



By
PETTIS PERRY

WHITE CHAUVINISM

and the STRUGGLE for

PEACE

WHITE CHAUVINISM
and the STRUGGLE *for*
PEACE

By PETTIS PERRY

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS: 1952

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

PETTIS PERRY, the author of this pamphlet, is one of the foremost leaders of the Communist Party and of the Negro people. He is presently under indictment and facing trial, together with 16 co-defendants, under the provisions of the infamous Smith Act.

He is the author of numerous articles which have appeared in *Political Affairs*, *Masses & Mainstream*, and other periodicals, dealing with fundamental aspects of the Negro question, problems of the farmers, etc.

White Chauvinism and the Struggle for Peace is reprinted from the October, 1951, issue of *Political Affairs* in which it appeared under the title: "Certain Prime Aspects of the Negro Question."

The drawing of Mr. Perry which appears on the cover is the work of the distinguished Negro artist, Edward Strickland.

WHITE CHAUVINISM *and the*
STRUGGLE *for* PEACE

White Chauvinism and the Struggle for Peace

By PETTIS PERRY

THIS is the first time since the 15th National Convention held at the end of 1950 that we have placed for serious consideration on the agenda of the leading committees of the Party some basic aspects of the Negro question.

In preparation for this report—which I wish I could have made more adequate—I re-read most of our Convention documents on the Negro question, including the main Resolution and the excellent Report of Comrade Ben Davis, “The Negro People in the Struggle for Peace and Freedom.”

In the course of this reading the question arose in my mind, in what concrete way could I contribute to furthering and implementing this fundamental policy of the Party? I concluded that perhaps I should elab-

orate on certain aspects of this policy in the light of developments since the Convention, and endeavor to clarify some of the points regarding which there is still considerable confusion in our ranks. I also concluded to propose to this National Committee that we insist with all vigor that the whole Party, on every organization level, re-study the Convention Reports and deliberations.

For, why should it be necessary to re-discuss and explain anew the line of our Party? Is it not clear that the line of the Party projected at the Convention is being confirmed in life day by day? I could arrive at but one conclusion: the important Convention documents had either not been read at all, or had been read and “shelved” without the study they required in order to be translated into action.

DEVELOPMENTS AT HOME AND ABROAD

Before attempting to deal with some of the questions demanding clarification which have arisen in the recent period, let me point to a few developments on the domestic and foreign scenes.

Since our Convention, seven innocent Negro men in Martinsville have been put to death; the six-year old fight to save the life of Willie McGee was lost and McGee was "legally" murdered; Edward Honeycutt, another victimized Negro, has been executed in Louisiana. And what of the countless other victims of police violence and court frame-ups who have been murdered, maimed, jailed, under the legal sanction of racist white supremacy?

Since our Convention, we have witnessed growing Ku Klux Klan terror. Recall if you will the outrage of Cicero that took place on July 10-12. Organized hoodlums under the eyes of the law enforcement officers let loose mob violence against Mr. and Mrs. Harvey E. Clark to prevent them from moving into their newly acquired apartment. In a number of towns in Georgia, Alabama, California, and other states, K.K.K. burning crosses have shot up their evil flames to terrorize the Negro community. In early September of this year, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Davis of Pittsburgh found the K.K.K. sign smeared on their home: "Negroes

Beware"—of course, it did not use the word "Negro." Both Mr. Davis and Mr. Clark, it should be borne in mind, are veterans of World War II. During this period, also, Mr. and Mrs. John Lewis, in Pittsburgh, were treated to the same kind of outrage.

And in these pro-fascist attacks, the minions of the law are either silent or flagrant partners of the Ku Klux Klan. Can anything be more repulsive than what the Grand Jury did in Cicero? Instead of indicting the hoodlums, the Ku Klux Klaners, it indicted three Negroes, including the Negro attorney of the Clark family, and two white progressives who took their stand against this white supremacist attack. All of this, at a time when the Federal Government has seen fit to indict Communist Party leaders on the charge of conspiring to overthrow the government by force and violence! Can there be anything more monstrously hypocritical?

Since our Convention, too, the drive of U.S. imperialism toward war and fascism has alarmingly advanced. This drive to war for world domination, with its Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Pact, which has turned country after country in Western Europe and in this hemisphere into vassal states of Wall Street, has as an additional major aim the strangling of the liberation movements in Asia. This is highlighted by the U.S. interventionist

war in Korea, its aggressive acts against the People's Democratic Republic of China, and its hurried conclusion of the war-plot "peace" treaty with Japan.

WHITE CHAUVINISM AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Our Convention noted in its Resolution that the direct military aggression of U.S. imperialism against the colored peoples of Asia was accompanied by intensified national oppression of the Negro people at home, that the colonial world liberation movement against Anglo-American imperialism was merging with a new upsurge of the Negro masses in which the Negro workers were playing an ever more conscious and militant role. The Resolution thus declared:

The beginning of the merger of the Negro liberation struggle with the world colonial upsurge is expressed in the growing moral and political unity of the colored peoples of the world against the racist, Jim Crow policies of U.S. imperialism, the fountain head of white chauvinism. . . .*

The Resolution with particular sharpness emphasized that:

The direct military aggression of U.S. imperialism against Korea and China is accompanied at home by the fostering of chauvinist nationalism and white chauvinism against oppressed colored peoples all over the world.

Hence the danger to the Negro people here at home is enormously increased. White chauvinism today merges with the drive toward fascism. White chauvinism is a racist ideology—one of the main weapons of the white imperialist ruling class in its drive to war.

Yet, in the face of the acute sharpening of this situation in the course of 1951, we still encounter in the ranks of the Party confused notions that the fight for the correct line of the Party on the Negro question at this time "interferes" with the fight for peace. In conjunction with this, many comrades peddle the idea, as preposterous as it is dangerous, that the fight against white chauvinism at the present time would "alienate" us from the broad democratic coalition we are anxious to build in the life of our country.

Can we for a single moment entertain the thought that there is a conflict between the fight for Negro rights and the fight for peace? It is an indisputable fact that there is a close affinity between the oppressed Negro people of this country and the newly liberated 475 million peoples of China, that there are common bonds, born of common suffering and common aspirations for freedom, on the part of the 15 million Negroes in the United States and the 380 million people of India, the 180 million people of Africa, the 150 million people of Latin America, the 70 million people of Indonesia, and the many millions of other peoples, of

* *Political Affairs*, January, 1951.

Asia, in their struggle against U.S. imperialism, and against imperialism in general. Therefore, the mobilization of the Negro people along the lines of peace and freedom is a powerful weapon that the peace and labor forces in this country should seize upon and develop to the highest possible level.

How can it be seriously maintained that the fight against a Jim Crow army in the United States contradicts the peace fight? Who does not know that in America there are two armies in one, a Negro army and a white army which is called the American army? No one recognizes this more fully than the imperialist bourgeoisie itself. It is for this reason that Negro reformists from the *Pittsburgh Courier* and from the *Afro-American* have been touring every single army camp throughout the North for the last three or four months supposedly to publicize, which to a certain extent they do, the existence of Jim Crowism in the army. But at the same time the main concentration of these papers is to try to find some modification, however slight, of the Jim Crow practices. It is for this reason that we learn that occasionally in this or that camp Negro and white soldiers eat together, or that this or that company is a mixed company.

Now, while all this may have some factual basis, a few things remain to be said: First, we Communists cannot, do not and will not accept the standpoint of gradualism.

That one or another regiment consists of Negro and white soldiers is in itself important; but the facts are that this is the result of a long bitter struggle on the part of the Negro people for over three hundred years. Further is the fact that this was not the gratuitous gift of the Truman Administration. All that this concession proves is that if the Negro masses and their white allies unite in struggle, gains can be won and that even a final victory over reaction is possible. In this light we have to view the appointment of a Bunche, a Hastie, an Edith Sampson. While avoiding a negative, narrow, sectarian view of such concessions, we must not take a laudatory position, and above all not a position that is tantamount to saying that the Negroes are thereby being liberated. *As a matter of fact, if the bourgeoisie were to appoint a Negro every day, 365 days a year, holidays and all, it would take fifteen million days to appoint fifteen million Negroes to freedom. Breaking this down in terms of years, that would amount to forty thousand years. The Negro people have no such patience.*

But to continue on the theme of the relationship of the Negro people's struggle to the fight for peace, we must again ask: Will the fight to eliminate Jim Crow in the armed forces conflict with the peace movement? It will not only strengthen it insofar as rallying the Negro people in the fight for peace, which is in

itself of first-rate importance; it will also heighten the understanding of the broad peace forces as to the whole character of the war- and pro-fascist drive of U.S. imperialism, and thus help bring consistency and determination to the peace movement. And what the Negro people themselves will bring in terms of militancy and persistence is of the greatest significance to the peace camp.

The Negro people in this country occupy a strategic position relative to the working class within the country and therefore to the forces of progress as a whole. There is a greater percentage of industrial workers among Negroes in the United States than there are among any nationally oppressed people in the whole world, including not only Africa, but also India. These Negro proletarians, as our Resolution notes, are becoming more and more politically conscious, organizationally and politically more influential, both in the labor movement and in the Negro people's movement. Furthermore, unlike India, which is eight thousand miles from the "metropolitan" British working class, or Africa, which is far removed from Europe, in this country the Negro working masses labor side by side with the white workers, in many cases belonging to the same unions, in a few cases sharing leadership in these unions, and generally having sympathizers among the white population. These factors create tremendous possibili-

ties for the Negro people to attract to its side broad masses of the white workers and other sectors of the white population. An additional significant fact is that the subject Negro nation in the Black Belt exists within the geographical confines of the oppressor nation, the strongest imperialist nation the world has ever seen.

How much more difficult it is for the average Britisher who seldom goes to India, or Africa, and rarely sees an Indian or an African, to understand the character of colonial oppression than it is for the white people living, for example, in a city where tens of thousands of Negroes live, where the people of the white oppressor nation are able to see with their own eyes the horrendous ghetto conditions in which the Negro people reside, to see Negroes excluded from jobs, to see them insulted, terrorized and lynched. This close proximity of white and Negro workers makes for the strengthening of class ties, aids the development of the Negro people-labor alliance, and is of strong advantage to the peace forces in this country.

To turn now to a further aspect of this question. Is it against the interests of the peace movement to struggle to end once and for all job discrimination against Negroes in industry? Is it against the interests of the peace movement to conduct the sharpest struggle against fascist

attacks on the Negro people? Decidedly not!

Rather, the question has to be put as follows: Can the Negro masses in their great majority be won to the peace movement by wholesale capitulation to white chauvinism and in many cases by its actual practice? *There is no surer way to alienate the Negro people.*

The Negro people can be attracted in their great majority to the struggle for peace only if and when the broad peace movement begins to champion some of their burning demands. The last World Peace Congress declared, "As long as there is race discrimination, there can be no peace in this world." This declaration is an indispensable guiding principle for the peace forces of this country as of the rest of the world.

It is almost inconceivable that white progressives and, even more, white workers, can approach their task in the cause of peace, which involves the struggle for international solidarity, proletarian internationalism, without meeting this task first of all in solidarity with the Negro people.

The Negro question is a national question that has world-wide import. There is nothing more embarrassing today for U.S. imperialism posing as world "democratic" leader than the thorny problem of Jim Crow at home. Every newspaper and magazine, every avenue of high-powered propaganda has been called into

service to explain away the Negro question, to straighten out the "rough edges," because of the growing alarm at the world-wide resentment against this "American way of life." In their notorious manner of seeking to deny truth that embarrasses, the defenders and apologists of white supremacy resort, of course, to the demagogic cry of "Communist propaganda." Many Negro reformists, too, are urging: "Remove the inequalities so that the Communists will be left without a propaganda weapon."

But the stark, brute reality of white ruling class "democracy" lays bare at every turn the hideous lie of the "propaganda" charge. No Communist "fiction" but bourgeois fact was the speech, last September, of Thomas L. Hamilton, Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan, in Gaffney, South Carolina, delivered while a sheriff and ten state troopers stood around and listened, and while a thousand persons, according to the press, attended the open air rally. Here is what he said: "The first time Negroes enter white schools in this state, that is the time blood will flow in the streets. The Ku Klux Klan will shed blood to see segregation maintained in South Carolina." Hamilton played on the prejudices of his listeners by attacking the Negro people's struggle as "Communist." And he roared: "It is left up to you and me to do it. Communists must be stamped out if it takes every

man, woman and child in the country to do it" (*N. Y. Compass*, September 14, 1951).

Propaganda? Yes, the propagation of the truth of the national oppression of the Negro people—this is the charge that may truly be levelled at the Communists.

The bourgeoisie has raked up all its filth from the sewers, including the Trotzkyites, in the service of reactionary Negro reformists. Thus, Herbert Hill, a white Trotzkyite, unfortunately assistant field secretary of the N.A.A.C.P., wrote an article in *Crisis*, official publication of the organization, for the June-July issue of this year under the lying title, "The Communist Party, Enemy of Negro Equality." This diatribe has a foreword by Roy Wilkins, national administrator of the N.A.A.C.P., a Negro misleader. Hill purports to "prove" that the Communist Party is interested in the Negro people for purposes of "Moscow propaganda," and he reiterates the familiar fable that all the Party desires is to "use" the Negroes.

Rather than enter into polemics at this time with this gutter-journalism, let me state: If the Trotzkyites, if the Truman Administration, if the whole capitalistic class and its reformist leaders among the Negro people and the labor movement are worried about the Communists "making propaganda" out of the misery of the Negro people, I offer a single suggestion—that they forthwith guaran-

tee complete freedom to the Negro people, including self-determination for the Negro subject nation in the Black Belt. If then the Negro people refuse this freedom and decide to go back to plantation conditions and to live in ghettos and accept the denial of full-fledged citizenship—if this happens, then the Communist Party will be happy never to issue another piece of "propaganda" with respect to the Negro people.

What does all this show? It shows that the bourgeoisie fears the vitality of the Negro people's struggle and wants to deflect it into "safe" channels. But every interest and aspiration of the Negro people is directly contrary to the reactionary policy of U.S. imperialism.

Accordingly, the peace forces, unless and until they face up to this question, will never win the Negro masses—the broad sections of the Negro workers, the sharecroppers, the Negro farmers, in the fight for peace. And without this, the peace movement can never be an effective movement in the United States.

Needless to say, it is not incumbent on the peace movement to support the entire program for Negro national liberation. Indeed, none of the Negro organizations has such a program. But it is imperative that some of the basic questions in relation to the Negro people's struggle be tackled by the peace movement; and the Left-progressive forces—first of all, the Communists—have a duty

and responsibility, through patient teaching and persuasion, to bring the understanding of this position to broad sections of the whites. For example, the peace camp in general, and the Left forces in particular, should begin to raise in a new way the question of the fight against Jim Crow in the armed forces. It is insufficient to say that we are against Jim Crow in the armed forces. The time has come to speak in concrete terms: The abolition of Jim Crow in the army means among other things, the complete merging of Negro and white in every branch of the service without exception; the army should have Negro officers of every rank, including generals; Negro officers should not be limited to the command of Negro troops, and they are not simply to serve as advisers to white officers on how to handle Negroes, but they are to be officers in the full sense of the word, commanding officers of units and camps, in the North and South. Nothing short of this represents abolition of Jim Crow in the army.

THE PERSISTENCE OF WHITE CHAUVINISM

Are we plagued with white chauvinism, subtle and concealed, as our Resolution indicated? Yes, comrades, and in many forms. We have not only hidden and subtle chauvinism, but all too numerous evidences of open and crass white chauvinism. The most widespread expression of

white chauvinism today is the lack of sustained struggle for the rights of the Negro people. In all the months since the glorious struggles around Martinsville and McGee we have not seen any sustained mass struggle in any state on the part of the Party and the Left forces. Whatever struggle has taken place has been sporadic. This state of affairs must be changed. This serious situation has meant a deterioration in many places in the fight of the Party for its line on the Negro question.

It is reported that at the great peace conference in Chicago, many white progressives and even a few Communists were constantly complaining: "There are so many Negroes wherever you look. They are on all kinds of committees." What these people failed to see was that the large Negro attendance spelled the growing strength of the peace movement. They were blind to the meaning of participation by broad sections of the Negro people—including sharecroppers from the deep South. Instead they were "horrificed" that Negroes should play so leading a role in this broad movement.

A like situation obtains in many unions, mostly where Negro members play leading roles. In every such case so long as a Negro does not express an independent opinion or put up a fight for his view, he is a hero in the organization. But the moment a Negro trade-union leader takes an independent position a

whispering campaign starts, very often taking this form: "So-and-so is arrogant," or "So-and-so is a careerist, an opportunist." And what is ironical is that the white trade-union leaders who argue this way are more often than not the kingpins of opportunism, the apex of arrogance.

Actually what you have in this approach is that many white progressives, among them Communists, attempt to set themselves up as experts on the efficiency and integrity of Negro leadership. More often than not, it is these very people who are quite ready to rationalize the existing white chauvinism and to cover up for those white comrades and progressives who are most guilty of its practice. This condition exists in almost every union. The tendency goes so far that if two or three Negro trade-union functionaries go to lunch together, this is immediately regarded as evidence of "factionalism" or "bourgeois nationalism." Of course, these accusers think nothing of the fact that the white trade unionists not only lunch and dine together, but generally pal with one another, without the company of Negroes. In fact, these accusers constantly caucus among themselves about problems and policies affecting the Negro trade unionists. And just let anyone call this by its proper name—white chauvinism—then the wrath of God is let loose. This idea that Negro leaders must always say

"yes" to their white co-workers in order to remain in their good graces is nothing short of the attitude of the Southern white "liberal," no, worse, it borders on the attitude of the Southern plantation owner.

All too often, Party organizations and leaders receiving reports on what is taking place among the Negro masses, accept such reports as gospel, without so much as consulting the Negro comrades. That the comrades thus reporting—however good comrades they may be—and some are not above question—can have erred in their judgment is, of course, never given a thought. "Oh, he? Why he's been around for years. He is such a wonderful comrade." True, such a person may perhaps show a little bias, have a "little" anti-Negro feeling, express "some" anti-Semitism, but he is really a swell guy. "You see, he has been around for years." It would seem that merely because some of these people have "been around for years" they could not have grown stale, or fallen under all kinds of opportunist influences.

The present situation demands especially that we sharpen up the struggle against white chauvinism and heighten the fight for Negro rights. We must say categorically that there is absolutely nothing that the working class, the peace forces, any broad democratic coalition, or any movement for progress, can win in this country without the participation of the Negro people. Therefore, none

should think that the fight for Negro rights is a missionary act of "good will." The Negroes are not beggars. They are fighters and have no intention of accepting anything short of *complete* equality.

Certainly, the first place where the Negro people should expect to find this equality is among white progressives—first of all among Communists. Therefore, they have the right to expect to find no chauvinism, overt or hidden, in their relationship with Communist and Left forces. Only to the extent that white Communists and Left forces show by their own example that they are capable of inspiring this confidence among Negroes—the full confidence that here at last are the people cleansed of the filth of racist chauvinism—can they fulfill their responsibility of helping to weld the firm alliance of the working-class and progressive movements with the cause of Negro liberation. Without this, full unity of Negro and white is impossible.

THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST WHITE CHAUVINISM

There are those who utilize the present attacks upon the Party to say: "Well, you shouldn't expect us now to raise the issue of white chauvinism. After all, we need everybody we have." Of course, it is true. We need everybody we have. But it is also true that within the ranks of the Party we do not need opportun-

ists, we do not need white chauvinists. We need Marxists. We need those who will seriously try to understand the basic precepts of Marxism, to take some responsibility to become Marxists, to overcome chauvinist tendencies. We cannot apologize for white chauvinism, nor rationalize its manifestations with arguments about "the present situation." If anything, we must say, precisely because of the present situation, our Party and the Left forces must become more relentless in the struggle on this question. Our Resolution states that "white chauvinism is a fascist ideology, one of the main weapons of the white imperialist ruling class in its drive to war." How can this ideology be tolerated in our midst?

I think we should say that we were not sharp enough with a whole number of comrades when we launched the intense struggle against white chauvinism. In district after district, we have conducted discussions with a number of white comrades for a year or more, patiently endeavoring to make these comrades understand their white chauvinist behavior. But, frankly, such liberalism is seldom displayed with regard to Negroes who might deviate. It seems to me that those white comrades who fail over a long period to understand the Negro question, and above all those who refuse or fail to fight white chauvinism, have no place in the leadership of the Party on any level.

Some, indeed, have no place in our Party. We have to be categorical to that degree. At times we come across the argument, "Well, you can't do this because after all you would have to do it to everybody." That is not so. Our Party does not consist of white chauvinists. The overwhelming majority of our members can be rallied for the struggle against white chauvinism. In certain instances drastic action becomes necessary to strengthen the Party, to fortify our ranks in Marxist-Leninist theory and practice.

There may be a misconception of what is meant by education. Suppose, for instance, there were a strong anti-lynching law on the statute books providing the death penalty for lynchers and that such a law were enforced. This would be a dramatic form of education for the Southern white masses that would find its repercussions throughout the country. Or suppose there were a strong F.E.-P.C. law that would provide prison sentences with heavy fines for offending employers or union bureaucrats, and that this law were strictly enforced. There can be no doubt that this would be another dramatic form of education. It is in this light that we must understand disciplinary measures whenever applied to members of our Party. Once the explanation for such disciplinary action were made the full property of the Party—and the membership mobilized to support it—this would likewise be a

powerful educational weapon for the Party. The process of analyzing why a comrade committed the act of white chauvinism and why the Party adopted disciplinary measures would immeasurably clarify the whole issue. I must say, however, that disciplinary action is not the primary measure in the struggle against white chauvinism. The main weapon needs to be the ideological struggle and the mass political struggle expressing itself in an all-out fight on an ever higher level for the rights of the Negro people.

While saying this, however, we cannot tolerate the tendency—all too prevalent—of hesitating to apply organizational measures when necessary. Instances of such hesitancy are numerous. Thus, a white woman comrade was talking to a conservative white woman who said: "I have tried very hard, but I just cannot bring myself to the position of liking Negroes, no matter how hard I try." The comrade strangely agreed: "I am in the same position. I likewise have tried and I think it is disgraceful for white people socially to intermingle with Negroes. No matter what you say, Negroes are drunkards and irresponsible." This conversation was known by a number of Party members; yet no one thought it necessary to file charges and demand the immediate expulsion from our Party of a person voicing such K.K.K. ideology. Instead, the comrades confined themselves to whisper-

ing among one another, contenting themselves with the comment, "Isn't this terrible?" Their concern was to "save" this individual.

Let me give another example: In the course of a recent tour, I attended a meeting in a Negro church where Mrs. McGee spoke. The white comrades in attendance, in almost every case, were smoking. The Minister pleaded with them to refrain; some of the white comrades became indignant with the Minister and went out to the vestibule—still inside the church—to smoke. A young white woman comrade walked into the church in dirty overalls. When one of the Negro comrades criticized this behavior, a white woman comrade became the mediator, pleading: "Why, you don't have to be rough with people, you have to teach them."

Then, in another district, again with Mrs. McGee speaking, a Ku Kluxer, during her speech, said that all Negroes should be hanged. When this remark was heard by a white progressive, he demanded that the racist be expelled from the mass organization. This got a ready response from the Negro members, but when the matter was put to a vote it was the one white protester and the Negro bloc that voted for the expulsion, while the rest of the whites, including Communists, voted to defeat the motion.

Lenin, during the First World War, in fighting against social-chauvinism, had this to say:

Those who do not wish to see the most intimate and indissoluble connection that exists between social chauvinism and opportunism, pick up individual cases and accidents—this or that opportunist, they say, has become an internationalist, this or that radical, a chauvinist. But this argument is entirely non-essential as far as the development of *currents* is concerned. For one thing, the economic foundation of chauvinism and opportunism in the labor movement is the same: it is an alliance between the none too numerous upper strata of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, strata enjoying crumbs out of the privileges of "their" national capital as opposed to the masses of the proletarians, the masses of the workers and the oppressed in general. In the second place, the political ideology of both currents is the same. In the third place, the old divisions of Socialists into an opportunist and revolutionary wing characteristic of the period of the Second International (1889-1914), by and large corresponds to the new division into chauvinists and internationalists.*

The combatting of white chauvinism is intimately bound up with the entire struggle against Right opportunism, which reflects the ideological influences of the imperialists.

BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM

If the rise of chauvinism to its present high point is a direct concomitant of the whole war drive, it must be added that this chauvinism,

* V. I. Lenin, *The War and the Second International* (International Publishers), p. 41.

in turn, is bound to stimulate bourgeois nationalism. This nationalism on the part of the Negro bourgeoisie expresses itself in capitulation to the imperialist bourgeoisie. The imperialist bourgeoisie is resorting to unprecedented bribery, cajoling, and intimidation of sections of the Negro population. A portion of the Negro bourgeoisie has sold out to U.S. imperialism and is now peddling its war drive. One immediately thinks of such names as Lester Granger and Roy Wilkins, whose main job now is to hold back the Negro liberation movement with sundry demagogic devices.

Bourgeois nationalism, like other bourgeois ideologies, also finds reflection in our ranks. But is it correct to ascribe bourgeois nationalism to those comrades who militantly challenge white chauvinism within the Party? Clearly, not; for theirs is an act of proletarian internationalism. Yet it is this struggle of Negro comrades against chauvinism which is considered by some of our white comrades as bourgeois nationalism. How often we hear it said of Negro comrades that they are "over sensitive." Yet, if there is any service that our Negro comrades have rendered the Party it is precisely the sharp way in which they have raised the question of white chauvinism. This has helped to strengthen the consciousness and outlook of the Party on the whole Negro question.

It must be stated, however, that

bourgeois nationalism finds expression in the Party. Those Negro comrades who think that the question of white chauvinism should not be raised and adapt themselves fatalistically to its existence suffer from bourgeois nationalism. They express a complete lack of confidence in all whites, including white Communists, and evidence an attitude that the whites are incapable of understanding the Negro question. Bourgeois nationalism is often manifested by certain comrades who say: "We must do this alone; never mind the whites, we're disgusted with them." This is in essence a lack of confidence in the working class, in the Party. This is a lack of confidence in the science of Marxism-Leninism. The fact that such a position is often coupled with seemingly militant phrases does not at all cover up its essentially bourgeois nationalist character.

If the Negro people could settle the question of Jim Crow by themselves, Jim Crow would belong today to ancient history like the first slave ship that came to America. Furthermore, this "go it alone" attitude is even more backward than that of the Negro reformists today. While years ago the latter said, "Down with the whites," this is not so today. As a result of the historical struggle of the Party and the Left forces for unity of Negro and white, the Negro reformists have been compelled to declare themselves for Negro and white unity. As a matter

of fact, but for the struggles of our Party, there would not be today hundreds of thousands of Negro workers in industry. The imperialist bourgeoisie would not so slyly maneuver to head off the struggles of the Negro masses, to prevent their unification with the organized labor and progressive forces, were it not for its fear of the unity of labor with the Negro people's movement.

It is hard to understand how comrades with eighteen to twenty years in the Party can take the position that since the white comrades, who are supposed to lead in the struggle against white chauvinism, do not understand their responsibility, therefore the whites are impossible. This is the sheerest bourgeois nationalism and has nothing in common with Marxism and proletarian internationalism. It is no help to the Negro liberation movement for one to throw up one's hands and depart to a nationalist tent.

The struggle against white chauvinism is a struggle that must go on increasingly even beyond the stage of working-class assumption of power. But the fact is also that the working class will never come to power unless there is a relentless struggle against white chauvinism. The Negro comrades must help to convince the Negro people that the American working class is its only consistent ally. The white workers, however backward they are today, will move toward greater understanding of the

Negro question. They will come to accept the Marxist axiom that to free themselves they must help free the oppressed Negro people. But this understanding will not come of itself. It will require a sharp and relentless struggle, a struggle that must be waged jointly by Negro and white.

White chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism are both bourgeois ideologies. Bourgeois nationalism has its base in the sphere of market relationships. If it is a ruling bourgeoisie that through its oppression of weak and small nations, has taken over a portion of the world market and seeks more of it, this is the root, the material base of national chauvinism. If it is a subordinate bourgeoisie, which is the case within all oppressed nations, then it has been ousted from the markets, or prevented from getting markets in the first place, by the imperialist bourgeoisie, and its nationalism arises out of this economic fact. Bourgeois nationalism among the Negro people finds its economic roots in the Jim Crow markets upon which it is based.

While recognizing the bourgeois essence of both white chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism, we cannot and must not equate the struggle against them. The main danger now and in the foreseeable future is white chauvinism. To the extent that we mercilessly combat white chauvinism, we will strengthen the ability of our Negro comrades more ef-

fectively to carry on the fight against Negro nationalism. Hence, the need to fight on two fronts, delivering the main blow against white chauvinism, while stepping up the fight against bourgeois nationalism and national reformism in the ranks of the Party, in the Negro people's movement, and in the labor and progressive movements generally.

There is no other Party with a program for Negro liberation except the Communist Party. There never will be any other Party in the United States except our Marxist-Leninist vanguard which carries on a struggle against the virus of white chauvinism. Ours is the Party of proletarian internationalism.

TASKS FOR TODAY

Finally, it should be clear that the struggle for peace and freedom is today central to advancing the cause of Negro liberation. In this connection I should like to outline a number of immediate tasks.

First, as to events in Cicero. The happenings there occurred but a few brief weeks after the magnificent struggles on the part of the Negro people and the labor and progressive movements around the cases of the Martinsville Seven and Willie McGee, and after the significant partial victory in the case of the Trenton Six. Yet it is shameful to record that it took weeks after Cicero before a single important labor leader spoke out against the outrage. To this date

not a district of the Communist Party, except Illinois, made the protest against the Cicero disgrace a major part of its activities.

Now, with the vicious indictments of Negro and white victims of white ruling class terror, and the cynical exoneration of the fascist hoodlums, the crime of Cicero calls out for immediate, resolute protests and actions. The demands must be raised for the quashing of the indictments, the immediate arrest and prosecution of the perpetrators of the violence, for full indemnity to the Clark family and their right to occupy their legally acquired home.

I think it is a scandal of the first magnitude that our Party in the country as a whole, including our National Committee, especially our Party in New York, did not react vigorously to develop a mass campaign for relief following the recent hurricane in the West Indies. The fact is that thousands upon thousands of West Indians live in this country, with a particularly large number residing in Harlem. The Negro people all over the country are very much concerned about this tragic event. It is urgently necessary to overcome this situation. A national movement must be created to raise large-scale relief for the people of the West Indies made homeless and destitute by the hurricane.

Generally, I would say that we need to give special attention to the whole West Indies question in Har-

lem. We cannot allow the situation to persist where leading comrades, Negro and white, myself included, can utterly omit any reference to this question in speech after speech and otherwise fail to stimulate activities among this section of the population.

The fight for Negro rights has taken a turn which can be very advantageous to all peace and democratic forces in America and that is the demand for full political representation that Negroes are beginning to raise in sharper and sharper form. I think it is a great tribute to the American Labor Party that it put forward a Negro candidate, Mr. Jacques Isler, for a judgeship. But this must not be considered and treated as an isolated effort. This candidate should receive all-out support from every section of the progressive forces in Manhattan and the Bronx, and everything should be done to encourage the entire Negro population, regardless of political affiliation, to turn out in his mass support. The organized labor movement has a special responsibility in New York to mobilize its resources for full support of Isler's campaign. The Jewish masses and their organizations can play an important role in this respect. Such a development would be a great stimulus to all sections of the Negro population.

In addition, every district needs to give immediate consideration to the question of Negro representation

as a mass political demand which would be most effective for the 1952 elections. This, quite aside from the question of just putting up a Negro candidate from time to time. Think of the irony of the situation: of the forty-eight states not one has a Negro on its highest court. Yet the Republicans and Democrats meet every two years in convention and adopt resolutions on anti-lynching and anti-poll tax bills, etc., as bait to the Negro people, without any real challenge from the Left and progressive forces on such matters as the persistent failure to appoint Negroes to high judicial office and influential administrative positions. It is high time to demand that Negroes be appointed to all the courts in the country. Every time there is such a vacancy the demand must be raised that state and Federal governments appoint Negroes.

The subject of redistricting is another aspect of the question of Negro representation. This should be taken up immediately and the demand raised that areas like New York, for instance, be so redistricted that the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens will have the opportunity of electing Negro congressmen, state senators, etc. Not even in Harlem's own borough of Manhattan is there a Negro state senator. For the New York elections in 1952 this should become a key demand. In developing these movements on a state-wide scale we must see them as helping to promote a

national movement that would energetically take up the question of Negro representation at all levels in the South and the actual enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. This immediately raises as something of prime importance the question of reviving the campaign for the immediate passage of an anti-poll tax bill at this session of Congress, so as to facilitate the whole process of achieving Negro representation on all levels in the South.

Finally, the central problem confronting the Negro people is the fight for peace and for civil and democratic rights. The war economy has produced little or no increase of employment so far as the Negro people are concerned. And Negro women, who were driven from industry right after the Second World War, have never regained any mass base in industry anywhere in the country. With regard to Negro youth, the prospect for jobs is dismal indeed. Thus, the question of jobs and job discrimination is a fundamental one confronting the Negro people, and it is here that the labor movement is weakest.

There are only two or three unions in the whole country that in the last year have boldly tackled this question. First, there is the Marine Cooks and Stewards, which is the only union threatening to strike on this issue, in this case in connection with efforts to prevent a Negro woman from becoming stewardess on one of the

steamship lines. The second is District 2 of the International Woodworkers of America, which is in the State of Washington. In the early spring that District took steps to guarantee that Negroes be brought into the industry, hitherto entirely white. This was done, and the process of employment and integration of Negroes already began in the early part of this spring. What is more, in April, the leaders of the union went before their convention and explained why this policy had been adopted. The convention went on record, not only approving it, but calling upon all locals to engage in a vigorous campaign against the Jim Crowism that barred Negroes from living in many of the towns in the area. Consider the fact that this District is part of a Right-led International, and yet such a far reaching step can take place in a period like the present.

Within the labor movement generally, however, the fight for Negro rights and the struggle against white chauvinism remain extremely weak, a condition that must be changed if we are going to make the headway that we should.

It is necessary, therefore, that every effort be made to help strengthen the Negro Labor Councils throughout the country and to give every possible support to the coming convention of the National Negro Labor Council, in Cincinnati. Along with this, special efforts are needed to strength-

en all Negro institutions in the progressive camp in order to make possible the effective leadership of larger and larger sections of the Negro people. In this respect, maximum support should be given to *Freedom*, the vital Negro monthly, at the head of which stands that great champion of peace, Paul Robeson.

Concluding, I wish to urge again

that everyone re-discuss and re-study the decisions of our Convention, because the line developed there on the Negro question and on all major questions is fully valid today. Let us apply it and let us go forward to the building of a real peace movement based on firm unity of Negro and white workers and all other progressive forces.

More on the Fight for

NEGRO LIBERATION

NEGRO LIBERATION, <i>by Harry Haywood</i> . . .	\$1.00
IRON CITY (a novel), <i>by Lloyd L. Brown</i> . . .	1.50
DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE U. S., <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i> .	7.50
THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE SOVIET UNION <i>by Paul Robeson</i>02
THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM, <i>by Benjamin J. Davis</i> .	.05
LIFT EVERY VOICE FOR PAUL ROBESON, <i>by Lloyd L. Brown</i>03
BEHIND THE FLORIDA BOMBINGS, <i>by Joseph North</i>05
HARRIET TUBMAN, <i>by Earl Conrad</i>20
THADDEUS STEVENS, <i>by Elizabeth Lawson</i> . .	.10
FREDERICK DOUGLASS: SELECTIONS, <i>by Philip Foner</i>35
ABRAHAM LINCOLN: SELECTIONS, <i>by Philip Foner</i>35
THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN AMERICA, <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>40

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.