal in a beautiful palace in Paris to end all these troubles. At this great Assembly the high and mighty prosecutor appointed and anointed by God himself was Uncle Sam, also known as John Foster Dulles or George Marshall. The prosecuting attorney had many assistants, chief among whom were such angels of peace as diplomats from Great Britain, Holland, France, Syria, Belgium, Greece, Turkey, and many other cherubs.

But the same newspapers, movie newsreels, radios, and schools had a

hard time after the great trial was over. The criminal in the dock was not chastened. The mighty but just prosecutor and all his assistant angels came home with what they had departed. As a matter of fact, things didn’t end the way such a grand trial usually does in the movies, comic pages, radio stories, and newspaper serials. Hardly was the refuse swept out of the Palais De Chaillot when—

—war in Palestine gave hints of the “real thing”—but strangely it was British planes, not Russian, that seemed to be messing around the Negev;

—war in Indonesia became the cruel and unrelenting aggression of a colonial power—but, stranger still, the power wasn’t Russia and the weapons were American, not Polish or Czech;

—war in China turned the entire trial into a shambles; here nothing, but nothing, went according to the newspaper, movie newsreel, radio, and school conception.

—And a few weeks after the session was over, not the Soviet Union, but the U. S. State Department wrote off the United Nations, substituting a North Atlantic military alliance for the covenant of the United Nations.

That very covenant was predicated on the accord that the United Nations would be the instrument for maintaining peace only if the five permanent members of the Security Council were united against aggression, with the principle of unanimity and

co-operation as the basis for a successful world organization. When the relentless politics of imperialism came in collision with this rock upon which the U.N. charter was founded, the debacle of Paris was one of the results.

A brief examination of the main issues that came before the U.N. in Paris bears out that simple conclusion. We leave the main issue for last—Germany.

Korea. The voting majority decided to sanction continued U.S. military occupation of the Southern half of Korea and to recognize a Korean puppet regime based on U.S. military occupation forces, a regime including those Koreans who had sided with the Japanese during the war. All this was given a cloak of legitimacy by continuation of the U.N. Temporary Commission on Korea.

But the Korean issue is a simple one. All the newspapers in America can’t convince the Korean people that they are naturally ordained to live under military occupation. Before the Paris session of the U.N. ever met, the Soviet Union proposed that its troops be withdrawn from Northern Korea and that American troops leave the South.

What Korea needs is independence. Its own people should decide its own destinies. Under foreign military occupation and dictation this is obviously impossible. The last Soviet soldier left Korea during the Christmas holidays. But the voting majority

in Paris decided that Korea should remain divided into two parts and that U.S. troops should continue to occupy the Southern half. Our land and air forces were exceedingly busy in Southern Korea, building air strips capable of accommodating the largest bombers, and generally building a tremendous military base a few miles from Soviet boundaries. The establishment of a people's government in the North, however, gives promise that Korea will take the path toward its own liberation, despite the efforts of the men in striped trousers in Paris. However, the situation does pose a grave responsibility for the American people. Much bloodshed can be averted if the American people do their part to prevent the colonization of a heroic people who fought against Japanese rule for three decades but who must still fight to unite and free their country.

Disarmament. On this issue the Assembly took a giant stride backward compared with the first session of the Assembly in New York. In December 1946, the U.N. Assembly unanimously voted for a general reduction of armaments—all armaments, including weapons of mass destruction. In all lands that decision was hailed as a great event.

But the Paris voting majority reversed that decision when confronted with a proposal to begin carrying out the 1946 resolution. Instead of adopting the Soviet proposal for a one-third cut in the armed forces of

the Big Five during the coming year, the majority voted to "study" the question still more. John Foster Dulles' speech was tantamount to a declaration that as long as there was a socialist Soviet Union he would see to it that U.S. armaments were increased, not curtailed.

The same majority then rejected a Soviet Ukrainian proposal on international atomic control. This plan called for the *simultaneous* signing of agreements for international control and inspection, and for the destruction of all atom bombs. The Baruch plan was endorsed again, providing for an international cartel controlled by the U.S.-controlled voting majority to take over the uranium resources and ownership of atomic energy piles and plants all over the world.

While the Soviet delegation modified its stand on this issue, by supporting simultaneous destruction of the bomb and establishment of a U.N. system of control and inspection, the State Department clung to its original position. This Baruch plan has been brilliantly analyzed in the recently-published book, *Fear, War, and the Bomb*, by P. M. S. Blackett, Nobel prize winner. Blackett shows that adoption of the U.S. proposal on atomic energy would in effect establish all the uranium and all the atomic energy plants in the world under direct American control. By eliminating the Big Power unanimity clause, the Baruch plan insures the same voting majority on

atomic energy controls that worked so mechanically at the Palais De Chaillot. And by "U.N. ownership" of atomic plants, socialist countries would be surrendering a vital element of their socialist economy to control by U.S. monopolists.

Palestine. As in the instance of Korea, China, Greece, and Indonesia, Palestine is plagued by foreign military intruders. Invading troops in Palestine are there in utter disregard of international law and of U.N. decisions.

U.S. military forces are in Palestine ostensibly as U.N. representatives. Israel must be freed from the threat of intervention and aggression, and Palestine should consist of two independent states, as was decided in the historic U.N. decision of November 19, 1947.

But the dutiful voting majority rejected the Soviet proposal calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Palestine. The decision to establish a "Conciliation Commission" consisting of Turkey, France, and the United States was another blow at Israel. Both Turkey and France voted with the aggressors on crucial questions concerning Palestine, while the U.S. sided with the British in support of the Bernadotte plan which would have deprived Israel of the Negev, of Galilee, of Jerusalem.

Greece. True to form, the military intervention by U.S. troops was sanctioned and the voting majority condemned instead Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. Greece's neighbors,

and indirectly the Soviet Union, were condemned for not supporting the Truman Doctrine. But then President Truman himself officially announced the bankruptcy of his doctrine. Reporting on the Greek military aid program, Truman admitted that there was a larger People's Army fighting against the monarcho-fascists than before the U.S. had intervened. Using the President's figures, we learn that it cost the American taxpayer \$30,000 to kill each Greek anti-fascist fighter.

Germany. This issue did not come before the Assembly, but before the Security Council, where it had as little place under the charter as it would have had in the Assembly. As *Daily Worker* correspondent Joseph Starobin wrote when the Berlin question was brought before the U.N.: "The Security Council is not going to settle the Berlin issue, and the men who brought that issue to the Council knew it."

The Berlin issue was brought before the U.N. by the U.S. for two principal reasons. First, because American imperialism sought, under all circumstances, to prevent the possibility of peaceful agreement. Secondly, because the State Department had long in advance planned to create a Berlin crisis in order, at the U.N. session, to brand the U.S.S.R. an "aggressor," to issue a U.N. ultimatum, and to press its present and potential satellites into an anti-Soviet war front. This strategy boomeranged. Marshall and Co. suffered a

major setback. Fearing the peace forces at home, and faced by their deteriorating economic situation and political uncertainty, the assorted satellites were impelled to resist the intensified U.S. pressure to war. Hence, when the issue came up, even many members of the club of the voting majority found that the only way the Berlin issue could be solved was through Big Power negotiations—that is, in precisely the manner decided upon during the war by the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain. Security Council President Juan Atilio Bramuglia of Argentina assumed the role of mediator among the Big Four on the Berlin issue. While it was far from his intention, Bramuglia's efforts exposed the U.S. attempts to use the United Nations as a club against the Soviet Union on this issue. Bramuglia proceeded to draft proposals, not for consideration by the Security Council, but for approval by the Big Four. Each time, the State Department managed to extricate itself from such a terrible eventuality. The crisis continued and agreement was prevented—but not before many people who do not live by our newspapers, radios, newsreels, and schools saw more clearly than ever who wanted agreement on Germany and who wanted a crisis.

On October 24, Bramuglia came up with a compromise proposal on Berlin, which was agreed to by Soviet representative Andrei Vishinsky. This agreement provided two things

simultaneously and thus cut the knot of contention between the powers:

1. Lifting all restrictions on communications, transportation, and commerce between Berlin and the Western Zones of Germany, as well as transport and trade to the Soviet Zone.

2. Unifying Berlin's currency on the basis of the German Mark of the Soviet Zone, this to be carried out under the supervision of the four occupying powers in Berlin.

On October 25, the United States, Britain, and France rejected the Bramuglia-Vishinsky agreement.

Why was this agreement the natural solution for the impasse in Berlin? Because the introduction of the Western Zone Mark into Berlin precipitated the crisis and led to the Soviet restrictions on transportation and communication with the Western Zones. Establishing two currencies in one city was as vicious as it was absurd. It would wreck the economy of the city and would make as much sense as the circulation of British pounds and American dollars as legal tender in the city of Chicago.

Bramuglia did not have to be a Solomon to devise a plan providing for a simultaneous action that would remove the immediate causes of friction between the powers in Berlin. Rejection of that proposal on October 25 placed the onus for the Berlin crisis on those who prefer crisis to solutions, cold war to agreements, war to peace.

The negotiations dragged on at Paris till once more, on November 16, a basis for agreement was reached but vetoed in Washington. Australian delegate and Assembly President Herbert V. Evatt and U.N. Secretary General Trygve Lie proposed that the Big Four undertake peace talks and negotiations regarding Berlin and Germany. Vishinsky replied that his government agreed to such talks. He told Evatt and Lie: "The Soviet government also shares your point of view regarding the importance of personal contact and mutual confidence among the heads of the powers in the improvement of relations."

On the same day that Vishinsky made this reply, President Truman told reporters that he was rejecting peace talks among the Big Four. He took the occasion to reaffirm his support of Marshall's cold-war policies. What must be noted, however, is that there is something new and encouraging in the situation. The indecent haste with which U.S. imperialism was driving to the showdown of a "shooting war" strengthened the possibilities of a rift in the war camp. The conditions were facilitated for negotiated peaceful agreement on the basis of co-operation of a number of European capitalist states with the U.S.S.R. for ending the cold war, for making advances toward peace.

In summary, the Paris meetings of the United Nations became another episode in the cold war. What light does this cast on the overwhelming issue of the day: war or peace? What

can we learn about the attitudes of the ruling circles here regarding the possibility of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems—capitalism and socialism?

American imperialist spokesmen are waging a strenuous ideological campaign to shift the onus for war-mongering from Wall Street where, by the facts, it rests, to the Soviet Union. The article by a State Department representative signing himself "Historicus" in the January issue of *Foreign Affairs* is among the latest efforts in this demagogic campaign. "Historicus" labors in the vineyard of Marxist-Leninist literature in a vain effort to "prove" that the socialist state and the capitalist countries cannot live at peace together. But, for all its trappings of "scholarship" and "objectivity," this piece is but another sordid attempt to justify the present foreign policy of the American capitalist class—to justify the cold war, and to throw the blame for conflict in the world today on the forces of socialism and democracy. More than that, it is an effort to rationalize Wall's Street drive for world domination as a policy "forced upon us" by the Soviet Union.

But, cutting through all the calumnies, distortions, and falsifications that are the stock-in-trade of bourgeois "studies" of Soviet policy, the most diligent research serves only to confirm the unswerving confidence of the Soviet leaders in the possibility of the peaceful co-existence of the

two systems—a position that is validated in the proven peace policy of the U.S.S.R.

It is this principled peace policy of the socialist state which led Stalin to declare on November 6, 1944:

To win the war against Germany is to accomplish a great historical task. But winning the war is not in itself synonymous with insuring for the nations lasting peace and guaranteeing security in the future. The thing is not only to win the war but also to render new aggression and new war impossible, if not forever then at least for a long time to come. . . .

Well, what means are there to preclude fresh aggression on Germany's part, and, if war should start nevertheless, to nip it in the bud and give it no opportunity to develop into a big war?

There is only one means to this end, in addition to the complete disarmament of the aggressive nations: that is, to establish a special organization made up of representatives of the peace-loving nations to uphold peace and safeguard security; to put the necessary minimum of armed forces required for the averting of aggression at the disposal of the directing body of this organization, and to obligate this organization to employ these armed forces without delay if it becomes necessary to avert or stop aggression and punish the culprits.

This must not be a repetition of the ill-starred League of Nations which had neither the right nor the means to avert aggression. It will be a new, special, fully authorized world organization having at its command everything necessary to uphold peace and avert new aggression.

Can we expect the actions of this world organization to be sufficiently effective? They will be effective if the great powers which have borne the brunt of the war against Hitler-Germany continue to act in a spirit of unanimity and accord. They will not be effective if this essential condition is violated.

The late President Roosevelt was firm in his belief that the U.N. must rest on the principle of Big Power unanimity and co-operation. As Elliott Roosevelt notes in his record* of the Yalta conference, it was F.D.R. who was responsible for the U.N. unanimity ("veto") clause. "The solution of the dilemma," Elliott Roosevelt wrote, "posed by this procedural question was Father's. The Big Three, plus China and France, must agree unanimously, so said the solution, before the world organization can take economic or military action against an aggressor."

The steady deterioration of American-Soviet relations since the formation of the U.N. in 1945 can be traced directly to the violation of the principle of Big Power co-operation. As soon as the United Nations was transformed into a convenient cloak for covering Western political and military alliance, it could no longer serve in the spirit of its charter. The so-called Berlin crisis, as projected in Paris, was only a continuation of the situation created when the Yalta and Potsdam agreements became scraps of paper. The bipartisan foreign pol-

* Elliott Roosevelt, *As He Saw It*, Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, New York, 1946, p. 239.

icy that evolved under Truman represented the open abrogation of those wartime agreements. Senator Arthur Vandenberg admitted as much when he said he would "never return to Yalta." The history of the German question then became a shameful race to convert Germany into an arsenal and military base for an ever-expanding American imperialism. The wars in China, Indonesia, Palestine, and Greece became expressions of that world-wide expansion which uses war as a continuation of the politics of capitalist exploitation here and throughout the world.

And the North Atlantic military alliance proclaimed by the State Department was a fist punched through the charter of the United Nations. This military alliance, along with

the unprecedented budget in which President Truman proposed a 50 percent (\$21,000,000,000) expenditure for war, indicated that policy in Washington was running counter to the peace promises made during the election campaign.

"Historicus" and Co. really prove one thing—that the peaceful co-existence of the two systems is endangered because aggressive imperialism is the warmaker. But war is not inevitable. There can be peace, but it will be because the forces of anti-imperialism and peace, of democracy and socialism the world over, are daily growing stronger and are capable of checking the war incendiaries. Therein lies the hope for the future of the United Nations, for a future of peace.

"Whatever fate may befall the great Chinese republic against which various 'civilized' hyenas are now sharpening their teeth, no power in the world will re-establish serfdom in Asia, or wipe out the heroic democracy of the masses of the people in Asiatic and semi-Asiatic countries."

V. I. Lenin, in *Marx-Engels-Marxism*.

How "Historicus" Caricatures History

by George Siskind

"STOP-THIEF" demagoguery has become the major ideological method of imperialism to justify its feverish war preparations and to shift responsibility for the increased war tension upon the Soviet Union.

With terrific fanfare, the semi-official State Department quarterly review, *Foreign Affairs*, in its January issue, displays an article purporting to be an "exhaustive," "scholarly," and "objective" study of Stalin's writings on the relations between the Socialist Soviet Union and the capitalist world.

The article, entitled "Stalin on Revolution," appears anonymously, signed simply, "Historicus." The author, it has been reported, is George Morgan, first secretary to the U.S. Embassy in the U.S.S.R. and heralded as one of the few "Soviet experts" in the State Department.

The article was carefully publicized in prominent newspaper stories on the date of its appearance, and has since been quoted widely by apologists for American imperialist policy.

MASTERPIECE OF DISTORTION

As an ideological work, the *Historicus* article is a masterpiece of distortion and calumny, a sleight-of-hand performance to capture the

credulous, the naive, and the ignorant.

What is *Historicus*' technique? It may be summed up as follows: With pompous "scholarship," he marshals an imposing array of citations and quotations from "originally published" and "republished" sources, which he palms off as Stalin's fundamental views on the "science" and "art" of revolution.

Embracing the cosmos (in a few pages), *Historicus* lightly glides over such vast areas as dialectical and historical materialism, productive forces and production relations, the "basic" contradictions of capitalism, the imperialist epoch, objective and subjective conditions for revolution, the Party, strategy and tactics, etc., etc. This entire "investigation" into Marxism-Leninism is undertaken to establish the Goebbels thesis—that socialism is *the* menace to peace and that imperialism is therefore justified in its policy of war.

This thesis of Goebbels and his latter-day American disciples can be established only by calling night day, myth reality, and warmongering the pursuit of peace.

Before proceeding to the heart of the question, namely, the possibility of peaceful co-existence of the two systems, it will be helpful to expose *Historicus*' pretense to objectivity.

HOW "HISTORICUS" CARICATURES HISTORY

29

Of course, we can have no quarrel with *Historicus*' quoting from Marxist-Leninist classics; indeed, readers of bourgeois publications have too long been denied access to the scientific thought that animates tens of millions and is shaping the future. But *Historicus* is not quoting Marxist-Leninist works in order to inform or enlighten.

Historicus has a job to do for the State Department. He has to "prove" that capitalism and socialism cannot live together in peace, that the Soviet Union, by its very nature as a socialist state, is, and must be, committed to a policy of waging war against the capitalist world. But he cannot disregard the open record, known to the whole world, namely, the repeated emphasis of the Soviet Union on the possibility and desirability of peaceful co-existence, and the unremitting struggle of the Soviet leaders for peaceful, friendly relations with all states. His problem, then, is to wish this position and this struggle for peace out of existence. If, then, to make his point, quotations and citations must be ripped out of the context of specific relationships of forces pertaining to given situations, intellectual integrity must bow before the categorical imperative of cold cash and cold war.

What cynical lack of principle, to close the door to the very possibility of agreement and feverishly to organize war against the Soviet Union, and at the same time to shout that those who emphasize the possibility and desirability of peaceful relations

are driving to war, that those exposing imperialist aggression are the fomenters of war! What colossal hypocrisy this monopoly hireling displays when he tortures a quotation from Lenin implying the possibility under certain conditions of the Socialist state resorting to armed force against capitalist states and says not a word about the bestial intervention, the "March of the 14 Nations" in 1918, against the Soviet Union, when he "forgets" the Pilsudski expeditions financed by Britain and France, the blockades, embargoes, cordons sanitaires and all the imperialist attempts to strangle the socialist state!

Nor should it be forgotten that the imperialists, in the days of intervention, sang the same tune to rationalize their crimes against humanity, as does *Historicus*. To cover their intervention at that time, the imperialists shouted that Lenin, by taking Russia out of the first imperialist war, had "betrayed" their struggle against Germany; that Soviet Russia "fomented" revolution in Europe; that the weak socialist state, beset by enormous internal problems, was "preparing war" against the "peaceful West."

And, fresh in our memories is the fact that none other than Hitler, seeking to justify fascist Germany's premeditated assault upon the U.S.S.R., also accused the Soviet Union of "aggressive preparations and acts."

HOW HISTORICUS QUOTES

Faced by insuperable difficulties in attempting to prove his thesis, Historicus seizes upon one quotation from Lenin which he arbitrarily monumentalizes as the very heart and center of Leninism, and hence of Stalin's entire theoretical position.

What is this overpowering quotation, as given by Historicus? The "victorious proletariat" in the socialist state, "after organizing its own Socialist production, *should* [my italics—G.S.] stand up . . . *against* the remaining capitalist world, attracting to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raising revolts in those countries against the capitalists, in the event of necessity coming out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their governments."

The impression Historicus wishes to create, in order to trap the reader unschooled in Leninist literature, is that in this quotation Lenin states, and Stalin accepts, as the principle that must govern the Soviet Union's relations with the capitalist world, an iron-bound program applicable to all situations and world relationships.

But what are the facts? What was the specific setting, the true context, from which this garbled text was plucked?

The quotation is excised from a brief article by Lenin entitled "The United States of Europe Slogan," written August 23, 1915, for publication in the newspaper *Sotsial-Demo-*

krat. In this article Lenin analyzed the slogan "For a United States of Europe," proclaimed in the midst of the first imperialist war by Trotsky and others. Even a cursory reading of the article makes it clear that Lenin was studying that slogan (which he rejected) from the viewpoint of the law of the uneven development of capitalism particularly characteristic of the imperialist epoch, on the basis of which he drew two fundamental conclusions: (1) that the simultaneous victory of socialism on the whole European continent is precluded by the operation of the law of uneven development, and (2) that this same law determines a more likely course, namely, the victory of socialism first in one country.

At the very end of this article, written, it should be remembered, in 1915, *before* the Soviet state came into existence, Lenin took a look into the future. The passage quoted by Historicus and cited above was a theoretical prognostication by Lenin (made in an environment of raging imperialist war) concerning the possible outlines of the future, of the most likely relationships that would obtain between one socialist country emerging from the war and the imperialist world.

Basically, in this brief passage Lenin dealt with the attitude and policies of *the imperialist world* toward a newly-arisen socialist state which would emerge during the imperialist war.

What were the dangers foreseen

by Lenin? Lenin foresaw the danger of imperialist counter-revolution and intervention, of violent attempts to strangle the socialist state. A war against socialism cannot be separated from violent counter-revolution and frightful repression of the masses in the imperialist home countries and in the colonies. And when Lenin said that, "in the event of necessity" the socialist state "would rise up against the remaining capitalist world," what necessity would compel the socialist state to follow that course? The socialist state, in conjunction with the separate national struggles of the masses in the imperialist and colonial countries, fighting for their own vital interests, *would* be compelled to take the steps that Lenin so clearly outlined, in the event of an anti-socialist, counter-revolutionary war against the people.

What Lenin regarded as a possibility, arising out of necessity, Historicus shamelessly distorts into a fundamental program.*

It would be well if our "American century" monopolists and their statesmen and apologists paid heed to Lenin's qualifying phrase "in the event of necessity." For, in actual fact, when, since the birth of the Soviet Union in 1917, did the socialist state come out "with armed

force" against "exploiting classes and their governments"? Twist and squirm as he might, Historicus cannot deny that such "coming out" occurred precisely twice in history—during the war of intervention against the Soviet Union, and during the recent fascist invasion. Most certainly, the event of the necessity caused by the German fascist imperialist invasion, aided by its quisling and Munichite abettors, aimed at the extermination of the Soviet people and world enslavement, caused the land of socialism to come out with such armed force that decisively crushed the invader and helped eliminate the number of fascist ruling classes and their governments. History justifies the assumption that in the case of similar "events of necessity," the results will be even more disastrous for imperialism. It is no accident that the same Churchill who projected at Fulton a repeat performance of "the war of fourteen nations," the phrasing of which he had cynically coined, should be the arch-hero of our "peace-pursuing" Historicus.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE TURNED INTO OPPOSITE

Let us now turn briefly to Stalin's use of the above quotation from Lenin.

As we saw, Historicus moves heaven and earth to sell the monstrous Lie that the very heart of Marxism-Leninism, and the "logical outcome of Stalin's entire theoretical position" is the intention to use the

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 141. Incidentally, it must be noted that Lenin's own words do not suffice for our "impartial" and "precise" scholar who breathes "objectivity." This pen pirate is obliged to distort the sense of Lenin by substituting the word "should" (italized above) for the word "would" used by Lenin: Thus, in Lenin's words, "the victorious proletariat . . . would [my italics—G.S.] stand up against the rest of the capitalist world."

Soviet Union as the base for world revolution thus, according to Historicus, making peaceful relations impossible and armed conflict between the two systems inevitable. Lacking a single shred of evidence in actual Soviet practice, he seizes on the above-quoted citation from Lenin used by Stalin in 1924, and cynically rejects numerous explicit and crystal clear programmatic statements by Stalin on the possibility of peaceful co-existence of the two systems. He disregards the confirmation of the validity of these statements by history, by the actual policies of the Soviet Union, by life itself.

In his interview with Harold E. Stassen in April, 1947, Stalin made the following clear-cut reply to Stassen's question whether he (Stalin) thought "these two economic systems can exist together in the same modern world in harmony with each other":

Of course, they can. The differences between them is not of essential importance insofar as co-operation is concerned. The systems in Germany and the United States are the same, yet war broke out between them. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. systems are different, but we have not waged war against each other and the U.S.S.R. does not propose to. If during the war they could co-operate, why can't they today in peace?

And Stalin continued:

Let us not criticize mutually our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain.

Which is the better will be said by history. . . . To co-operate one does not need the same systems. One should respect the other system when approved by the people. Only on this basis can we secure co-operation.

What is the frame of reference of Stalin's article, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists," in which Stalin cites the quotation from Lenin discussed above? That article is a polemic against the Trotskyist denial of the possibility of socialism in one country. After outlining the teachings of Lenin establishing that possibility, Stalin examines the conditions that make it possible for a single socialist land to survive in a capitalist encirclement. Stalin proceeds to remind the Soviet people of Lenin's forecast (in 1915) of what would be the relation of the socialist land to the capitalist world *in the event of necessity* (which came with the German fascist imperialist invasion).

The full implication of Historicus' deliberate distortion becomes clear when we note that virtually every citation from Stalin on the relation between two world systems deals with the question of the final, *ultimate* guarantee of survival of one socialist state encircled by a capitalist world. That *ultimate guarantee* against imperialist armed intervention, Stalin states, can come only as a result of victorious socialist revolutions in a number of capitalist countries. For, as long as relatively strong imperialist states exist, there will inevitably be the continu-

ing danger of imperialists of the Churchill, Dulles, Marshall, Historicus stripe baring their fangs against the socialist state.

However, to say that the victory of the revolution in a number of other countries will *finally* guarantee the single socialist state against intervention does not by any stretch of the imagination imply that the Leninist program calls for the socialist state to carry the revolution by force of arms to the encircling capitalist states. Anyone not blinded by bestial hate of humanity and socialism can readily see that it is not the socialist state that threatens the imperialist world with force of arms. On the contrary. It is because the imperialists never relinquish their ambition to crush the socialist state that Lenin and Stalin are compelled to deal with the question of the *final* guarantee against such intervention. And the whole essence of Marxism-Leninism determines that revolution "in a number of other capitalist states" will develop only as a consequence of the maturing contradictions of capitalism and of the revolutionary will of the working classes and toiling people of those countries, and never as a result of outside force.

That socialism in one country is by example a powerful moral and political force inspiring the struggle for socialism in all capitalist countries was never denied but openly proclaimed by Lenin and Stalin.

Thus, in that same article, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists," Stalin

wrote: "It goes without saying that we need support. But what does support of our revolution by the West-European proletariat imply? Is not the sympathy of European workers for our revolution, their readiness to thwart the imperialists' plans of intervention—is not all this support? Is this not real assistance? Of course, it is. If it had not been for this support, if it had not been for this assistance, not only from the European workers but also from the colonial and dependent countries, the proletarian dictatorship in Russia would have been in a tight corner. Has this sympathy, this assistance, coupled with the might of our Red Army and the readiness of the workers and peasants of Russia to defend their Socialist fatherland to the last—has all this been sufficient to beat off the attacks of the imperialists and to win us the necessary conditions for the serious work of construction? Yes, it has been sufficient."

The fundamental position of Stalin is crystal clear. It is the moral and political support of the socialist state by the toiling people everywhere, and not armed force, that has been sufficient—between the two wars of intervention *launched by imperialism*—to maintain the Soviet Union.

The record of the socialist state establishes that it is committed to a consistent policy of the peaceful competition between the two systems. It is content to let history give its verdict. The objective laws of social development determine that the superior social system will win by ex-

ample, by the extent to which it raises the material and cultural standards of the people, and guarantees the highest happiness of all as the condition for the greatest advance of each.

MAIN BODY CONTRADICTS CONCLUSIONS

It would require a book to give a detailed treatment of the numerous misinterpretations, crude errors, misstatements and falsifications in the *Historicus* article. What must be dealt with, however, is the violent contradiction between the main body of the article, which presumes to summarize the Marxist scientific world view, and the conclusions of the article.

Dialectical materialism, as applied to society, scientifically establishes the historical character of capitalism which, like the social formations preceding it, arises at a definite historical stage, generates insoluble inner contradictions in the course of its development, and at a specific point in its development gives way to the higher system—socialism. It is because of its organic inner contradictions, and because it brings to maturity the conditions requisite for socialism, that the fall of capitalism and the triumph of socialism are equally inevitable. This well known postulate of Marxism expresses itself with particular sharpness in the monopoly stage of capitalism. Thus, capitalism cannot survive without the periodic destruction of enormous masses of means of production and labor power through cyclical crises and predatory imperial-

ist wars—without visiting the most incredible horrors and suffering upon the people.

Marxist-Leninists have always mercilessly combatted all anarchist, Blanquist conceptions of social revolution as plots or putsches hatched by conspirators. Only the millions can effect social transformations when the prerequisites for revolution have matured as a result of the objective laws of development and the inner contradictions of the social system. And Leninism emphasizes the fundamental lesson of all social revolutions, that revolutions cannot be made at will, but *only* when the millions find it impossible to live in the old way, and the ruling classes cannot rule in the old way. Furthermore, Marx and Engels established as long ago as 1848 that no social system can be abolished so long as it continues to advance the productive forces of society, so long as it does not become a fetter upon the further development of the social productive forces.

Historicus, the refined and “scholarly” war incendiary presumes to summarize the whole body of Marxist-Leninist theory in the main body of his article only to ignore and contradict all the basic tenets of that science in his conclusions and bring forth the hoary, oft-discredited, and crude lie of revolutions made to order in Moscow.

The truth of Stalin’s dictum that revolutions are not articles of export is borne out by the very essence of Marxism-Leninism and in the practice of the Soviet state.

For changes in the life of a people are never accomplished by the advice of a party, and because tens of millions of people do not undertake a revolution on the mere advice of parties. And such a change will be far more of a revolution than the overthrow of the imbecile Nicholas Romanov. I repeat, tens of millions of people do not undertake a revolution to order. They do so when privation has become desperate, when the condition of the people has become intolerable, and when the general pressure and determination of tens of millions of people shatter all the old partitions and are truly able to create a new life.*

Despite the deceit and distortions of a *Historicus*, motivated by his masters’ fear of peace that would result from the peaceful negotiation of differences with the Soviet Union, *war is not inevitable*. The peaceful co-existence of capitalism and socialism is not only desirable as the condition for saving mankind from the untold horrors of atomic slaughter, but it is fully possible.

In the final analysis, however, the decisive word rests with the people. A *Historicus* thesis threatens economic ruin, loss of freedom, atomic war, death and destruction to millions of Americans. Peaceful relations and mutual respect between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. is not of concern to the people of the Soviet Union alone. It is of equally vital concern to the American people. The Soviet leaders have spoken for disarmament, for negotiation of differ-

ences, for the full sovereign equality and freedom of all nations, for the right of every nation to conduct its affairs without outside intervention or coercion, for honoring and respecting commitments in mutual agreements.

The undeniable record of the Soviet Union’s magnificent struggle for peace exposes the utter cynicism of the imperialist ranting about the so-called sudden “peace offensive” of the U.S.S.R. today. This *so sudden* peace offensive actually began with the very birth of the Soviet Union and has not waned for a day since.

The great American people are devoted to peace. The fact that Americans live under capitalist conditions is our concern, just as the fact that the Soviet people live in a socialist state is their internal affair. When the American working class, at the head of all the exploited and oppressed, sees fit to change the social system under which they now live (as they inevitably will), it will come as a result of their will and their decision alone.

In the meantime the two great peoples, living under two diverse systems, who collaborated in winning the war, can and must cooperate in securing a stable peace. But to end the cold war, to save this generation from a third, more destructive, atomic war, the American people must isolate and defeat the instigators of war.

The American people want peace. Even though the Marshall Plan

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 369.

demagoguery has temporarily misled considerable sections of the masses, the people are definitely opposed to the sinister objectives of that Plan for imperialist world domination and for reaction at home. Truman is in the White House today fundamentally because, in their fear of an aggressive war policy, the people were in great measure influenced by the Truman "peace" demagoguery in the last weeks of the election campaign. The answer to the fascist-like anti-Communist hysteria, to the frame-up thought-control trial of the Communist Party leaders, to the antics of the Un-American Committee, must be the people's increased resistance to the warmakers who foment this hysteria to further their war aims. With united strength, the people can defeat the war plotters. The conditions for ending the cold war are made brighter than ever by the glorious victories of the Chinese people. The camp of peace and democracy is immeasurably stronger than the camp of imperialist reaction and war. The American people, with the working class taking the lead, can and will act for peace and freedom.

"We surely cannot deny to any nation that right whereon our own government is founded, that every one may govern itself according to whatever form it pleases, and change these forms at its own will; and that it may transact its business with foreign nations through whatever organs it thinks proper, whether King, Convention, Assembly, Committee, President, or anything else it may choose. The will of the nation is the only essential thing to be guarded."

Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Gouverneur Morris, March 12, 1793.

The Struggle For the Lincoln Heritage

by Abner W. Berry

ON FEBRUARY 12, this year, Republican bigwigs will rattle the bones of Lincoln at their pompous dinners. But they will be careful to leave undisturbed the real substance of Lincoln's objectives, not to mention the real significance of Lincoln today.

In other quarters, certain Negro "leaders," satisfied with imperialism's promises of freedom, will proclaim Harry S. Truman the inheritor of Lincoln's mantle. And "liberals" who sugar-coat the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, twin instruments of the bipartisan attack on democracy around the globe, will don Abolitionist robes and curtsy to a tradition they dare not invoke in action today.

They who damned Henry A. Wallace when he blazed a trail in the South in the best tradition of John Brown, the man who prepared the way for Lincoln, will fraudulently lay claim to the memory of Lincoln enshrined in the hearts of the people. Reaction cannot help but pervert to its own ends the symbol of the builder and leader of the great historic coalition against the forces of slavery.

LINCOLN AND THE PEOPLE'S COALITION

Frontier capitalism, hemmed in by the slave power, chafing under the

fetters clamped upon it by the slavocracy, found in the "railsplitter" its revolutionary representative. Every progressive force in Lincoln's day united under his leadership in a political and military coalition against the Southern slaveholders. Lincoln's ascendancy to the Presidency in 1860—on a third party ticket—was the crowning achievement in more than a decade of struggle against the expanding slave power.

Workers and Abolitionists, exponents of an ascendent capitalism, Communist followers of Karl Marx, Southern upland whites, Negroes of the South, and the free Negroes of the North—all played a part in developing the struggle against slavery. These were the forces which shaped Lincoln's political outlook.

The Civil War was waged by all the progressive forces in American society whose future hinged on the abolition of slavery.

Industrial capitalism, slowly emerging and developing in the United States in the first half of the 19th century, required for its further development the capitalist unification of the country, with freedom to exploit the natural resources and labor power in the South as well as in the North. The Northern manufacturers required a complete monopoly on the cotton raw material produced in

the South. For this group, chattel slavery was a great obstacle to the further development of the newer means of production, to the spread of machine production.

For the working class being born in the Northern factories, and interested in improving its lot, in organizing and struggling for better working and living conditions, and ultimately for a better society, Negro slavery in the South was a heavy millstone weighing down its further development, organization, and struggles. The working class readily understood the truth in the words uttered by Lincoln in March of 1860: "If you give up your convictions and call slavery right . . . you let slavery in upon you. Instead of white laborers who can strike, you'll soon have black laborers who can't."

Lincoln himself stemmed from the class of farmers, small storekeepers, and small traders. This class, too, was fettered by the "monstrous injustice of slavery itself" (Lincoln). Slave production meant the death of agriculture conducted by free men, it placed distinct limits on the growth of commerce. The growth and spread of plantation farming based on slave labor signified an end to the frontier, to the free lands in the West available to farmers faced with exhausted soil and domineering cities springing up in their midst.

For all of progressive humanity, interested in the extension of democracy, of civil rights, of science, education, and culture, slavery was the central issue of the day, the road-

block to further progress. And it was Lincoln who best represented the coalition that was forged in the common struggle for the abolition of the slave system.

In its early stages, Lincoln waged the war against the slave states with the limited aim of preserving the Union. As late in the conflict as August 22, 1862, he could write (to Horace Greeley):

. . . My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. . . . What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union.

At the same time, however, he reassured Greeley that: ". . . I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free."

Lincoln's early reluctance, as displayed in this letter, to pursue a revolutionary course, was reflected concretely by the acceptance within his political coalition of the border slaveholders in Maryland and Missouri. But he learned—both from the war itself and from the Abolitionists and Communists who pressed for an Emancipation Proclamation.

The Negro leader Frederick Douglass, by his untiring work in the Abolitionist movement and his recruitment of Negro regiments for the Federal armies, was an important figure in Lincoln's coalition. Douglass did much to influence Lincoln

to sign the Emancipation Proclamation.

In England, Karl Marx and his followers played a prominent role in preventing British and West European intervention on behalf of the slavocracy by conducting mass agitation in support of the war against slavery and by mobilizing the workers in mass protest actions. At the same time, Marx pressed for a turn from the purely *constitutional* waging of the war by the North, to the waging of a *revolutionary war* for the uprooting of slavery.

Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation, issued on January 1, 1863, was a coalition document, fought for, from the beginning of the conflict, by the most advanced sections of the anti-slavery coalition.

The contributions of the Communists were not limited to the political sphere. As early as March 27, 1862, writing on the military aspects of the struggle, Marx noted in brilliant fashion that "Georgia is the key to Secessia [the South]," and proceeded to outline an audacious plan for the conquest of Georgia which was designed to split the Confederacy in two. This was, in outline, the plan which General Sherman later executed, thereby reducing the Civil War to a mopping-up campaign. But Sherman's march could be undertaken only after the political line of the war had changed from one of merely saving the Union to one of saving the Union by abolishing slavery. Marx's dialectical

view of the interrelationship between the military and political aspects of the war is what enabled him to propose a battle plan fully a year before the Federal armies adopted it.

Nor should it be forgotten that American Communists, far from being falsely branded and hounded as "foreign agents" or "conspirators plotting the overthrow of the government"—as is the current vogue among the real enemies of the nation, the men of the trusts—were officially recognized as having performed outstanding services for the preservation of the Union, the defeat of the slave power, and the extension of democracy. Symbolic of the acknowledged contributions of the Marxists to the Northern cause is Lincoln's commissioning of Joseph Weydemeyer, a leading American Marxist, as brigadier general, following his service as commandant of the St. Louis military district; and also the commissioning as general, in 1862, of August Willich, who had been a prominent member of the *Communist League* for which Marx and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto*.

THE BASIS OF LINCOLN'S GREATNESS

Lincoln was well-fitted for his tasks as leader of the anti-slavery coalition. Despite his middle-class hesitations, he matured politically and personally in the course of struggle. His unwillingness to compromise with the slave power against the national interest made his transition to the

revolutionary form of struggle inevitable.

Five years before he was elected to the Presidency, Lincoln wrote (to George Robertson): "Experience has demonstrated, I think, that there is no peaceful extinction of slavery in prospect for us."

In the same letter, Lincoln criticized the compromisers, among whom he named Henry Clay, for seeking and hoping for "gradual emancipation":

When we were the political slaves of King George, and wanted to be free, we called the maxim that "all men are created equal," a self-evident truth, but now when we have grown fat and have lost all dread of being slaves ourselves, we have become so greedy to be masters that we call the same maxim "a self-evident lie."

In commenting upon the "utterances of Lincoln in which he resolutely declares that he will not deviate a hair's breadth from his [preliminary] proclamation [dated September 22, 1862]," Marx quoted a London newspaper as follows:

He [Lincoln]—observes *The Morning Star* with justice—has by successive exhibitions of firmness, taught the world to know him as a slow but solid man who advances with excessive caution, but does not go back. Each step of his administrative career has been in the right direction and has been stoutly maintained. Starting from the resolution to exclude slavery from the territories, he has come within sight of the ulterior result of all anti-slavery movements—its extirpation from the whole

soil of the Union—and has already reached the high vantage ground at which the Union ceased to be responsible for the enslavement of a single human being.

In this period of intense struggle between the forces of reaction led by the Wall Street monopolies and the forces of the future under the leadership of the working class, the stature of Lincoln as a great democratic leader must be seen, not only with relation to his role in the struggle against slavery, but also in terms of his outspoken declarations on such questions as the rights of labor to strike, to organize, and to struggle for a better life; the rights of the foreign born and defense against their persecution; the right of the enslaved colonial peoples to revolt; the right of the Negro people to vote; and the inalienable right of the people to change their system of government when they so desire.

In the early days of the formation of the Republican Party, Lincoln denounced the Know-Nothing movement, which was conducting a vicious, chauvinist crusade against immigrants. Unlike Truman, Lincoln did not order his Attorney-General to start deportation proceedings against revolutionary democrats like Carl Schurz—he appointed such men to government posts. Lincoln, the great patriot, did not fear the appellation "internationalist." He told a committee from the New York Workingmen's Association that: "The strongest bond of human sym-

pathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindreds."

Lincoln's interchange of correspondence with Karl Marx and the International Workingmen's Association is well known. Through the U.S. Ambassador to Britain he not only thanked the International, but welcomed the political support rendered the Union cause by Communists and European workers.

Lincoln was not a Socialist, but his great social insight and his kinship with the toiling people from whom he sprang were such as to enable him to tell Congress (in his annual message of December 3, 1861):

Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration.

It was this view that prompted him to lash out at the Taft-Hartleyites of his day, who labelled every union and every strike a "conspiracy," in his ringing defense of the right of labor to strike:

I am glad to see that a system of labor prevails in New England under which laborers can strike when they want to, where they are not obliged to work under all circumstances, and are not tied down and obliged to labor whether you pay them or not! I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail every-

where. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here.

Let those apologists of the bourgeoisie who whined when the people labelled Taft-Hartleyism as a slave labor set-up, take note of Lincoln's intimate linking up of the rights of labor with freedom from slavery.

Again, in these days, when official representatives of the U.S. imperialist government cynically request the Dutch imperialists to remove U.S. labels from the weapons used to drench Indonesian soil with the blood of patriots struggling for *their* 1776, it is fitting to recall that Lincoln wrote: "That it is the right of any people, sufficiently numerous for national independence, to throw off, to revolutionize, their existing form of government, and to establish such other in its stead as they may choose." (Written in 1852, shortly after the arrival in this country of Louis Kosuth, leader of the Hungarian revolution of 1848, this was part of a resolution prepared by Lincoln for a meeting held in behalf of Hungarian freedom.)

The tragic death of Lincoln at the hands of an unreconstructed Dixiecrat assassin occurred before the adoption of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution. Nonetheless, the deeply democratic sentiments and ideals of the "rail-splitter" on the subject of Negro rights were expressed as early as 1842, in his words to a group of free Negroes in Cincinnati:

. . . All legal distinction between in-

dividuals of the same community, founded in any such circumstances as color, origin, and the like, are hostile to the genius of our institutions, and incompatible with the true history of American liberty. Slavery and oppression must cease, or American liberty must perish.

I embrace, with pleasure, this opportunity of declaring my disapprobation of that clause of the Constitution which denies to a portion of the colored people the right of suffrage.

True Democracy makes no inquiry about the color of the skin, or place of nativity, or any other similar circumstances of condition. *I regard, therefore, the exclusion of the colored people as a body from the elective franchise as incompatible with true democratic principles.* (My emphasis—A.W.B.)

These ringing words were uttered one hundred and seven years ago. Yet what is the shameful reality of the present day? Millions of Negroes in the South live under a constant reign of terror, of force and violence if you please, designed to prevent them from exercising their fundamental Constitutional right to the ballot. The poll tax is still the law of the land in the South. Mr. Truman's Dixiecrat partners in imperialist piracy sit in the House, in the Senate, and in his Cabinet, in flagrant violation of the 14th Amendment. His Attorney-General, that Bourbon-minded Southern gentleman, Tom Clark, instead of tracking down the Ku Klux Klan gangsters who are responsible for the cold-blooded murder of the young Negro veteran,

Macio Snipes, who sought to vote, and of countless other innocent men, women, and children, occupies his time hounding Communists, trade unionists, and other progressives. Truman's "loyalty order" intimidates government workers, demanding their views on the subject of equal rights for Negroes. His F.B.I. agents persecute Negro post office employees and other government workers who are fighting to realize an equal rights program *now*. Instead of invoking the 14th Amendment, which calls for "supremacist" appointees, Truman countenances the attempt to jail Eugene Dennis, the bold challenger of the whole rotten Jim-Crow system. And under the President's direction, Tom Clark secures from a Jim Crow-empowered Grand Jury the unconstitutional indictments designed to silence the voice of the Communist Party, the champion of Negro rights, the leader in the struggle against fascism and imperialist war. The presence among the indicted Communist leaders of Henry Winston and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., true sons of the Negro people and valiant fighters for full Negro freedom, is not a matter of accident, but a fact in the *logic* of the situation created by the bipartisan drive toward war and fascism unleashed by the President and his Administration.

With what shameless hypocrisy, then, did Harry Truman—who by the stroke of a pen could abolish segregation in the armed forces and end all discrimination in the capital of

our country, who acquiesced in the death of the F.E.P.C.—campaign as the defender of civil rights! Truman's running mate, Alvin W. Barkley, now Vice-President, joined last year in sponsoring a Dixiecrat bill in the Senate for freezing Jim Crow in Southern schools.

Contrast, if you can, the spectre of Communism which stalks through and haunts Truman's Inaugural Address of January 20, 1949, with the shining statement of the right of the people to agitate and work for a better society which permeated Abraham Lincoln's first Inaugural Address of 1861:

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.

MONOPOLIES NEW LORDS OF THE PLANTATION

The military victory won by the North achieved the abolition of the institution of chattel slavery. But the economic basis which underlay that institution—the plantation system—was left intact after Lincoln's death. And it is this plantation system which is the source of strength for those forces today—the monopoly capitalists and their Southern partners in white "supremacy" rule—which dam up the streams of national progress.

Today, eighty-four years after the death of Lincoln, it is patently clear

that the capitalist class has long forfeited its place as political leader in the cause of national integrity and the nation's progress.

This fact was already made manifest in the cynical Hayes-Tilden compromise of 1876, which crystallized the abandonment by the bourgeoisie of any intentions it may have had to uproot the plantation system, which course alone could create the material basis for implementing the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments in real life.

After the Civil War, the newly-arising monopoly capitalists entered into a firm alliance with the Southern Bourbon rulers to keep in subjugation, in a state of peonage and semi-slavery, the millions of Negroes who had achieved their liberation on paper.

Wall Street pays the piper and calls the tune in the South. The goateed slavemaster on the cotton plantation has given way to the absentee mortgagee and land shark in the plushy offices of Northern corporations. The plantation hells—where cotton profits are sweated from unpaid Negro labor—are owned by the sleek insurance executives of Metropolitan Life and by the Morgan and Rockefeller banks. And it is these same robber barons, bloated with four billions in super-profits derived from Jim-Crow oppression, who are now feverishly militarizing the country and arming their reactionary allies throughout the world in their effort to become global emperors.

For Forrestal, Vandenberg, Taft, Dulles, and Harriman and Co., who

are now ruling in Washington, to become organizers of a coalition for freedom is tantamount on their part to committing economic and political hari-kari. To believe that such men could follow the Lincoln tradition is to believe that Jefferson Davis himself might have led the fight against slavery. The bourgeoisie internationally has branded its brow with the word VICHY.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND LABOR

Only the working class—white and Negro worker in indissoluble unity—is capable, in alliance with the popular forces, of leading the country forward to a lasting peace, to progress, to democracy.

Throughout the country, the Negro people are rising to their responsibilities in this struggle. And in equal measure, Truman and his brothers-in-arms, the wealthy leeches who batten on the labor of Negro and white workers and farmers, are replying with a wholesale program of philanthropy. The Rockefellers, conspicuously absent in the fight against Jim Crow in education, are organizers of the Negro College Fund. Another group of Northern and Southern capitalist promoters are busily drumming up funds for a memorial to Booker T. Washington, as part of the dissemination of the philosophy that the Negro can fare well under Jim Crow. Still another group, which includes such imperialists as James V. Forrestal, Winthrop Aldrich, Henry Luce, etc.,

is busy collecting funds to enable the National Urban League to apply its "theories" of bourgeois sociology in the Negro ghettos.

Needless to say, all of these schemes, devised in order to muffle the clank of the chains, have the support of substantial sections of the Southern Bourbons as well as of the Northern coupon clippers.

Nor should we overlook the "refined" bribery, the tossing of a few crumbs to those Negroes who are willing to "lead" their people according to the rules laid down by Harry Truman and his financier colleagues. This is the real meaning of the appointment of William Hastie as Governor of the Virgin Islands, and of the grooming of Dr. Ralph Bunche as assistant to the Truman Administration in charting the imperialist course in colonial areas.

This policy of capitalist philanthropy is practiced not only by bankers. It is supported in the most flagrant way by the dominant, Trumanized labor leadership. Instead of fighting against Jim-Crow education in the North and South, the officialdom of organized labor still supports the Rockefeller-led Negro College Fund.

The Social-Democratic and bourgeois reformist misleaders of labor who speak on February 12 of the Lincoln tradition are the fashioners of the second-line of defense for the modern slavemasters. To the best of their abilities, they are converting the labor movement into an adjunct of finance capital with its Jim-Crow

national oppression of the Negro people.

Labor followed Lincoln and supported Emancipation because the elimination of slavery meant the growth of the labor movement and the creation of a more favorable arena within which the workers could fight for their immediate demands and advance to higher stages of struggle. Carrying forward the Lincoln tradition in the present situation demands of the working class that it come forward as leading force in the democratic coalition of the people in the fight against the drive of the men of the trusts toward war and fascism. But such leadership is no more possible while travelling in the wake of Red-baiting monopolists than would Lincoln's victory have been possible with a battle plan handed him by Confederate generals.

Van Bittner, leader of the C.I.O.'s "Operation Dixie," addressing a C.I.O. organizing conference in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 8, pussy-footed on the Negro question and ducked the fight against the Ku Klux Klan. He was brazen, however, in advancing the N.A.M.-bred line of union-splitting through Red-baiting. He declared that "there is no place in this campaign [the Southern organizing drive] for a single, solitary Communist." So it can be assumed that Dixiecrat and anti-Negro employers now can "trust" the leaders of Southern labor not to harm their Jim Crow racket. But by being "trustworthy" to Southern employ-

ers, the labor movement is frittering away its heritage and binding behind its back its "strong black arm" without which there can be no final victory. It was the need for that strong black arm which led the Lincoln coalition to turn the Civil War from a purely constitutional war into an anti-slavery war, a democratic revolution.

THE CONTINUING LINCOLN TRADITION

The Lincoln tradition is alive in the Progressive Party, which challenges the modern monopoly conspiracy to tear up the Bill of Rights and destroy all freedom in America and throughout the world.

It took a political party unwilling to compromise with slavery to push America forward in the 1850's and 1860's. In today's social context, the need is for a mass party oriented toward an uncompromising fight against the heirs of slavery and the preserves of its decadent plantation remnants. The Progressive Party represents the beginnings of this type of party, an inheritor of the tradition of Lincoln's third party. Wallace's anti-Jim-Crow tour through the South last year served to arouse the Negro people and Southern progressives to a level of political struggle not equalled since Reconstruction days. And it is to the lasting shame of the majority of official labor leaders that they were either silent or openly hostile to Wallace while he was the butt of Southern missile-

hurlers instigated by reaction throughout the country.

As the party of Socialism and the champion of the Negro people, the Communist Party today goes beyond the slogan of "Jim Crow must go!" and calls for the fulfillment of the promise of Reconstruction — the smashing of the plantation. Beyond a legislative program for civil rights, the Communists call for destroying the basis for the perpetual re-birth of national oppression. The completion of the job which Lincoln started demands the national liberation of the Negro people, their right to the land, and their right to self determination—in the central area of their centuries-long oppression, the plantation Black Belt.

Because the Communist Party, with an unequivocal program, fights valiantly for full Negro freedom, its

leaders are now on trial, victims of the traducers of the Lincoln tradition.

The Lincoln tradition is not dead. It cannot be forever distorted by the enemies of everything for which Lincoln stood. It lives in the struggles of the American people against Wall Street for the political control of the country's destinies. It lives in the large body of organized workers who are daily fighting to pull the labor movement from the opportunist mire of pro-monopoly politics. It lives in the heroic struggle which the Negro people are waging for their second Emancipation. It lives in the Communist Party of the United States, the Party of Socialism, clearest voice against the exploitation and oppression of capitalism, and uncompromising fighter for Negro liberation.

"They gave the freedman the machinery of liberty but denied him the steam with which to put it into motion. They gave him the uniform of soldiers, but no arms; they called them citizens and left them subject. . . . They did not deprive the old master class of the power of life and death which was the soul of the relation of master and slave. They could not of course sell them, but they retained the power to starve them to death, and wherever this power is held, there is the power of slavery."

From the *Emancipation Address*
by Frederick Douglass (Washington, 1888).

The Triumph of Mitchurin Biological Science

by I. Laptev

[During the summer of 1948, there occurred an event of enormous significance for the Soviet people, who are systematically advancing toward Communism, as well as for world science. We refer to the session of the Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Science, which registered great progress toward the fulfillment of Engels' scientific forecast of the historic significance of Socialist emancipation:

. . . Man finally cuts himself off from the animal world, leaves the conditions of animal existence behind him and enters conditions which are really human. The conditions of existence forming man's environment, which up to now have dominated man, at this point pass under the dominion and control of man, who now for the first time becomes the real conscious master of nature, because and in so far as he has become master of his social organization (*Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*).

[The ideological running dogs of imperialism everywhere, particularly in the United States and England, have seized upon this occasion (as they have upon so many others) to unleash a renewed campaign of anti-Soviet, anti-Socialist calumny, in which no tale is too fantastic to circulate. An example of scientist turned

lackey to Wall Street was Professor H. J. Muller's shameful obeisance, on the front page of a prominent "literary" journal, to the war-mongering corrupters of science and scientists. In its reply to Muller's letter of resignation from the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., the Presidium of that body aptly stated:

It is amazing that Professor Muller rises not against the utilization of scientific achievements by American imperialism with the object of mass annihilation of people and cultural values, but against the Mitchurinian biology which seeks to improve with the utmost speed the well-being of the people. . . .

The Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. parts without any feeling of regret with its ex-member who has betrayed the interests of real science and openly joined the camp of the enemies of progress and science, peace and democracy.

[*Political Affairs* is pleased to present, on the occasion of the English translation of T. D. Lysenko's speech,* the following article which appeared in *Pravda*, September 11, 1948.**—*The Editors*.]

* Trofim Lysenko, *The Science of Biology Today*. International Publishers, New York, 1948, 62 pp., 25 cents.

** This translation is republished, with permission, from *Soviet Press Translations*, December 15, 1948.

(On the publication of the book *The State of Biological Science. Stenographic Record of the session of the V. I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, from July 31 to August 7, 1948. OGIZ—Selkhozgiz, 1948, 536 pp. price: 12 rubles, 200,000 copies.*)

We have before us a bulky, beautifully printed scientific work. This is the Stenographic Record of the session of the Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences. The Record contains a report by Academician T. D. Lysenko on "The State of Biological Science," and complete stenographic accounts of the discussion on this report. Taking part in the debates were fifty-six participants in the session of the Academy—regular members of the Academy, scientific workers from agricultural and scientific research institutes, professors of agricultural colleges and biological institutes, agronomists, mechanization experts, and managerial personnel from the Ministry of Agriculture of the USSR and the Ministry for *Sovkhozi* of the USSR.

The session of the Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences was one of the major events in the ideological life of the Soviet people. The report by Academician T. D. Lysenko and the numerous statements by our scientists on the subject of this report elicited enormous interest from the scientific public, practical workers in socialist agriculture, and Party workers. This is quite understandable. Biology, as a science of

the laws of the origin and development of life, is one of the important elements of the natural scientific basis of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. In this field of science an intense ideological struggle is in progress between materialism and idealism on questions pertaining to knowledge and the changing world. Biology is immediately bound up with the solution of the historic problem of creating an abundance of products in our country.

The Stenographic Record of the session is of enormous scientific value. The profound theoretical report by T. D. Lysenko and the detailed comments by Mitchurin scientists have breathed new life into our science. The report and the comments on it sum up many years of theoretical struggle between the Mitchurinites and the Weismannites, as well as the practical achievements of progressive Mitchurin biological science. The record not only enriches the reader's understanding with the most recent discoveries in one of the most important fields of natural science, but testifies graphically to the enormous role that science plays in the building of communism when this science serves the people.

In his report, Academician T. D. Lysenko has shown the existence of two diametrically opposed trends in biological science: the progressive and materialistic, as represented by the *Mitchurin* school, named after its founder, I. V. Mitchurin, the outstanding Soviet naturalist and great

transformer of nature, and the reactionary, idealistic, represented by the *Weismann* (Mendel-Morgan) school, founded by Weismann, the German biologist; the monk Mendel, an Austrian biologist; and Morgan, the American biologist.

The history of biological science has always been an arena for ideological struggle. Charles Darwin (1809-1882) laid down the principles of scientific biology in his work *The Origin of the Species*, published in 1859. With his theory of natural and artificial selection, Darwin gave a scientific explanation of the origin and development of life and thereby refuted the idealistic and theological explanation, which had prevailed up to his time, of the origin of plants, animals, and man himself. The classic writers of Marxism-Leninism set a high value on this contribution of Darwin. "While setting a high value on the importance of the Darwinian theory," says T. D. Lysenko, "the classical writers of Marxism at the same time pointed out the errors admitted by Darwin. The Darwinian theory, while indisputably materialistic in its basic features, contains a number of substantial errors. Thus, for example, it was a serious blunder when Darwin introduced reactionary Malthusian ideas into his theory of evolution side by side with materialistic principle. In our time this serious blunder is being made worse by reactionary biologists."

The English parson, Malthus, propagated the reactionary idea of "an

eternal, natural law," to the effect that living beings multiply more rapidly than the quantity of food at their disposal permits. In this way he explained the impoverishment of the working class under conditions of capitalism.

This Malthusian scheme, which Darwin borrowed in order to explain the struggle for existence in nature, radically contradicted the materialistic principles of his own doctrine. But Darwin was unable to free himself from the errors he admitted. They were revealed and pointed out by the classical writers of Marxism.

The reactionary biologists made every effort to discard the materialistic elements of Darwinism, and, conversely, to develop the erroneous aspects of Darwinian theory, based on the Malthusian scheme of overpopulation, together with the struggle within the species allegedly following therefrom. Our country, unfortunately, has had its proponents of Weismannism and Morganism — I. I. Schmalhausen, B. M. Zavadovsky, A. R. Zhebrak, N. P. Dubinin, and others. Truckling to the reactionary biologists, they propagated the doctrines of the latter and were guided by these doctrines in their own scientific work.

The founders of reactionary, idealistic biology, proclaiming themselves as "Neo-Darwinists," completely denied, in effect, the materialistic side of Darwinism and dragged idealism and metaphysics into biology.

Reactionary, idealistic biology is

based on a denial of the effect of environment on the development of the organism and on a denial of the inheritance of the features and characteristics acquired by plants and animals under the influence of changing conditions of life.

The Weismannites regard the body as isolated from the environment in which it exists. They divide the living organism in a mechanical fashion into two basically different entities: the inherited substance in the nucleus (genes, chromosomes), which according to their theory is the bearer of heredity, and the body, which is supposed to have no relation to heredity.

They regard the inherited substance as immortal, as never reproducing itself, while the living body is only the repository, the culture medium. T. D. Lysenko has exposed these reactionary views and has subjected them to minute and scientifically founded criticism. He points out:

An immortal hereditary substance, independent of the qualitative peculiarities of the development of the living body; controlling the perishable body, but not produced by it—such is Weismann's conception, openly idealistic and mystical in its essence, which he brought forward in the guise of a discussion of "Neo-Darwinism."

These idealistic views of the Weismannites and Morganites led them to the idea of the incomprehensibility of the inherited substance, to a denial of the laws of development of life,

and to the recognition of a divine principle in the origin of plants and animals. For example, the physicist, E. Schrödinger, applauding the Weismann theory in his book *What Is Life from the Viewpoint of Physics?*, came to the conclusion: ". . . A private, individual soul is equal to an omnipresent and omniscient soul." This conclusion, he says, is ". . . the most that can be offered by the biologist who attempts to prove at one stroke both the existence of God and the immortality of the soul." If not all the adherents of Weismannism and Morganism speak so frankly, they only exhibit their inconsistency.

Unequipped with a comprehension of the laws of the animate world, the Weismann-Morganites have been powerless to offer anything in the way of methods for its transformation. A characteristic feature of reactionary biology is its divorce from practice and from the requirements and demands of the people. T. D. Lysenko has shown the sterility and worthlessness of the practical and theoretical work of the Weismannites by the example of the work of Professor N. P. Dubinin, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, who "labored" for many years to ascertain the differences between the cell nuclei of fruit flies in the city and in the country. During the war, when Soviet scientists were contributing all their efforts to the task of our people's struggle against the German usurpers, this learned man was investigating

. . . the influence of the war upon chromosome changes in fruit flies!

The pseudo-scientific character of Weismannism-Morganism is furthermore to be found in the fact that it denies the possibility of consciously planned influence upon the development of plant and animal organisms. But a science that does not offer clear perspectives and practice the power of orientation and certainty in achieving a set goal is unworthy of being called a science.

The idea of the independence of the organism's inherited characteristics from the conditions of the environment has led the Weismann-Morganites to the assertion that characteristics due to heredity are dependent upon accident. It was not by accident that I. V. Mitchurin called Mendel's laws "pea-brained."

The Weismann-Morganites look upon animate nature as a chaos of accidents and unrelated phenomena. But a science that does not recognize the laws of nature yields its place in the comprehension of the latter . . . to Providence. It does not equip practical workers in the struggle for the transformation of the world. As a result it becomes fortune-seeking and quackery. "We must steadily keep in mind that *science is the enemy of accidents*," says T. D. Lysenko, recalling one of the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism.

The consistent defense and development of the materialistic principles of Darwinism represent the enormous contribution of the progressive

representatives of Russian biological science. The outstanding Darwinian biologists, I. I. Metchnikov, I. M. Setchenov, A. N. Severtsov, and, in particular K. A. Timiryazev, waged an irreconcilable struggle against reactionary biology in all its various forms, while defending and developing Darwinism.

I. V. Mitchurin, the great transformer of nature, laid the foundations for a new school of biology, legitimately named after him the Mitchurin school. Mitchurin biological science is the most advanced and progressive biological science, because it has dialectical materialism as its firm foundation, the all-conquering power of which has been verified by the entire experience of history, in all fields of the social sciences and in the natural sciences. "Dialectical materialism," writes Comrade Stalin, "is the philosophy of life of the Marxist-Leninist Party. It is called dialectical materialism because its approach to natural phenomena, its method of investigating natural phenomena, and its method of comprehending these phenomena is *dialectical*, while its interpretation of natural phenomena, its conception of natural phenomena and its theory are *materialistic*." The report by Academician T. D. Lysenko on "The Science of Biology Today" is a clear example of the application of dialectical materialism in the struggle against reactionary and idealistic theories in biology, in the comprehension of the laws of development of

the animate world, and in its active transformation.

Mitchurin biological science proceeds from the basic thesis of dialectical materialism, which states that the conditions of life determine the origin and development of the living organism, changes in its heredity, and the acquisition by it of new features and characteristics, which are thereupon transmitted through heredity. It completely refutes the basic thesis of Weismannism-Morganism of the complete independence of the properties of heredity from the conditions of life of plants and animals. It does not recognize the existence of a special substance in the organism governing heredity. The entire organism possesses the properties of heredity. A change in the conditions of life leads to a change in the organism, and to the acquisition by the latter of new features and characteristics, *i.e.*, to a change in its heredity. The organism and the conditions of life necessary to it represent a unit. This is a unit of form and content, in which the organism represents the form while the conditions and sources of life represent its content. The form changes with a change in the content. Quantitative changes become qualitative. This transition proceeds irregularly. The old heredity is exploded, so to speak. New properties of heredity appear. "*Changes in the conditions of life,*" says T. D. Lysenko in his report, "*compel even the type of development of plant organisms to change.*

The mutated type of development is, thus, the original source of change in heredity. All those organisms which cannot change in conformity with changed conditions of life do not survive and do not leave descendants."

The strongest side of the Mitchurin theory is its effectiveness, its close association of theory and practice, and its enrichment of practice with scientific generalizations drawn from practice itself.

On the pedestal of the monument to I. V. Mitchurin has been cut his famous maxim: "Man can and must create new forms of plants better than nature."

Developing this Mitchurin thesis, T. D. Lysenko says: "*The scientific solution of practical problems is the truest path to a profound comprehension of the laws of development of the animate world.*" These principles of Mitchurin biological science comprise one of those radically new theses that has placed it above Darwinism.

In their scientific research the Mitchurinites proceed from Darwinian theory. But Darwin's theory is by no means sufficient to solve the practical problems of socialist agriculture. Darwinism is a science that *explains*, preëminently, the history of the organic world. Mitchurin biological science is a further development of Darwinism as a science directed toward the practical and revolutionary *alteration* of the world. "Darwinism," says T. D. Lysenko, "has not

only been purged of faults and errors, has not only been raised to a higher level, but has to a considerable degree undergone alteration in a number of its theses. From a science which *explained*, preëminently, the past history of the organic world, Darwinism has become a creative, *effective* medium for planned mastery, from the viewpoint of practice, of the animate world."

Mitchurin went farther than Darwin in the development of biological science. Mitchurin biology not only embodies everything better and progressive that the leading scientists of the whole world have contributed to biology, but is a new and higher stage in the development of biological science. Mitchurin biology has become the most progressive in the world.

T. D. Lysenko's great contribution is that he has raised the banner of Mitchurin biology aloft; has successfully defended it in the struggle against Weismannism-Morganism, surreptitiously introduced into our country by certain Soviet scientists truckling to Weismann, Mendel, and Morgan; has developed the teachings of I. V. Mitchurin theoretically, and has embodied them extensively in the practice of socialist agriculture.

Agrobiolgy, an outstanding work by Academician T. D. Lysenko, and a number of his other studies, have set forth the theoretical principles of Mitchurin genetics and have made available to the public the enormous experience gained during the strug-

gle for an increased yield of agricultural crops. The theory of the development of plants by stages, worked out by T. D. Lysenko, made it possible to discover the laws of the development of plant organisms, to control the conditions of their existence, and to create and alter, in a controlled manner, varieties possessing the heredity that we need. The conversion of spring wheat to winter wheat, for example, is of great theoretical and practical importance.

The vernalization of grain crops according to the method of T. D. Lysenko has made it possible to extend varieties of spring wheat to more northerly regions and to guarantee a considerable increase in their yield. This year plantings of vernalized seed have been earmarked for an area totalling 7,000,000 hectares.* Summer plantings of potatoes, which have eliminated degeneration of plantings in southern regions, are taking place over an area of hundreds of thousands of hectares. Academician T. D. Lysenko has made a great contribution to the scientific basic of seed culture in our country. He has worked out new measures for cultivating rubber plants, such as, for example, cluster sowing of *kok-saghyz*. The system of agro-technical measures for increasing the crop yield of millet, worked out by T. D. Lysenko, has made it possible to obtain more than fifteen centners** of this valuable crop per hectare over an

* A hectare is the equivalent of 2,471 acres.

** A centner is equal to 110.23 pounds.

area exceeding 1,000,000 hectares in 1947. Topping of cotton plants, which insures this plant protection against dropping of the ovaries, and which increases the pre-frost yield, is practiced over an area totalling 85 to 90 percent of all cotton plantings.

This is by no means a complete list of T. D. Lysenko's scientific discoveries, which have been extensively incorporated in the practice of socialist agriculture—testimony to the great vital power of the Mitchurin teaching.

The session showed that Mitchurin science in our country can be justly proud of its achievements. This is clearly evident from the statements of our Mitchurin scientists.

Academician I. G. Eichfeld spoke on the work of the All-Union Institute of Plant Culture. In their day the Weismann-Morganites attempted to convert this Institute into their own stronghold, which impeded the development of creative work. Its scientific collective has achieved great successes on the basis of Mitchurin teaching. "The practical significance of the new approach in the study of universal complexes (seeds—*I. L.*)," says Eichfeld, "is evinced by the indisputable fact that the Institute directly produced more than 170 new varieties under the difficult conditions of war and the postwar period, while in 1949 this number will reach 200." During the war years the Institute did a great deal in consolidating the foodstuff base for industry in the Urals. On the basis of its studies, agri-

culture has been advanced great distances in the Far North and in the arid regions of the Soviet Union.

The Weismann-Morganites, such as Academician Schmalhausen, Professor N. P. Dubinin, and certain others, for example, have repudiated vegetative hybridization stubbornly and without evidence. Nevertheless, it is known that I. V. Mitchurin developed more than 300 varieties of fruit and berry crops by means of vegetative hybridization. Mitchurin gardens extend throughout the entire country. S. I. Isayev pointed out that the vegetative hybrid between apple and pear trees, for example, has become widely distributed in nineteen regions of the Soviet Union.

In his speech Academician P. N. Yakovlev stated that:

numerous investigators working under the direction of Academician T. D. Lysenko in diverse localities of the Soviet Union have conducted brilliant studies during the last eight or ten years on the vegetative hybridization of annual herbaceous plants with sharply contrasting features. Over a period of eight or ten years this school has obtained more facts concerning vegetative hybridization than have been obtained throughout the world during the last 150 years.

Academician A. A. Avakyan spoke of the wide application of the hybridization method in selection work, telling of the crossbreeding of winter varieties of common wheat with branchy wheat, while Academician

P. P. Lukyanenko spoke on wheat and couch grass hybrids, citing the experience of the Krasnodar Selection Station in creating high-yielding and high-standard varieties of winter wheat for the Kuban. The wide application of the hybridization method of selection work with winter wheat at the Krasnodar Station, points out P. P. Lukyanenko, has shown the extraordinary effectiveness of the Mitchurin principle of crossing varieties of different geographical origin. All the hybrid varieties of winter wheat developed by the Krasnodar Station and widely introduced in the production scheme were obtained on the basis of the application of this principle of selecting pairs during crossing. *Novoukrainka-83*, in particular, a high-yielding variety of winter wheat, was developed by crossing *Ukrainka* with *Marquis*, a Canadian variety of spring wheat.

Doctor of Agricultural Science I. A. Minkevitch cites telling figures on the achievement of Mitchurin teaching in the field of olive crops. "Suffice it to say," he points out, "that 70 percent of the area of the Soviet Union sown in olive crops is being planted with varieties selected by the Institute for Olive Crops." The studies of this Institute have proved that free cross-pollination between high-yielding varieties resistant to broom rape is an extremely promising method for obtaining new starting material in selection work on the sunflower.

Academician E. I. Ushakova sub-

jected the idealistic views of the Morgan-Mendelites to sharp criticism and justly expressed surprised in regard to the fact that our philosophers, for incomprehensible reasons, have tolerated these views. In contrast to the Morgan-Mendelites, who have never set themselves the task of developing new varieties, she demonstrated the achievements of the Gribov Selection Station, where new kinds of tomatoes, eggplant, pepper, and sugar peas have been created, and muskmelons and watermelons have been raised for mass cultivation in the *Kolkhosi* of the Moscow Region.

G. P. Vysokos, the director of the Siberian Scientific Research Institute for Grain Culture, speaks of the promising experiment of introducing seedings of winter wheat in Siberia. In the course of many decades neither science nor practice had been able to solve the problem of the freezing of this crop under Siberian conditions. Academician T. D. Lysenko was the first to discover the reason for this. He explained the winter destruction of winter wheat in Siberia as due to a mechanical injury to the subsoil portion of the plants and their leaves when the soil froze. He discovered that in the steppe portion of Siberia receiving little snowfall winter wheat can survive the winter very nicely if it is sowed in the completely uncultivated stubble fields of spring crops and with strict observance of the agrotechnical measures recommended by him. "Our institute and the Karagandinsk *soukhoz*," says

G. P. Vysokos, "have been cultivating winter wheat for six years, obtaining abundant harvests in recent years. Last year the Omsk *Obkōm* of the ACP(b) and the *Oblispolkōm*, taking note of the positive experience of our institute, projected the necessary measures for introducing winter wheat in the *kolkhoz* field."

Academician D. A. Dolgushin severely criticizes the followers of Weismannism-Morganism, who have held up the development of our work on selection and seed culture. His report on experiments with branchy wheat have given rise to special interest. Branchy wheat yields up to ten grams of grain per ear as compared with two grams per ear of ordinary wheat raised under the best conditions. Given a corresponding agrotechnical level, branchy wheat can yield harvests on the order of 80 to 100 centners per hectare! "I think that I am not wrong in saying that we stand today on the threshold of a new era in our seed culture," says D. A. Dolgushin.

Enormous vistas are unfolding before socialist agriculture in connection with the wide introduction of the Dokutchayev-Williams complex, that is, with the introduction of rationalized crop rotation, the planting of windbreaks, etc. Academicians I. V. Yakushkin and S. F. Demidov; agronomists I. I. Khoroshilov, A. V. Krylov, director of the Dokutchayev Agricultural Institute for the Central Blacksoil Belt; V. S. Dmitriev, director of the Agricultural Planning

Board of the *Gosplan* of the USSR; and others, spoke of achievements in this field.

I. I. Khoroshilov showed the enormous role played by the proper system of agriculture in the experience of the *kolkhozi* of the Millerov MTS and the Stalin *kolkhoz* of the Salsk District, Rostov Region. In the face of the unusual drought of 1946, this *kolkhoz* achieved a yield of grain crops equaling fourteen centners per hectare. In 1947, which was still less favorable for this region, the yield of grain crops equalled 16.2 centners per hectare. It is characteristic that at the Stalin *kolkhoz* the total yield of grain per able-bodied worker equaled fifty-seven centners as compared with thirty-nine centners on an average throughout the *kolkhozi* of the Salsk District; correspondingly, the monetary income of each able-bodied worker equaled 4,470 rubles as compared with 1,656 rubles, while the milk yield per forage cow equaled 1,857 liters as compared with 1,297 liters. The introduction of the Dokutchayev-Williams complex has created a high standard in agriculture and has increased the welfare of the *kolkhoz* peasantry.

Socialist agriculture is the most highly mechanized agriculture. The speech by Academician I. F. Vasilenko is of great interest. He spoke of the strong bond between progressive Mitchurin agrobiolgy, which is based on the works of Timiryazev, Dokutchayev, Williams, Kostytchev, Mitchurin, and Lysenko, and all

branches of agricultural science and mechanical engineering, in particular. Proceeding from the requirements of Mitchurin agrobiolgy, Soviet scientists have created machines of such design that they can aid the workers of agriculture to influence nature and to increase the fertility of the soil in a planned manner. Today our factories manufacture only plows with colters, which insure high-standard plowing, while Soviet combines work on a low cut. The situation in the USA, says Academician Vasilenko, is quite different. There, agronomy is divorced from biology. Plows with colters are not used. During threshing in the USA a high cut is used on the plants, only the grain is gathered, while the straw is strewn about the field by a special whirligig. An enormous quantity of weed seeds is thrown to the ground together with the chaff and straw. Shallow ploughing of stubble fields is not practiced. As a result the USA is among the first countries in the world in point of view of potential contamination of the soil.

The achievements of Mitchurin biology are also to be found in the field of cattle breeding. "Our zootechnical science and practice," said T. D. Lysenko in his report, "proceeding from the state plan for obtaining products of animal husbandry of the requisite quantity and quality, must align their work in accordance with the principle: *select and perfect breeds in accordance with feeding, maintenance, and climatic conditions,*

and at the same time, create feeding and maintenance conditions corresponding to breeds, which is inseparably connected with this."

V. A. Shaumyan, director of the State Pedigree Breeding Farm for Long-Horned Kostroma Cattle, spoke of the experience in developing a new native breed of cattle—the Kostroma breed. The collective of the Karavayevo *soukhoz* and the *kolkhozniki* of the leading farms have succeeded in making every cow in the best herds of the new Kostroma breed produce from 4,800 to 6,300 kilograms of milk a year. There are dozens and dozens of cows that produce from 10,000 to 14,000 kilograms of milk. "These many years of work," says V. A. Shaumyan, "confirm the fact that no law of the inalterability of hereditary traits and instincts exists."

Academician L. K. Greben threw light on the work at Askania-Nova, where new breeds of livestock, surpassing foreign livestock in many ways — the Askanian Rambouillet, producing up to twenty-one kilograms per ram per shearing, the Ukrainian white steppe hog, which produces up to eleven pigs per farrowing on an average, and the Ukrainian speckled steppe hog — developed on the basis of methods worked out by Academician M. F. Ivanov. E. M. Tchekmenev, USSR Vice-Minister for *Soukhozi*, noted that K. D. Filyansky, S. F. Pastukhov, G. R. Litovtchenko, N. A. Vasiliev, and Balmont had created valu-

able breeds of fine-wooled sheep on the basis of the progressive Mitchurin school of animal husbandry. At the same time he cited a number of facts serving as evidence that the Weismann-Morganites, Serebrovsky, Glembotsky, and others, were impeding the rate of qualitative improvement of the various breeds of livestock in our country and were inflicting serious economic damage upon animal husbandry.

The comments by the followers of reactionary Weismann biology again demonstrated the shameful bankruptcy of Weismannism-Morganism. As a consequence of their theoretical paucity and practical sterility, they could say nothing rational in defense of their views, nor could they demonstrate anything of practical value from their studies.

Academician I. I. Schmalhausen, who is considered to be the leader of the Weismann-Morganites in our country, attempted to prove in his statement that he is a follower . . . of I. V. Mitchurin. Actually, however, Academician I. I. Schmalhausen cleaves to the principles of Weismannism-Morganism on the basic questions of biology in his study *Factors in Evolution* and in many of his other works, as a number of the statements showed. S. I. Alikhanyan attempted to prove that the Weismann chromosome theory of heredity is not idealistic and that "Mendel's laws" allegedly do not contradict the teaching of I. V. Mitchurin. The pedantic speech by B. M. Zavadovsky

boiled down to the statement that "we must not think of throwing Mendelian genetics out of our Soviet science." He asserted that "the Mitchurin school cannot alone replace, exhaust, and eliminate all those schools of thought that we possess alongside the Mitchurin school," and attempted to contrast the works of T. D. Lysenko with the teaching of I. V. Mitchurin. All the "scientific arguments" of B. M. Zavadovsky amounted, in the end, to a mere juggling of citations, inadmissible for the scientific worker. Academician V. S. Nemtchinov rose to the complete defense of the Weismann-Morganites in his speech, and in particular to the defense of those who have been pursuing their studies at the Timiryazev Agricultural Academy. In setting forth his position, he stated, to the accompaniment of noise and laughter in the chamber, that "the chromosome theory of heredity has become part of the gold reserve of the science of humanity" and that this had been allegedly proved . . . by statistics.

The comments by Academicians M. B. Mitin, I. I. Prezent, P. P. Lobanov, as well as the address by V. N. Stoletov (now director of the Timiryazev Academy), in all of which the Weismann-Morganites were subjected to detailed criticism, are of great interest.

Academician M. B. Mitin criticized Y. A. Filiptchenko, N. K. Koltsov, I. I. Schmalhausen, and other followers of Mendelism-Morganism. He recalled that the Party had con-

demned Menshevik idealism in philosophy and natural science as early as 1931. In his interpretation of the teaching of I. V. Mitchurin he emphasized the importance of Soviet patriotism in science.

We can be proud that our Soviet scientist, I. V. Mitchurin, discovered and gained mastery of the laws of conscious control of the development of organisms. Let all the cosmopolites of science assert that "questions of priority in science are of no importance." But we cannot avoid being filled with a legitimate pride at the fact that this enormous contribution to biological science is the work of a Soviet Russian scientist.

Academician I. Prezent began his address with an exposition of the history of the struggle of progressive-materialistic biology against reactionary, idealistic biology — a struggle that has continued for several decades. He exposed the attempts by the followers of Mendelism-Morganism, such as, for example, B. M. Zavadovsky, and S. I. Alikhanyan to mold Mitchurin science along the lines of Morganism, and thus reconcile the irreconcilable. Such a falsification of Mitchurin ideas has met a determined rebuff. I. Prezent also exposed the ridiculous attempts by Academician Zhukovsky to deny the existence of vegetative hybrids. The Mitchurinites, by the actual demonstration of vegetative hybrids of various plants at the session itself, proved by facts the absurdity of such assertions. Having convincingly proved the theoret-

ical inanity and the practical sterility of a number of other Morganites, I. Prezent states:

Today Darwinism is not what it was in Darwin's day. The law of selection is not formulated in the light of Mitchurin theory as Darwin himself formulated it. This law of selection must include the role of the environmental conditions, and when we consider artificial selection, it now emerges on a Mitchurin basis, as planned, environmental selection. Darwinian science was ignorant of this level of selection. . . .

V. N. Stoletov devoted his address to exposing the Morgan-Mendelites, their sterility, and their divorce from practice. He demonstrated by striking facts that A. R. Zhebrak, M. S. Navashin, B. M. Zavadovsky, and I. A. Rapaport, in spite of their boastful promises that the Morganites would allegedly bless humanity in the future with great discoveries, were in effect barren fig trees. V. N. Stoletov states:

All the investigations of T. D. Lysenko and the Mitchurinites are subordinated to the solution of this or that important practical problem. On this basis Mitchurin science is growing in stature and strength.

A vital cause is the foe of formalism. In the light of the vital Mitchurin cause which is gaining strength in our country, the scholasticism, metaphysical nature, and sterility of Morganism have become especially apparent. And this has therefore proved a deterrent for the Morganites. They do not desire to occupy themselves with a vital cause

that would quickly cure them of their formalism. But the investigation of worthless questions, such as those that interest Dubinin . . . only intensifies this formalism.

Science is the vital organism by which truth develops, said Herzen in his day. Soviet science is all the more vital an organism in that it is the science of the people. And this vital, healthy organism will find a way to free itself from defunct, reactionary Weismannism.

Evidence of this is to be found at the present session of the Academy that bears the name of the immortal Lenin; an Academy watched over by the paternal care of our great Stalin.

At the end of the deliberations of the session, P. M. Zhukovsky, S. I. Alikhyan, and I. M. Polyakov, in the face of the indisputable achievements of Mitchurin biological science, declared that they renounced their erroneous views and would continue their work in the future from the standpoint of progressive, Mitchurin biological science. Practical experience will show the extent to which their statements are sincere.

The addresses by the representatives of progressive, Mitchurin biology showed that it has become inseparably incorporated in the practice of socialist agriculture; has become a close ally of the *kolkhozniki* and the workers of the *sovkhosi*; and is raising the level of our agriculture to unprecedented heights, inaccessible to the countries of capitalism.

Mitchurin biological science is a powerful force aiding the Soviet peo-

ple to create an abundance of products in our country and to make it the richest country in the world.

Before passing to his concluding remarks, Academician T. D. Lyсенko made the following statement:

One of the notes asks me what the attitude of the CC of the Party toward my report is. My reply is that the CC of the Party has examined my report and has approved it.

This statement evoked a storm of applause which became an ovation. All rose to their feet, greeting with enormous enthusiasm the great friend and coryphaeus of science, our leader and teacher, Comrade Stalin.

The session revealed the complete triumph of the Mitchurin school over Morganism-Mendelism. It represented an historic landmark in the development of biological science. In the letter to Comrade J. V. Stalin cited in the Stenographic Record, the participants of the session wrote:

In continuing the work of V. I. Lenin you have rescued the teachings of I. V. Mitchurin, the great transformer of nature, for progressive, materialistic biology; and you have elevated the Mitchurin school of biology before all science as the only true and progressive school of all branches of biological science. This has, at the same time, further consolidated the natural scientific foundations of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, the all-conquering power of which has been confirmed by the whole of historical experience.

At the conclusion of the Steno-

graphic Record, the decisions of the session are cited, which emphasize the importance of Mitchurin science as a new and higher stage of materialistic biology and which condemn the idealistic, metaphysical Weismann school of biology. The session appealed to the workers of agricul-

tural science to present a united front, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, in developing Mitchurin science, which is capable of successfully solving the problems involved in the further development of agriculture.

“To the flourishing of science! Of such science as does not let its old and recognized leaders smugly retire into their shells as pontiffs of science, as monopolists of science; of the science which appreciates the meaning, significance, and omnipotence of a union of the old scientists with the young scientists; which voluntarily and willingly throws open all its gates to the youthful forces of our country, offering them the opportunity to conquer the peaks of science; which recognizes that the future belongs to the youth in science.

“To the flourishing of science! Of such science whose devotees, while realizing the force and significance of the traditions established in science and making skillful use of them in the interests of science, yet refuse to be slaves to these traditions; of science which has the daring and determination to shatter old traditions, standards, and methods when they become obsolete, when they turn into a brake on progress, and which is able to establish new traditions, new standards, new methods.”

Joseph Stalin, *In Praise of Learning*.

What Is National Income? *

by Hilary Minc

FIRST—the problem of assessment of national income. Let us define the Marxist terminology with regard to the problem of national income. Marxist terminology introduces, first of all, the total or social product, understood as the whole of material goods produced within a year. The total or social product is the sum of gross production of the various branches of national economy. In a symbolic equation the product will be expressed by the formula $C+V+S$, where C represents the value of elements of constant capital engaged in production, that is, the wear and tear of machinery, buildings, raw materials; V the value of elements of variable capital in the process of production, that is, the labor force used; and S the surplus value produced in that period by the labor force.

The first element in our terminology is thus established—the total or social product, which is the sum of gross production of the various branches of national economy. One part of this total product, the constant (C) is used for the replacement of the means of production expended in the process of production,

that is, raw materials, fuel and other materials, the wear and tear of machinery, and buildings. The second part of the total or social product, the part produced by work in a given year, or otherwise the new value created in a given year, is the *national income*.

Thus we have the second element of our terminology—national income as part of the total product obtained as a result of work in a given year, as a sum of *new* values created during the year. In the symbolic presentation, national income will be equal to $V+S$. In practice it is possible to assess national income by deducting from the gross production of the various branches of national economy the total material expenditure of these branches and the total of administrative costs.

We shall introduce a third terminological element, namely, the so-called net production. We shall not call the new value, produced for instance in the textile industry, the national income of the textile industry; the new value produced by the textile industry will be called the net production of the textile industry. The sum total of net productions of the various branches of national economy will give us the total national income.

Summing up, we have the total product, or the whole of material

goods produced in a given year; *national income*, or a *new value, created in a given year*; net production, or elements of national income in the various branches of national economy.

After establishing this terminology, let us pass to the problem of the creation of national income. It has been said that national income is the sum of new values created in a given year as a result of work expended during the year. The question arises now—is it a result of expending all kinds of work, and if not all kinds of work, which? A result of work performed in all spheres of human activities or only in some, and, if only in some spheres, in which?

National income arises not as a result of expending all kinds of work, but as a result of expending work which is productive in the sense of Marxist political economy. National income results from work expended not in all its spheres, but only in the sphere of material production and material services. The concept of total product and national income in Marxist doctrine refers only and exclusively to the sphere of material production.

What is productive and what non-productive work? Productive work is work in the sphere of material production. Marx defines material production as the direct harnessing by man of goods of nature. Work which is direct harnessing of the goods of nature is, in Marxist terminology, productive work, and work

which does not consist in it—whether necessary or not—is only an ideal reflection of productive work. Work which does not reflect the relations of man to nature but reflects the relations of man to the community is not productive work—it is, in the Marxist sense, non-productive work.

The famous Marxist example relating to the work of bookkeeping is very revealing and instructive. Marx underlines the importance of this work, but says at the same time that it consists in the ideal generalization of production processes and only reflects the real, direct process of material production, directed to the harnessing of the goods of nature. As this is only a reflection of the real process and only generalization of the real process, in Marxist terminology the work of bookkeeping is non-productive work.

The division into productive and non-productive work has nothing to do with the division into manual and intellectual work. Marx says: "To make work productive, it is not necessary directly to work with one's hands. It suffices to be an organ of the collective worker and to perform one of his functions." The division into productive and non-productive work cannot be made according to an objective criterion. It cannot be said that productive work is only work materialized in a given object. Similarly, all work which is not materialized in a given object cannot be considered as non-productive.

To elucidate this matter further, I

* From a statement by Hilary Minc, Minister of Industry and Trade, in a discussion on the National Economic Plan for Poland. Reprinted from the *British Communist Review*, September 1948.

would like to quote an excerpt from the work of a serious Soviet student of this problem, Kronrod, entitled *Fundamental Problems of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Productive Work*:

"A picture, a sculpture, a book are goods of nature adapted and transformed in accordance with social needs. In that character they are a result of work expended in the process of production on canvas, paints, frames, sculptor's materials, the work of typographers and printers, of workers in a paper factory, etc. But the result of the work of the writer, artist or sculptor appears in the book only in its ideal content, as the sum of ideas expressed by means of an object. The objective form does not change the character of work of a painter, writer or sculptor. Similarly, it will not change the character of the work of a musician, whether he gives a live performance before an audience, or makes a recording. The objective form means only that, with the help of matter, obtained from nature by way of productive processes of spiritual creation are realized, the essence of which does not consist in direct relation of man with the nature surrounding him, but in a reflection and transformation in the human mind of the material world."

It is not the objective materialization of work which is the criterion of division into productive and non-productive work. Not every work which produces things and is realized

in things, is productive. On the other hand, there exist kinds of work which do not produce objects directly, but are doubtless kinds of productive work and are used in the sphere of material production. Such work is the work of transport, communications, signals. This is productive work consisting in man influencing the surrounding nature; it is productive work, although it does not create separate objects unrelated to processes of production. The division into productive and non-productive work is not made either according to mechanical objective criteria, or according to mechanical division into intellectual and manual work, but according to a dialectical criterion of man's nature.

The division into productive and non-productive work has nothing to do with the division into useful and useless work, that is, work useful socially and socially useless. Non-productive work—this must be emphatically stressed—does not mean work socially useless. In the sum of non-productive work we encounter work which we might vulgarly call useless and parasitical, but there also exist a number of jobs socially useful, such as the jobs of teachers, artists, writers, doctors, clerks, soldiers, etc. Certain kinds of work do not function either in the sphere of material or in the sphere of spiritual production. Some kinds of work function in the sphere of consumption, such as work in the household, which Marx compares to expenditure on consumption.

The division into productive and non-productive work is the fundamental element of dialectical materialism. "Productive workers create a material basis for the maintenance, that is, for the existence, of non-productive workers"—Marx. The division into productive and non-productive work is an important element of the Marxist differentiation between foundation and superstructure.

Thus, the division between productive and non-productive work—an indispensable element in the theory of the creation of national income—is at the same time a fundamental part of the Marxist theory of value and of dialectical materialism.

Income is created by productive work; productive functions in the branches of material production. This is a living dialectical criterion, but one which does not and cannot operate automatically. An important question arises—the question of classification, which must decide what is and what is not a branch of material production. To this classification volumes have been devoted in the Soviet Union, based on research into various enterprises and various phenomena of economic activities.

In this classification there are a number of clear and uncontroversial points. It is clear that industry is a branch of material production, that agriculture, building, transport, communications, are also branches of material production. On the other hand, it is clear, too, that national defense, security, administration, health

services, education, finance, schools, culture, art, science, etc., cannot be included among branches of material production.

Of course, a number of borderline instances might be found, and in those clearly a decision one way or another will not be easy. Here is an example of such a controversial problem, solved by an agreed "short cut." Public administration in the Soviet Union is included among branches of non-material production. But how should one deal with public administration in government departments whose task is to manage directly production? Here Soviet classification applies "short cuts." It considers work in various government departments, up to and including the Central Administrations of Industry, as work in the sphere of material production. This is a "cut." There are a number of such controversial instances, but all of these constitute a small part of the problem as a whole. Somebody once said that it is also difficult to establish a definite dividing line between zoology and botany. However, we have no difficulty in saying that a cow belongs to the animal kingdom and a rose is a plant.

In the sphere of economy there exist a number of controversial and difficult matters which require detailed classification. The problem of trade is one. The functions performed by trade can be divided into two groups. To the first belong functions which are the direct extension of material

production in the sphere of distribution: the storing, packing, sorting, weighing, etc., of goods. These functions create a new value, which must be included among the values created by industry. But there exist a number of other functions which dominate in trade, especially in capitalist trade, functions which result from the task of transforming commodity value to money values, or the reverse. The performance of these functions requires naturally a great outlay of work which, however, is non-productive. Marx wrote about it as follows: "Neither the difficulties of this metamorphosis nor the extent of the operation can transform this work which does not create values, but only serves to change the form of value, into work which creates values."

In the Soviet Union in recent years the total trade is included among branches of material production. It is considered there that commercial functions consist mainly in material functions, that material functions within the scope of trade are an enormous dominating part in relation to formal functions, resulting from the metamorphosis of goods into money and money into goods. In the Soviet Union commerce provides only five per cent of the material income. In the United States where, according to American statistics, the value of the part of national income provided by agriculture amounts to \$14,000 million, the value provided by trade amounts to \$17,400 million. It is clear

that an enormous, a dominating part of these \$17,400 million results not from the material functions of trade, from an addition of new values to the values created in the sphere of industrial production, but from functions resulting from the formal metamorphosis of goods into money and money into goods.

A large, important, as yet untouched problem, without which no planning is possible in Poland, is to decide what place is occupied by trade in Poland's mixed economic structure, how to classify trade, how to discover in it the material processes of accruing values on the one hand and the non-productive formal functions on the other hand.

There are still other problems of classification. The division of branches of production into material and non-material ones does not exhaust the matter. Within branches of production, recognized as material, it must be decided what refers to income, to a value newly created, and what to values previously created.

In the Soviet Union a great number of books has been devoted to these problems. A detailed plan of dealing with different themes, different for every branch of production, resolves this matter in a specific way.

Further problems of classification include the rational division into branches of production and the necessary, from the Marxist point of view, division into social classes, the aim of which is to define the partici-

pation of the various social classes in the creation of national income. According to Marx's theory, the size of national income in the various years must be arranged into a dynamic series. To present the dynamics of national income undoubtedly requires the application of constant prices.

We have stated that national income is the result of productive work in material branches of production. We have stated further that commercial profits, the services of administration, finance, income resulting from the services of the professions, civil service salaries, expenditure on militia, security, national defense, etc., are not elements creating national income. If they are not, what exactly is their nature?

The answer to this question is: *they do not contribute to the creation of national income, but are an act of consumption, of distribution of national income.*

Thus, after discussing the problem of creating national income, we pass to the problem of distribution of national income.

The Marxist theory of creation and distribution of national income differentiates between the primary and the secondary distribution of national income and parallel to it between fundamental income, which originates as a result of the primary distribution of national income and secondary income, which results from the secondary distribution of

national income. As a result of the primary distribution, workers' wages, capitalist dividends, pensions, the earnings of craftsmen and of peasants are paid out. Later comes the turn of the secondary distribution or, to be exact, of secondary distributions. On the one hand, these are made through the budget, by way of taxes and dues; on the other hand, especially in capitalist countries, by way of payments for individual services. A worker pays, for instance, his doctor's fees from his wages, a capitalist pays the services of a teacher, painter, sculptor from his profits: the State, by a secondary distribution of national income through the intermediary of the budget, pays the administration, defense, etc. As a result of the secondary income, and secondary distribution of national income, the final result is achieved. This final result arises by the subtraction of the secondary from the primary income. This final result must be, according to Marxist principles, divided according to class criteria—must be ranged into a dynamic file (in constant prices). *The sum of all these operations with regard to national income and their crowning, so to speak, must be the assessment of income and expenditure, must be a clear-cut answer to the question of how much national income has been created, by whom, and how much they have received from it as a result of the final process of distribution.*

This is how the Marxist theory of

creation and distribution of national income might be represented.

It will not be out of place to present now, even in general terms the bourgeois theory of creation of national income. One principle lies at the source of all these theories: income is created where it is realized. Following this most general principle, the non-Marxist, bourgeois formula is: national income is the sum total of individual incomes, plus the undistributed profits of enterprises. It is clear that after what we have said here, it is easy to state that the creation of income and its distribution are mixed together here as well as primary with secondary incomes. It is clear that according to these principles, trade, finance, administration, education, culture, etc.—are all branches which create national income.

A classical example of such an approach to the problem can be found in the writings of Alfred Marshall, one of the leading lights in bourgeois political science: if, for instance, the income of a landowner is £10,000 and out of his income he pays his secretary £500 a year, and the secretary, in turn, maintains a servant, paying him £50 a year, the sum total of income, according to Marshall is £10,550. Marx deals with this point:

Let us suppose that that part of the social product, whose value is equal to income, diminishes as a result of the fact that during the past year a smaller amount of fresh work has been added

and this newly added work was less efficient. If capitalists and workers wanted, as before, to consume the same values as material goods, they would have to purchase fewer services of doctors, teachers, etc., and if they were forced to spend the same amount on services, etc., they would have to diminish the consumption of other things. Thus it is clear that the work of a teacher or doctor does not create a direct fund from which it can be paid. (*Theories of Surplus Value*, Vol. I.)

This much Marx said on certain respectable categories of non-productive work, namely on the work of doctors and teachers. And yet it is possible—and Marx does it with his characteristic irony — to enumerate scores of other parasitical, useless, and socially harmful categories of non-productive work. The absurdity of similar methods of assessing national income becomes apparent here in all its magnitude. The results of applying these bourgeois principles when assessing national income are clear. On the one hand we have an apology for capitalism, the concealment of all parasitical, non-productive functions behind a screen of would-be creation of national income, on the other hand we have the diminution of the role of truly productive work.

One of the results of such a method of assessment is naturally the faulty interpretation of the size of national income. Let us imagine that as a result of market speculation or up-

sets in the commodity market, the income shown by the American capitalist method under the heading of "trade" will increase. An observer might then come to the following conclusion: the larger the margin of trade as a result of speculation, the greater the increase in national income.

Let us consider something else—war. During war, expenditure on national defense shows a violent rise. The earnings of soldiers, included by capitalist economists in national income, are increased. The interpretation should be thus: the greater the expenditure on defense, the greater the expenditure on the army, the larger the increase in national income. The Americans have found themselves concretely facing such an absurd notion, which forced them even to introduce certain changes in deducting the earnings of members of the armed forces as elements of national income.

Marx approached this problem clearly and distinctly.

The number of persons living on their income is considerable only because the efficiency of productive workers is high, and therefore the additional product on which parasites can be maintained is great. In this case, the work of productive workers is efficient not because many parasites live on the additional product, but on the contrary—the number of parasites is great because the work of productive workers

is efficient. (*Theories of Surplus Value*, Vol. I.)

What are the theoretical foundations of this bourgeois method of assessing national income? Just as the theory of value is the basis of the Marxist method of assessing national income, so the subjective theory of value is the foundation of the bourgeois method of assessing national income; according to it income is a reward for services of the so-called factors of production—capital, land, administration, work. The bourgeois political science cannot accept any other foundation because to accept it would mean the necessity of explaining the problem of surplus value. Therefore it must operate with "factors" of production, it must put the equation sign between the income and the service rendered.

We have seen that dialectical materialism lies at the basis of the Marxist theory of national income, that the division of work into productive and non-productive and the very criterion of productive work, are means of perceiving the economic basis of society and of differentiating between foundation and superstructure. At the basis of bourgeois theories of national income lies philosophical idealism, a basic negation of differentiation between foundation and superstructure.

The 1948 Elections in Bedford-Stuyvesant

by James W. Ford

IN THE NOVEMBER elections, the Negro people, together with their white progressives allies, made a dent in the armor of Jim Crow. They broke through the Jim-Crow policies of the warmongers, and, for the first time in the history of Brooklyn, succeeded in electing a Negro, Bertram L. Baker, to the State Assembly.

This achievement, together with other notable advances made in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn, has aroused considerable interest locally as well as on a national scale. The purpose of this article is to discuss the election campaign in Bedford-Stuyvesant and to indicate the lessons which may prove of value elsewhere.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRESSIVE FORCES

The campaign in Bedford-Stuyvesant was conducted as an integral part of the campaign nationally to defeat the war-and-fascism program of monopoly capital. The residents of this large ghetto area—particularly the Negro people, but also the white population—have felt the full force of the postwar offensive of the trusts. Accordingly, the struggle for Negro rights and for democratic liberties generally was intimately bound up

with the struggle against the Administration's war policies.

The people's forces had a number of political objectives in the election struggle. First, there was the aim of shattering the Jim-Crow policies of the major parties, which prevented Negro candidates from being nominated and elected, by electing one or more Negro candidates to office. Such a victory would spearhead the drive against Negro oppression in Bedford-Stuyvesant; but it would also strengthen the people's coalition and facilitate a breakthrough on this question nationally.

Secondly, there was the aim of asserting the will of the people's forces, Negro and white, of solidifying the coalition against fascism and war, against U.S. imperialism. The need here was to bring forward the key role of the Negro people within that coalition. For, without the Negro people's active and leading role, the coalition could not achieve its objectives; and, conversely, the Negro people could not succeed in advancing their own struggle for freedom and equality except by full-scale participation and leadership in the coalition. The building of a solid base for the Progressive Party, as well as the achievement of a mass vote for Wal-

lace and his program, was therefore a key aim.

Further, there was the objective of bringing forward the Negro workers in the Negro people's movement, together with the working-class sections of the other national minorities in the area as the leading force in the community and in the anti-monopoly coalition. This was particularly important because Bedford-Stuyvesant and the surrounding area are made up predominantly of toiling people who are bearing the main brunt of the reactionary offensive.

Not least of all, the Communist Party had the objective of meeting headon the vicious campaign of Red-baiting and of affirming its independent, traditional program and role as champion of the rights of the Negro people, as well as vanguard of the working class. Our Party had the task of helping to build the coalition and of inspiring the forces gathered in and around the American Labor Party (A.L.P.), the New York arm of the Progressive Party.

The achievement of these objectives clearly required a powerful campaign to forge the greatest possible unity of the Negro people and to challenge and defeat the white "supremacy" attacks which tend to divide Negro and white; to expose the anti-democratic, Jim-Crow, warmongering policies of the two parties; and to link up the oppressive conditions of the Negro and white masses in Bedford-Stuyvesant with the reactionary war drive of Wall Street.

The strategy of the Big Business forces in control of the tweedledum-tweedledee parties also had to be carefully estimated. This strategy clearly was designed to defeat the objectives of the people's coalition by maintaining the system of lily-white representation, by increasing terror against the Negro people in order to intimidate the masses, and by sowing division and confusion among the people by means of increased Red-baiting and chauvinism.

BACKGROUND OF THE CAMPAIGN

The Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn is one of the largest ghetto communities in the North. Its Negro inhabitants live under highly oppressive and discriminatory economic, social, and political conditions. It is therefore easy to see why the struggle to nominate and elect Negro candidates was one of the most crucial issues in the campaign, and why the Democrats and the Republicans have long conspired to prevent this from taking place. More than this, the twin parties of chauvinism and war have long pursued the tactic of misrepresenting the position of the Communists and the progressive forces generally on this question, of falsely accusing the people's forces of responsibility for the lack of Negro representation in public office. This strategem had achieved certain successes, in that many Negroes came to believe these false charges.

The only means of decisively re-

futing these attacks, and of exposing the real Jim-Crow and white-supremacist forces, was to conduct a full-scale campaign for Negro rights, for the full economic, social, and political equality of the Negro people, and to wage an unyielding struggle against white chauvinism. During the course of the 1948 campaign, it became increasingly clear exactly which camp stood for Negro rights, and which forces for Jim Crow and chauvinism.

Thus, on October 10, at the height of the national election struggle, the people of Brooklyn were offered a large dose of white "supremacy" poison by the *Brooklyn Eagle*, a newspaper which has long posed as a friend of the Negro people. This paper carried the story of an interview with Monsignor John L. Belford, pastor of the Church of the Nativity located in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section. "I want to make it clear," declared Monsignor Belford, "we are not dealing with civilized people. We are dealing with a bunch of savages." He went on to say: "This was once a very fine parish. Now among many persons who are fine and civilized, we must deal with a minority who are savages, not civilized." These slanderous words, uttered by a cleric of the Roman Catholic Church—which frequently boasts about its supposedly unprejudiced and non-chauvinistic position,—is nothing less than a lynch-incitement against Negroes designed to

intimidate the Negro people and to divide them from their white allies.

One of the most outrageous conditions in Bedford-Stuyvesant is the reign of brutal police terror. The police seem to consider it their duty, let alone their privilege, to beat Negroes on any and every pretext. In one instance, the unborn child of a pregnant Negro woman was dislodged when she was pounced upon and knocked down by detectives. In the "Case of the Lipscomb Brothers," two Negroes—who had given no provocation whatever—were shot down by a drunken policeman who was off duty.* There was the case of the two Negro school boys beaten with rubber hoses by police officers in their schoolyard, the charge being that they were "drunkards." And there was the brutal murder by policemen in nearby Williamsburg of William Milton—a case which caused widespread indignation and deeply affected the people of Bedford-Stuyvesant.

But this record of police brutality, from which we have cited only a few cases, apparently is not yet sufficient for the reactionaries. Monsignor Belford cried out that "We need

* This case, which was prosecuted by the N.A.A.C.P., resulted in a conviction. The offending probationary patrolman, Francis T. Hogan, was sentenced to six months in the penitentiary. In pronouncing sentence, County Judge Nathan Sobel declared that if he had discovered that Hogan was motivated by "hatred toward Negroes, it would have been a pleasant duty to send him away for the maximum term possible, two and a half years." Yet all the evidence in the case showed obvious anti-Negro prejudice—and everybody involved knew it.

a policeman on every block." And a "citizens' committee," set up at the headquarters of the 17th A.D. Republican Club, passed resolutions calling for more police "protection," ostensibly because an alleged "curfew" had been imposed upon (white) residents in Bedford-Stuyvesant as a result of "the rowdyism of Negroes."

It is within the context of this situation that one must see the other pressing problems of Bedford-Stuyvesant, particularly of its Negro residents.

Unemployment is rising. It is estimated that one out of every six families in the area is dependent on welfare aid. The wages of Negro workers who are fortunate enough to be employed are miserably low. Small home-owners are unable to meet taxes, and the claims of mortgagees are hanging over their heads. Child welfare is neglected in criminal fashion. (For example, the Stuyvesant Interracial Community Center lacked the funds with which to continue to operate, yet the city and state welfare agencies, and Mayor O'Dwyer, did nothing to prevent the closing of this institution's doors.) The housing situation is terrible, but there is nothing being done to relieve it. New schools, playgrounds, recreational centers, and child nurseries are all badly needed—but nothing is being done to provide them, although some of the existing schools date back to about the Civil War period and are literally falling down.

FIRST BROOKLYN NEGRO ELECTED TO THE STATE ASSEMBLY

It is against this background that one is able to assess the outcome of the elections in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

The results of the elections were a complete shock to the Republicans. They had been so sure of victory that toward the end of the campaign they addressed a letter to the Communist Party boasting that they were going to elect their candidate for State Assembly over the Democratic-A.L.P. candidate, and that the Communist Party could not prevent them from winning.

The election of Bertram L. Baker meant a shattering defeat for the G.O.P. candidate and for the Red-baiting campaign of the Republicans, who had shouted that Mr. Baker was a "prisoner of the Communists." The Republicans had declared that the Communists were "un-American" and out to "rob Negroes of their right to hold public office." But their anti-Communist campaign was repudiated by the voters.

The support of Bertram L. Baker by the progressive forces, including the Communist Party, on the A.L.P.-Democratic coalition ticket was based upon the policy of guaranteeing the election of a Negro to the State Assembly of New York around the issues of Negro equality, civil liberties and peace.

This support was based upon local

conditions and relations of forces, as distinct from the imperialist war-mongering policy of the national Democratic Party and the O'Dwyer-Cashmore democratic machines. It was also based upon assuring the defeat of Republican reaction, headed by Thomas Dewey.

The Communist Party was itself a part of the coalition and its support of the local Democratic nominee in the coalition was conditional and aimed at achieving the broadest people's unity to advance the struggle for Negro rights, civil liberties, democracy and peace.

In the conditions of Bedford-Stuyvesant and despite Mr. Baker's tie-up with the County Democratic machine, this general policy was in the best interest of the people's forces of progress, and these forces will advance their interests still further, providing a broad progressive unity movement is developed around a people's program.

Baker received 21,086 votes, 15,694 on the Democratic line, and 5,392 on the A.L.P. ticket. The G.O.P. candidate, Mrs. Maude B. Richardson, also a Negro, was given 8,571 votes on the Republican line, and 2,777 on the Liberal Party slate. Her vote piled up mainly in the Republican-controlled Christian-Front election districts.

Most of the Liberal Party voters were trapped into support of the G.O.P. candidate. Many of them

are members of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, and of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union—both of which are under Social-Democratic control. Strong pressures were brought to bear on the memberships of these unions to vote on the line for the Liberal Party, whose main reason for existence is to attempt to smash the American Labor Party.*

The first victory scored by the progressive forces in this campaign occurred when a mass picket line at Democratic Party headquarters, conducted by the A.L.P. and the Wallace-for-President Committee (which included also Democrats, Republicans, and Communists), forced the Democratic Party chieftains to substitute a Negro nominee (Baker) for their white incumbent assemblyman (John Walsh).

When, in 1946, Mrs. Richardson missed being elected on the G.O.P. ticket by the margin of 77 votes, she accused the Communists of responsibility for her defeat. But the results of the 1948 elections, even more than those of 1946, show that Mrs. Richardson was rejected by the voters for her Red-baiting and her allegiance to Governor Thomas E. Dewey.

The 1948 election returns also point up lessons for the Democratic leaders in Bedford-Stuyvesant, including Mr. Baker himself. These

* The G.O.P.-Liberal Party alliance was the result of a trick write-in of thirteen signatures for Mrs. Richardson in the Liberal Party primaries.

Democrats make the mistake of boasting that their man defeated Mrs. Richardson "on the Democratic line alone." This is a false conclusion, because it is one which leaves altogether out of account the powerful unity movement forged by the progressive forces, including the Communist Party—a movement which was decisive for Baker's nomination and subsequent election. It must be noted, also, that the Democratic leadership conducted a listless campaign lacking initiative and aggressiveness on the issues confronting the people. The Democrats hitched their campaign to the spurious civil rights program of President Truman, and let it go at that. They distributed very little literature, and what they did issue was mainly centered on the personality of their candidate.

It is true that many Negroes voted on the Democratic line, largely in the belief that President Truman was "less dangerous" than Dewey. But the Democrats had better not forget that the Negro people are determined to win a real change of policy toward their pressing problems, and that if it were not for Truman's shameless demagoguery, Wallace and the Progressive Party would have rolled up a really mass vote.

THE CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN IN THE 17TH A.D.

The Congressional campaign, conducted around the independent, A.L.P. candidacy of Mrs. Ada B.

Jackson, also aroused intense interest among the people of Bedford-Stuyvesant. The interest in both the local and national campaigns in this area was already testified to in October, when the registration figures—in this district alone, of all the assembly districts in Brooklyn—climbed higher than in 1944.

The 10th Congressional District in Brooklyn is composed of three assembly districts: the 1st, 17th, and 18th. Because of its large Negro population, the 17th A.D. is the key political unit among them. The 1st and 18th A.D.'s consist mainly of three national groups—Jewish, Italian, and Irish—with the Jewish people predominating.*

Because the Negro people have special interests of their own which are, however, parallel to the democratic interests of the other national groups in the area, and because Mrs. Jackson is a Negro, political observers saw her as a commanding figure around whom the progressive, independent A.L.P. ticket could be united to the maximum.

The following table shows the returns in the Congressional campaign:

* Brooklyn has a Jewish population of more than one million out of a total population of two and a half million. But out of nine representatives in Congress from the borough, only two are Jewish. There is no representative of Italian-Americans in Congress from Brooklyn, although Italian-Americans constitute the second largest group in the Borough. And there are approximately 300,000 Negroes in Brooklyn, but there is no Negro Congressman from the Borough. This glaringly inadequate Negro, Jewish, and Italian-American representation in Congress from Brooklyn is another example of the undemocratic character of "representative government" in the United States.

	1st A.D.	17th A.D.	18th A.D.	Totals
Somers (Dem.)	22,450	15,222	21,407	59,079
Somers (Liberal)	3,812	2,084	4,568	10,464
Hirsch (Rep.)	15,039	8,144	9,102	32,285
Jackson (A.L.P.)	7,187	7,294	7,581	22,062

Of the 46 elections districts in the 17th A.D., 22 consist mainly of Negroes, with scattered numbers of Negroes in the other 24. Mrs. Jackson carried 20 of the first group overwhelmingly over her G.O.P. opponent, and 5 election districts of the second group. Her total vote in the 17th A.D. was 7,294, while Wallace got 5,084 votes on the A.L.P. line.

Inasmuch as the 1st and 18th A.D.'s are predominantly white areas, Mrs. Jackson's vote here was very encouraging. The New York *Amsterdam News*, for instance, wrote that political observers were "very pleased with the showing Ada B. Jackson made." Her vote "definitely illustrates that a Negro has a chance. Mrs. Jackson should be congratulated for her very fine effort."

Mrs. Jackson's showing relative to the G.O.P. candidate in all three assembly districts was remarkable. So far as the Democratic candidate was concerned, she was considered a real threat to a man who had served in Congress for 24 years. As a result, the Democratic national campaign leaders sent none other than Senator Claude Pepper into the District to campaign against her. In addition, Somers circulated widely a statement praising him by A. Clayton Powell, Jr., Negro Congressman from Har-

lem. The Executive Board of the N.A.A.C.P., in an action exposing the organization's "non-partisan" position as hypocritical, also put in a strong "plug" for Somers.

Thus we see the kind of heavy artillery which was called into action in order to keep Somers in office, and to frustrate again the legitimate desires of the Negro people to be represented by a Negro Congressman.

Mrs. Jackson's candidacy was of great significance. She emerged from the election campaign as an outstanding national political figure of sterling character and wide influence, and after the elections she was chosen as a delegate to the World Congress of Women at Budapest, thus achieving even greater international stature.

THE CAMPAIGN FOR CITY COURT JUDGE

In the campaign for City Court Judge, the A.L.P. set another precedent by running a Negro attorney, Thomas R. Jones, as its candidate. The A.L.P. is thus the first political party to nominate a Negro as candidate for the post of Justice in the borough of Brooklyn.

Jones garnered 145,000 votes in the county-wide campaign, running 66,996 votes ahead of the highest

Liberal Party candidate for the same post. He topped the Liberal Party in the 17th A.D. by 3,157 votes and in the 18th A.D. by 2,471 votes. His vote compares favorably with that of the highest vote received by an A.L.P. candidate for City Court Judge (159,000). Jones' splendid campaign proves again that Negro candidates have a real chance of election on the progressive ticket.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRESSIVE CAMPAIGN

As the New York State Committee of the Communist Party noted in its analysis of "The Election Results in New York,"* an important factor in the achievement of more than one-half million votes by the A.L.P. in New York State

was the correct two-fold policy followed by the A.L.P.: that of building the A.L.P. as an independent political force, while achieving electoral agreement to defeat the most reactionary candidates wherever this would advance the best interests of the progressive forces. The outstanding achievement of this policy was the election to the State Assembly of Bertram L. Baker from the 17th A.D., Kings, giving representation to the Negro people of Brooklyn for the first time.

The keynote of the election struggle waged by the progressive forces in Bedford-Stuyvesant was the two-fold policy of the A.L.P. in uniting the people around the issues raised by Henry Wallace and the Progress-

sive Party nationally, and in building the A.L.P.-Democratic coalition for the election of Bertram L. Baker. In both of these aims, the A.L.P. was able to build up considerable united action which involved rank-and-file Democrats and Republicans. This coalition policy resulted in strengthening the independent position of the A.L.P. and in advancing the immediate interests of the people. The policies and program of the A.L.P. also significantly improved fraternal relations between the Negro people and their white progressive allies, and laid the basis for an even stronger alliance in future struggles.

During its campaign, in which young people played an extraordinarily fine role, the A.L.P. issued an enormous amount of literature, and organized struggles around its program. Its campaign literature called for: an end to Jim Crow; abolition of the slums and the construction of housing, playgrounds, and better schools; an end to police terrorism; the enactment of anti-lynch legislation; the elimination of the poll tax; the restoration of rent and price controls; the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; the repeal of the draft; the lifting of the embargo on Israel; a halt to military aid to Greece and Turkey and an end to the cold war; the extension of veterans' benefits; lower taxes on small home owners; etc.

ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

As an official part of the progressive coalition, the Communist Party

* *Political Affairs*, December 1948, p. 1032.

played an active role in building and supporting the coalition. In addition, it conducted its own independent campaign for the Communist candidate for City Council, Simon W. Gerson. At the same time that our Party forces sparked the campaign around the anti-monopoly, anti-war program of the A.L.P. and of the Progressive Party nationally, the program of socialism was also brought to the people as the only basic permanent solution to their immediate and long-range problems.

The broadest unity in the election campaign in Bedford-Stuyvesant was achieved in the struggle for the rights of the Negro people, because Negro rights are the acid test of the rights of all democratic sections of the population. The agents of reaction furiously attacked the Communist Party, but the Negro people did not succumb to Red-baiting, because they knew the Communist Party as a stalwart fighter for their rights. Already in February 1948 our Party had issued the call for the election of a Negro to the State Assembly:

The Communist Party will work for the election of a Negro to public office from Bedford-Stuyvesant. To that end we will unite with all organizations of the people of the community and support any candidate around whom unity and a real people's program for the District can be achieved.

The Party fought vigorously to implement this policy in real life. We met with a number of people's

organizations to plan the election of a Negro to the State Assembly. The outcome of the election now exposes the libel that the Communists sought to "rob the Negro people of their right to hold public office" and delivers a sharp rebuff to those who sought to blackmail the Communists into unprincipled support of G.O.P. reaction.

The Party mobilized its forces for the campaign throughout 1948. In February, there were eight Communist Party clubs in Bedford-Stuyvesant. By the middle of the summer there were already eighteen clubs in the area. This came about in two ways. Large clubs were reduced in size, and during May and June 125 new members were recruited. All this required the training of many new leaders. In addition, the Section Committee, particularly its organizational and educational departments, gained considerably in strength. These measures enabled the Party to spread its activity throughout virtually all of the 46 election districts in the 17th A.D.

The Party in Bedford-Stuyvesant was also strengthened by the special attention given it by the County Committee, and by a county concentration policy. Experienced forces were brought in and a harmonious cadre of old and new forces sparked the work of the Party. One of the outstanding factors in consolidating and advancing the work of the Party was the excellent spirit of fraternity between white and Negro members. This strengthened the struggle in the

community in defense of Negro rights.

During the course of the campaign the Party distributed more than two hundred thousand pieces of literature. The circulation of the weekend *Worker* and the sale of Marxist literature were boosted.

The Party's activity was felt among wide circles. It was not unusual, for instance, to see former figures of the Republican Party speaking from the platform of the Communist Party at street-corner meetings. The Party also sent out a special "News Letter" to leading personages in the community.

Our campaign exposed the dangerous, anti-democratic character of Red-baiting and of the Un-American Activities Committee. The Party leaflet entitled "Who are the Friends and Who are the Enemies of the Negro People?" replied to the G.O.P. attack on the Communists and progressives according to which the people's forces were "carpet-baggers" out to "rob Negroes of their right to hold public office." The Republicans were exposed as distorters of Negro history who twist the facts of the Reconstruction period and malign the real leaders in the struggle for Negro rights and Negro representation in public office.

The Party also exposed the role of certain misleaders among the Negro people who serve U.S. imperialism at home and abroad. Ralph Bunche, U.S. representative in the U.N. and "mediator" in the Pales-

tine struggle, was shown to be an agent of the imperialist Anglo-American policy in Israel. The N.A.A.C.P. was sharply criticized for dismissing Dr. W. E. B. DuBois as part of its design "to minimize the struggle for American Negro rights before the U.N. and also to weaken the struggles of the African masses against imperialism." The Party exposed the hollowness of the charge that Dr. DuBois was violating the "non-partisan policy" of the N.A.A.C.P., since some members of the Executive Board themselves took a decided stand for Truman.

The Party was also very active on the key questions of the day, ranging from such local questions as playgrounds, housing, etc., to such national issues as the struggle against the Mundt-Nixon Bill and for the defense of the indicted Party leaders, the campaign to free Mrs. Rosa Lee Ingram and her two sons, etc.

WEAKNESSES IN THE CAMPAIGN

One of the main objectives of the campaign was to highlight the candidacy of Mrs. Ada B. Jackson as the central figure around whom maximum unity of Negro and white could be achieved for the Progressive Party ticket. But despite the excellent results here, the progressive forces, including some of the top leaders of the Progressive Party itself, did not grasp early enough the importance of this approach. And we, the Communists, did not suffi-

ciently promote understanding of this approach among the forces of the coalition. This fact hampered the general campaign considerably and prevented the maximum mobilization of the progressive forces.

Although the 1948 registration in the 17th A.D. exceeded the figures for 1944, some 2,000 eligible voters failed to come out on November 2nd. This was due in part to the fact that, as the campaign developed, the choice between Truman and Dewey did not emerge very sharply for all the voters. But the biggest factor was the failure of the progressive forces, including the Communists, to influence the new voters sufficiently in support of the Progressive Party ticket.

The progressive campaign was also marked by a certain reliance on spontaneity. Thousands of pledges were secured for the Progressive Party ticket, but these were not followed up by continuous action. It was taken for granted that those who had signed pledges would vote progressive without consistent political and organizational follow-up.

It should also be noted that the results of the superb campaigning of Paul Robeson, who did an extraordinary job, would have been enhanced, had other leading figures of the Progressive Party come into the District.

Further, maximum coordination of the work in the three assembly districts of the 10th Congressional District was not achieved—a shortcoming for which we must assume

partial responsibility. The attacks on the Negro people and the growth of anti-Semitism were not combined sufficiently so as to organize a broad, joint struggle on these issues. There was an underestimation in the entire area of the significant issue of the war in Israel. As a result, despite the betrayal of Israel by the Truman Administration, Representative Somers was able to capitalize on this issue.

In addition, despite the many grievances of the people which found voice in the program of the progressives, there were insufficient organized actions and mass meetings. The tendency was to rely upon negotiations and to take coalition agreements for granted. This was a serious violation of the approach of building the united front from below. Moreover, this was accompanied by the failure to conduct a vigorous campaign against the bourgeois ideology of white "supremacy" and against the pro-imperialist influence of Social Democracy in the people's movement.

Finally, despite the fact that Bedford-Stuyvesant is a working-class community, practically nothing was done to build up trade-union committees supporting the A.L.P. campaign. The bulk of the Negro longshoremen on the Brooklyn docks, who suffer from unemployment and a conscious policy to drive them out of the industry, live in Bedford-Stuyvesant. They are intimidated by the reactionary Ryan leadership of the International Longshoreman's

Association (A. F. of L.). Their plight, as well as that of other Negro trade unionists in the area, is a community, as well as trade-union, problem. A struggle around the key issues which they face must be one of the main objectives of the progressive forces, if the leading role of the working class in the community and in the people's coalition is to be achieved.

While considerable responsibility for these and other weaknesses which expressed themselves during the election campaign rests with progressive forces, a share of the responsibility must be borne by the Communist Party itself.

CONCLUSION

The progressive forces now have the task of overcoming the weaknesses and shortcomings revealed by the elections and of setting out to consolidate their positive achievements. They must launch a mass, people's campaign of political action around the key questions facing the people. This means, in the first place, the organization of a Legislative

Conference of the broadest possible scope based on a people's program.

Measures need to be undertaken by the progressive forces to consolidate the old and new recruits to the progressive movement by building up the membership of the clubs of the A.L.P. and by working out concrete programs of activity. United front actions centered around the burning immediate issues of the people must get under way. A consistent campaign of political education must be waged among the members of the A.L.P., as well as among the broad masses. A trade-union committee must be set up in Bedford-Stuyvesant to bring forward the leading role of the working class, especially its organized section.

If the proper lessons are drawn from the election results, and if effective political and organizational steps are taken to implement those lessons, the level of work in all its aspects in Bedford-Stuyvesant will be increasingly heightened, and the ground will be prepared for greater victories for the progressive forces in struggles to come.

The Philosophy of John Maynard Keynes

by Howard Selsam and Harry K. Wells

I

MORE THAN any other name, that of John Maynard Keynes will be associated with bourgeois political economy in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. The chief difference between Keynes and his predecessors among vulgar economists is that he had to *start* with the fact that something is seriously wrong with the working of capitalism—that it has a constant “propensity” toward crisis. His objective was to overcome the general crisis of capitalism and thereby to save the system. Acutely aware of the recurring danger of economic crashes, he must try to prevent them. A truly scientific analysis would reveal the internal contradictions of the system and the impossibility of resolving them.

As with all other sciences, political economy—the study of the nature and evolution of production relations under capitalism—must take as its starting point “the real mutual relations” of the real world. The British classical school of political economy, in conformity with the needs of the capitalist class at that time, sought to make an objective study of economic laws. But not until Marx was a genuine science of political economy actually achieved. Only the

Marxist dialectical materialist world outlook permits the scientific analysis of the “laws of motion” of capitalism.

The philosophical basis of all bourgeois political economy since Marx is, of necessity, idealism of one type or another. Bourgeois economics, faced with a rising working class, cannot cope with the social relations of capitalism because the bourgeoisie is interested solely in cloaking its own class domination. Basing itself on the “eternality” of capitalism as the “best of all possible worlds,” bourgeois economics, aptly termed “vulgar economy” by Marx, constitutes a system, not of objective science, but of apologetics. It must take as its point of departure secondary, derivative features of capitalist economy (as credit, currency, some disproportionality or other, etc.), or some element in the ideological superstructure (subjective “preferences,” “instincts,” “propensities,” state policies, etc.), or both.

As the court economist of imperialism in the period of the deepening general crisis of the capitalist system, Keynes sought to develop a theory which, while necessarily unscientific, yet has the appearance of being scientific. Admirably suited for his purpose is that trend in phil-

osophy known as subjective idealism—the outlook developed by Berkeley and Hume and further refined in the contemporary bourgeois currents of logical empiricism and pragmatism.

It was David Hume, the eighteenth century British philosopher, who, following the lead of Bishop Berkeley, created the classic way of denying the existence of an objectively real, knowable world. This idealism of Hume is built on the doctrine that we know only appearances, our own sense-impressions. From this postulate it follows that causality is a purely subjective category contributed by us rather than found in the relations of things, and that it is impermissible to talk of a real world, or of processes which exist independently of our knowledge and which are what they are whether we know them or not.

Keynes' writings clearly reveal the consequences Lenin taught us to expect from this subjectivist position: once the barrier of matter is removed it is always possible to smuggle in God, faith, or religion, and to substitute all kinds of subjective factors such as “instincts,” “propensities,” etc., for real analysis of the objective world. With Keynes, as with most bourgeois economists of the twentieth century, this takes the form of explaining history in terms of the influence of ideas or of “instincts,” of making subjective factors basic in the operation of economic processes. But, as in the case of Hume, there is

a fundamental contradiction between theory and practice. When it comes to the very real dislocations in capitalist economy, Keynes does not rely wholly on subjective factors, but proposes concrete and objective measures, such as assumption by the state of the responsibility for finding outlets for capital investment.

II

Keynes' subjective approach underlies his whole economic theory. The laws of economic movement of capitalism are not, as they were for Marx and the whole classical school, laws that operate independently of the wills and interests of individuals. Again, the actions of individuals do not flow from needs and interests created by the given economic organization of society, but rather the economic organization exists and operates in accordance with subjective interests and ideas. This is clearly illustrated in the preface to Keynes' chief work, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, where he criticizes his own earlier *Treatise on Money*. “The outstanding fault of the theoretical parts of that work,” he says, was “that I failed to deal thoroughly with the effects of *changes* in the level of output. . . . This book, on the other hand, has evolved into what is primarily a study of the forces which determine changes in the scale of output and employment as a whole. . . . A monetary economy, we shall find, is essentially one in which changing

views about the future are capable of influencing the quantity of employment and not merely its direction."* At first glance, this may seem sound and objective. Actually what Keynes "discovered" is that somehow capitalists acquire new views about the future, and that this fact of changing ideas fundamentally alters the operation of the economic system. In short, instead of the laws of capitalist development determining the thought and attitudes of capitalists, it is the other way around with Keynes: thoughts, ideas, determine the direction of development.

Keynes writes that his central thesis throughout has been "the profound conviction that the Economic Problem, as one may call it for short, the problem of want and poverty and the economic struggle between classes and nations, is nothing but a frightful muddle, a transitory and an unnecessary muddle. For the Western World already has the resources and the techniques, if we could create the organization to use them, capable of reducing the Economic Problem, which now absorbs our moral and material energies, to a position of secondary importance."** The "organization to use them" means, as further elaboration will reveal, not a new economic system, but new "habits" and certain practical measures. To make capitalism function smoothly, controls and state intervention are needed; but what must

be controlled are ultimately the motives and habits of spending and saving—subjective, not objective factors.*

It has already been indicated in such previous studies of Keynes as that of William Z. Foster in *Political Affairs*, January, 1948, that his system operates essentially through the two concepts of "the propensity to save" and the "propensity to consume." If the propensity to save becomes too great, crisis results. The main economic problem, therefore, is the control and proper balancing of these two psychological factors. In keeping with his subjectivist approach, Keynes makes these subjective factors themselves dependent on other subjective or psychological laws. He writes: "The fundamental psychological law, upon which we are entitled to depend with great confidence both *a priori* from our knowledge of human nature and from the detailed facts of experience, is that men are disposed, as a rule

* It will be noticed that there is an apparent contradiction in the above—a contradiction between the mere modification of psychological factors, in line with Keynes' subjectivist philosophy, and measures of state intervention and control. The contradiction is a real one and it is found among all subjective idealists, whether in private or in public life. David Hume, for example, noted that his skeptical doubts vanished when he played backgammon and dined with his friends. Bertrand Russell, likewise, doubts the existence of the objective world and insists that even if it did exist, we could not know it; but this skepticism does not prevent him from calling for objectively existing atom-bombs to be dropped on the manifestly real socialist state. With Keynes, as with Hume and Russell, there is a complete split between theory and practice, and like them he does not and cannot even make an attempt to reconcile the two. Thus Keynes, seriously concerned with saving society, cannot rely solely on the manipulation of subjective elements, as his theory would really require.

and on the average, to increase their consumption as their income increases, but not by as much as the increase in their income."* This psychological law, in turn, depends on the interrelation of a host of Human customs or instincts which Keynes calls "propensities." "There are, in general, eight main motives or objects of a subjective character which lead individuals to refrain from spending out of their income. . . . These eight motives might be called the motives of Precaution, Foresight, Calculation, Improvement, Independence, Enterprise, Pride, and Avarice." Similarly, there are six motives included in the propensity to consume: "Enjoyment, Shortsightedness, Generosity, Miscalculation, Ostentation, and Extravagance." (Why Keynes, with his love of logical symmetry, stopped with six motives here rather than eight is somewhat puzzling. It should have been perfectly easy to add two more. It is interesting to note that Keynes forgot completely that among the motives for consuming are the need of people for food, clothing and shelter. Or perhaps he did not regard these as having sufficiently deep psychological roots!) It may follow from this that to reform capitalism the economist must call upon the services of the psychologist to achieve the proper balance and control of these fourteen psychological motives.

There is one motive or propensity, however, with which it would be

very dangerous to tamper too much, namely, the money-making proclivity. Keynes writes:

There are valuable human activities which require the motive of money-making and the environment of private wealth-ownership for their full fruition. Moreover, dangerous human proclivities may be canalized into comparatively harmless channels by the existence of opportunities for money-making and private wealth, which, if they cannot be satisfied in this way, may find their outlet in cruelty, the reckless pursuit of personal power and authority, and other forms of self-aggrandizement. It is better that a man should tyrannize over his bank balance than over his fellow citizens. . . .*

This quotation provides three important clues to the roots of Keynes' thinking. First, there is his naive belief that one can "tyrannize over his bank balance" without tyrannizing over men. The truth, however, is that under capitalism economic relations only appear as relations among things, but in actuality are relations among men, and that therefore the ownership of wealth *is* power over men. Secondly, in Keynes' view some men (namely, capitalists) have such "dangerous human proclivities" that they should be "canalized into comparatively harmless channels," even if this means, *as it must*, at the expense of the rest of society (namely, the standard of living, the security, and the rights of the working class). Thirdly, money-making is to

* *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, pp. 6-7.

** *Essays in Persuasion*, p. vii.

* *The General Theory* . . . , p. 96.

* *Essays in Persuasion*, p. 369.

his mind a relatively "harmless" substitute for "cruelty, the reckless pursuit of personal power and authority." But money-making is the exploitation of man by man, and in all exploiting societies it necessarily involves the use of force and brutality to maintain that exploitation, cruelty, and the reckless pursuit of personal power and authority.

Although the task of the economist, according to Keynes, is to advise the state and the financiers on those measures necessary for controlling and balancing the motives for consuming and for saving, he makes a sharp distinction between this and anything that could be called "changing" human nature: "The task of transmuting human nature must not be confused with the task of managing it." So the problem is to "manage" human nature. In an essay written "to disembarrass myself of short views and take wings into the future," Keynes writes that the transmutation of human nature can only be expected, say a hundred years hence, when so much capital has been accumulated that "all kinds of social customs and economic practices, . . . which we now maintain at all costs, however distasteful and unjust they may be in themselves, because they are tremendously useful in promoting the accumulation of capital, we shall then be free, at last, to discard." Then, at last, will utopia be ushered in, and the love of money as a possession "will be recognized for what it is, a somewhat disgusting

morbidity. . . ."* The way to utopia, in short, is only through the further accumulation of capital, and the only way capital can be accumulated is by encouraging "money-making instincts." Thus, again, it is evident that Keynes' economic analysis is basically psychological,** resting on a table of relatively permanent human motives. This in turn rests on the general subjectivist position of Hume, which holds that our ideas, etc., do not come from an independently existing objective world, but that the world is a form of the organization of our ideas determined by inherent tendencies of our minds to associate or organize our ideas in one way rather than in another.

III

Keynes' subjective idealism is reflected, not only in his economic theory, but in his approach to history, to classes, and to society generally. In surveying history, Keynes is puzzled by what seems to him to have been the total lack of progress in the standard of life of the average man and the absence of important technical improvements in the whole period between 2000 B.C. and the eighteenth century. The interesting resolution of this difficulty he finds

* *Essays in Persuasion*, pp. 369 ff.

** The following quotation further supports this contention: "Thus we can sometimes regard our ultimate independent variables as consisting of (among other things) the three fundamental psychological factors, namely, the psychological propensity to consume, the psychological attitude to liquidity and the psychological expectation of future yield from capital assets. . . ." (*The General Theory* . . . pp. 246 ff.)

in the "discovery" that it was all due to the failure of capital to accumulate, or rather that the habit of accumulating capital had been lost by men and was only recently re-established. From the time of the bringing of American gold to Europe by the Spanish "until today the power of accumulation by compound interest, which seems to have been sleeping for many generations, was re-born and renewed its strength. And the power of compound interest over two hundred years is such as to stagger the imagination."*

One could call this the "habit-theory" of history. Men get habits, like that of accumulating capital, and then lose them, only to get them again at a later age. But the most important habit of all, in terms of its influence on the historical process, is the habit of compound interest. It is not labor, but the idea or habit of accumulating capital by compound interest, that creates wealth. This is clearly the kind of thing that Marx called "the immaculate conception theory of interest." Keynes never dreams of asking why habits arise or disappear when they do. But it is precisely here that his idealism, with its denial of an objective world, prevents him from going beyond ideas and habits, because in the last analysis they are for him the ultimate reality.

Such a reactionary theory also serves the purpose of making capitalists, with their "habit" of accumu-

* *Essays in Persuasion*, p. 361.

lation and compound interest, the motive force of scientific and technological development and of progress in the standard of living. This is the "theoretical" basis for Keynes' preposterous doctrine that "the bourgeois and the intelligentsia . . . are the quality in life and surely carry the seeds of all human advancement." The converse of this is his detestation of "a creed which, preferring the mud to the fish, exalts the boorish proletariat."* In these cynical remarks, which dismiss exploited and oppressed humanity as "boorish" and exalt the small minority who coin workers' blood into capital, Keynes explicitly reveals his role as the St. George of finance capital bent on slaying Marxism.

II

Behind the "instincts," "propensities," and other subjectivist concepts Keynes uses in his analysis of the workings of capitalist economy, and in his interpretation of history generally, there lies, as has been indicated, a philosophy more explicit than anything for which Keynes has been given credit.

In the opening chapter of his *Treatise on Probability*, Keynes reveals in one simple sentence his basic philosophical position. He writes: "The objects of knowledge and belief . . . as opposed to the objects of direct acquaintance which I term

* *Ibid.*, p. 300.

sensations, meanings, and perceptions . . . I shall term propositions.”* In this sentence we find both the key for the interpretation of the statements given below on “probability” and other subjects, as well as the basic identity of Keynes’ philosophic thought with that of the whole subjectivist tradition stemming from Berkeley. What Keynes says here is that the objects of our knowledge are *not* the things, events, processes of a real and objective world, but *are* simply the propositions, statements, we assert. Further, these propositions in turn are simply statements linking together, organizing, the “objects of direct acquaintance,” our sense impressions. It is in keeping with this position that Keynes reduces degrees of probability to degrees of belief, and bases belief on “useful mental habits.” In other words, our beliefs or knowledge are not based on, or derived from, an objective nature of things revealed in our sensations and perceptions, but rather on mental habits given us by natural selection and found to be useful. Here there is clearly a direct connection with the views of James, Dewey, and American pragmatism generally, a position toward which Keynes found his young friend, F. P. Ramsey, tending, and with which Keynes seems to agree.**

In a eulogy on Ramsey, who died at the age of 26, and whose *Foundations of Mathematics* was published

posthumously, Keynes wrote: “I do not think that there is any book of equal importance for those who would think about fundamental matters in a modern way. . . .”* This indicates immediately that Keynes belongs in the Russell, Wittgenstein, Ramsey tradition—one marked by its descent from Berkeley and Hume and its subjectivist approach to all questions. Keynes completely accepted Ramsey’s criticism of his own theory of probability, as set forth in his *A Treatise on Probability* (1921)—a criticism which made probability even more completely subjective than Keynes himself had made it. Paraphrasing Ramsey, Keynes says: “Formal logic is concerned with nothing but the rules of *consistent* thought. But in addition to this we have certain useful mental habits for handling the material with which we are supplied by our perceptions. . . .”** He goes on to say that “probability is concerned not with the objective relations between propositions but (in some sense) with degrees of belief. . . . Thus the calculus of probabilities belongs to formal logic. But the basis of our degrees of belief—or the *a priori* probabilities, as they used to be called—is part of our human outfit, perhaps given us merely by natural selection, analogous to our perceptions and our memories, rather than to formal logic.” (p. 300 f.) In this connection Keynes writes: “Ramsey reminds

one of Hume more than of anyone else, particularly in his common sense and a sort of hard-headed practicality towards the whole business.”* An example of these qualities of Hume is found in the following quotation from him: “We are determined by *custom* alone to suppose the future conformable to the past. . . . The Powers, by which bodies operate, are entirely unknown. We perceive only their sensible qualities: and what *reason* have we to think, that the same powers will always be conjoined with the same sensible qualities? It is not, therefore, reason which is the guide of life, but custom.”** Interestingly, this small essay of Hume’s, written as a book review of his own book, was discovered and published in 1938 with an introduction by J. M. Keynes and an associate.

What Keynes calls Ramsey’s “common sense and hard-headed practicality” is revealed as pure subjectivism in fragments of Ramsey that Keynes published in his eulogy of him. “If I was to write a *Weltanschauung* I would call it not ‘What I believe,’ but ‘What I feel.’ This is connected with Wittgenstein’s view that philosophy does not give us beliefs, but merely relieves feelings of intellectual discomfort.”*** This is in complete conformity with the American pragmatic tradition which holds with its founder, C. S. Peirce, that “the action

of thought is excited by the irritation of doubt,” and has no other end than to remove this irritation. The logical outcome of such an approach to thought is found clearly in Ramsey’s further statement, quoted by Keynes, “I don’t really believe in astronomy, except as a complicated description of part of the course of human and possibly animal sensation.”*

We are now in a position to compare Keynes’ statement quoted earlier on the objects of knowledge being propositions, with the opening sentence of Part I of Berkeley’s *Principles of Human Knowledge*. Berkeley begins: “It is evident to anyone who takes a survey of the *objects of human knowledge*, that they are either ideas actually imprinted on the senses; or else such as are perceived by attending to the passions and operations of the mind; or lastly, *ideas* formed by help of memory and imagination—either compound-
ing, dividing, or barely representing those originally perceived in the aforesaid ways.”** Given this sentence, all the rest of subjective idealism follows. If our ideas are the objects of our knowledge, rather than the knowledge of objects, then knowledge never extends beyond the charmed circle of our own ideas, and these ideas are merely the sense impressions themselves or organizations of them in various ways. This is precisely the meaning of subject-

* *Treatise on Probability*, p. 12.
** *Essays in Biography*, p. 299.

* *Ibid.*, p. 296.
** *Ibid.*, p. 300.

* *Ibid.*, p. 301.
** *An Abstract of a Treatise of Human Nature*, p. 16.
*** *Essays in Biography*, p. 310.

* *Ibid.*, p. 311.
** George Berkeley, *Works* (ed. Fraser), Vol. I, p. 257.

tive idealism: I *know* only my *own* sensations—although this is almost always qualified by the acceptance (without logical warrant) of other minds, and hence of a public world of sensations, ideas, etc. What Lenin said early in this century of the Machists can be said equally of Keynes and his philosophical associates, the logical positivists and pragmatists: “there is nothing in their teaching but a paraphrasing of subjective idealism.”

III

Keynes' subjective idealism and pure empiricism provide him with a method for seeking to justify his position as an ideologist for capitalism in the epoch of its decline. He requires, in his effort to develop an economic theory that will serve as a weapon in the hands of the ruling class, a philosophy which will allow for certain needed adjustments in the economy of monopoly capitalism in order to seek to avoid its impending collapse. At the same time, it must perpetuate the superstitions, myths, and habits among the masses calculated to immobilize them from effective action in behalf of their interests and thus to freeze the existing class relations. It was Berkeley and Hume who discovered the classic way of doing this in the modern world. Subjective idealism and pure empiricism are essentially instruments for denying the possibility of scientific knowledge of the objective

world. Since the 1880's, logical positivism (Machism) and pragmatism have been employed increasingly as weapons against Marxism. Professor Herbert W. Schneider makes this point perfectly clear in his recent *History of American Philosophy* where he says that political pragmatism “is primarily a theory of power, or rather of powers, pluralistic and opportunistic.” It thus provides “a practical substitute for the Marxian concepts of class conflict in a society where classes are vague but conflicts continual.”* This statement admits that pragmatism is a philosophical expression of political opportunism. It further admits that a basic aim of pragmatism is to provide an alternative to Marxism. It is plain, too, that the alternative is not a scientific but a “pragmatic” one—that is, it *works* as a camouflage for hiding the fact that class conflict is rooted in the nature of capitalist society.

Keynes' philosophical position is that of a logical positivist with an orientation toward American pragmatism. Both positions stem from the subjective idealist-pure empiricist tradition of Berkeley and Hume. The positivists have been primarily concerned with the logical analysis of language. Reducing science to the logical analysis of the propositions in which it is expressed, they then reduce the forms of these propositions to supposed innate characteristics of

* pp. 567-569.

mind. This leaves the positivists with a passive approach to knowledge, completely divorced from practice. The pragmatists, on the contrary, make the meaning of a proposition consist in the behavior which it calls forth. Thus, for them, truth consists, not in the relation of a proposition or idea to reality, but in its relation to behavior. Their aim, they say, is the reconstruction or changing of experience; but what they want to change has more to do with subjective experience than with objective reality. Keynes is not content with the logical analysis of the language of economics. Fearing what crises may do to capitalism, he wants to get rid of them. But his method of accomplishing this aims at adapting the behavior of “men,” by certain economic measures which manipulate the subjective “propensities” to the existing capitalist system in order to perpetuate that system—not at scrapping or changing the system to meet the needs of the people.

Why does Keynes not remain content with the mere logical analysis of economic propositions? For one whose concern is only with the academic world, with the influencing of professors, logical positivism suffices. But when the aim is such as to require the influencing of politicians, businessmen, financiers, and susceptible “leaders” of labor, then positivism must be much more “practicalized,” it must be fused with pragmatism. This fact may help to ex-

plain the relative ease with which Keynesism has permeated economic thinking in the United States, not only among capitalists, but also among leaders in the labor and progressive movements.

The question naturally comes to mind as to how such a basically irrational and unscientific body of thought is seized upon by the leading economists and statesmen as a great and lasting contribution to economic theory. The answer is to be found, not in any actual contributions to general theory or economic practices, but in the general crisis of capitalism itself. Capitalists desperately seek any means of buttressing their dying system. Inasmuch as monopoly capitalism cannot be defended on rational grounds or continued by rational means, they eagerly clutch at any straw, no matter how preposterous and irrational. And this holds equally of avowed defenders of capitalism, of reformists, and of Social-Democrats of various complexions.

Since the publication of the first volume of Marx's *Capital* in 1867, the dialectical materialist basis has been provided for a scientific understanding of capitalist economy. But a scientific analysis reveals the internal contradictions of capitalism, and the inevitable replacement of that system by socialism. Those committed to the capitalist system, therefore, have no recourse but to an unscientific approach resting on some form of philosophical idealism. And in the

period of the general crisis of capitalism, pressed ever more closely by the working class—which is already victorious in the Soviet Union and on the march to socialism in the new democracies—the only possible philosophical defense lies in pure empiricism disguised with the “hard-headed practicality” of American pragmatism.

“The teaching of Marx evokes throughout the civilized world the greatest hostility and hatred on the part of all bourgeois science (both official and liberal) which regards Marxism as something in the nature of a ‘pernicious sect.’ No other attitude is to be expected, since there can be no ‘impartial’ social science in a society which is built up on the class struggle. All official and liberal science *defends* wage slavery in one way or another, whereas Marxism has declared ruthless war on that slavery. To expect science to be impartial is as silly and naive as to expect impartiality from employers on the question as to whether the workers’ wages should be increased by decreasing the profits of capital.”

V. I. Lenin, in *Marx-Engels-Marxism*.

Communications

by J. Martin

The Editor.
Political Affairs

In his reply to Betty Gannett in the July 1948 issue, John Lewis remarks that “Pragmatism is, philosophically, a back number.” He also observes that the proletariat has allies among bourgeois philosophers, and that most scientists are not sceptics or idealists at all.

Pragmatism, Machism, and other varieties of agnosticism are not dead or forgotten among scientists. As a matter of fact, they have been further developed in logical positivism, logical empiricism, operationalism, and other bourgeois philosophies.

In their modern form, pragmatism and Machism influence scientists, scientific philosophers, and even Dr. Lewis himself. The typical introduction to writings on the theory of relativity, for instance, is prefaced by a discussion on the fallibility of our knowledge, on the need to limit ourselves to what we “really” know, that is, to scale readings and pointer marks. Concrete reality becomes both unknown and “unknowable.” Some physicists, like Weyl, take this position fairly consistently; others, like Einstein, occasionally veer into materialism.

In many books on quantum theory, you will find a similar agnostic

position on Heisenberg’s so-called indeterminacy principle.

“As modern scientists have pointed out,” says Lewis “every kind of observations is itself *selective*, it excludes the possibility of finding out some things by registering others. When light falls on a moving electron, it alters the velocity of the electron, so you cannot find its position *and* its velocity at the same time. If you locate its position you lose its velocity, if you measure its velocity you have no notion where it is. Strange but true.”

The Heisenberg theory itself is a materialist theory; the philosophical deductions that “modern scientists have pointed out” were made under the influence of Machism. (See, for evidence, the discussion in Philipp Frank’s *Einstein: His Life and Times*.) Heisenberg, seeking a new atomic theory, began by eliminating quantities that were for his immediate purposes both unknowable and unnecessary. Among these “unknowables” were the actual position of the electron in the atom, its velocity, the nature of its orbit, and so on. For him reality consisted of wave numbers and spectral intensities, derived, of course, from those fundamental scale and pointer readings.

Having eliminated these “unknowables” from the foundation of his

theory, he found, naturally enough, that later his theory could not assign them definite values. This hardly ranks as a great theoretical conclusion. What about experimental evidence? The experiments to prove unknowability are hypothetical, of a kind that cannot be carried out!

Thus the "fact" about electrons that so impresses Lewis stems from the *limitations* of quantum theory, limitations inevitable at the present stage. But only scientists under the influence of the agnostics hold that both the theory and its limitations are final. Will physicists some day construct a theory that goes beyond the present limitations, that permits the prediction of both the position and velocity of an electron at the same time? Soviet scientists, as well as many bourgeois scientists, now think that they will.

It is ironic that the "final truth" of the Heisenberg principle should so strongly influence Lewis' thinking at a time when it is losing its influence upon the physicists themselves.

Skepticism and idealism control much of the thinking of scientists in other branches of physics, in astronomy, and in biology. In mathematics, all three major lines of approach are predominantly idealist. (For a quick summary, see the Introduction to the Second Edition of Bertrand Russell's *The Principles of Mathematics*.)

To Russell and his followers, "mathematics and logic are identical," and "logic aims at independence of empirical fact, and the existence

of the universe is an empirical fact." In other words, in so far as the propositions of mathematics are true, Russell goes beyond the unfortunate Dühring, who sought for truths valid on other planets, and seeks for truths valid in other universes.

The second group, led by the late Prof. Hilbert, regards mathematics as a meaningless game, played according to formal rules. And the third, following Brouwer and Weyl, would throw out large sections of mathematics, if not all mathematics and all science—because the proofs hitherto given do not meet their criterion of what is intuitively evident.

"This doctrine," says Russell, "is an aspect of thorough-going empiricism." But, he adds, "Disastrous consequences, however, cannot be regarded as proving that a doctrine is false; and the finitist doctrine, if it is to be disproved, can only be met by a complete theory of knowledge." There speaks the idealist again; philosophical theory and human practice have nothing to do with each other.

Bourgeois psychology, as Soviet critics have shown, is saturated with idealism. A bourgeois psychologist, even one who flirts with Marxism, can hardly write a page without bringing in such idealist abstractions as the Ego, the Unconscious, Anger, Fear, the Death Wish, the Oedipus Complex, and others—all existing eternally in an eternal and changeless human nature. Materialists use abstractions too; but they do not en-

dow them with an independent life of their own.

In the so-called social sciences, idealism is in complete control. Read Bliumin's analysis of Keynesism, in the same issue of *Political Affairs* that contains Lewis' *Reply*, to see how such psychological factors as individual whims and desires are utilized by bourgeois economists to explain the role of money, the production of crisis and unemployment, and so on. Read any professorial bourgeois analysis of society to learn how all modern evils, from anti-Semitism and white chauvinism to the waging of world wars, are due to evil instincts and bad training, and can be overcome, if at all, only by education and good will.

Consider such a supposedly academic science as anthropology, which the bourgeoisie ordinarily regards as rather harmless, and where it accordingly allows greater freedom of thought and expression. How does an anthropologist approach a primitive tribe (or a modern nation, for that matter)? What does he consider the most fundamental feature of a group's life?

He emphasizes the tribe's religion, its ceremonies, its magic practices. (And in the case of a nation, its literature, its art, its music, its "tradition.") To him, these determine the mode of life. The Marxist, on the other hand, centers attention on the use of tools, on the mode of production in general, on the class struggle, and on the social changes continually

resulting from changes in the mode of production.

If idealism and skepticism thus permeate all spheres of bourgeois science, how can Lewis claim that, "Most scientists are not idealists or sceptics at all"?

First, because he has centered all his attention on the physical and biological sciences, where idealism usually plays its role in the background. Apparently, he does not regard psychology, mathematics, or anthropology as sciences at all.

Second, because in the physical and biological sciences, idealist concepts are continually coming into conflict with the reality of a factory or laboratory. It is useless to tell a chemist that the acids and hydrocarbons stop existing when he turns his back to them, or to announce to a biologist that the dog which he has injected with a new drug is not a dog at all, but a mere collection of pointer readings.

But this does not necessarily make the chemist and biologist thorough-going materialists. When they hang up their laboratory robes—*then* they often listen respectfully to their colleagues of the philosophical faculty, who assure them that the laboratory may be a delusion, that the results they obtained with so much trouble are "subjective," that these depend on the experimenter as much as on the experiment, and worst of all, that the results could have been obtained more readily and accurately, with much less trouble, simply by sitting

in an armchair and doing some pure idealist thinking.

At a certain stage, chemist and biologist balk at such idealism. By that time they have usually reached a state of bewilderment and have been left with a peculiar muddle of materialist and idealist beliefs. No wonder, therefore, that modern bourgeois science is the happy hunting

ground of clever idealists and semi-idealists of every shade. And no wonder that instead of finding "allies" there, the proletariat has to engage in a continual struggle to safeguard and advance the positions of its own dialectical materialist science.

Comradely yours,
J. MARTIN.

"Science must not be a selfish pleasure. Those who are so lucky as to be able to devote themselves to scientific pursuits should be the first to put their knowledge at the service of mankind.' One of his favorite sayings was, 'Work for the world.'"

Karl Marx, quoted by Paul Lafargue, in *Reminiscences of Marx*.

RECENT INTERNATIONAL BOOKS

SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SINCE 1917

By MAURICE DOBB

\$4.00

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE EVE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR (two volumes)

Vol. I \$2.75; Vol. II \$2.50

TRENDS IN AMERICAN CAPITALISM

Prepared by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Cloth \$1.50; Paper \$.75

THE SCIENCE OF BIOLOGY TODAY

By TROFIM LYSENKO

Cloth \$1.25; Paper \$.25

PEOPLE COME FIRST

By JESSICA SMITH

2.50

GIANT AT THE CROSSROADS:

THE STORY OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATION

By M. Ilin and E. Segal

\$2.50

THE STORY OF YOUR BREAD

By CLARA HOLLOS, with illustrations by LAZLO ROTH

\$1.50

TO BE FREE

By HERBERT APTHEKER

\$2.75

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

notes on reading

THE LIFE STORY OF A LABOR CHAMPION FIGHTING WORDS

Selections from 25 Years of the

DAILY WORKER

History-in-the-making is packed into the pages of this exciting 256-page book—the human drama of a quarter century of daily struggle to forge a better world. Across its pages pass great names and great events—Lenin—Sacco and Vanzetti—Scottsboro—Mooney—Dimitroff. Here is the living panorama of the workers' struggles in the Great Depression—the march on Washington—the sit-down strikes—and the inexorable forward march of history—Munich—Spain—Pearl Harbor—Stalingrad—Suchow. The heroic record of labor's day-to-day battles led by the Communist Party against monopoly, against warmongers and racists, against exploiters and profiteers.

Here, also, is gathered selections from the best of the *Daily Worker's* reportage, editorials, news stories, columns, cartoons—by William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, Robert Minor, Art Young, Mike Gold, Elizabeth Flynn, Ben Davis, John Gates, Milton Howard, Joseph Starobin, Rob Hall, George Morris, Abner Berry, Fred Ellis, A. B. Magil, Joseph North, Sender Garlin, Samuel Sillen, and many, many others, including the humor of Alan Max, Ted Tinsley, Chips, Redfield and Royden.

You will be thrilled by this great story of the *Daily Worker* which has consistently championed the interests of labor and the people, and has, at every step, helped organize the people for a better life and Socialism. This is a book you will treasure; it is a *must* for your permanent library.

Price: popular \$1.50; cloth \$2.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.