

in defense  
of the  
**COMMUNIST PARTY**  
and the  
indicted  
leaders



by WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

Full text of a statement presenting the general line of the defense of the Communist Party and the 11 leaders now on trial.

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • NEW YORK  
JULY, 1949 PRINTED IN U.S.A.



## **Contents**

1. The Political Frameup Against the Communists	5
2. The Facts about the Emergency Convention	12
3. The Uneven Development of the Struggle for Socialism	17
4. The Force and Violence Distortion	21
5. The Communist Line in the Russian Revolution	28
6. The Political Line of the Communists After the Rise of Fascism	33
7. The New Political Line in Application	39
8. The People and Aggressive American Imperialism	50
9. The Elements of American Communist Party Policy	66
10. The General Political Line of the American Communist Party	80

## About the Author

This pamphlet contains the text of a statement issued on May 22, 1949, by William Z. Foster, outlining the position of the Communist Party on all issues introduced in the Government's case against the twelve members of the National Committee of the Party on trial in New York City for "conspiring to advocate and to teach Marxism-Leninism."

Mr. Foster, whose trial has been "severed" because of illness, is the National Chairman of the Communist Party and a veteran of over fifty years in the labor, progressive, and Communist movements in the United States.

Mr. Foster is the author of many books and pamphlets among which are *Pages From a Worker's Life*, *American Trade Unionism*, and *The New Europe*. His latest book, *The Twilight of World Capitalism*, was published in June by International Publishers in an initial edition of 100,000 copies.

# 1. The political frameup against the Communists

---

The Prosecution charges the 11 Communist defendants in this trial with conspiring to organize the Communist Party for the purpose of teaching and advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

To this indictment the Prosecutor himself, in his opening remarks to the Jury, added the further charge that the Communists are trying to create a facsimile of the Russian Revolution in the United States. As he put it, "The Russian Revolution is studied in detail, as a blueprint for the revolution in every other country.... This is the model for the revolution in this country."

This is double-barreled nonsense; first, because even the most elementary analysis of the policies of Communism in this country shows that our Party does not advocate force and violence, but, basing itself squarely upon the national interests of our people and upon democratic processes generally, at all times seeks the most peaceful and democratic means for the defense of the workers' and people's immediate interests and for the ultimate achievement of Socialism.

And second, because even a beginner in politics should know that the movement for Socialism, developing in countries with widely differing economic and political conditions, necessarily takes on very different forms.

Contrary to Mr. McGohey, one of the things that Communists everywhere are on guard against is to take the Russian Revolution as a "blueprint" model for the winning of Socialism in their respective countries.

Before proceeding to demolish this monstrous indictment, it is necessary to make a number of clarifications of specific points:

First, there is much more on trial here than these 11 defendants. The Communist Party is on trial – American democracy is at the bar.

The purpose of the Prosecutor's charges is to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States. The reactionaries of this country know that if they can illegalize our Party, this will create an atmosphere in which, by a frenzied Red-baiting and with cries that Communists are lurking behind every door, they may the more readily attack other people's movements and thus proceed with their program of fascism, imperialist conquest, and war. First to outlaw the

Communist Party and then to outlaw other democratic movements – this was the road taken by Hitlerism in Germany and it is also the route of fascism in this country.

This is why the democratic forces of all countries have their eyes fastened upon this trial. The outcome of the trial, therefore, will be of real importance not only to the United States but to the whole world. It will give a clear signal as to whether democracy is still vigorously alive in the United States or whether it has already been gravely undermined by fascist-minded, warmongering reaction. The very holding of this trial is a heavy blow against American democratic prestige all over the world.

The second necessary clarification is that the Communist defendants are not charged with any overt acts but of merely saying certain things. More outrageous yet, they are charged with conspiring to say these things.

The Prosecution with all its stoolpigeons, informers, and renegade witnesses, and in spite of their nonsensical tales about conspiratorial meetings, does not dare to charge us American Communists with advocating or practicing force and violence during the daily strikes and other struggles of the workers. This is because, even with the most imaginative perjurers on the stand, there could not be scared up against us the slightest pretext of evidence on this score.

Fifty years ago, Lenin taught the Communists the folly of "putschism" and individual terrorism as working class weapons. One can search in vain through the record of the Communist Party in this country for the use of such means. Historically, violence has always been the weapon of the capitalist exploiters. Ours is the method of the broad democratic economic and political struggle of the workers.

It is, therefore, a political frameup, and contrary to our Party's whole life practice, when the Prosecution comes in here with the 6 baseless charge that we Communists are conspiring to overthrow the American Government by force and violence.

The charge against us actually reduces itself to an allegation that we advocate a forceful overthrow of the American Government to bring about the transition from capitalism to Socialism at some time in the more or less distant future. The mere presentation of such a charge, besides being a lie in itself, is also a complete denial of free speech and a violation of our constitutional rights. In reality, it is an attempt to

prohibit criticism of capitalism and to introduce Japanese fascist thought-control into this country.

Behind the absurd charges that the Communist Party is advocating the achievement of Socialism by force and violence lurks the sinister aim of the ruling class not only to suppress all propaganda for Socialism, but to make capitalism sacrosanct, unchallengeable in word or deed. They want to create a situation where you have to believe in the private ownership of industry and in monopoly domination or be denounced as a "traitor." This would mean ultimately the abolition of all freedom of political opposition, on the fascist plan.

Our capitalist rulers are pathologically afraid of Socialism. They know that the U.S.S.R. would never attack us but they are ridden by a corroding fear that Socialism, with its scientifically organized industries, its planned economy, and its freedom from economic crises, as demonstrated in the U.S.S.R., is inherently a far superior social system to the industrial chaos called capitalism, with its bitter class struggles, economic smashups, tyrannical fascism, and ruinous wars. So they are trying to make it a crime even to criticize their capitalist system.

A third necessary clarification is to point out the indispensability in this trial of examining Communist practice as well as Communist theory, if Communist policy is to be understood. This is so because the Prosecution, unable to prove from the life of the Communist Party of the United States their absurd charge against us that we are advocating the overthrow of the American Government by force and violence, in their desperation have loaded up the Jury with a lot of distorted quotations and misrepresented experiences of Communist leaders and parties from all over the globe.

They have especially deluged you with quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, as well as from certain members and ex-members of the American Communist Party. These quotations, the Jury should note, are usually torn from their context and are so juggled about as to make them imply the very opposite of what the writers really meant and said; they also deal with situations widely different from that prevailing today in the United States; and they often refer to events that happened many years before June, 1945, the date when we are charged with having entered into a conspiracy to advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government.

How are the members of the Jury to grasp and understand the basic truth of all these quotations, as this truth bears upon the present case? In the quotations that have been laid before you and in the explanations of them that the Defense will make as it goes along, you have much of the world view of Communism, with all its complexities.

The Prosecution's distortions and misinterpretations of the many quotations make it doubly difficult for any body of men and women, who are not specialists in this complicated question, to disentangle the basic truth in the whole presentation, namely, that the Communist Party of this country does not advocate the forceful overthrow of the Government.

There is, however, a very simple and a very reliable key to understanding and properly estimating this whole theoretical complex. It is one the Jury should not fail to utilize in its deliberations. This is, along with analyzing the various theories, to weigh and measure the Communist movement here and abroad in relation to its actual practice, to check on how the Communists have applied their theories in the political life of various nations.

The decisive importance of taking practical Communist political policy as a major guide to the understanding of the Communist movement in all its aspects lies in the fact that this actual practice of the Communist movement expresses in real life the theories of Marxism- Leninism.

Theory and action interact upon each other. Action is theory come alive. Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement, said Lenin. At the same time, practice spurs new theoretical growth. As Stalin says (*Foundations of Leninism*, p. 94), "Revolutionary theory is a synthesis of the experience of the working class movement throughout all lands – ... the generalized experience."

In political practice we therefore see Marxism-Leninism stand out most clearly in its true meaning. The most reliable way to judge what any movement really signifies by its theoretical and political pronouncements is to examine how it translates them into life. We Communists welcome this elementary test; indeed we insist upon it.

During this trial, while demolishing all the Prosecution's misrepresentation of Communism in the realm of theory, we will also insist upon the indispensability of judging our Party according to its political practice. Communist theory and practice are inextricably interlaced with each other, and they cannot be separated. Any



examination of Communism which does not give full weight to the lessons of the practical experience of the Communist movement is only a travesty, and cannot possibly understand the true meaning of Communism.

World Communism, during the past generation, has accumulated a vast amount of practical experience in a large number of countries. We propose to show what this experience really amounts to and also what bearing it has upon American Communist Party policy. This outline checking of the experience of world Communism has been made imperative because the Prosecution, over the Defense's objections, has brought in documents and quotations relating to many other countries and running as far back as a century ago.

This review will make clear, not only on the basis of scientific Communist theory, but of widespread political experience, that throughout the whole historical life of the Communist movement, the general aim of the Communists always, in all countries and under all conditions, is to promote the deepest interests of the workers and the nation, and to find the most peaceful and democratic road to Socialism in the given circumstances.

The examination will also demonstrate the indisputable fact that violence in the class struggle always originates with the capitalist reactionaries, in their efforts to deny the workers and other people's forces their democratic rights in the fight for their demands. And lastly, it will smash the Prosecution's nonsense that the Communists use the Russian Revolution of 1917 as a detailed "blueprint" for the achievement of Socialism in this country.

In making a factual examination of Communist theory as applied in action, which is a basically true test of it, it is especially important for the Jury to take note of the fact that Communism does not operate with a cut-and-dried, static body of theory and practice.

We have no "blueprints," notwithstanding the Prosecution's assertions. On the contrary, on the basis of an application of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, Communist political policies grow and expand with the development of the class struggle.

Consequently, the Communist political line varies widely in different countries and situations. Especially is this true in the realm of strategy and tactics. Marxism, as Lenin pointed out, is not a dogma but a guide to action. And as Stalin said: "The strategy of the Party is not something permanent, fixed once for all time. It changes to meet

historical turns, historical shifts." (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 57.) During the years since the rise of fascism, the Communist movement has had a vast fund of experience, and out of this rich experience, much new Communist theory is developing.

The most important recent developments in Communist tactics, and also to some extent in strategy, began to take place in the period just prior to World War II. These changes in line were brought about by the rise of fascism as a world danger. They have since continued to play a tremendous role in world affairs from that time right down to the present moment.

This fact, the Prosecutor would like to have the Jury ignore or misunderstand. He wants you to believe his nonsense that we are working according to an everlasting "blueprint," created at the time of the Russian Revolution. The Communist Party must be judged upon the basis of the reality of its theory and its actual record, and not upon the heated denunciations of grossly biased and frightened enemies.

Before proceeding to analyze the actual theory and practice of Communism, and to refute the indictment against our Party's leaders, let me evaluate briefly the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin that have been so extensively mis-cited here before this Jury.

These books are Communist classics. They contain the fundamental principles and program of Communism. These are universal in their scope and they are accepted by all Communist Parties, including our own. They are the scientific guides of humanity to a freer, fuller life. They must be read, however, in the light of the actual situations to which they are applied. We American Communists apply them strategically and tactically in the need of specific American conditions.

By circulating these books we are falsely alleged to be teaching violence. But if we are to be imprisoned for circulating these revolutionary classics of Socialism, then, too, many other people may be jailed for circulating the works of Paine, Jefferson and Lincoln, all of whom freely advocated the people's right of revolution. As for the American writings on Communism that have also been cited here, written by members or ex-members of our Party, these, if produced before the changes in the world situation and in our political tactics that I have spoken of, now have little more than a historical value, as indicating the Party's policy at the given time.

Take, for example, my book, *Towards Soviet America*: I have long since criticized this work on the grounds – first, that it contains many incorrect formulations, and second, that the book in general no longer corresponds to the present political situation and to our policies. We do not circulate this and other outdated and often unsatisfactorily written American books, pamphlets, and articles on Communism.

In this general connection, let me state that our Party, at its three recent conventions, was compelled to adopt resolutions announcing that its political policy was expressed only in those documents specifically indicated by the Party, and that the Party was not responsible politically for the vast body of Communist writings, many of which were merely personal opinions or which were written to fit different political situations than that prevailing in our country.

The important thing the Jury should understand from all this is that we cannot be judged fairly, except upon the basis of writings and political activities that truly reflect the present line of the Party, in relation to the political situation in the United States.

## **2. The facts about the Emergency Convention**

---

Now let us proceed to deal concretely with the specific charges in the Prosecution's indictment. First, regarding the actions taken by the Emergency Convention, held by our Party in New York, in July, 1945.

The Prosecutor paints a picture like this: The Communist Party, or rather the Communist Political Association, as it was called prior to the Convention, had had a policy, initiated by Earl Browder and which Mr. McGohey seemed to find quite acceptable. When, lo, all of a sudden, a mysterious communication (the well-known Duclos article) came from abroad (allegedly from a Communist international body). Whereupon, at the Emergency Convention the Party, so the Prosecutor alleges, upon these "orders from abroad," ditched Browder and his policies, and conspiratorially adopted a new program, one of "force and violence." But this is all a monstrous distortion of what actually happened, as we shall see:

During 1944, the former General Secretary of our Party, Earl Browder, tried to run our Party off the solid steel rails of Marxism-Leninism. On Jan. 8 of that year he came into our National Committee with a utopian and opportunistic interpretation of the Big Four wartime meeting in Teheran in November, 1943.

Browder developed the theory that thenceforth American big business was launched upon a progressive policy. According to him, Wall Street's government would voluntarily adopt a cordial collaboration with the U.S.S.R. It would also set out in the postwar period to industrialize the backward areas of the world.

In all this there would be no American imperialism, no typical capitalist profit-grabbing. Here in the United States, the capitalists, in their new "progressivism," would also voluntarily double the real wages of the workers and they would damp down the class struggle into a situation of friendly class collaboration.

In this "golden age" of capitalism, of course, there would be no need for a militant Communist Party so Browder proposed that our Party be dissolved into the amorphous Communist Political Association. There would also be no necessity for the revolutionary works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, nor for their perspective of Socialism; so Browder also undertook to throw all this "outworn ideological baggage" into the discard.

Browder's opportunist proposals at once met with opposition in the Party. In many sections of the country voices were raised against

it. I myself, on Jan. 20, 1944, 12 days after Browder had submitted his report, sent a long letter to the National Committee opposing all the major phases of Browder's project (my letter is contained in full in the pamphlet, *On the Struggle Against Revisionism*, p. 5). Among other things, in dealing with Browder's policy, I said:

"In this picture American imperialism virtually disappears, there remains hardly a trace of the class struggle, and Socialism plays virtually no role whatever."

This letter, after an extended discussion, was rejected at a special leadership meeting called in New York on Feb. 8, 1944 to consider it, only one other National Committee member supporting my position. Consequently our Party, but with much reluctance and hesitation, adopted Browder's general policy.

As for myself, under threats from Browder of expulsion from the Party, with the certainty of a ruinous wartime Party split, I had to agree to confine my opposition within the ranks of the National Committee, which I did. In doing this, I was convinced that the Party would soon free itself from Browder's grossly opportunist line and the ensuing events bore out this expectation.

The course of American and world events during the next year quickly exposed the fallacy of Browder's line. American imperialism, as the war's end drew near, embarked upon a course of aggressive expansionism and rampant opposition to the U.S.S.R. Already at the foundation of the United Nations in San Francisco, it launched the beginnings of the "cold war." Besides, storm signals of sharpening class struggle began to appear all over the domestic scene.

Our Party, which had adopted Browder's proposals only halfheartedly in the first place, now began seriously to question them in the light of this repudiation of them by life itself. Thus it was that propositions came to be made repeatedly in the National Board – by Dennis, Green, Thompson, Davis, Williamson, Stachel, and others – going contrary to Browder's policy in one respect or another.

During this period I also submitted many proposals, in head-on collision with Browder. Obviously our Party was on the road to eventually freeing itself of Browder's policy.

Just at this juncture, with opposition tendencies to Browder rapidly developing, Jacques Duclos, the noted French Communist leader, in April, 1945 (15 months after my original letter was sent to the National Committee on the matter) published an article in the

French journal, *Cahiers du Communisme*, characterizing Browder as a "notorious revisionist of Marxism," and assailing his policy all along the line.

Communists rarely criticize publicly the work of Communist Parties of other countries, save in very important situations, such as the spread of Browder revisionism. It is a well-known fact that Browder's line had had serious repercussions in other Communist Parties throughout the Americas, and in Europe and Asia. Many of their leaders, even before Duclos, spoke out against Browderism. It was a distinct menace to all of them.

Duclos, therefore, wrote his article of criticism because Browderism was beginning to permeate and confuse in certain circles in the French Communist Party. For example, in May, 1944, there was a full-spread article endorsing Browder's line in the French Communist journal *France Nouvelle*.

The Duclos article, which fitted right in with the expanding anti-Browder trend in our own Party, naturally helped to clarify the developing Party situation. Duclos' great reputation as an outstanding Marxist was not without its influence. But with the growing spirit of opposition against Browder's line already rapidly spreading and crystallizing, it is a certainty that even if Duclos' article had never appeared our Party would nevertheless have arrived at its present policies, although probably at the cost of a serious internal struggle.

The Party's Emergency Convention of July, 1945, unanimously rejected Browder's opportunist policy. It characterized his revisionist line as a gross distortion of the Communist Party's correct wartime line of national and international united front, anti-fascist unity.

The convention condemned Browder's program as an abandonment of Marxian Socialism, as an elaboration of illusory "progressive capitalism," as Keynesian liberalism, and as an attempt to tie the American working class to the war chariots of militant American imperialism. Many of these basic questions were not contained in the Duclos article.

The convention reorganized the Communist Party. The convention also realigned the Party, not upon some new and mysterious program of force and violence, but upon its traditional principles of Marxism-Leninism, those that it had embraced ever since the Party's foundation in 1919.

Browder, himself, stubbornly rejecting the Party's decision, later issued a journal, *Distributor's Guide*, and began openly to attack the Party. For this he was finally expelled from the Party on February 12, 1946, by unanimous action of the National Committee.

The substance of the decisions of the Emergency Convention was to re-establish the Communist Party on the basis of its former sound Marxist-Leninist program. But now comes the Prosecutor and alleges that in taking these steps the defendants committed a great crime for which they should be sent to the penitentiary for long terms.

To this end he is hiding from the Jury the fundamentally important reality that the Emergency Convention worked in the light of the fact that ever since the foundation of our Party we have always been of the profoundest conviction that the advocacy of Marxism-Leninism fell within the limits of free speech as described by the United States Constitution, as throughout its 26 years of life our Party had been legal nationally.

Besides this, not long before, the FBI had conducted an elaborate investigation of our Party in the light of prevailing repressive legislation, examining its documents and policies and quizzing its leaders, but nothing had been made out against our Party.

And then, more important yet, in the Schneiderman case of a few years earlier, the Supreme Court, listening to our counsel, Wendell L. Willkie, gave forth its favorable decision, which we Communists naturally considered a full justification of our long-term conviction that our Party was a legal body.

Consequently, in the deliberations of the Emergency Convention there was complete conviction among the delegates that what they were doing was perfectly legal. What better assurance did they need for this than the remarks of the majority of the Supreme Court Judges?

It is indeed a monstrous situation, therefore, when the Prosecution, blandly ignoring the Schneiderman decision, and the other reasons we had for assuming that our Party was legal, violently accuses us of having committed a heinous crime. Its course is in flagrant violation of the most elementary principles of democracy and justice.

The Prosecutor in this trial, who beams benignly upon the Browder type of "Communist" who would liquidate the Communist Party and discard Marxism-Leninism, in his opening address to the Jury, has crassly misrepresented the entire Duclos incident.

Among his many distortions, he played down the key significance of my very important letter to the National Committee attacking

Browder's whole proposition, a letter which was written over a year before the Duclos article.

Nor did Mr. McGohey even mention the fact that long before the Duclos article appeared there had been a strong and rapidly growing sentiment in our Party against Browder's revisionism. He ignored, too, the penetration that Browderism had made into the French and other Communist Parties, which provided the reason for Duclos' writing as he did.

He especially failed to call attention to the major fact that the Emergency Convention, by including in its program a searching analysis of American imperialism's developing campaign to conquer the world, and by indicating clearly the new danger of fascism and war that this provoked, had gone far beyond the political framework of the Duclos article. Mr. McGohey imaginatively painted a lurid picture of the situation, false in all its essentials.

The purpose of this line of falsification is plain. The Prosecutor wants to exploit the lies that the Communist Party "takes orders from Moscow" and that there is a secret, conspiratorial international Communist organization in existence. The truth completely belies all these misrepresentations.



### 3. The uneven development of the struggle for Socialism

---

Now I will refute basically the Prosecution's charge that we American Communists are trying to bring about in the United States a facsimile of the Russian Revolution. This is its notorious "blueprint" theory.

Marxism-Leninism, the principles of scientific Socialism, are universal in their application, fitting all countries in all stages of development. Nevertheless, the mass fight for Socialism does not develop under identical "blueprint" conditions everywhere.

On the contrary, it displays in the several countries much variety in forms and methods. This is due primarily to what Lenin analyzed as the "uneven development of capitalism," which is one of his greatest theoretical achievements. As Lenin pointed out, capitalism does not develop evenly and uniformly all over the world.

For various reasons there are the widest divergences in capitalist development in the many countries. This is exemplified at the present time, for example, by the immense differences in capitalist development between, say, the United States and India.

In passing, it may be remarked, as Lenin also pointed out, that one of the major causes of imperialist wars comes precisely from this uneven development of capitalism, from the attempts of the capitalist empires violently to readjust their world relationships in accordance with their changing ratios of power, arising out of their different rates of development.

This uneven development of capitalism naturally conditions the development of the fight for Socialism, which is born out of the womb of capitalism everywhere. In consequence, the movement for Socialism in every country is inescapably marked by the specific state of development of capitalism (including culture, traditions, etc.) in the given country. This basic fact is to be observed on all sides. It is what Stalin calls (*Foundations of Leninism*, p. 108) "the varying speed of social evolution in different capitalist countries."

One manifestation of this unevenly developed struggle for Socialism is that Socialism is not achieved by the workers in all countries simultaneously. Thus it was that Socialism was established first in old Russia, because of peculiarly ripe conditions there. This led to Stalin's great achievement of developing in theory and practice Lenin's basic idea, flowing out of his theory of the uneven

development of capitalism, that Socialism could be built in one country, Russia.

Another example of how the uneven development of capitalism brings about a corresponding uneven development of the struggle for Socialism is the fact that in the many countries Communist-led mass movements for Socialism take on different organizational forms, with widely varying programs, class alliances, and speeds of development. Even a novice, such as the Prosecutor obviously is in these matters, should be able to see that the experience of the masses in this great industrial country of ours, in their relatively slow movement toward Socialism, is greatly different from that of the Russian workers, who fairly leaped from semi-feudalism to Socialism.

It is obvious, too, that the masses of China, in their march toward Socialism, are meeting with vastly different experiences and problems than the working class, for example, of the United States. The same law of uneven development of Socialist struggle applies to all other countries as well. Nowhere is there to be found a general "blueprint" of Communist development, such as the Prosecutor would have the Jury believe exists.

When we point out these differences in development of capitalism and the fight for Socialism in various countries, we must, of course, also bear in mind the basic likenesses of each of the two social systems throughout the world.

Thus capitalism, whatever its degree of development, is nevertheless everywhere capitalism. However it may be hindered by feudalistic hangovers and physical limitations (as in India), or be spurred on by exceptionally favorable conditions of growth (as in the United States), it is still capitalism, and it carries that system's characteristic features, including the private ownership of industry, the exploitation of the workers, the tendency toward monopoly, imperialism, fascism, etc., etc.

The same general principle also applies to Socialism. There is only one kind of Socialism, whatever the conditions of its development, and this is characterized by the social ownership of the means of production and distribution, by the rule of the working class, by the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, etc., etc. It is the widely different means and speed of arriving at Socialism that we are concerned with here, however, not the nature of Socialism itself, nor the main historical road toward its realization.

Naturally, Communists learn many fundamental lessons from the Socialist experience of the Soviet people, who are the great leaders and pioneers in Socialism. It is true, too, that Communists are also learning much from the experiences of the Chinese people in their march toward Socialism. It is also a fact that Communists are everywhere imbued with a common philosophical outlook, in this case Marxism-Leninism. (None is surprised to find capitalist ideological groupings thinking alike all over the world).

But that these facts, of Communists learning from other peoples and of their possessing a common outlook, should amount to working on the basis of a "blueprint," to their duplicating in all countries the experiences of the Russian Revolution, is just plain nonsense.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 was the greatest political event in human history. In their revolution the Russian people made the first breach in the capitalist system and founded the first Socialist country. This great Revolution provides for the workers everywhere the most profound lessons in their battle for human freedom. It teaches fundamental lessons in theory, program, strategy, tactics, class alliances, role of the Communist Party, and in many other fields. Nevertheless, it is absurd to say that the Communists, "blueprints" in hand, are going about the world trying to bring about, as the Prosecution alleges, detailed repetitions of that revolution in the various countries.

The very essence of Communist policy everywhere is, with their Marxist-Leninist understanding of the fundamental laws of development of capitalism and Socialism, and on the basis of defending the needs of the workers and the whole people, to apply these theoretical principles, and to shape their programs and activities in strict harmony with the specific economic, political, and social conditions confronting them in their respective countries. This truth we shall demonstrate amply as we go along.

It may interest the Jury and also be instructive to the Prosecution to know that Lenin, Stalin and all other Communist leaders have long since warned Communists precisely against any tendency to transfer mechanically the political experiences of one country to the policies in another country, including any tendency to use the Russian Revolution as a "blueprint" for the achievement of Socialism in other countries. Thus Lenin (*Left-Wing Communism*, p. 3), while insisting that many fundamental features of the Russian Revolution had "international

significance," nevertheless, added: "Of course, it would be the greatest mistake to exaggerate this fact."

It, therefore, is an attempt to befuddle the Jury and the American people to picture the great Communist movement all over the world as composed of groups of conspirators, working in the dark of the moon to force Socialism arbitrarily upon their peoples. In view of the Communist fight against anything even remotely resembling "blueprintism," it is incongruous, to say the least, to have the Prosecutor come in here at this late date and try to build a case against us on the grounds that we, as "blueprinters," are using the Russian Revolution as a "detailed model for revolution in this country."

The Prosecution has built its whole case around its "blueprint" theory, around the false allegation that the American Communists, copying the Russian Revolution in detail and using it as their model, are trying to develop a revolutionary facsimile of it in this country. When we show in detail by Communist theory and practice that the Prosecutor's "blueprint" fantasy is concocted out of thin air, his entire political frameup will collapse.

## 4. The force and violence distortion

---

Now let me deal with the Prosecution's main charge against us, namely that our Communist Party is teaching the overthrow of the American Government by force and violence. This charge, even with the help of reckless perjurers and phony anti-Communist "experts" in Marxism-Leninism, cannot be made to stand up. For it goes contrary to the whole body of Communist theory and practice ever since the days when the *Communist Manifesto* was issued by Marx and Engels a century ago.

The working class and other toiling elements are always and instinctively the champions of peace and democracy. This is true even when they have to wage wars and revolutions against barbarous oppressors and exploiters.

This fact is so because the toilers are the ones who always have to suffer the most from tyranny and from war's destruction. They pick up the sword against those who oppress, exploit and would butcher them only when they have no other alternative, only when the road of peace is closed to them. They are the forces of democracy and peace.

The Communists are the authentic spokesmen and leaders of these inherently peace-loving and democratic masses.

The ruling capitalist class, on the other hand, never fails to grasp at weapons of autocracy and violence whenever their class interests are threatened. Habitually, and as a settled policy, they use their courts, police, jails, armies, and other means of repression against a resolute, Socialist-minded working class. They are the instigators and organizers of fascism, civil war, and international war. Social violence always originates, under modern conditions, in the ranks of capitalist reaction. This is an indisputable truth of current history.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist writers and leaders who have been so lavishly quoted, or misquoted, here by the Prosecution's witnesses, were not advocating force and violence in their writings, speeches, and deeds. The essence of what they were saying in all the quotations that have been read to you, was that, under the existing conditions, attempts of the working class peacefully to establish Socialism through democratically elected parliaments could not succeed, because of ruling class violence.

They pointed out that, at most, there was little democracy in the capitalist countries and that the employers, faced by a working class trying *en masse* to establish Socialism by electing a majority in the

parliament, would inevitably and unhesitatingly abolish whatever feeble democratic procedures they might have, and would use open violence in order to beat down the movement, leaving the workers no other alternative than to reply with all their strength.

The great Communist theoreticians, however, have never taken the position that it was impossible, under any conceivable conditions, to achieve Socialism by peaceful means. On the contrary, they distinctly foresaw such possibilities.

Thus Marx, estimating the situation three generations ago in Great Britain and the United States, said: "If, for example, the working class in England and the United States should win a majority in Parliament, in Congress, it could legally abolish those laws and institutions which obstruct its development." (*Briefe an Bebel, Liebknecht, Kautsky und Andere*, p. 516, 517, Moscow, 1933.)

Lenin, too, who has been grossly slandered here as an apostle of violence, at one time not only saw a possibility for the peaceful development of the Russian Revolution, but, as we shall see, worked out a definite program of action upon that basis.

And Stalin, who has also been falsely presented as advocating force and violence for the overthrow of democratic governments, while pointing out that capitalist anti-Socialist violence was inevitable under existing conditions (he writes in 1928), nevertheless stated that it was thinkable that with a great growth of world Socialism, "A 'peaceful' path of development is quite possible for certain capitalist countries."

Stalin also, in his interview with H. G. Wells in 1934, correctly put the question of the Communists' attitude toward violence, as follows (*Marxism vs. Liberalism*, p. 17, New Century):

*"Communists do not in the least idealize the methods of violence. But they, the Communists, do not want to be taken by surprise, they cannot count on the old world voluntarily departing from the stage, they see that the old system is violently defending itself, and that is why the Communists say to the working class: Answer violence with violence; do all you can to prevent the old dying order from crushing you, do not permit it to put manacles on your hands, on the hands with which you will overthrow the old system."*

Lenin, like other Communist leaders, therefore, on the basis of a scientific appraisal of actual conditions in his time, correctly warned

the workers against nursing legalistic illusions about capitalist democracy. He told them that, confronted with the employers' eventual violence, they would have no alternative but to fight resolutely for their program.

Lenin's warnings against the violence of reaction were much the same in principle as when Communists point out to the people that war is inevitable so long as the capitalist system lasts. Obviously, however, it would be stupid to conclude from these warnings of Communists against war that they thereby advocate war. It would be no less stupid to interpret Lenin's similar warnings against capitalist violence as constituting an advocacy of violence.

The warnings by Lenin and other Communists that violence would be used against all genuine attempts to establish Socialism have been amply borne out by the armed attacks upon the Socialist movement in old Russia, by the never-ending warlike hostility of the capitalist world, including its two all-out armed attacks in 1918 and 1941, against the first Socialist Republic, and nowadays, too, by the rise of fascism and by the constant attempts of capitalist elements to foment armed counter-revolutionary uprisings in the various new People's Democracies of Central Europe which are rapidly marching toward Socialism.

Such capitalist violence is further illustrated by the Chiang Kai-shek government's attempts to stamp out Chinese Communism by force. The inevitable capitalist violence against Socialism is at this very moment also being shown by the plottings of world reaction to develop a third world war in order to destroy the Soviet Union and world democracy.

The capitalists always go to every possible extreme of violence to crush Socialism. It is no contradiction of this historic fact if world capitalism does not seek to organize armed plots against the Labor Government in Great Britain. The capitalists' attitude toward that regime is tolerant because they know that it is in no sense a Socialist government.

Actually, under the Labor Government, which is openly abandoning every pretense of Socialism, the capitalists are making bigger profits than they ever did under the former Churchill Tory government. Capitalist reactionaries correctly consider the Labor Government as a barrier to world Socialism.

It is of the most profound importance for the achievement of justice in this case to point out that the Prosecution, in order to find examples of alleged advocacy of force and violence by Communists, has been compelled to go back many years for its quotations. The books and other documents that it has cited here so liberally and with such an air of complete finality, were written, in the main, 10, 25, 50 or even 100 years ago.

With all its flexibility and imagination in totally misrepresenting the meaning of Communist writings, the Prosecution has been unable to produce any instances of the so-called advocacy of violence from the Communist movement of today.

This is a most remarkable and significant fact, because the Communist movement now, far more than ever before, is pouring out great numbers of newspapers, pamphlets, books and political speeches in this country and all over the world.

Why, then, may we pertinently ask, does not the Prosecution cite some quotations of alleged advocacy of force and violence from the pages of the present-day programs, pamphlets, articles, and leadership speeches of the Communist Party of the United States? Or why not some quotes from the 1945 Emergency Convention documents which the Prosecution has condemned so sharply? Or from the journal entitled *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, published for the past 18 months by the Communist Information Bureau, often called the Cominform? Or from any of the other innumerable publications of the Communists throughout the world?

The answer is that the Prosecution cannot do so. Not because its research department is weak, but because such quotations simply do not exist.

The Prosecution in this case, like other thought-control inquisitors of the present period, has not failed to note the remarkable shortage of its favorite "force and violence" quotations in current Communist writings, and this has proved to be a very serious stumbling block in the building up of its deliberate frameup against us. So it proceeds glibly to try to explain it away by alleging that nowadays Communists, saturated with conspiratorial moods, are not so frank in their utterances about force and violence as Lenin used to be.

We are charged with using "Aesopian" language to obscure our meaning. But this is just another dose of political nonsense out of the same bottle as the Prosecutor's ridiculous "blueprint for revolution" theory.



Contrary to such reactionaries' claims Communist Parties always enunciate their policies with complete frankness, as the *Communist Manifesto* so dramatically points out. If any books speak out more forthrightly and frankly upon the question of force and violence than Lenin's *State and Revolution* or Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* (which we daily circulate), I cannot imagine what they could be.

The Prosecution, in an effort to find a way out of its dilemma of having no so-called force and violence quotations from the Communist writings of this period, has been compelled to resort to a device which, for political illiteracy, has hardly been equaled anywhere. This is its contention that merely by the Communist Party stating that it favors Marxism-Leninism it thereby automatically advocates force and violence. This is nonsense compounded upon absurdity.

Marxism-Leninism represents a whole new world outlook, embracing every phase of human intellectual and physical activity – philosophy, economics, politics, science, art, literature, etc., etc. – yet the Prosecution has the assurance to try to reduce this whole vast complex of theory and practice simply to a question of the advocacy of force and violence. To such desperation is the Prosecution driven in its futile efforts to sustain its tottering frameup.

The real explanation for the absence of the so-called force and violence formulations in current Communist writings is that for the past decade or more, since the 7th World Congress of the Comintern in 1935, the Communist movement in this country as well as abroad, has been going along on the practical working theory that in this period, because of the broad mass struggle against fascism and war, it had become possible in a whole number of democratic countries, including the United States, legally to elect democratic governments which could, by curbing and defeating capitalist violence, orientate in the direction of building Socialism. This trend, as we shall see, has involved many tactical and strategical developments in Communist working policy.

This decisive united front, coalition government development in the modern Communist movement, which completely explodes the Prosecution's phony "force and violence" charge and which we will demonstrate to the hilt as this trial proceeds, in no sense weakens or invalidates what Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist spokesmen have said on the question of force and violence. On the

contrary, it all goes to reinforce the correctness of their realistic conclusions.

It is only now, after militant American imperialism has provoked civil wars in Greece and China and is at present busily trying to create similar conditions in France, Italy and other European countries, that Communist leaders are once again beginning to warn their followers of the danger of capitalist violence against the labor and Socialist movement in the so-called western democracies.

However, the Communist Parties have by no means, even in such war-torn countries as Greece and China, abandoned their general perspective of a broad coalition, democratic advance to Socialism. He who says that the Communists are advocating force and violence either does not know our movement or else deliberately misrepresents it.

In the famous Schneiderman case a few years back, the United States Supreme Court, although not called upon formally to decide upon the legality of the Communist Party in this particular case, nevertheless, after making a study of the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and others, including practically all the key quotations presented here, and after conducting a survey of Communist history, had the following to say regarding the existing political line of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.:

*"A tenable conclusion from the foregoing is that the Party in 1927 desired to achieve its purpose by peaceful and democratic means, and as a theoretical matter, justified the use of force and violence only as a method of preventing an attempted counter-overthrow once the Party had obtained control in a peaceful manner, as a matter of last resort to enforce the majority will if in some indefinite future time because of peculiar circumstances, constitutional or peaceful channels were no longer open."*

American Communists consider this expression by the Supreme Court to be a fair and objective statement of the fundamentally peaceful and democratic character of Communist policy, not only of the Party's tactical line in 1927, but of its present policy as well.

This statement is a crushing refutation of the wild charges of the flock of stoolpigeons, perjurers, informers, and renegades, as well as of the phony anti-Communist "experts," who with every form of distortion and misrepresentation, have falsely sought to convince this

Jury that Communists are going about the country plotting and advocating the forcible overthrow of the United States Government.

It is an outrage, therefore, for the Prosecution to come into this Court to charge us with advocating force and violence, and to demand of this Jury that we Communists, although working in the light of this Supreme Court expression, be condemned as criminals and given savage prison sentences. After what the Supreme Court said, our Party had every reason to conclude that its activities were entirely within its rights under the United States Constitution.

The charge that we are advocating force and violence can be made here against us only on the basis of a deliberate misrepresentation of Communist policy. An abundance of easily available facts shows that we Communists do not now, nor have we ever, advocated the establishment of Socialism by force and violence.

Indeed the Constitution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. specifically provides for the expulsion of members who should advocate force and violence. Such members would be considered not only as violators of the Party line, but as stoolpigeons or provocateurs, and treated accordingly.

The *New Times*, a journal published by the trade unions of Moscow, in its August 4, 1948, number, in discussing this trial and referring to the defendants, correctly remarks: "Only idiots can believe that they plotted to overthrow the government by force and violence."

This estimation is borne out by the fact that the Department of Justice, as admitted by Attorney-General Clark himself, has been unable, in the nearly 30 years of our Party's life, to gather any evidence of such plottings by our Party. The charges made here against us are a bald-faced frameup, buttressed by the lies of professional perjurers and Red-baiters, the purposes of which are to outlaw our Party, to further break down the Bill of Rights, to intimidate the democratic masses, and to facilitate Wall Street's program of reaction and war.

## 5. The Communist line in the Russian Revolution

---

The Prosecution and its witnesses, as though they were speaking the truth of unchallengeable revelation, tell us in a hundred ways that the Russian Revolution of 1917, which the Prosecution falsely tells you we are taking as a detailed "blueprint" model for this country, was a horrible example of deliberate and planned Communist violence.

But the truth is something altogether different. Of course, there was violence in that revolution, but it originated in the desperate attempts of the Czarist-capitalist reactionaries to save their doomed system from advancing democracy and Socialism through an appeal to armed force. These reactionaries lived by the sword and they politically died by it.

It is just plain stupid to suppose that the ultra-rotten Czarist regime could have been supplanted by peaceful, parliamentary means. The ruling reactionary classes, true to the actions of similar classes in the past, were bound to attack, and they did, with all the force at their disposal, against every democratic movement, even the mildest. They repeatedly deluged the streets of St. Petersburg and other cities with the blood of the Russian people, who were demanding the most elementary reforms. It was inevitable, therefore, that even the Kerensky capitalist government, which grew out of the February, 1917, revolution, could be established only upon the basis of a violent overthrow of Czarist feudal reaction.

But the Russian people were determined not to stop with the Kerensky regime, which, allied with many reactionary forces, was systematically fighting against the people's demands for peace, bread, and land. It is nonsense to consider the Kerensky regime as a beneficent democracy. It was nothing of the sort. As the months passed after the February Revolution, it became more and more evident to the Russian people that behind Kerensky's banner were rallying the combined reactionary forces of Russia, who were determined, at any cost in the people's blood, to beat down the rising mass movement for Socialism.

Lenin, the brilliant head of the great Communist Party of Russia and one of the most outstanding political leaders of all time, would have been happy to find a peaceful, democratic path to Socialism, if any were to be had. But there was not. In the critical months following

February, 1917, Lenin spared no efforts to secure a peaceful development of the revolution.

All through this period there were in reality dual powers in existence: one, the Kerensky Government, organized by the capitalists as a result of the February Revolution, and the other the local mass Soviets, organized simultaneously by the workers, peasants and soldiers all over the vast expanse of Russia. Between these two rival forces a struggle for power went on, which, in November, 1917, finally culminated in the victory of the Soviets, the real organizations of the Russian people.

Lenin, who had behind him eventually the great mass of the Russian nation, stated Communist general policy for achieving power for the people, as follows (*Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p, 29):

*"In order to obtain the power of the state the class-conscious workers must win the majority to their side. As long as no violence is used against the masses, there is no other road to power. We are not Blanquists, we are not in favor of the seizure of power by a minority."*

Certainly there is no advocacy of violence in that conception. It was a line of peaceful transition to Socialism, and it expressed not only the policy of Lenin at that time but of the whole world Communist movement ever since.

In furtherance of this policy of the peaceful winning of Socialism, Lenin came forward with a whole program for the development of the Russian Revolution. In presenting this program, Lenin said in his book (*Toward Seizure of Power*, p. 263):

*"Before the democracy of Russia, before the Soviets, before the S.R. and Menshevik Parties, there opens a possibility very seldom to be met with in the history of revolutions, namely, a possibility of securing the convocation of the Constituent Assembly at the appointed date, without new delays, a possibility of securing the country against a military and economic catastrophe, a possibility of securing a peaceful development of the revolution."*

*In the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B), written by Stalin, the following comment is made upon these proposals of Lenin:*

*"This meant that Lenin was not calling for a revolt against the Provisional Government, which at that moment enjoyed the confidence of the Soviets, or that he was demanding its overthrow, but that he wanted, by means of explanatory and recruiting work to win a majority of the Soviets to alter the composition and policy of the Government. This was a line envisaging a peaceful development of the revolution in Russia."*

Lenin's proposals for the peaceful transition to Socialism in Russia were not accepted by the other political parties, however. This was because the Kerensky Government, which had the backing of the Russian capitalists as well as of those of the United States, Great Britain, France and Japan, was opposed to Socialism, whether achieved by peaceful means or otherwise. Its central aim was to crush by force the rapidly growing movement for Socialism and to keep the capitalists in power.

But this counter-revolutionary plan failed completely, and the Soviets, representing the workers, peasants and soldiers, and in which councils, by then, the Bolsheviks had won large majorities, brushed aside the decrepit and reactionary Kerensky regime, which had no democratic mandate, and organized the Soviet Government in the November Revolution.

The newly-born Soviet Government had the backing of the overwhelming majority of the Russian people. Kerensky, too, like other reactionaries, chose the sword to defeat Socialism, and he perished politically by it.

One of the chief arguments used against Lenin by the Prosecution in connection with the Russian Revolution, in its attempt to condemn him as an advocate in principle of force, was a distortion of his use of the famous slogan, "War Against War," or the transformation of the imperialist World War I into civil war for the establishment of Socialism. This slogan, the Prosecution suggests, is absolute proof that Lenin and all Communists do advocate force and violence.

But Lenin's slogan, which was originally endorsed at the Basle Congress of the Second International in 1912, proves nothing of the sort.

First, this slogan was not put out as applying to all wars of all times. The application of slogans in connection with war depends upon the kind of war it is and the given situation. It is significant that

this slogan of Lenin's was not used during World War II. The renegade Budenz is a deliberate liar when he accuses Gene Dennis of putting out this slogan during the war.

Second, Lenin's slogan must be especially evaluated with regard to the specific circumstances under which it was issued and by the results that it achieved. If this evaluation is done honestly, there can be no other conclusion arrived at than that it was fundamentally a peace slogan. The "War Against War" slogan pointed out, in the given political conditions, the very best way for the working class to go in order to halt the murderous World War I and also to find the most direct and peaceful route possible for the establishment of Socialism.

Lenin, as stated, issued his celebrated civil war slogan during World War I. This was a cold-blooded struggle between two groups of imperialist powers for a re-division of the world among themselves. The war needlessly cost the lives of at least 20,000,000 people, who were brutally slaughtered by the ruling classes in their insatiable struggle for profit and power.

Although Lenin's slogan was advocated generally in all the warring countries during World War I, its real political substance and applicability, so far as the practical achievement of Socialism was concerned, was that the peoples of the reactionary, monarchistic empires of Eastern and Central Europe should fire their political tyrants, put an end to the butchery of the war, take their political fate in their own hands, and establish Socialist governments. The autocratic rulers of these countries, not one of whom could make the slightest claim to having a democratic mandate from his people, had long since merited swift removal from their positions by the criminal way in which they had forced their peoples into the terrible shambles of World War I.

Lenin, with his famous slogan, proposed the only way possible for the oppressed and slaughtered peoples to get rid of these political criminals by driving them out, for there was no trace of democracy in any of these reactionary regimes. It is well for those who criticize Lenin's slogan to remember that President Wilson, with his well-known 14 points, also called upon the masses in the enemy Central Powers to do what amounted to making a revolt, although, of course, Wilson, unlike Lenin, did not want these peoples to go so far in their revolt as to overthrow capitalism itself.

As things actually turned out, the peoples of three great empires – Russia, Germany and Austria – upset their imperial governments in consequence of the war. These revolutionary democratic movements in each case had the support of the overwhelming masses of the nations concerned. The loss of life in the three revolutions, all of them put together, amounted only to a small fraction of the numbers of men killed in any one of dozens of great battles that had been fought during the reactionary World War I.

The three major revolutions after World War I were all bourgeois in character; that is, capitalist revolutions. Only one, that in Russia, took the course of Lenin's call and continued on over into the stage of a Socialist revolution. Such loss of life as later took place in some of these countries, including Russia, was entirely due to the ruthless efforts of the reactionaries, arms in hand, to reestablish the old regimes which had been so justly overthrown by their peoples.

The basic political implication of this whole revolutionary situation was that if the peoples of the world, and particularly those in Eastern and Central Europe, after the German Kaiser, Austrian Emperor and Russian Czar had been deservedly knocked off their thrones, had taken Lenin's advice and established Socialism in their countries, the general result in the long run would have been a gigantic saving of life and property all around.

All of the whole vast area of Eastern and Central Europe was especially ripe for Socialism, notably Germany. If the latter country had actually gone Socialist, as Russia did, many other European countries, if not the whole continent, would have followed suit and there never could have taken place the later rise of fascism nor the eventual outbreak of World War II, with its 40,000,000 dead. Nor would there now be the threat of a new world war.

Humanity all over the world, by following Lenin's path, would have spared itself measureless suffering and bloodshed. But the German Social Democrats, who had succeeded to power as a result of the people's overthrow of Kaiser Wilhelm II, refused to push on to Socialism. In consequence, there were all the tragic results to the world that have since happened, and which continue to follow, from the maintenance of an obsolete European capitalism.

Lenin's great slogan of transforming the imperialist war into civil war, therefore, far from being a slogan of violence, actually pointed the way for the most peaceful, democratic, and progressive advance of Europe under the existing circumstances. The slogan was one of the



most significant peace slogans ever enunciated by any political leader. This was all very fitting, because Lenin, contrary to the slanderous allegations of the Prosecution, was the greatest of all fighters for peace and democracy in his time.

## **6. The political line of the Communists after the rise of fascism**

---

Previously I have stated that the Communist movement, in this country as well as abroad, has been going along on the practical working theory that in this period, because of the mass struggle against fascism and war, it has become possible in a whole number of democratic countries legally to elect democratic governments, which could, by curbing and defeating all capitalist violence, orientate in the direction of building Socialism.

The rest of my testimony will be directed to proving this proposition, which destroys the whole charge of the Prosecution, that our Party advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

The political line of the world Communist movement, as championed by Lenin, especially in the Russian Revolution, was profoundly correct. We defend and support it in every sense.

When we say this general policy was right we mean that it produced the maximum achievable defense of the workers' position at the time under capitalism and that it also brought about the greatest possible advance to Socialism – all at the least cost in struggle to the working class and the world's peoples.

Fundamentally, it was a line of democracy and peace. This political line made one-sixth of the world Socialist, the U.S.S.R., and it would have brought all of Europe to Socialism and forever banished the danger of war, had it not been for the flagrant betrayal of Socialism by the Social Democrats of Germany and other countries during and after World War I.

But Lenin's was not a static line; it was developed with the changing world situation. This makes it necessary to consider the developments in political policy that have been made in recent years by Communists all over the world, including those in the U.S.A.

These developments, which are a natural growth of the earlier line, have been the result of the profoundly altered economic and political situation leading up to World War II. They especially began to take definite shape about 15 years ago. Mostly of a tactical character, they do not depart from the fundamental principles and program of Communism. They illustrate again the Communists' seeking of the most peaceful, democratic way to Socialism. They also emphasize with dramatic clarity the utter falseness of the Prosecution's

charge that Communists mechanically copy a "blueprint" of the Russian Revolution.

It is only upon the basis of a correct appraisal of these new tactical developments and the present political situation, and not by garbled references to political tactics and situations which differ sharply from ours in this country, that the Jury can truly decide whether or not the Communist Party of the United States is advocating the overthrow of the American government by force and violence.

If an objective appraisal of these facts is made, the Jury can do only one thing, namely, throw the Prosecution's charges against us into the waste-basket and thus deal a smashing blow to this infamous attack upon the people's civil rights.

The new tactical development of world Communist policies flowed previously out of the changing situation created by the deepened general crisis of capitalism. By the deepening of world capitalism's general crisis we mean the intensification of all the contradictions of capitalism.

Major among these contradictions are the antagonisms between the increasing producing power of industry and the lagging consuming power of the capitalist markets, the conflicts between the workers and the capitalists, between the imperialist countries and the colonies, between the great capitalist nations themselves, and between the decaying capitalist world and the growing Socialist world.

This deepening general crisis of capitalism manifests itself by heavier and more prolonged economic crises, by a sharpened class struggle, with growing assaults upon the living standards, freedom and labor organizations of the workers, by ruthless attempts to strangle the economic life and growing political aspirations of the colonial peoples, by the outbreak of two world wars and preparations for a new one, and by the intensified capitalist hatred and fear of all manifestations of Socialism.

A decisive result of this deepening world capitalist crisis, which signifies the growing decline of that social order, is the growth of fascism. The victory of fascism, however, is not inevitable, given a united working class led by the Communist Party.

Monopoly capital, the ruling force in all developed capitalist countries, has become essentially fascist in its outlook. More and more the leadership of the capitalist class in every nation tends to be concentrated into the hands of the biggest, most ruthless and most

chauvinistic capitalists, who are the fountain-head of all fascism and warmongering.

These fascist-minded capitalists try to solve the increasing problems of themselves and their whole capitalist system by sharpened attacks upon the workers, by the abolition of democratic civil liberties and by wars upon other capitalist countries and the U.S.S.R., in short, by fascism. But this reckless course only still further deepens the capitalist crisis.

Fascism is not a phenomenon peculiar to Germany, Japan, and Italy. All monopoly capital is today basically fascist, whether these capitalists advocate fascism openly or not. This characterization is true also of American monopoly capital. Were the Wall Street imperialists to succeed in accomplishing their present drive for world conquest, the result would be an imminent danger of a fascist world.

On the reverse side of the picture, another vital effect of the deepening crisis of capitalism, with its fascization of monopoly capital, is the growth of a tremendous peoples' anti-monopolist, anti-fascist, anti-war movement on a world scale.

The anti-fascist movement, born in a new situation, is essentially a new phenomenon. Vast bodies of the people, in fact, whole groups of classes and even entire nations, are finding themselves compelled to fight to defend their most cherished rights against the attacks, domestically and on an international scale, of powerful capitalist groupings, led by fascist-minded bankers and industrialists.

Thus, the anti-fascist masses have to fight against the growing economic chaos, against the deprivation of elementary democratic rights which they strove for centuries to secure, against national subjugation, or even national extinction, at the hands of the new fascist war-making barbarians, both domestic and foreign. Never in history has world humanity faced such a dangerous threat to its life and liberty as it does now from fascisized big business.

This new world situation, bred of the deepening crisis of capitalism and involving, on one side, the growth in all major capitalist countries of big-business-created fascism, the sharpest expressions of it being the fascist Axis powers, and on the other hand, a gigantic world-wide anti-fascist movement, all of which took shape in the period between the two world wars, imperatively demanded a further development in policy on the part of the world Communist movement. This development duly took place, beginning in the middle

1930's shortly after Hitler's seizure of power in Germany. The resulting changed tactical line may be briefly stated under two heads.

First, it consisted of developing vast united front movements of the awakening anti-fascist masses in individual countries. These were far broader in scope than anything that had been possible in the pre-fascist period.

Not only Communist Parties, but also Socialist parties, trade unions, peasant movements, middle class groupings, some Catholic organizations, and also even sections of the smaller capitalists, were showing a readiness to join forces in common political movements and struggles to defend themselves against the deadly threat of fascism and war, coming from the fascists within and without their countries. These united front, or people's front movements, while generally not yet ready to fight for Socialism, were determined to fight for the establishment of anti-fascist, anti-war governments.

Second, on the international scale, the new tactics, in the face of the rise of the fascist war danger, by rousing many peoples to the danger of the loss of their national independence, or even of their very physical existence, at the hands of the fascist warmakers, made it possible for the U.S.S.R. to take the initiative in the formation of a great international peace movement to restrain the warmongers.

The implications of this two-phased new tactical line – of people's fronts in the respective countries and of the international peace front on the world scale – were far-reaching.

The first domestic implication was that because of this tremendous mass backing, based on an elementary defense of their living standards, trade unions, people's liberties, and international peace, against the offensive of the fascists, it became possible for these great popular united front movements, in countries where there existed at least a certain minimum of democracy, legally to elect peoples' front governments on anti-fascist programs in critical political situations, notwithstanding violent capitalist opposition. This was a very different situation than during the pre-fascist period when, as Lenin pointed out, it was impossible for workers to secure legally elected governmental majorities in the face of the employers' violence, when they were fighting directly for the proletarian dictatorship and Socialism.

Another very important domestic implication of these new people's front governments, particularly in the conditions following World War II, was that, in their imperative fight against the violence

of fascist-minded big capital of their own and other countries, they had to, if they were to survive at all, take measures that inevitably orientated them in the direction of Socialism. With the state power in their hands and with the active support of the trade unions, the workers' political parties, and other people's organizations the new People's Democracies, as we shall see further along, were able legally to initiate these Socialist transition measures, in spite of whatever violence the employers might develop against this new type of state.

In such situations the employers were at the big disadvantage of fighting violently against democratically elected governments. The broad significance of all this was that there had been opened up in certain countries at least and under special conditions, what has been called a new route to Socialism.

In these instances, instead of society making a direct transition from monopoly capitalism to Socialism, all in one leap, as was imperative in pre-fascist days, there was now the possibility of electing interim people's front governments which were able, effectively checking or defeating capitalist resistance, to move toward Socialism.

The second broad implication of the new Communist tactical line, this time in its international aspects, was that the bringing together of the peace-loving peoples in a world peace front enabled the placing of a powerful curb upon the fascist war-makers.

Lenin was right when, 30 years ago, on the basis of much bitter experience, he said it was "unthinkable" that the peace-loving Soviet Union would be allowed to live at peace in the jungle-like capitalist world. But Stalin was also correct when, during the past few years, he has several times stated (notably in his interview with Harold Stassen) that it is desirable, wise, and realizable that the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist powers should live peacefully in one world together. If Stalin could make this statement it is because the democratic forces of the world, in their fight against the fascist menace, have now grown politically so much stronger that they can compel the fascist-imperialist monopolists to keep world peace.

When Communists say that war is inevitable so long as capitalism lasts the implication has been that the capitalists were still in the deciding position. But now, when the forces of world democracy have grown so powerful, it becomes possible for the first time to put a

bridle on the capitalist war-makers. Prevent the war, therefore, was the main slogan of the Communists before World War II.

Now, in the face of the capitalist preparations for World War III, the democratic forces have become strong enough to halt the war, if they act unitedly, but also to defeat the capitalists if they should launch the war.

The foregoing constituted, in brief, the new tactical line of the world Communist movement, including the American Communist Party, as it developed with the rise of world fascism. With its perspective of legally elected people's front governments in various countries and of a world front of the peace-loving nations to restrain and defeat the imperialist warmongers, it is simply absurd to charge, as the Prosecution is doing here, that this Communist program was one of advocating force and violence.

Obviously, here we have policies based upon the cultivation of peace and the strengthening of democracy in the individual countries and in the world generally.

It is also ridiculous to charge, in the light of these world-wide developments in Communist policy, including that in the United States, that the Communists, as the Prosecutor, Mr. McGohey, alleges, simply follow a "blueprint" of what took place during the Russian Revolution of 1917, for, again obviously, the Communists in their national and international policies through the years, have been striking out into fields of decidedly new political experiences, never experienced at any stage of the Russian Revolution.

Here, in the crucible of practical experience, you see Marxism-Leninism in action. It is the meaning in life of all the writings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, which have been so profusely and incorrectly quoted to the Jury by the Prosecutor. And the sum result of it all is a Communist political line, which only ignoramuses or deliberate distorters can deny, that clearly and definitely is founded upon the most fundamental principles of peace and democracy.

## **7. The new political line in application**

---

The new tactical line of the world Communist movement, in its fight for peace, democracy, and Socialism, began to take definite shape at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, held in July, 1935, in which the Communist Party of the United States participated. This Congress was held only a little over two years after Hitler had seized power in Germany, and the menace of fascism, with its threats of human enslavement and war, was already alarming the democratic world.

The Seventh Congress proceeded boldly to reshape its political line to meet the new and threatening danger to mankind. In summing up the work of this congress, Georgi Dimitrov, General Secretary of the Comintern, said: "Ours has been a Congress of a new tactical orientation of the Communist International."

The chief change made in the prevailing tactical line by the Seventh Congress was to emphasize still more the fight for democracy and peace and against fascism and war as the all-decisive task of the working class and of the various peoples. To this general end the Congress evaluated the tremendous scope of the developing mass anti-fascist world movement, pointed out the way for the building of people's front, anti-fascist governments in individual countries, and indicated possibilities for the formation of an international peace front of the world's democratic peoples against the aggressor states: Germany, Japan, and Italy.

Here again, in concrete democratic policy, we find the true meaning of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

The Seventh Congress, as the sequel showed, did not as yet develop the full implications of the new line, but it nevertheless gave a clear indication of the features of the anti-fascist struggle which were eventually to become the policy, not only of the Communists, but also of unnumbered millions of non-Communists from one end of the world to the other.

Considering the profound role that this anti-fascist policy was to play in the ensuing years, right down to this very Court trial, the Seventh Congress of the Comintern ranks definitely as one of the most important international meetings of recent times. The Communist Party of the U.S.A., at that time an affiliate of the Comintern, took full part in the Seventh Congress and gave the new united front, anti-fascist tactics its fullest support.



The actual beginnings of the united front struggle of the Communists against the fascists go back, however, to before the Seventh Congress, to the all-out fight against Hitler proposed by the German Communists to the Social Democrats in 1932. But this was rejected by the Social Democrats, and Hitler won an easy victory.

The preliminary application of the new line, as worked out by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in 1935, began, however, early in 1936, when popular front anti-fascist governments were elected in France and Spain by the two peoples who were deeply aroused by the victory of German fascism and were determined to defend themselves. In the meantime, in September, 1934, the U.S.S.R. had entered the League of Nations and begun to fight for the establishment of a joint international peace front against the fascist war organizers, Germany, Italy and Japan.

These early united front anti-fascist efforts, products of the new Communist tactical line, although they temporarily checked fascism, did not achieve their main objective of crushing it.

In France, notwithstanding that the Communists had initiated the broad people's front movement, they were not part of the French People's Front Government which was elected early in 1936. The Social Democrats and Radical Socialists (liberals) who controlled a majority, were quite incapable of taking the necessary measures to cripple the power of the big capitalists and to move toward Socialism, namely, by clearing the capitalist state apparatus and the army of reactionary elements, reorganizing the police, eliminating capitalist influences from the schools, etc. So the French People's Front Government, although it temporarily stayed the rise of fascism in France, eventually went down to defeat, callously betrayed by the right Social-Democratic and liberal leaders.

Spain taught much the same lessons. In the democratically-elected Spanish People's Front Government, the Communists, initiators of the movement, were members after Franco's uprising and they played an important part.

But, as in France, the Party was then relatively small and again the decisive leadership was in the hands of Social Democrats, Anarchists, and liberals. They refused to take the necessary measures to break up the capitalist state machine, to disarm and repress the reactionary capitalists, militarists, and landowners and to begin to move definitely toward Socialism. The result was that the Franco counter-

revolutionaries, like reactionaries generally in such situations, violently attacked the democratic government, determined to overthrow it.

In this critical situation, faced by the violent intervention of Hitler and Mussolini, by the cold-blooded sabotage of French and British Social Democrats, and by the hypocritical non-intervention policy of the French, British and American Governments, which forbade the sale of arms to the legally constituted Spanish government, the Spanish People's Front Government fought a heroic but losing civil war. Both France and Spain illustrated again the truth of Marx's profound remark about the Paris Commune – that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes."

In the United States, during this early period, the struggle against fascism did not take on such well-defined people's front characteristics as it did in these European countries. The Roosevelt New Deal regime, although it had solid popular backing, was not a people's front. In supporting Roosevelt's measures, therefore, the Communist Party always bore this fact in mind. All through this pre-war anti-fascist struggle the Communist Party held as its major objective for the United States, the eventual election of a people's front government. It is silly to speak of this line as a program of force and violence.

As for the gallant effort of the U.S.S.R., during the latter 1930's, to organize the peace-loving peoples of the world against the marauding fascist powers, that, too, did not register immediate success. This was because of the refusal of Great Britain, France, and the United States to support common democratic action to halt Hitler.

The big monopolists of these three countries, themselves fascist-minded like Hitler and his allies, refused to unite against Hitler, but, on the other hand, would have been very glad to support Hitler in an all-out capitalist war against the U.S.S.R., such as they are planning today. But they could not strike a bargain with the greedy German and Japanese fascists who, between them, wanted to dominate the world and to leave the other monopolists on the side lines. So, when the U.S.S.R. by means of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, stepped out of the line of fire between the groups of imperialists, World War II burst out in the Fall of 1939 as a war among the imperialist powers themselves.

Had the western democracies supported the Soviet Union's intelligent anti-Hitler united front plan, World War II could have been prevented, for Nazi Germany was still very weak. Two score millions of lives would have been saved by an application of the Communists' international peace front line.

Let this gigantic fact be borne in mind by those reactionaries who dare to charge Communists with advocating policies of force and violence.

After the U.S.S.R. got into the war, in June, 1941, the new Communist anti-fascist tactics, initiated by the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern and expanded to meet the war conditions caused by the fascists, actually got into effective, successful operation.

By this time, the western democracies, which were then at the point of defeat from Hitler's armies, were glad enough to form the anti-fascist international alliance, such as the U.S.S.R. had proposed to them several years before. The anti-fascist people's fronts of pre-war days also developed into anti-Hitler national fronts. It was this great national and international anti-Hitler combination, based on the Communist tactics of the Seventh Comintern Congress, that finally won the war.

If the Communists of the world finally found themselves participating in a great war, it was only after they had exhausted every effort to defeat fascism and to prevent that war. All this was in full harmony with the fundamentally peaceful, democratic character of Communism. This fact is of profound significance in the issues before us in this trial.

On the battlefields the Communist forces, above all the great Soviet Red Army, were second to none in valor in fighting the fascists. Actually, the Red Army did several times as much real fighting as the armed forces of the United States, Great Britain, and France all put together, and it suffered several times as large human losses.

And in the super-dangerous underground fighting against Hitler in the occupied countries, the Communists were everywhere the leaders and organizers. Also, in the struggle for maximum wartime production the Communists, too, were indefatigable fighters and loyal supporters of labor's no-strike pledge. Everywhere the Communists were the most vigorous supporters of the vital wartime slogan of national and international unity of the anti-fascist forces.

It is an incontestable fact that the war could not have been won without the Communists and their solid policy of all-out anti-fascist struggle. Especially, had it not been for the Red Army the world today would be under the heel of the fascist barbarians. Let the Jury in this case also bear this fact in mind when they hear our accusers so glibly level charges of "traitors" and "foreign agents" against us.

During World War II the Communists indeed followed a policy of force and violence; but this violence was directed against the violence of the fascists; and it is a fortunate thing for humanity that this was so. Otherwise the world would have been conquered by fascism. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. is proud of the fact that it militantly supported this decisive unified struggle of the democratic forces against fascism, both on an American and a world scale. It gave 15,000 of its members to the armed struggle, many of whom died and many others were decorated for bravery in action.

And let me say again that this whole united front, anti-fascist World War II was fought out and won by the democratic peoples, our own included, on the basis of the fundamental democratic, anti-fascist policy formulated by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

It was during the World War II period, in 1943, that the Communist International was dissolved. That this important step was taken indicates to what a profound extent Communist policy had changed under the new conditions in the world-wide struggle against the fascist danger. The Comintern was liquidated for at least two major reasons: Firstly, because the mere fact of its existence was being seized upon by reactionaries as a pretext to disrupt world democratic unity; secondly, because its centralized form no longer corresponded to world Communist needs. They are cheap liars who assert that the Comintern has continued to exist and function as an underground organization.

With the end of World War II, the Communist anti-fascist tactics entered a new phase of application, again with modifications, but always animated by the fight for democracy, peace, and Socialism. This was the continuation into the postwar conditions of the line of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, which had achieved such a brilliant success in the great war against fascism. That is, when the war was concluded, the world democratic forces carried over into the postwar period essentially the same general policy of anti-fascist unity that they had been developing before and during the great war. They

did this in the setting of a worldwide people's democratic upsurge of masses and nations, who were determined to put into the peace the democratic principles fought for in the war, and who were resolved to make a resurgence of fascism forever impossible.

On the international field, the united front unity against the fascist nations took shape in the postwar period through the formation of the United Nations. In accordance with the will of the great postwar world-wide democratic movement generally, and in harmony with Communist united front anti-fascist policy, naturally the U.S.S.R. was an ardent founder of the United Nations.

Premier Stalin stated on many occasions that the U.S.S.R. would cooperate with the capitalist powers fully in order to maintain world peace, to prevent a regrowth of fascist aggression, and to repair the terrific damage caused by the war. And all Soviet postwar policy became based upon this democratic perspective of peace and international cooperation.

At the end of World War II the situation in all the countries of Europe that had been occupied by Hitler's troops presented a peculiarly favorable opportunity for a relatively rapid and peaceful advance of the peoples toward democracy and Socialism. Much of the organized political power of the big capitalists, the chief weapon with which they always make violent resistance to Socialism, lay nearly everywhere in ruins.

These capitalist reactionaries, who had treasonously lined up almost solidly with Hitler during the war, found themselves largely disarmed and disorientated by the latter's defeat. World War II, therefore, was not only an international war, but also a civil war. Hitler's original advance across Europe had broken up the old pre-war capitalist governments, shattered their armies, disrupted their police organizations, disintegrated the state bureaucracies, and even upset the hitherto prevailing economic organizations. Then, in turn, the victorious Allied Armies, aided by the underground resistance movements, smashed the governments of the fascist states, plus all the puppet regimes that Hitler had set up in the many conquered countries.

Thus, the shattering of the capitalist state machinery which Marx, Lenin, and Stalin had long before laid down as a condition for the successful Socialist revolution, had been largely accomplished by the peoples during the course of the great anti-fascist war.

It was in this situation of extensive capitalist disorganization that the peoples of Europe set about reorganizing their economic and political life at the end of World War II. In this effort the underground resistance movements, in which the Communists had everywhere played the leading role, constituted a most important force.

Coming out in the open, in full struggle against the fascist armies, they proceeded, with victory finally won, to organize new governments all over the Continent. These were new type "national unity" coalition governments, with Communist participation and organized largely upon Communist initiative. They were composed of all the parties of a democratic trend or that had taken more or less part in the underground resistance movements; including Communist, Socialist, Peasant, and Catholic parties, and even some parties of the smaller capitalists. France, Italy, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Albania, and various other countries, established such united front, multi-party governments.

Germany, too, would have surely taken this same course had it been allowed to set up a national government. In several colonial and semi-colonial lands, notably China, Burma, Korea, Indonesia etc., the surging national liberation movements also took on this general character of all-around united front, anti-fascist combinations.

In the same period, the first couple of years after the war's end, there was also a tremendous growth of democratic movements of all sorts in many parts of the world. These included big Socialist parties, bigger Communist parties, immense unified trade unions, etc. In these years, the World Federation of Trade Unions was formed, with 75,000,000 members, and also there were organized international youth and women's organizations, with equally large memberships.

This tremendous postwar united front, anti-fascist democratic development, both in its national and international aspects, flowed along the broad general lines foreseen by the Communists as far back as the Seventh Comintern Congress of 1935, and they everywhere gave it their heartiest support. The capitalist reactionaries, as Lenin had so often warned, in several countries managed to pull their shattered forces together and they made an armed opposition against the setting up of the "national unity" coalition governments. Nevertheless the new governments were all legally elected by overwhelming majorities, ranging from 75 percent to 95 percent of the total number of voters.

These governments expressed, in varying degrees in the several countries, the rapidly growing trend of the masses toward Socialism. Undoubtedly, a huge majority of all the peoples of Europe, at the end of the war, favored, and still do, the establishment of Socialism. This whole, vast legal and peaceful coalition movement represented fundamentally the Communists' new tactical line of action in the postwar period.

The new European coalition governments, with Communist participation everywhere, tackled vigorously the huge tasks of industrial rehabilitation. All over the Continent it was the Communists who came forward with the industrial plans and with boundless enthusiasm. Strikes were practically unknown throughout Europe, and the whole Continent was making rapid strides toward industrial recovery.

In most of the countries the toiling masses were moving toward the nationalization of industry and the banks, the break-up of the great landlord estates, the introduction of planned economy, and other far-reaching reforms as their answers to the bankrupt capitalism that had led them into the sorry mess of the war.

In Middle and Eastern Europe, which had been freed by the Red Army from Hitler's yoke, where the democratic effects of the U.S.S.R. were most powerfully felt, where the big monopolists and landlords who had openly supported Hitler during the war had been heavily defeated, and where the working class had become the leading political force of the nation, a number of the countries with people's democracies, acting in line with the national will of their peoples, began to move definitely toward the establishment of Socialism. Among other measures, the new democracies found it necessary, on pain of death, not to mention as a necessity for Socialism, to cleanse their state apparatus, armies, police, industries, schools, etc., of all fascist, counter-revolutionary, capitalist influences.

These various steps toward Socialism are being taken legally, peacefully, and with the active support of the overwhelming majorities of the peoples. In some countries, notably Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, and Czechoslovakia, remnants of fascist reactionaries (with the help of American and British agents) tried to block this whole development by armed plottings and revolts, one of the latest of which we have seen exposed in the Mindszenty trial in Hungary.

But, learning from the victorious and positive experience of the Soviet Union, which dealt vigorously with counter-revolution, and also from the tragic negative experience of the Spanish Republic, which failed to adopt precautionary measures against the fascists' counterrevolution, the new democracies in Eastern Europe put down these plots and revolts with the firmness that any responsible government, acting in the spirit of the gigantic majority of the people, must exercise. Due to the proximity of the Red Army, the Anglo-American imperialists did not dare to make direct military intervention against these People's Democracies, as they had done against the U.S.S.R. in 1918-21 and as they are now doing in Greece and China.

In sum, the nations of the new democracies in Middle and Central Europe, during the war and the postwar period, had accomplished national people's revolutions.

In Western Europe, however, the movement of the postwar coalition governments toward democracy and Socialism was neither so marked nor so successful as in the Eastern part of the Continent. This was particularly true of France and Italy.

In Western Europe a whole series of factors militated against the mass progressive movement – monopoly capital had survived the war in strength, the American and British armies were occupying these countries and influencing their politics in a reactionary direction, the Social Democracy was much stronger than further East, and the strength of the Vatican clericals was more extensive. Hence, combating the powerful mass democratic trend in these western European countries with the help of these allies, monopoly capital succeeded in maintaining the upper hand. In this combination, American imperialism played the decisive role by its lavish use of financial loans, its political use of food reserves, its atom-bomb diplomacy, its reckless Redbaiting demagoguery, and its military war threats. But of this drive by American imperialism more further along.

The broad meaning of the early post-World War II situation in Europe was that the great masses of its peoples were moving in a legal, peaceful manner, despite the reactionary capitalist opposition, not only to the repair of the war damages but also to the eventual establishment of Socialism. The deepest significance of this great postwar democratic development was that in Eastern and Central Europe, where the movement was most pronounced, for the reasons



given above, there was opened up what has been called a new route to Socialism, through the people's democracies.

The People's Democracy is a type of government which is moving toward Socialism. This reality embodies some of the profoundest aspects of the present-day political line of Communism. The far-reaching consequences of this whole Socialist development are indicated by the following typical statements from outstanding European Communist leaders:

"We must find an Italian way to the creating of a democracy of the new type which opens the way to Socialism." (Togliatti, General Secretary, Italian Communist Party – *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, January, 1948.)

"We are treading our own way to Socialism. We know that this road is longer and more difficult, but the fundamental changes in the Czechoslovak economic and political situation make us confident that we are on the right path." (Gottwald, Communist President of Czechoslovakia – *The New Europe*, p. 96.)

"We regard the People's Front as the most appropriate form of the movement towards strengthening democracy and towards Socialism in our conditions." (Dimitrov, Communist Premier of Bulgaria – *The New Europe*, p. 95.)

"This is a Socialism born on Hungarian soil, adapted to Hungarian conditions." (Rakosi, Communist Premier of Hungary – *The New Europe*, p. 95.)

These leaders were here speaking not of the fundamentals of Socialism, but of the strategy and tactics employed in arriving at Socialism. This flexibility in Communist strategy and tactics, as expressed in the new tactical line of the Communist movement in general, including united front anti-fascist movements and the new People's Democracies, was long ago foreshadowed by the great Lenin, who said:

*"But while the working class movement is everywhere passing through what is practically the same preparatory school for victory over the bourgeoisie, it is in each country achieving this development in its own way."* (Left Wing Communism, p. 72.)

This whole postwar peaceful advance toward Socialism in many parts of Europe not only expressed the majority will of the European masses, but was the living expression of the soundness of the Communist political line initiated at the Seventh World Congress. It

was, furthermore, a graphic example of how completely the Communist program dovetails with the democratic interests of the peoples everywhere. Finally, it was also a devastating refutation of the lying charges of reaction that the Communists are out to sabotage European recovery and that they seek to overthrow democratic governments, including ours, by force and violence.

Although in the early postwar period the political development proceeded along different general lines in the United States than in Europe, with reaction rapidly consolidating its forces and extending its activities after the death of Roosevelt, as we shall point out later on, nevertheless our Party sympathized with and fully supported the great, peaceful and democratic advance to Socialism that developed in Europe upon the close of the war.

These great events, involving policies and programs quite new in Communist political experience, especially demonstrate the absurdity of the Prosecution's charges that Communists are inexorably guided in their activities by a detailed "blueprint" of what happened in the Russian Revolution of 1917.

The reality is, of course, that Communists in the United States, as everywhere else, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and learning from all the developments of the class struggle, are incomparably flexible and adaptive in meeting the many complex and difficult political situations of the various countries in their relentless struggle for peace, democracy, and Socialism.

## **8. The people and aggressive American imperialism**

---

My remarks up to this point have amply proved the truth of my statement made earlier that the Communists, including those in the United States, have been following, ever since the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935, a policy based upon the practical conclusion that it has been possible for the workers and their democratic allies, in the conditions of broad anti-fascist struggle, to elect leftward-moving people's front governments in the democratic capitalist countries. This constitutes an irrefutable answer to the charges of force and violence that have been leveled against us by the Prosecution.

Now, let us examine into the significance of that related statement made by me earlier, in this general connection, to the effect that it is only now, in the face of the reactionary conditions created by the aggressive drive of American imperialism, that Communist leaders are again beginning to warn their followers and their peoples of the danger of capitalist violence against the labor and Socialist movement in the "western democracies." This examination is necessary in order to appraise correctly the current significance of the many quotations that have been read to the Jury and also to evaluate the prevailing policies of the Communist Party of the United States.

World reaction watched with dismay the complete defeat of Hider in the war and the rapid growth of democracy and Socialism in Europe and Asia after the end of the war. To the monopolists and exploiters it all amounted to the handwriting on the wall for their capitalist system.

They shivered in fear at the legal and comparatively easy establishment of coalition governments and People's Democracies in various European countries, at the spread of great national liberation movements in the Far East, and at the vast increase in the world prestige of the Soviet Union. Generally they were terrified at this whole peaceful movement in the direction of Socialism. Especially were they alarmed because the Communists, with their anti-fascist political line, were in the heart of it all.

These capitalists were all the more scared because the reactionary forces in Europe and Asia, badly shattered and discredited because of their traitorous pro-fascist attitude during the war, could do little, except to launch abortive civil wars in Greece and China, to stem this elemental democratic-Socialist forward movement of the people.

It was in this spirit that the powerful American reactionaries, deeply alarmed at the world democratic picture and also seeing a chance to feather their own nest in the disturbed situation, took it upon themselves to smash this tremendous progressive movement at any cost and with every means. When American imperialism went violently into action the world outlook immediately became ominous in Europe and elsewhere, and fresh fears were at once aroused among the peoples everywhere of a re-birth of fascism, the precipitation of civil war in many countries, and the outbreak of a still more terrible third world war.

Wall Street imperialism, which has created this tense situation, does not represent the interests of the American people. The great masses of the American people, like those of other nations, are honest, democratic, and peace-loving. But, unfortunately, they have as yet no decisive say in shaping either the domestic or foreign policies of our government. Our boasted democracy is very thin – ask the 15,000,000 Jim-Crowded Negroes about that.

This country is dominated by the richest, most strongly organized, and most ruthless capitalists in world history. These exploiters not only own our great industries and national resources, but they also control the two big parties, as well as all major sources of public information, and they dominate the government from stem to gudgeon. These capitalist oligarchs are aggressive, fascist, imperialist, and warlike. Their ultimate objective is to establish a Wall Street mastery over the world, including the Soviet Union.

There are three major forces driving American capitalism on to its imperialist policy of world domination:

First, the tremendous, unhealthy expansion of American industry during the war makes it absolutely necessary for the United States to make a desperate effort to control the markets of the world in order to dispose of as much as possible of its vast surplus production and also to find fields for the export of its mountains of idle capital.

This urgent domestic economic situation is why, too, so great a proportion of American production is devoted to war armaments. Without the current armaments expenditures our economy would explode overnight into a devastating crisis. Fear of a tremendous economic crisis is the basic reason why the big capitalists of the United States are driven on to try to bring the whole world not only

economically, but also politically, under their control, even at the cost of war.

Second, the broken-down condition of world capitalism gives added strength to the imperialist drive of American capitalism. The big trust-controlled government of this country, with great wealth, industrial power, and military force at its disposal, is impelled, by the very weakness of the other capitalist states, to secure control over them, both for the benefit of American capitalism and as the only possible way, they believe, to save ramshackle world capitalism from collapsing altogether.

Third, American imperialism is also impelled to fight for world domination out of fear and hatred of Socialism. It believes that it must suppress Socialism at all costs, or else the capitalist system is lost. And as the leading capitalist power of the world it takes over the job of organizing for an anti-Socialist war. Above all, it aims at subjugating the U.S.S.R., which it correctly understands to be the backbone of world Socialism and democracy.

Wall Street imperialism, in striving for world political domination, has most of the capitalist countries on its financial dole, and is able to force their political policies to conform to its militaristic, imperialistic aims. Whole groups of nations – France, Italy, Western Germany, Japan, Nationalist China, Latin America, etc. – are at present hardly better than puppet states to the United States. Even the once-proud British Empire is now largely under American influence, although it remains a bitter rival, fighting this country on many fronts for political position and markets.

The degree of American political control over the capitalist countries is illustrated by the fact that the United States was able to force the expulsion of the Communists from the French and Italian Governments. As for the U.S.S.R. and the new democratic countries of Europe, the United States has made no progress whatever in securing control over them, except in the cases of Yugoslavia and Greece.

This program of world imperialism by Wall Street is doomed to failure. It is full of tragedy for the world. In fighting for economic and political world domination, American policy is leading toward the following major disorders:

1. Wall Street imperialist policy produces world economic chaos. With the leverage of the Marshall Plan, the United States is largely dictating to European industry; it is crippling those industries that are competitive to the United States; it has largely embargoed trade

between the countries of Western Europe and Eastern Europe; it is forcing the wrecked industries of the West to turn to war production; it is busily stealing the world markets from its war-weakened trade competitors. All these policies, pushed vigorously by Wall Street under slick-sounding slogans about peace, free trade, and postwar rehabilitation, can only have disastrous long-run effects upon capitalist world trade and industry,

2. Wall Street imperialism is fascist-minded and is resurrecting fascism. All over the world, in its reckless struggle against democracy and especially against the U.S.S.R., the United States is lined up with fascists, monopolists, big landholders, Vatican clericals, Right Social Democrats, and other reactionary elements.

It is building Germany and Japan into war bases and it is deliberately shielding and re-establishing in power their fascist moguls of industry and politics. In France and Italy it is cultivating DeGaulle and DeGasperi, who are more or less open clerical fascists, and it is the accepted friend of every avowed fascist grouping. In Central and Eastern Europe every fascist plotter against the New Democracies is receiving American aid in one form or another. In Greece and China the reactionary, fascist ruling cliques get their main support from the United States. And now the United States Government is maneuvering to give Marshall Plan aid to Franco Spain and to bring that country into the United Nations.

Also, one of the major tasks Wall Street imperialism has set for itself is to split the trade unions of France and Italy, and to wreck the Latin American Confederation of Labor and the World Federation of Trade Unions. The imperialistic-minded A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders are doing this strike-breaking and union smashing. The meaning of such a reactionary hue of policy can only be that if Wall Street should score a major success in its imperialist drive, humanity would once again be faced with the danger of a fascist world.

3. Wall Street imperialism is also cultivating civil wars in many countries. In its world-wide fight for domination it does not hesitate to use armed force in order to defeat the democratic masses. With its outrageous Truman Doctrine, the United States is responsible for the continuance of the Greek Civil war, which, to no good purpose, has cost us 600 million dollars. The United States has also furnished aid, to the tune of 4½ billion dollars, to the rotten Chiang Kai-shek government and is basically responsible for the devastating civil war in China. The

United States shares much of the blame for the civil war conditions that prevailed in Palestine.

In France and Italy also, during the recent elections and big strike movements, organized reactionaries, who enjoy the full support of our State Department, let it be clearly known to the world that in the event of decisive Left-wing economic or political victories they were quite resolved to resort to civil war. And in Eastern and Central Europe, in the New Democracies, American-financed plotters are seeking to provoke civil war. The facts brought out in the Cardinal Mindszenty treason trial in Hungary have emphasized this danger afresh.

Waging civil war has now become an established form of Wall Street imperialism's technique of world conquest. They would try it, too, in the U.S.S.R. if they had half a chance. Is it not a daily spectacle for such warmongers as Winston Churchill openly to call upon the people of the Soviet Union to revolt against their government?

4. Wall Street imperialism is also provoking and organizing another world war. Notwithstanding all its economic and political pressures, the United States is obviously not succeeding in overwhelming the Soviet Union, the new democracies and the world democratic forces; hence the Wall Street imperialists are now planning to accomplish by military means what they have not been able to do with financial, diplomatic, political, and other methods. And their war blow is being prepared against the U.S.S.R., the main fortress of world democracy.

These capitalist oligarchs have long been calculating upon making war against the Soviet Union. Already during World War II they had this dangerous scheme definitely in mind. That was why, sabotaging the Allies' general war strategy, they did their utmost to have Germany and the Soviet Union cut each other to pieces; so that the U.S.S.R. in the postwar period would not be able to resist them. This was also why they delayed the opening of the Western war front for at least 18 months, thereby causing the Russians millions of needless casualties. This was why, too, they shipped only one-third as much lend-lease supplies to the U.S.S.R. as they did to the British, although the Russians were doing at least 20 times more actual fighting.

In organizing their premeditated, aggressive war against the U.S.S.R., the imperialists are making unprecedented military preparations both in this country and abroad. These include a huge yearly military budget of 15 billion dollars, the maintenance of a navy

bigger than all the rest of the navies of the world together, the building of the world's largest air fleet, the construction of air bases all over the world, the combination of all the armed forces under one Cabinet head, the introduction of peace-time conscription for the first time in our history, the piling up of atomic bombs and other super-deadly weapons, the re-arming of many capitalist countries in Europe, Asia, and Latin America, the building of the Western European Union, the actual industrial-military mobilization of American war strength, and now, most sinister of all, the new North Atlantic Pact, or military war alliance.

Wall Street's policies, both domestic and foreign, are all similarly geared to its war program. The intense militarization and fascization of the American people, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan are all war policies, directed against the U.S.S.R. And so is our atomic bomb diplomacy, or get-tough-with-Russia line. Present-day American so-called diplomacy consists of confronting the U.S.S.R., in the United Nations and elsewhere, with hard-boiled ultimatums on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, backed up with a stiff-necked Anglo-American majority of capitalist states in the United Nations, two-thirds of whom are on the payroll of the United States, and the rest want to be.

And when this intimidation of the U.S.S.R. does not succeed, our so-called diplomats often by-pass the United Nations altogether, while they never give up their hope of driving the U.S.S.R. out of the United Nations and of transforming that body into an anti-Soviet military alliance.

President Roosevelt followed the sensible policy of live-and-let-live with the U.S.S.R. This was the secret of his success with that country. But President Truman, with his "bi-partisan" policy and at the behest of Wall Street, has taken upon himself the impossible task of destroying the U.S.S.R. and the great world Communist movement. This is the old line of Hitler, and if persevered in it can only lead to fascism and war. The monopolists who have given us this outrageous foreign policy are the same forces that are responsible for the Taft-Hartley Act and other near-fascist developments in the United States.

Talk about preparing a program of force and violence. Here, indeed, is one, and on a scale never before seen in history. Cold-bloodedly the agents of Wall Street are planning a World War III that would slaughter hundreds of millions of people. These exploiters are now readying a perspective for the American people of dying in



masses for the glory of the "free enterprise" system and for the profit of the National Association of Manufacturers.

If our government were interested in tracking down the real advocates of force and violence it would not have the Communist Party leadership on trial here, but would be trying such figures as Dulles, Forrestal, Marshall, Acheson, Vandenberg, Johnson, Hearst, Truman and Dewey. It is such champions of monopoly capitalism, along with their European similars, the Churchills, Bevins, Attlees, Blums, Schumachers, Spaaks, DeGaulles and DeGasperi, who are the real advocates and organizers of the most terrible conceivable orgy of violence, a third world war.

Our government would also arrest the Thurmonds and Rankins, advocates of Jim-Crowism and "white supremacy" and protectors of the lynchers of Negroes. It would arrest, too, the anti-Semites and other race-haters.

The tragedy of the whole situation is that the monopoly capitalists, with their complete control of all the major means of public information in the United States, have succeeded in hiding their criminal war and fascist activities from vast masses of the people by making them actually believe that the Soviet Union, which lost 7,000,000 soldiers and 10,000,000 civilians killed in the war and had half of its industrial plants wiped out, is attacking the United States. They also have made many believe that Wall Street and its political stooges are the great champions of world peace and democracy.

All this is enough to make the late Mr. Goebbels turn green with envy, for he and Hitler never put over a greater deception than this upon the German people.

The furious and reckless drive of Wall Street imperialism for world domination became especially obvious with the launching of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, as well as the bald announcement of the get-tough-with-Russia policy, during the first half of 1947. This caused great alarm among the democratic forces of the world, among these elements that, unlike the reactionary trade union leadership of the United States and Great Britain, are not being led around by the nose by the glib agents of Wall Street but are seriously trying to preserve world peace and to defend the democratic achievements of the war.

As for the U.S.S.R., which is the mainstay of world democracy, that country met the postwar expansionist drive of Wall Street,

especially as this drive went into high gear early in 1947, by pointing out to the world the grave danger caused by the warmongering of reactionary elements in the United States.

Refusing to be intimidated by the open threats of the atomic bomb fanatics to bomb Russian cities in a "preventive" war, it has courageously stood its ground and fought resolutely in the United Nations for the loyal fulfillment of the democratic Yalta and Potsdam agreements. It has come into the United Nations with one practical proposal after another, for control of atomic energy, for the solution of the German situation, for a fair settlement of the Palestine dispute, for a general reduction in armaments, for the development of a broad United Nations program of war relief and world rehabilitation.

But the American delegation, controlling a solid majority of the votes of nations on the American dole, brushes aside these proposals with insults and fresh provocations for war, leaving the U.S.S.R. no alternative but the use of the veto. Meanwhile, the U.S.S.R., steadily refusing to accept the American big business theory that war is inevitable, has actually greatly reduced its military budget, while the United States is rapidly increasing its own. And whereas the United States and its stooge European governments are systematically carrying out air, naval and troop movements in a real war mobilization, the U.S.S.R. stands firm in its fight for peace, as the recent proposals of Stalin for a conference with Truman illustrate once more.

Not surprisingly, in view of this developing world tension, the nine leading Communist Parties in Europe came together in Poland in September, 1947, to consider measures for the defense of their peoples against the new menace of fascism and war that was arising out of Wall Street's imperialistic expansionist drive. These parties, in their conference, recognized that the wartime international anti-fascist alliance had broken up and that in all the capitalist countries the capitalists, under Wall Street's general leadership, had launched a reactionary offensive against the workers and all manifestations of democracy. They also recognized that the Right-wing Socialist and Catholic parties had become allies of American imperialism, the world had been split into two camps: one, the camp of reaction and imperialism; the other, the camp of democracy and anti-imperialism.

The nine parties warned the peoples everywhere against the threats to peace, to democracy, to economic recovery, and to national

independence of various countries that are inherent in the Truman and Marshall plans. At the same time, they corrected numerous mistakes that had developed in the work of various Communist Parties in the recent past, including an underestimation of the danger presented by American imperialism, an underestimation of the leading role of the working class, etc. The nine parties then formed an Information Bureau among themselves.

For us, in this trial, the important thing to signalize is that the substance of the decisions of the nine big European Communist Parties was to counter the expansionist drive of American imperialism by essentially reaffirming and strengthening the basic anti-fascist, people's front tactical line that had been initiated by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

That is, although the broad wartime international and national unity is no more, the struggle is continued, on the one hand, on the international field by uniting all the genuinely peace-loving nations in the United Nations to halt the warmongers and, on the other hand, in the respective countries, by going ahead with the building up of people's front movements and governments, to strengthen democracy and to defeat the fascists, imperialists, and war-makers on their home bases.

The European Communists in their conference did not accept the inevitability of war. Nor did they give up the perspective of electing people's front governments, with their implications of the New Democracy and the transition to Socialism. But they did take into cognizance the rising violence of the reactionaries, the more difficult conditions of struggle and the consequent dangers of civil war.

The united front policy of the conference was clearly reaffirmed later on in the French and Italian elections, where the Communist aim continued to be the winning of a parliamentary majority, on the basis of a broad coalition movement of workers, peasants, professionals, small business elements – a democratic combination – actively supported by trade unions, Socialist Parties, Communist Parties and non-party organizations.

Two serious danger spots in Europe are France and Italy. There, as I have already indicated, the reactionaries, with Wall Street backing, are quite prepared to launch civil wars to prevent the establishment of genuinely democratic coalition governments, including the Communists. They are trying to reduce the democratic struggles in

these countries to a force and violence basis. In the face of these dangerous provocations, the French and Italian parties nevertheless are fighting to retain their line for the democratic election of united front governments.

Thorez, general secretary of the French Communist Party (*For a Lasting Peace*, Nov. 1, 1948), called for the election of "a government of Democratic Union" and put out the slogan: "Let us unite – Socialists, Communists, Catholics, Republicans."

And Togliatti, head of the Italian Communist Party (*For a Lasting Peace*, Oct. 15, 1948), after the violent interference of Anglo-American imperialism in the Italian elections of last April, stated at his party's Central Committee meeting on Sept. 23, that although the workers obviously face harsher conditions of struggle, "*our aim is still to win over the majority of the people.*" Togliatti sharply condemned those elements who "considered April 18 [the election] as a defeat from which we could only recover by launching a broad movement of insurrectionary character, by using armed force to sweep aside the enemy."

It is absurd to characterize as force and violence these democratic, broad, united front policies of the Italian and French Communists.

Capitalist reactionaries ail over the world are now shouting that Czechoslovakia presents a glaring example of a democratic republic deliberately overthrown by organized Communist violence. But such an interpretation completely falsifies what actually happened. When the shift in political control took place last February, the Czechoslovak government was based on a national unity coalition in which the Communists and Left Social-Democrats held a majority.

This situation greatly irked the local capitalists and their British-American imperialist allies, especially when the Government came in with far-reaching plans to further nationalize industry and foreign trade and to introduce new reforms into agriculture. So they determined to put an end to the People's Democracy in that country. Therefore, using as a pretext a manufactured police incident, all of a sudden 13 of the ministers of the three more conservative parties in the national unity Cabinet resigned in a body. Their aim was to provoke a violent political upheaval, during which the Communists were to be forced out of the Government and they themselves would take over completely, as had been done shortly before in France and Italy.

But the wide-awake workers were on guard. With their splendid trade union and Party organizations, they held the situation solid, nipping in the bud the contemplated counter-revolution.

Thereupon, the workers insisted upon the acceptance of the resignation of the 13 ministers and also that more Communists and Left Social-Democrats be brought into the Cabinet. Both of these workers' demands were acceded to by President Benes. Thus, Czechoslovak democracy successfully defended and strengthened itself, ever since which the defeated counter-revolutionaries have filled the world with their shouts of anguished frustration. The whole action was legal, peaceful and democratic.

The Communists' role in the Greek civil war is also fully in line with the united front, democratic, peace policy of Communists everywhere, despite reactionary allegations to the contrary. The violence in that country stems entirely from reactionary sources. In Greece, immediately after World War II, the victorious wartime united front resistance movement set up a democratic coalition government, backed by at least 80 percent of the people, as was done in a dozen other European countries. But Great Britain, fearing that it would lose control of Greece, its key Mediterranean bastion, brought about the overthrow of this democratic people's government, put the present fascist-minded king on the throne, and deliberately precipitated the civil war.

Later on, Great Britain becoming bankrupt in Greece, the United States took over the civil war as part of its general struggle against European democracy and the U.S.S.R. The Greek people are only defending themselves against the assaults of aggressive reaction.

In China, the civil war had basically similar origins. The Communist Party, during the middle twenties, had a united front with the Kuomintang, a combination of forces which defeated first the Manchu feudalists and then the local warlords. Whereupon Chiang Kai-shek, 22 years ago, doing the bidding of the Chinese bankers and big landlords, suddenly and treacherously purged his Communist allies, butchering 150,000 of them and driving the Party into the mountains and underground. This brutal attack started the long civil war.

Throughout World War II, Chiang Kai-shek, instead of fighting the Japanese, concentrated his military forces against the Communists.

Two years ago, when General Marshall was in China, the Communists were quite ready to end the civil war and to establish a coalition government. But Chiang Kai-shek, a rabid Red-baiter, believing that with American aid he could defeat the Communists in a few months' time, rejected all Communist approaches and continued the civil war. Naturally, the Communists fought back. In the resulting breakup of the Nationalist Government and the complete defeat of its reactionary cause, Chiang and his Wall Street backers are but reaping the whirlwind they have sown.

The essence of the present political situation, especially in Europe, is, therefore, that the Communists and the broad democratic masses are trying to continue the democratic and peaceful advance to Socialism that took place in many countries immediately following the end of the war. Whereas, on the other hand, the forces of reaction, organized and led by Wall Street imperialism, are striving, at all costs, to block this democratic Socialist advance.

To do this, the reactionaries are pushing to suppress democracy and to establish conditions of fascism and civil war in the various countries. The purpose of American policy in Europe, together with that of its reactionary allies, is thus to make it impossible for the European masses to elect people's front governments, with their elementary anti-fascist, anti-imperialist, anti-war programs, and to reduce the whole situation to a state where there is no alternative but open revolutionary struggle by the forces of progress against those of reaction. Such a situation already exists in Spain, where the friends of national freedom have no alternative but to conduct an armed guerrilla struggle against the butcher Franco.

Under American pressure, the class struggle in Europe is rapidly sharpening, and the prospect is for it to become still more acute. For it would be silly to expect that the European peoples will calmly allow Wall Street imperialism to rob them of their domestic democracy, to enslave them nationally, and to lead them into another war shambles. On the contrary, they will deal blow for blow, and more, against rising fascism and warmongering.

If there is to be civil war, it will be the choice of the reactionaries, not of the people. Two years ago, before Wall Street had gotten its aggressive drive for world control well under way and while the Communists were still members of the French and Italian governments, all Europe, let me repeat, was practically devoid of

strikes. The populations, save for capitalist saboteurs, were unitedly engaged in rehabilitation work, and the rate of industrial recovery was rapid.

But now, with Wall Street imperialism's drive to strangle European democracy, to destroy the Communist Party, to split the trade unions, to halt the nationalization of industry, and to establish its own economic and political combination, Europe has been thrown into turmoil. Great strikes now follow on one another in rapid succession. The American-sponsored reactionary governments are seeking to suppress these strikes by force and violence. The workers are fighting back resolutely, and the danger of civil war becomes more and more acute in France, Italy, and other countries.

Besides, over everything, hangs the danger of a Wall Street-provoked World War III. The responsibility for the present disturbed and tense condition of Europe and the world, and for the growing violence of the class struggle, rests squarely upon the shoulders of American imperialism.

The very heart of working-class and Communist policy in Europe, as elsewhere, is that it seeks to develop the most peaceful possible path to progress and Socialism; but if American reaction gives the peoples no other alternative than to fight, then fight they will, and the long run consequences will be disastrous for American big business. American reactionary pressure is driving the democratic European peoples to more militant action and to more Left policies.

This was graphically illustrated not only in Czechoslovakia but in Poland, where, faced by American-organized armed attempts to overthrow their New Democracy, the people dealt heavy blows to the domestic reaction and speeded their country even faster along the road to Socialism. The French, Italian, and many other workers are showing new militancy, provoked by the offensive of American reaction. The Greek and Chinese civil wars also give indications of how the peoples will resist the attempts of reaction to beat down the democratic-Socialist movement of the world.

It can be said to the Wall Street imperialists that if, in spite of the democratic resistance, they should succeed in plunging Europe (and the Far East) into civil war and the world into another great international conflagration, this would not give the mastery to American capitalism. Those atom-bomb fanatics who believe that war can solve all their problems would be in for a rude awakening.

Democracy and Socialism have now become far too strong to be crushed by capitalistic military force. The peoples are not going to stand by passively and let Wall Street fasten its yoke upon their necks. They will not surrender their national independence; they will not submit to a new fascist tyranny; they will never give up their new democratic and Socialist regimes.

Wall Street imperialism, with its war program, cannot defeat Socialism by military action and thus save dying world capitalism. All Wall Street could do, were it to have the war it wants, would be to bring ruin upon itself, at a terrible price to humanity.

An American-Soviet war, which could only come as the supreme expression of American aggression, would be a thoroughly hated war. Obviously throughout the capitalist world the Communists would oppose such a war and so would the overwhelming masses of the peoples. In the face of that new war provocation, the North Atlantic Pact, the French and Italian Communist Parties have clearly stated their determination not to fight against the U.S.S.R. Our American Party has done likewise. Where the great Communist Party of China and its democratic allies stand on this question, we are told by the *New York Times* of April 3, which quotes these Allied democratic forces as follows:

*"If the imperialist aggressive bloc dares to provoke this reactionary war, endangering the peoples in the world, we will unite the people throughout the country, observe the immortal behest of Sun Yat-sen, adopt necessary means, and march forward hand in hand with the ally of China, the Soviet Union, and world forces for peace and democracy in determined struggle against the instigators of an aggressive war, to defeat the aggressors, overthrow the entire imperialist system, and realize the liberation of all mankind and permanent peace. We believe that if war breaks out, the imperialist aggressors are sure to be defeated and the invaded countries opposing imperialism are sure to win."*

Who can believe the American people favor such a war? Those warmongers who delude themselves into thinking that the whole non-Socialist world would join enthusiastically in an all-out war against the U.S.S.R. and against the New Democracies of Eastern and Central Europe would find their plans shattered if they should try their desperate gamble. In case of war there would be many neutral



capitalist countries, and others, at most, would be but half-hearted participants.

Then, in such countries as France and Italy, for example, the outbreak of a Wall Street war obviously would at the same time mean the precipitation of civil war. The present mass opposition everywhere to the proposed war could only increase tremendously with the beginning of actual hostilities.

The masses will not stand for millions more being slaughtered by the new and dreadful weapons of war. The stage would be set for a tremendous revolutionary movement to bring the war to the earliest possible conclusion, despite the warmongers, on a basis of a general democratic settlement all around. It would be an evil time for monopoly capital.

The hot-foot warmongers of this period would do well to read again the warning given by the Comintern in its 1928 Congress to the war organizers of that time.

It said:

*"Thus the development of the contradictions within modern world economy, the development of the general capitalist crisis, and the imperialist military attack upon the Soviet Union, inevitably lead to a mighty revolutionary outbreak which must overwhelm capitalism in a number of the so-called civilized countries, unleash the victorious revolution in the colonies, broaden the base of the proletarian dictatorship to an enormous degree, and thus, with tremendous strides, bring nearer the final world victory of Socialism." – (C. I. Program, p. 68.)*

The capitalist imperialists responsible for launching World War II ignored this clear-sighted warning. Consequently, they deluged the world with blood and their social system reaped the whirlwind. Hitler's great bid for world mastery failed, and the attempt to smash the U.S.S.R. also met ignominious defeat. And as a result, as the Comintern program forecast, the war produced a great weakening of the world capitalist system, a big upsurge of colonial revolutions, a heavy growth of trade unionism and other democratic movements, the beginning of Socialism in a number of European countries, and a tremendous strengthening of the general position of the Soviet Union. Thus history made the imperialist murderers pay for their crime of starting World War II.

If the Wall Street imperialists dare to launch the new world war which they are now so actively trying to organize, the consequences to their capitalist system will be even more catastrophic. The fomenters of a World War III cannot turn back the wheels of history. They cannot drown Socialism in blood and thus give new life to obsolete capitalism. Their war aims, if they are able to put them into effect, will have the reverse effect, just as World Wars I and II had, but to a much more pronounced extent.

The peoples of the world will never submit to another world war, as the American imperialists will learn to their surprise if they dare to begin dropping their atomic bombs. A new world war would surely result in shattering the world capitalist system, and before the last chapter of it were written, the great democratic masses, victorious over the imperialist war-makers, would indeed take up with tripled vigor their inexorable work of building a Socialist world.

Such a war is totally unnecessary. The American people want American-Soviet collaboration, and the American Government can have such collaboration with the Soviet Government for peace any time it wishes. But in order to accomplish this it must treat the U.S.S.R. on a basis of equality. Our Government can expect only opposition when it tries to slug the U.S.S.R. into submission by threatening it with the atom-bomb and by confronting it with hard-boiled majorities in the United Nations.

Communists are irreconcilable enemies of war. The charge that Communists want war in order to bring about revolution is a typical Redbaiting slander.

Socialism is inevitable, war or no war. It is stupid, then, to think that the Communists want the common people, their people, slaughtered off by tens of millions in a devastating atomic war which would lay waste the whole of civilization. The Communists stand four-square for the most peaceful possible development of society. The danger of war, like the danger of civil war in Europe, comes entirely from the American big capitalists, who are being made desperate through the failure of their capitalist system and the irresistible advance of Socialism.

## 9. The elements of American Communist Party policy

---

It is now necessary to examine more closely American Communist policy, because this policy is the living demonstration of how Communists in this country understand and apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism in specific American conditions. It would be only a mockery of justice not to consider the actual practice of our Party. Moreover, Communist policy, and specifically the question of whether or not our Party is advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence, can be understood only on the basis of considering our body of policy as a whole, and not by attempting to separate theory from practice or by isolating some particular fragment of our practice to suit the distortions of the Prosecution.

In this sense, of a full statement of Communism, therefore, I am outlining the following propositions as the working elements of Communist policy in action, and in propaganda, in the United States.

The Communist Party of the United States is an independent political organization, with no organic connections with the Communist Parties of other countries. Our Party is not bound by programs, strategy and tactics as enunciated and applied by other Communist Parties, although naturally, as a Communist Party, it is deeply interested in them, learns much from them, and is animated by a high spirit of proletarian internationalism.

Our Party works out its own policies upon the basis of its own understanding of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in accordance with the requirements of the political situation in the United States and the world.

It should surprise nobody, however, that there is a fundamental similarity between the policies of the Communist Parties in the various countries as they are all imbued with the same principles of Marxism-Leninism. No one is surprised at likenesses to be found in the policies of other international ideological-political groupings – including Social Democrats, trade unionists, Catholics, fascists, etc.

First: *The Communist Party is American*. We Communists love our vast and beautiful country; we cherish our great people, with their splendid achievements in industry, in science, and in democracy; we revere, too, our flag, which has been gloriously carried through two

revolutions, and through the recent anti-Hitler war. We take second place to nobody in our devotion to the United States and its people.

The foundation principle of all Communist policy is to make ours a freer, happier and more prosperous nation. Whoever does not understand this high patriotic motive as the basis of our policy knows precisely nothing about the Communist Party in this country or anywhere else. We are flesh and blood of the American people, and we reject with scorn the charges of reactionaries that we are "agents of a foreign power."

It is in the spirit of the highest patriotism that the Communist Party, ever since its foundation almost 30 years ago, has fought tirelessly for every cause that is in the interest of the workers and the broad masses of the people. In the big struggles during the past generation to unionize the basic industries – steel, auto, lumber, metal, mining, electrical, and many others – the Communists were excelled by nobody as active and effective organizers.

Every strike or movement to raise wages, improve working conditions, and shorten hours of labor, also has found in the Communists its most ardent supporters. We were pioneers in the fight for social legislation, many of our members going to jail in the struggles for unemployment insurance and relief, while top labor leaders were fighting against these measures. We have also long been active workers for trade union unity, for trade union democracy, for the world organization of labor. We have strengthened the labor movement in the full realization of its vital role for the workers, as the very foundation of genuine democracy, and as indispensable for eventual Socialism.

One of the proudest pages in our Party's history is its long and relentless fight for full economic political and social equality of the Negro people. In the Scottsboro case, the Herndon case, the Camp Hill cases, the Trenton cases, and in scores of other struggles against the Jim-Crowers and the lynchers, the Communist Party has boldly taken the lead and blazed the trail to liberty for these most oppressed of all our people. The fight for Negro rights is a major front in the whole struggle for the defense and extension of democracy in this country.

The Communist Party also stands second to none in its fight against fascism, which is surely a struggle in the interests of the American people. While most top labor leaders were busily appeasing Hitler, there were tens of thousands of Communists, including 3,000 Americans, fighting against Hitler, arms in hand, in Spain. And in

World War II our Party furnished no less than 15,000 valiant anti-Hitler soldiers, many of whom were decorated for bravery on the field of battle.

The Party's three present-day central issues are also obviously in the very best interest of our whole people. These are, first, to protect the workers, by social insurance and other measures, against the ravages of the developing economic crisis, signs of whose coming are daily multiplying on the horizon; second, to defeat growing fascism in the United States, with all its insidious and complex manifestations; and, third, to prevent the outbreak of a new world war, the danger of which becomes more and more threatening as Wall Street imperialism develops its policies of imperialist expansion and world conquest.

It is also in this spirit of conserving the national interest of the American people that the Communist Party advocates its program of eventual Socialism. We reject with contempt the National Association of Manufacturers' argument that only those who endorse capitalism can be good Americans. For only through Socialism can our people and the rest of the world finally free themselves from the economic chaos, fascism, and war that the dying world capitalist system is increasingly inflicting upon them.

Capitalism has long since exhausted its once progressive role. It is now the breeder of social calamities of every sort and it is on its way off the stage of history.

In advocating Socialism, therefore, the Communist Party is defending a program that is in the deepest interest of the working class and the overwhelming majority of the American people. In long years of struggle we Communists have shown that we are the most loyal defenders of our people's welfare against oppression and exploitation by their capitalist jailers. This is the precise reason why we are standing as prisoners in this dock today. The voice of the Prosecution is the voice of Wall Street.

Second: *The Communist Party is a working class and people's movement.* When we Communists speak of the American people, we draw the sharpest distinction between the broad toiling sections of the people and the ruling capitalist class that dominates our country. The masses of our people are democratic and peace-loving; they want a free and prosperous land, and they want to live in friendly relations with other peoples. They have demonstrated all this repeatedly.

But their political will is distorted and thwarted by the rich monopolists who, controlling the Government, arrogantly presume to

speak in the name of the American people. These big exploiters own the industries of our country; they dominate both the Republican and Democratic Parties; they consider the Government to be their personal property; they use the press, the radio, the schools, and every other means of public information as weapons with which to maintain their class rule. Their influence also saturates the churches and runs deep into the ranks of the conservative trade union leadership.

The ruling capitalists' sole objective is to increase their private profits, which last year, after taxes, reached the fabulous figure of 21 billion dollars. The monopolists are poison sources of fascism, imperialism, war, and reaction of every kind. And all this reaction and exploitation they shamelessly carry on under the false pretext that they are the custodians and protectors of the interests of the American people.

The Communist Party bases itself upon the fundamental policy of strengthening the hands of the democratic masses against their capitalistic exploiters. Monopoly capital is the cancer of modern society. Its power must be curbed and eventually broken.

This is the key to social progress generally, the basic way for the prevention of economic breakdowns, fascism, and war. To the end of defeating monopoly capital and of strengthening the power of the masses of the people, the Communist Party is entirely devoted. The Communist Party is the true voice of the masses of the American people.

Third: *The Communist Party is a democratic movement.* One of the many slanders directed against Communism is that it is anti-democratic. Such a charge runs directly contrary to all the theory and practice of Communism. At the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935, General Secretary Dimitrov, speaking on this question, correctly stated Communist policy in capitalist countries as follows:

*"Though upholders of Soviet democracy, we shall defend every inch of the democratic gains which the working class has wrested in the course of years of stubborn struggle, and shall resolutely fight to extend these gains."* (The United Front Against Fascism, p. 111.)

Lenin (*Selected Works*, Vol. III, p. 122) gave an even more fundamental reason why Communists are the best and most consistent defenders of democracy in all countries. He said:

*"We must not forget that there is not, nor can there be at the present time, any other means for bringing Socialism nearer, than complete political liberty, than a democratic Republic...."*

These statements by Dimitrov and Lenin entirely conform to Communist practice, both under capitalism and in countries where the Communists lead in the government. In all capitalist lands the Communists are indefatigable battlers to defend and extend the people's democratic rights. And in the Soviet Union, with such measures in effect as the socialization of the industries, the collectivization of the land, the complete equality of the sexes, the elimination of all discrimination against national minorities, the establishment of the legal rights to work, to leisure, and to education, etc., all under the political leadership of the working class – there exists a higher type of democracy than in any other country in the world.

This is Socialism, and the Communists in the Soviet Union, in their ultimate goal of Communism, are aiming at achieving the highest form of democracy man has yet conceived, namely, a society in which the state itself, with its various compulsions, has withered away. But, of course, this maximum of Communist democracy cannot be achieved, nor is even the fullest measure of democracy possible realizable under Socialism, until the constant war threat of world capitalism against the Soviet Union has been lifted. So long as this warlike pressure exists the Soviet people must retain a strong state and a high national discipline.

Fourth: *The Communist movement is peace-loving.* The masses of the American and other peoples love peace, but they are not pacifists.

They do not want peace at any price. If, in order to protect their liberties or to secure their just demands, they must fight, they will do so, and resolutely. This is also precisely the Communist attitude on this question. Communists are known as good fighters, whether on the battlefield, in the anti-Hitler underground, or on hard-fought picket lines. At the same time, Communists are the most consistent in striving for the most peaceful line of social development possible under the given conditions. As a matter of major principle, Communists never lead the people needlessly into violent struggle.

In line with this general peace policy, Communists are the most levelheaded and determined opponents of imperialist war. The American Communist Party was born in the fight against World War I.

It was the Communists, too, who, during the rise of Nazism in the 1930's, sought to unite the world's democratic peoples into an international peace front, a policy which, had it been supported by Great Britain, France, and the United States, would have surely strangled Hitlerism in Germany and thus prevented the devastating World War II.

According to the same peace-loving principle, Communists, in their fight for the workers' immediate demands and for their maximum program of Socialism, always pursue the most peaceful route possible in given circumstances. Violence in the class struggle is provoked by reaction, not by the forces of the people. This fact we will make abundantly clear as this trial progresses. It is the height of absurdity, therefore, in view of Communist theory and practice, to allege that Communists are advocates of force and violence.

The supreme irony of this trial is that Communists, the best champions of peace, are here put on trial as advocates of force and violence by spokesmen of a capitalist system which, in one generation has been responsible for two devastating world wars and which, if unrestrained, will surely lead the world into another even more terrible blood-bath.

Fifth: *The Communist Party is internationalist.* Communists have long understood what the American people are just now learning, namely, that all nations live in one world and that the various peoples must and can, in conformity with their deepest national interests, live in harmony and cooperation together. Communists are relentless enemies of imperialism, of capitalist domination over other peoples, of the policy of world conquest which the monopolists who run the United States are trying to impose upon our people.

We hold that the key to peace in the world today is a friendly relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. This collaboration is possible; it is also indispensable. Such cooperation, as proposed by the U.S.S.R. more than a decade ago, would have prevented World War II. It was this cooperation, finally achieved during the hostilities, that made it possible to defeat Hitler in the war. And the only hope for the postwar world is precisely such American-Soviet cooperation.

The only alternative to this is international disaster. Because we Communists, flatly challenging the imperialist policies of big business, have long and resolutely fought for the vital policy of Soviet-American friendship we have been denounced as "foreign agents,"



discharged from jobs in industry, denied the right to hold government positions, prohibited from being elected as trade union officials, blasted all over the country as traitors, and finally indicted before this Court as "dangerous criminals."

It is significant also that even Henry Wallace, a liberal and former Vice-President of our country, who is courageously warning the American people of the war danger created by Wall Street imperialism, is being denounced as a "fifth columnist" and an enemy to his country.

Wherever there is capitalism there is Communism. The Communist movement is spontaneous and is native to all countries. It is not a world revolutionary plot, as our enemies declare. The growth of world Communism is an inevitable process, not somebody's device or conspiracy. There were Communists in the United States many years before there were any in Russia. During the Civil War the Communists actively supported Lincoln and fought bravely in the Northern Armies. Take myself, for example. I have advocated Socialism for nearly 49 years, long before there was any Soviet Union, until now, suddenly, I am arrested and charged with crime for so doing.

As capitalism decays more and more, the Communist movement, forerunner of the eventual world system of Socialism, grows and expands. From China to Chile there are scores of big native Communist Parties and Communist-led trade unions and governments, amounting all told to several hundred millions of people.

Only a political illiterate or a dupe of the fascist House Committee on Un-American Activities could be guilty of the asininity of classing as "Soviet fifth columns" these great spontaneous mass movements, all of which are based upon the most vital needs of their respective peoples.

Sixth: *The Communist Party is revolutionary.* When society takes a long step forward, involving fundamental changes in its basic economic system and in its ruling classes, this is a revolution. Hence, Socialism, which changes the productive system and abolishes capitalist class rule, is revolutionary. But let us not consider the word revolution as something alien to us or frightening.

Advancing humanity has passed through a whole series of revolutions: (1) from primitive tribal communism to slavery; (2) from slavery to feudalism; (3) from feudalism to capitalism; (4) it is now

beginning to pass from capitalism to Socialism. Historically, this series of revolutions constitutes an upward spiral of progress.

These revolutions, in greater or lesser degree, have all been violent; for unfailingly the reactionary ruling classes of the given social systems always defend themselves with every means in their power against the new, rising progressive social orders that are displacing them. "Force," said Karl Marx, "is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one." (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 824.)

The Prosecution tries to frighten us with the word "revolution" and would have us forget that the world capitalist system was established by means of revolutions in many countries, extending over a period of hundreds of years. Among the countries having had such capitalist revolutions are the United States, England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Russia, Latin America, etc.

Of the many revolutions in history, those that established capitalism were by far the most violent. More than that, during the life of capitalism the world has been plagued with the most terrible wars in all its tragic history. The capitalists, however, want us to ignore their revolutions and wars, and to believe that their social system is of heaven-sent origin and is as peace-loving as a sucking dove.

But Americans especially should be immune to the reactionaries' kindergarten scare of the word revolution, because our national history is studded with revolutions. We have had no less than three of them. Whether or not a social change is violent or peaceful is not what determines whether it is a revolution!

The decisive factors are the basic changes in the production system and in the political controls that are being brought about. Measured by this scientific yardstick, our three American revolutions were all genuine revolutions, or, more strictly speaking, clearly marked phases of the broad capitalist revolution.

The first American revolution, which began almost immediately after the arrival of Columbus and which dragged on for at least 350 years, was the most brutal overthrow and destruction of the Indians' primitive tribal communalism (the Inca and Aztec of Peru and Mexico had more highly developed societies than the Indians of the United States) and the substitution for it of a young and growing capitalism, but still tinctured with feudalism and slavery.

This vast movement involved stealing a whole continent from the Indians, waging many ferocious wars against them, wiping out entire Indian tribes altogether, and herding the remnants of the once proud

Indian peoples of the United States into concentration-camp-like reservations. The destruction of the Indians' social system was the ruthless revolutionary way in which capitalism established itself all over the Western Hemisphere. It is one of history's most tragic stories.

The second American revolution was the revolt of the 13 colonies against England, beginning in 1776. This was the break-away of vigorous young American capitalism from the domination of semi-feudal England, as well as, eventually, from various degrees of controls by France, Spain, Russia, Holland, Sweden, etc. This revolution, fought through with fire and sword by the young American people, required a seven years' war before it was finally brought to a successful conclusion.

The third American revolution was the Civil War of 1861-65. Prior to 1860, Congress, the Presidency, and the Supreme Court, were all in the hands of the Southern slave-owning class. This slave regime constituted an intolerable, stifling obstruction for the upspringing capitalist system of the North. Hence, the combination of Northern capitalists, workers, and farmers, plus much assistance from the slaves themselves and from friendly foreign allies, shattered the power of the Southern slaveholders in four years of hard-fought war.

The American capitalist system, born in this series of revolutionary struggles, was thus established and thereupon began its era of swift development. All three phases of the American capitalist revolution, despite their loss of life and destruction of property, were historically progressive. They marked tremendous steps forward for our people. Thus, mankind marches irresistibly onward.

It is of the greatest significance to note that it was Tory England that refused to accept the democratic demand of the American people for independence and shot down the rebellious colonists. And it was the Southern slaveholders, fighting against the outcome of the democratic elections of 1860, who fired on Fort Sumter and provoked the terrible Civil War.

This is always the case in struggles of the people – the violence comes from the ranks of reaction.

In the early days of our country the people's right of revolution was freely recognized by American political leaders. The *Declaration of Independence* states:

*"That whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to*

*institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such forms, as to them shall seem most lively to effect their safety and happiness."*

Jefferson also said, referring to the famous Shays' uprising: "God forbid that we should even be 20 years without such a rebellion." And, half a century later, Lincoln declared that: "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."

In these present days of reaction, however, under the Smith Law, if the Prosecution could have its way, these great patriotic statements would be denounced as treasonous and their authors jailed as advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence. If they would put us in prison for circulating the revolutionary works of Lenin, others could be jailed for circulating the writings of Paine, Jefferson, and Lincoln, all of whom freely advocated the right of revolution.

The United States, like all the rest of the capitalist world, now faces the revolutionary issue of Socialism. Americans, as yet, are not inclined to think that Socialism is much of an American question, except indirectly. It is true that when looking out over the war-shattered world, many Americans realize that the capitalist system in other countries is in a bad way, and they can admit reasons for the advance of Socialism in Europe. But when it comes to advocating Socialism for the United States that is a horse of an altogether different color.

Seeing the strength of American capitalism, many people hop to the conclusion that the economic system here is immune to the corrosive forces that are undermining capitalism in other countries. They believe that American capitalism is fundamentally different from these stricken capitalist systems. Some enthusiasts of the Eric Johnston type even think that American capitalism is strong enough not only to survive, but also to rejuvenate the capitalist system in all other countries and to defeat world Socialism altogether.

But such ideas are a great illusion and those who believe them are living in a fool's paradise. American capitalism is cut from the same cloth as the capitalism of other countries and it is subject to basically

the same disintegrating inner contradictions. If American capitalism is still strong, while the rest of world capitalism is gravely sick, this is simply because this country's capitalism enjoys certain advantages that protect it temporarily. The system here is blessed with unusually great natural resources, and its favorable geographical position enabled it to escape the deadly ravages of the two world wars. In fact, the United States waxed fat on these wars.

But even in the midst of the present artificial and feverish "prosperity" there lurks widespread the well-founded fear that once the present war-begotten industrial activity has run its course the United States will be plunged into an economic crisis far more ruinous even than the one that began in 1929. That is, we are surely in for such a crisis unless our Wall Street warmongers in the meantime succeed in flinging our country into an atomic war that would smash us altogether.

In an attempt to stall off the coming economic crisis, the Truman policy has become what the professors designate as that of a "managed economy," and which President Truman ignorantly calls "planned economy." The general idea of all this was borrowed from the British economist, the late Sir John Maynard Keynes.

The theory of this system is that by checking both inflationary and deflationary tendencies through various financial devices, economic crises can be averted. In carrying out this "managed economy" policy the government is trying to build up barriers against a deflationary crash by such economic measures as the Marshall Plan, the export of capital to backward areas (Truman's Inaugural Address idea), and especially the manufacture of huge supplies of war munitions. All this scheme boils down to is the expansion of state monopoly capitalism and to the establishment of a war economy in this country, which fits right in with Wall Street's program of world conquest. Its whole pressure is toward war.

Americans generally do not realize the great extent to which American industry, during the past 35 years has been dependent upon war for its so-called prosperity. It has, in fact, literally fed on the blood of the millions who died in the two great world wars. Our industrial system (and the big capitalists who own it) grew fat and bloated on World Wars I and II, until now it is swollen to the bursting point, with no chance whatever of disposing of its products in normal capitalist

markets. So we are asked to feed this capitalist monster on more and more war orders.

This is the most decisive reason why the Wall Street leaders of our government systematically cultivate the war-scare against the U.S.S.R. For they know that if that war-scare should die down and they were no longer able to get billions and billions in munitions orders from the Government, then their sick industrial system would collapse overnight into a terrific economic crisis.

The other basic reason why they have the war-scare in their business (and the two reasons are tightly bound together) is that without such a war hysteria they could never build up the great war machine that is absolutely indispensable in their drive to master the world. That is why the Truman Administration, carrying out the dictates of Wall Street, is opposed on principle to peaceful collaboration with the Soviet Union. Such policies, if left unchanged by the American people, lead straight to devastating war.

But Truman's "managed economy" scheme, which is a means of giving the trusts more power and is just a war economy with a fancy name, will not succeed in averting the economic crisis. The government's expenditures for these imperialistic schemes, amounting to a huge militarization of this country and a perspective of war, cannot possibly offset economically the effect of the wholesale robbery of the workers and the American people by the capitalists. Consequently, mass purchasing power falls farther and farther behind producing power. The result will finally be overproduction on an immense scale, with gigantic mass unemployment.

Signs of the coming crisis are multiplying on every hand. Capitalism in Europe is ruined economically, politically and physically, and that is the fate reserved for world capitalism in general, including capitalism in the United States.

The people of this country, like so many others, will eventually have to adopt Socialism in order to solve their multiplying problems. There is no other way. The private ownership of the industries and natural resources and their exploitation for the benefit of parasitic capitalist owners who perform no useful social function whatever, must give way to the system of Socialism, in which all the social means of production are owned democratically by the people and operated in their interest.

The rich American capitalists, true to the instinct of every obsolete ruling class to hang on to its power as long as it can, will use every means, violent and otherwise, to defeat advancing Socialism. Their present attempt to plunge the world into an anti-Socialist war that might cost several hundred million lives and wreck our country, shows how far they will go with violence against Socialism and democracy.

Socialism is the inevitable climax of the class struggle. The capitalist contention that there are no classes and no class struggle in the United States, that these are merely figments of Marxist imagination, are, of course, silly. Here, as in all other capitalist countries, there are well-defined social classes and a constant struggle is going on among them over the division of the toilers' products and for political control.

In this country we have a clearly marked capitalist class, the wealthiest, strongest, and most arrogant in the world. We also have a vast, variegated middle class. There is likewise a farmer class, with several gradations from poor to rich. And finally, there is the great class of workers, men and women, who toil all their lives in the industries, who were born in working class families and who fully expect to die as workers. Each of these classes has its own definite viewpoint, and a more or less active struggle goes on among them constantly to improve their respective class positions. The main and decisive clash is between the workers and the capitalists.

All this constitutes the class struggle, and it is as American as Plymouth Rock. The progress of the class struggle, with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, can only lead in the United States, as in other lands, to the growth of class consciousness among the workers, to the strengthening of their economic and political organizations, to the solidifying of their alliances with other democratic strata of the population, and finally, to the establishment of Socialism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the political form in the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism. This scientific Marxist term has been grossly misused and distorted by enemies of the workers. Reduced to its simplest terms, it simply means the rule of the workers. Under capitalism, in the United States as elsewhere, there exists the rule of the capitalists, or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The basic difference between these two systems, however, is that the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is exercised by the relatively small

employing class to repress and exploit the working class, against the interests of society as a whole. Whereas, the dictatorship of the proletariat is exercised in behalf of the overwhelming mass of the people, to prevent exploitation of man by man, and in the general interests of society.

The Communist Party is the political leader of the dictatorship, not the dictatorship itself, which is the rule of the working class. As Stalin points out (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 31): "the dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle – sanguinary and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative – against the forces and traditions of the old society." It is the means by which the workers and their allies clear away the economic and political remnants of capitalism and lay the foundations of the new, free society.

The dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, especially in this period of the decline of capitalism, is highly reactionary and its ultimate expression is brutal, tyrannical, imperialist, war-making fascism. The dictatorship of the proletariat, or the rule of the workers and their democratic allies, on the other hand, is the world standard bearer of democracy.

As Lenin said, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a thousand times more democratic than any capitalist democracy. Its ultimate goal is Communism, under which system the classes will disappear and so, also, the State.

The Soviet Union, with its one-party system, is a dictatorship of the proletariat. The new democracies of Eastern and Central Europe – Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc., – with their coalition governments, are also essentially functioning as proletarian dictatorships. The United States, too, will undoubtedly produce its own effective form of the rule of the working class when it eventually adopts Socialism.

The supreme task of the Communist Party and its democratic allies, along with their daily support of the immediate demands of the people, and this is fundamental Communist program both here and abroad, is to bring about the inevitable transition from capitalism to Socialism in the most peaceful and orderly way, and with as little violence as possible on the part of the obsolete capitalist ruling class. In view of this peace-loving policy, to call the Communist Party a party of force and violence is to ignore the most obvious realities of Communist theory and practice.

The establishment of Socialism will complete the cycle of revolutions which the United States and other countries are inevitably



passing through in their advance from lower to higher stages of society. With the power of the capitalists finally eliminated and with Socialism definitely established, the road will then be wide open for the peaceful evolution of society to its highest stage, Communism,

These are, in general, the working elements of Communist policy. It is political chicanery to assert that they constitute a program of the forceful overthrow of the United States Government. And it is just plain silly to allege, as the Prosecutor does, that they add up to a detailed "blueprint" application of Russian revolutionary experiences of 1917 here in the United States.

## 10. The general political line of the American Communist Party

---

The Communist Party of the United States, in the present critical world situation, holds that its great task, in cooperation with all other peace forces, is to warn and unite the American people against the deadly war perils into which its rulers, the big monopolists, are leading our country and the world. This is fully in line with its basic program for peace, democracy, and Socialism. It is characteristic united front policy, whose development I have been tracing.

The Party finds that its supreme job is to mobilize the American people in struggle against the big capitalist fascists and warmongers. This task is all the more urgent because the bulk of the trade union leaders, saturated with a capitalist ideology, are servilely repeating all the warmongers' slogans and are stupidly following their imperialist line.

The Communist Party, which refuses to accept the inevitability of fascism or war, will continue to fulfill its historic duty of fighting against fascism and warmongers, regardless of the many persecutions that are being increasingly heaped upon its members and leaders.

That Wall Street imperialism would launch its present drive for world conquest, our Party foresaw long ago. Thus, as far back as March, 1941, in a pamphlet entitled, *World Capitalism and World Socialism*, expressing our Party's policy, I wrote the following:

*"Great Britain and the United States, on the other side of the war lineup, are also seeking to take firmly in hand the decaying capitalist system. They are building a great Anglo-American war alliance with which they seek to dominate the whole world to their joint sway. They hope that after the war has ended victoriously for them they will be able, with their great wealth and resources, to set everything right again in the interests of the fascist-minded bankers who control both great empires. American imperialism, with characteristic greed, is aiming to make Great Britain the junior partner in this world alliance."*

The foregoing is what is now actually happening in the world. It is a course that bodes ill for the American people, as well as for the rest of the world. There are those who, under the spell of the warmongers' jingoistic slogans, believe that an American war against the Soviet

Union would be a sort of a minor punitive expedition on our part, and that after this not too difficult job were finished by dropping a few atomic bombs on Russian cities, the United States would be sitting on top of the world, to the eternal glory and prosperity of its people. But this is all a hideous illusion. The course of Wall Street imperialism is the course of misery and disaster for the American people.

Wall Street imperialism, by loading our people up with gigantic armament expenditures, is slashing living standards and sending the cost of living soaring. This inflationary situation, bred of our war economy, will eventually culminate in a deep economic crisis. The expansionist drive of Wall Street imperialism is also hastening the trend toward fascism here – for if United States imperialism is to carry on a reactionary policy abroad, if it is to pile up its fabulous war profits, it must have a reactionary regime in this country.

Features of this fascist development, the products of Wall Street's war policy, are the Taft-Hartley slave labor law; the loyalty test for government employees, teachers, and newspapermen; the growing attacks upon Negroes, Jews, and foreign-born; the scandalous campaigns of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; the attempted passage of the Mundt police state bill; the wild anti-Red hysteria now raging; the attempt to jail Communist leaders and to outlaw our Party, etc.

We need no further proof of the attack upon American democracy than the present trial of the Communist leaders, which is an outrage to our national democratic traditions. But even worse than all the foregoing, Wall Street's imperialism, if not halted by the American people, will lead our country into an atomic war that would butcher tens of millions of our people, utterly devastate our country, and even threaten the very existence of our planet.

Such a war as Wall Street is planning would surely be a lost war for us. In World War I the United States, coming in late, had to do but little real fighting. Great Britain, France, and Russia bore the brunt of that war. In World War II it was pretty much the same, with the Soviet Union doing far more fighting than all the other Allies combined.

But if there is to be a World War III the American people would have to do the real fighting for Wall Street, as little or no help for years to come, if ever, could be expected from such broken-down countries as France, Italy, Germany, Japan, Spain, etc. Even Great Britain, lost in economic difficulties, could give only limited assistance, if any. The United States could not win the projected war

under such conditions. The statement of the Chinese Communist Party, quoted earlier, forecasts what would happen.

In the American people's desire for peace they would be naive to expect help from the Republican or Democratic Parties. Both of these parties are controlled by the trusts, lock, stock, and barrel. The Democratic Party, for all practical purposes, has become indistinguishable from the Republican Party. Those trade union leaders who supported Truman in the elections, no less than those who backed Dewey, thereby betrayed the interests of the working class and of the whole American people. They acted as bell-wethers to lure the masses into the traps of their worst enemies, the great capitalists of Wall Street of whom both Truman and Dewey are only office boys. Mr. Truman got himself elected by making demagogic promises, mimicking much of the program of the Progressive Party. Such parties as the Socialist Party, the Liberal Party and the Trotskyite party, with their hypocritical pretense of making an advocacy of peace, join with the warmongers in their unscrupulous attack upon the U.S.S.R.

Only the Progressive Party and the Communist Party are making a real fight for peace.

If the United States is to be put firmly on the path of peace, democracy, and general well-being, the power of the big monopolists who dominate our country must be curbed, and finally broken. To accomplish these ends our Party advocates the course of political development outlined below. This policy is in harmony with the general political line of Communism and with the united front tactics that are characteristic for the masses in the fascism-breeding period in which we live.

In good time the American people will decide how they will introduce Socialism, but this outline gives our conception as to how things may develop. No person acquainted with this perspective and policy can honestly call it an advocacy of force and violence, nor an attempted "blueprint" of the Russian Revolution.

First: We propose the election of a democratic government based on a broad united front coalition of workers, farmers, Negroes, professionals, small business men and other elements willing to fight against monopoly, fascism, and war. The outcome of the November elections demonstrated that the great masses of our nation favor more or less this general type of progressive program. Such a united front government could well have behind it an overwhelming majority of

the American people. The old Roosevelt coalition, until it was broken up by President Truman's betrayal of the New Deal policies, had features of this general composition. The aim of the new Progressive Party, led by Henry A. Wallace, is for a reorganization of the bulk of the old Roosevelt forces on the basis of the struggle against fascism and war.

Eventually the great masses of toilers, of all anti-imperialist, anti-fascist elements, will have to break with the crippling two-party system and apply independent political action. They will finally learn the futility of supporting reactionaries like Truman and will come together on a general coalition basis along the lines we suggest.

The following quotations, from reports of Gene Dennis, General Secretary, Communist Party U.S.A., indicate how our Party in the postwar years has stated the general question of a coalition democratic government in this country:

*"The main objective of the labor-democratic camp in the 1948 elections must be to defeat the candidates and the program of the reactionaries and pro-fascists. It must be to establish a democratic coalition and new political alignment capable of electing a progressive, pro-Roosevelt presidential ticket and Congress which will vigorously champion an anti-monopoly and anti-war program, which will take bold steps to grapple with the problems of jobs, security, democratic rights, and peace."* (Report to National Committee, Dec. 3, 1946.)

"For a people's government that will advance the cause of peace, security, and democracy! For an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly people's government!

*"What is projected in this slogan, it should be made clear, is a political objective that reflects the united front program which is bringing into a broad coalition all the democratic and anti-imperialist forces, including the present third-party movement. Such a people's government as here projected, in terms of American realities today, as regards both the objective factors and the forces comprising the people's coalition and third-party movement, would not be of the level of development of the new people's democracies in Europe. For, such a government on the American scene in the immediate period ahead would set itself as the main immediate task the drastic curbing of the monopolies, but its political level would not yet present it with the task of breaking the rule of the monopolies and thereby effecting the*

*transition to Socialism,"* (Report to the National Committee, Feb. 3, 1948.)

(Note: The emphasis above is in the original.)

Second: Our Party holds that such an anti-fascist, anti-war democratic coalition, once in political office, would be compelled to move forward and to take effective measures to curb and break the power of the monopolies. Such anti-monopoly measures it would have the full legal right to adopt and to enforce, as would any other duly constituted government. Confronted with the sabotage and open resistance of big capital, such a government, unless it took these decisive measures, could not continue to live, much less put even a limited progressive program into effect.

History teaches us clearly that big business would not hesitate to overthrow it by armed force if it could, as the Spanish Republic was overthrown.

The new united front democratic government would, therefore, be forced to enact far-reaching policies of nationalization of the banks and industries, the break-up of big land-holdings, the introduction of the beginnings of a planned economy, the elimination of reactionary elements from industry, the army, the schools, etc., as well as various measures to strengthen the working class as the leading progressive force of the nation. The economic, political, military, and social strongholds of monopoly capital would have to be destroyed. In these deep-cutting measures the government would imperatively need the militant backing of the trade unions, the workers' parties, and other democratic peoples' organizations.

Third: Such a democratic, anti-fascist, anti-war government, under the violent attacks of the capitalists and under the progressive pressure of the masses, would necessarily move toward Socialism.

Many liberals believe that this type of government would introduce in this country a system of "progressive capitalism," but we Communists consider this idea to be a political impossibility. Capitalism is now in its monopoly stage and is hopelessly reactionary.

A truly democratic government, unless it were to fail and be crushed under the violent attacks of big business, would have no alternative but to develop into the general type of government now existing in a number of countries of Eastern and Central Europe and known as People's Democracy. This new kind of government, in

which the basic economic system is controlled by the people, the power of monopoly capital is shattered, and the working class is the leading class, is one which definitely tends to orientate toward building Socialism, and not toward patching up obsolete capitalism.

Socialism in the United States naturally would have some specific American characteristics. However, it would embody the socialization of all the social means of production and distribution, the carrying on a planned production for use instead of for profit, with the Government under the acknowledged leadership of the working class. Only with such a system, with the exploitation of man by man completely abolished, will American society finally be freed of the fascism, poverty, economic chaos, and warmongering that are increasingly menacing our country as well as other lands.

All these Socialist measures would, naturally, be legally adopted by the people's democratically elected government, by the People's Democracy, despite employer resistance, whatever its form and violence.

In my book, *The New Europe*, published in May, 1947, I stated our general political perspective in a nutshell, as follows, on page 128:

*"Organized labor here must commence to think decisively of curbing, and eventually breaking, the power of the monopolies; of nationalizing the banks and key industries; of establishing by democratic action the new type of people's democracy in the United States."*

The Draft Resolution of our recent National Convention, as presented by our National Committee and published in the *Daily Worker* of May 30, 1948, develops this Socialist perspective further, as follows:

*"The special path along which the transition to Socialism will proceed will be determined by the democratic choice and struggles of the American working class and its popular allies on the basis of the concrete conditions in the United States."*

While proceeding upon this general line of the election of a united front coalition government in this country and of the adoption of Socialist legislation by an eventual People's Front Government of workers and other democratic masses, we Communists, in full harmony with the lessons taught us long ago by Lenin about employer violence, understand quite well that this people's coalition, at all stages

of its development, will have to face violent opposition from the monopolists and their hangers-on.

The whole history of the American class struggle, which is full of examples of employers' violence in strikes and in other struggles of the people, teaches this lesson with unmistakable clarity. To realize what is ahead in this respect, all that one has to do is look at the reckless attacks that were made against the moderate Wallace movement during the 1948 election campaign. One can imagine the frenzy and desperation of the capitalist forces if a broad, advanced coalition party were strong enough really to menace big business' control of the Presidency and its majority in Congress. Such a party could be elected only in the face of violent capitalist attacks.

Although the capitalists are not now seriously threatened by any broad mass political movement in the United States, they are nevertheless taking time by the forelock by systematically undermining American political democracy and making it more and more difficult for the masses of the people to register their strength in a democratic manner. They want to make peaceful democratic action impossible, as it now is in Spain, for example. They are driving toward fascism, a system under which legal democratic political action is out of the question and the class struggle, even over questions of reform, becomes a violent battle for political power.

But the United States, although its civil liberties are being daily whittled away, is by no means at the stage of fascism. Nor do we Communists consider fascism inevitable in this country. The vote in the Presidential elections was a justification of our faith in the democratic strength of the American people. It showed a strong anti-war sentiment among the masses, but, of course, this sentiment did not yet strike at the heart of capitalism.

The people of the United States are in for some very bitter and enlightening political experiences in the near future. The developing economic crisis, and also the war, if the warmongers should dare to plunge us into a World War III, with its horrible hardships and disasters, would be bound to free the American people from many conservative illusions and to ready them for more progressive programs.

Then, it may well be asked, what resistance will American capitalism be able to make when the great masses of people in this country finally decide, as they surely will, to establish Socialism?



Today American capitalism is strong; but not as strong as it appears to be. It is the world bully and is busy organizing civil wars in various countries and in arming itself and other capitalist countries for another world war.

But what will its power of resistance to Socialism be when, as may be likely, the vast bulk of the rest of the world has "gone Socialist," when its own foreign markets have largely dried up, when it is undermined by economic crises, when it may have just about wrecked itself by its projected world war, when its working class has developed a Marxist-Leninist ideology and sets out to establish Socialism?

It may well turn out that it will be far easier for the American working class, in the midst of an overwhelmingly Socialist world, to establish Socialism in this country than now appears to be the case, with American capitalism now at its peak of strength. Who can foretell these things? Certainly we Marxist-Leninists do not indulge in such prophecy.

Our Party's political line is based upon the assumption that it is possible in the United States, in a crucial economic and political situation, for the broad masses of the people, militantly led by the trade unions and a strong mass political party, to elect a coalition, anti-fascist, anti-imperialist government. Whether this possibility will last in the face of the dangerous fascist trends in this country, however, is problematical.

But ruling class violence and abolition of democratic procedures cannot permanently halt the advance to Socialism in this country or anywhere else. Such a democratic coalition government as we propose, once it had won power under favorable political conditions, would have the intelligence, the strength, and the legal right to do what Lincoln's government did (and what the ill-fated Spanish Republican Government failed to do), namely, to take all necessary measures to defend the peoples interests and to protect itself from the violent attacks of the capitalist counter-revolution. In this process, such a government would eventually develop into a People's Democracy, which would move inevitably toward the ultimate goal of Socialism.

This is the general political line of the Communist Party of the United States. This is how we look toward the future. Obviously, this policy does not advocate the forceful overthrow of the Government of

the United States. Obviously, too, it is not dictated by "blueprint" copying of the experiences of the Russian Revolution.

The Prosecution, therefore, cannot honestly charge us with advocating force and violence; either in our theory, or in our practice; either under our Party's tactical line before the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935, or under the tactical line that we are following during the present period of our struggle against fascism and war.

So far as the initiative and responsibility of our Party are concerned, we have a political program for peaceful and democratic progress. Whatever violence may occur in the course of the struggle to curb and eventually break the power of the monopolies, which are the menace of present-day civilization, will be originated and engineered by the capitalists, not by the Communists.

The review that I have made of Communist theory and policies in action – over the past generation and in various countries – proves the basic correctness of the propositions of Lenin and other Communist leaders in the general respect of the force and violence issue in this trial, which may be summed up as follows:

(a) The very heart of Communist strategy and tactics, in defending the workers' and the people's daily interests and in fighting for their ultimate goal of Socialism, is to follow the most peaceful and democratic course possible in the given situation. All over the world the Communists are the most resolute defenders of peace and democracy.

(b) Everywhere, operating upon the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles, Communists flexibly develop their policies in accordance with the specific conditions and the interests of their peoples in their respective countries. They have no "blueprints" whatsoever.

(c) The capitalists, faced by a resolute and determined working class with its allies who are following a course that leads to real democracy and Socialism, will surely use all the power at their control to suppress prevailing democratic procedures and to smash the movement by violence.

(d) But capitalist violence cannot defeat Socialism. The people's right of revolution cannot be denied. If a peaceful path to Socialism is open to the people that is the road they will always take. But if capitalist reaction and violence forces them to fight for Socialism, then fight they will, and as history shows, successfully. The future belongs

to Socialism, and capitalism, with all its violence against progress, cannot possibly change the main course of history.

In tracing Communist policy through the past generation (a course which has been made necessary by the Prosecution's bringing in of documents and experiences, in distorted forms, relating to this whole period) I have demonstrated, among other vital facts:

(a) that the violence in the Russian Revolution came from the reactionary forces and that the Bolsheviks were quite ready, and sought for, a peaceful development to Socialism;

(b) that with the rise of world fascism, the Communists, beginning with the Seventh Comintern Congress in 1935, developed their general policies in the sense that all through this period they have operated on the assumption that it was possible in democratic capitalist countries, including the United States, to elect leftward moving united front, coalition democratic governments;

and (c) that even now, although the people's movements are everywhere under the heaviest attacks and provocations from aggressive American imperialism, the Communists are still supporting the election of people's front governments.

In view of the foregoing facts, it constitutes a dangerous attack upon the Bill of Rights and the whole body of American democracy, to indict our Party upon the ridiculous charge of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the American Government by force and violence.

The whole business is a monstrous lie and frameup. The only way the defendants could possibly be found guilty of this charge would be by disregarding the plain facts of Communist political reality here and abroad and by surrendering to the clamors of the Red-baiters and warmongers.

This trial presents a situation in which the Jury, displaying political courage in defense of the most basic principles of democracy, must needs bring in a verdict of *Not Guilty*. The whole democratic world would hail such a decision as a major victory for American democracy.

We Communists stand before this Court in full confidence of the justice of our cause. We have frankly stated our policy and our perspectives. We are fighting in the best interests of the American people. We are confident as to the final result of our struggle.

Whatever may be the outcome of this particular trial, we will, in the end, be justified by the course of political events, by the American

masses, and by the peoples of the world. We are fighting on the side of history. Big capitalist reactionaries can never save their doomed capitalist system and defeat Socialism by persecuting Communists, by outlawing the Communist Party, by robbing the people of their hard-won constitutional rights, by increasing the exploitation of the workers, by plunging the world into fascism and war.