

Political affairs

AUGUST 1955 • 25 CENTS

DOEY A. WILKERSON

- [1] The 46th Annual Convention
of the NAACP

JULIAN LOWITT

- [19] Youth and the Struggle for
Peace and Democracy

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- [30] On the Fight Against Keynesism

HERBERT APTHEKER

- [42] Walter Lippmann and
Democracy

PALMIRO TOGLIATTI

- [59] On Building Unity in Italy

Greetings, Comrade Elizabeth, On Your 65th Birthday!



ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

*Member, National Committee, Communist Party
Smith Act Prisoner*

65 years young, August 7, 1955

Vol. XX

By Do

THE M
TION o
the Ac
demon
organ
center
ment t
for Ne
and ec
more
other
the Le
policy
coinc
break
crat r
eign a
quest
movem
the de
1956.
spirit
ter-mil
people

Re-ent
under t
Publishe
correspo
and Can

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

The 46th Annual Convention of the NAACP

By Doxey A. Wilkerson

THE RECENT 46TH ANNUAL CONVENTION of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People demonstrated, once again, that this organization constitutes the vital center of the Negro people's movement today. Its democratic program for Negro rights and on other social and economic questions is probably more advanced than that of any other mass organization in which the Left plays so modest a role. Its policy of independent political action coincides with the requirements for breaking through the G.O.P.-Dixiecrat road-block to progressive foreign and domestic policy. Its serious quest for allies, especially in the labor movement, will help to consolidate the democratic people's coalition for 1956. And its militant, fighting spirit reflects the mood of its quarter-million members and the Negro people as a whole.

ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION

Approximately 800 people attended the N.A.A.C.P. Convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey, June 21 to 26. On the fourth day the Credentials Committee reported 479 voting delegates and 286 alternates, observers and fraternal delegates; others arrived toward the end of the week.

There were 138 voting delegates and 136 others from the Middle Atlantic and New England states; the Mid-Western Regions sent 134 representatives; the Far West Region sent 52; and the Southern Regions sent 295, or 39% of the total. Approximately one-half of the 235 community branches, youth councils and college chapters represented at the Convention are located in Southern regions.

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

This relatively high representation from the Southern states reflects the Association's widespread organization in the South. Some 458 (61%) of N.A.A.C.P.'s 780 community branches, 121 of its 241 youth councils, and 28 of its 64 college chapters are in the South.

Reflecting N.A.A.C.P.'s high prestige in Negro life, this Annual Convention, like its predecessors, brought together an outstanding and varied group of prominent Negro leaders. First, of course, were the national officers of the Association itself. Also in attendance, either as observers or participating in the program, were Federal Judge William Hastie, labor leaders A. Philip Randolph and George Weaver, Supreme Liberty Life Insurance Company executive Earl B. Dickerson, *Afro-American* publisher Carl Murphy—to whom the Association presented the 40th Spingarn Medal—*Black Dispatch* publisher Roscoe C. Dunjee, and former Richmond, Virginia, City Councilman Oliver Hill.

A score or more elected and appointed Negro officials were present. Important white public officials also paid their respects to the Convention. It was welcomed at the outset by the Mayor of Atlantic City. The Spingarn Medal presentation Friday evening was made by the Governor of New Jersey. The closing session was addressed by the Vice President of the United States. All sessions were held in the Atlantic City High School.

It was a serious convention. Al-

though practically devoid of dramatic or "exciting" moments, it was notable for the dead-in-earnest concern of most delegates, especially those from the South, to grapple with the concrete problems they face back home. And out of it all there emerged a formulation of policy and program which underscores the key importance of N.A.A.C.P. in the fight for civil rights, civil liberties, economic security and peace, and which re-emphasizes the Association's great potential for helping to consolidate the Negro-Labor Alliance in a program of independent political action.

CIVIL RIGHTS

This Convention reaffirmed the 44th Annual Convention's slogan of "Free by '63," resolving "that the goal for complete elimination of all vestiges of second-class citizenship under which Negro Americans still suffer must be accomplished by not later than the one hundredth anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1963." Recognizing that "there remain years of intensive toil and labor, together with financial sacrifice and exposure of many of our workers and leaders to personal danger," the Convention declared: "We shall meet these challenges with resolve and determination, tempered and fortified with the knowledge that our cause is just and our methods legal and our devotion unyielding."

The key-note address by Dr. Tobias developed this "Free by '63" theme, listing some twenty specific civil rights "achievements" since the campaign began in 1953—"all due," he claimed, "to the success of N.A.A.C.P.'s legal and legislative program and publicity." Emphasizing that everything the Association stands for "we seek as loyal, law-abiding citizens," he called for continuation of the organization's "stubborn fight." Tobias reported that the million-dollar-a-year-for-ten-years Freedom Fund campaign went over-the-top last year. He proposed (and the Convention later established) a special Walter White Memorial Fund, with every member raising or giving an extra dollar per year to carry on the freedom crusade.

To the end of implementing the "Free by '63" slogan, the Convention defined nine specific civil rights objectives to be fought for in the period ahead. They include: (1) "equality of job opportunity" through passage and enforcement of federal and state F.E.P. laws; (2) abolition of the poll tax and protection of the right to register for voting; (3) a stronger Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice; (4) an end to discrimination and segregation in public and private housing; (5) "Speedy and diligent implementation of the recent Supreme Court ruling outlawing segregation in public schools, and integration of teachers on the basis of qualifications"; (6) "legislation to

guarantee complete access to public accommodations, transportation and recreational facilities on an unsegregated basis"; (7) unsegregated hospital and health service; (8) "protection of the safety and security of all persons without discrimination"; and (9) "initiation of a program of education in race relations by federal, state and local government agencies."

The civil rights issue which dominated the Convention from beginning to end was, of course, the problem of implementing the Supreme Court ruling against segregated schools. Next in importance were the fight for the vote in the South and the struggle against Jim Crow housing.

Spokesmen for the National Office, especially Thurgood Marshall and Channing Tobias, argued forcefully against the idea that the recent May 31 decree of the Supreme Court tends to undermine last year's May 17 decision, and to rally the delegates for struggle to translate the Court rulings into life. The May 31 decree, contended Tobias, confirms the May 17 decision, and "does not deviate one inch." The two rulings are a unit, said Marshall, insisting that they must be read together. They proclaim, he continued, that school segregation is against the law; that anyone requiring segregation is violating the Constitution and is open to criminal and civil prosecution.

With a powerful polemic against those who counsel "gradualism"

("Don't tell me to 'take it easy!"), Marshall outlined the Association's program for implementing the Supreme Court ruling. Each local branch in a segregated school area is to file a petition with the school board immediately, requesting that it act to implement the Court decision, with periodic follow-up to determine what steps are being taken. The branch is also to conduct an educational campaign in the community, and to solicit the support of parents, churches, trade unions, civic groups and prominent individuals. "Good faith compliance" by school officials is to be judged by whether they (1) recognize the principle of desegregation now, (2) plan now some implementing steps to begin this fall, (3) take some concrete steps toward integration this fall, and (4) complete the process of desegregation by September, 1956. As stated in the Directive to Branches adopted at the Regional Emergency Conference in Atlanta, Georgia, on June 4, "If no plans are announced or no steps toward desegregation taken by the time school begins this fall, 1955, the time for a law suit has arrived," and the issue will be turned over to the legal department for proceedings in the court.

Questions and discussion from the floor revealed that the delegates were fully in accord with the National Office approach to this question, and that local branches throughout the South are now in motion to carry it out. They are meeting hosts of concrete problems, and posed them

for answers at the Convention. Especially acute, it seems, are problems facing Negro teachers—firings in some areas where schools are being integrated, contracts with 30-day termination clauses, and a wide variety of threats and efforts at intimidation by school officials.

The comprehensive resolution on education adopted by the Convention incorporates explicitly the approach outlined by Special Counsel Marshall to school desegregation in the South. It also includes a section calling on "the northern branches [to] pursue with equal vigor the complete eradication of all forms of discrimination in schools."

It was clear at the Convention—and has been further emphasized by National Office and local branch activities since—that the N.A.A.C.P. is determined to maintain a vigorous offensive on this segregated schools question. It was also clear then—and is even more evident now—that the job of coping with the die-hard segregationist resistance is, indeed, "going to be tough." Moreover, despite the understandable public statements of N.A.A.C.P. leaders to the contrary, the May 31 decrees of the Supreme Court are of but limited help in the fight for early implementation of last year's May 17 decision. The more recent Court order surely represents no surrender of principle; but its failure to set a deadline for integration certainly does represent a tactical retreat—and one which greatly strengthens the delaying maneuvers and sabotage

of the
better
and if
have b
vention
trict C
and V
abolish
quire,
of the
stantial
of allie
The
the Sou
cussion
again,
pation
cited a
lems—r
ments
qualific
registra
rected
the rec
W. Lee
stacles
"white
They
achieve
many
number
importa
cratic
the elec
local pu
the disc
movem
ful civi
in the S
of N.A.
in its d
This

of the Dixiecrats. None knows this better than the leaders of N.A.A.C.P.; and if there were any doubt, it must have been dispelled by the post-Convention decisions of the Federal District Courts in the South Carolina and Virginia cases. The fight to abolish segregated schools will require, if it is to win, the full power of the Association and very substantial support from a wide range of allies.

The fight for the right to vote in the South loomed large in the discussion of several workshops. Here, again, there was impressive participation by Southern delegates. They cited a wide range of concrete problems—refusal to accept poll tax payments from Negroes, arbitrary “disqualification” of Negro citizens by registrars, threats and violence directed against Negro voters—as in the recent murder of Rev. George W. Lee in Belzoni, Mississippi—obstacles to voting in the (now illegal) “white primary,” and many others. They also reported significant achievements—in breaking through many barriers and increasing the number of Negro voters, in winning important footholds in the Democratic Party organization, and in the election of Negroes to state and local public office. It was clear from the discussion that the right-to-vote movement is one of the most powerful civil rights struggles under way in the South, and that local branches of N.A.A.C.P. are actively involved in its development.

This question was dealt with form-

ally in a resolution which pledges the Association “to use all legal means to destroy restrictions and practices which adversely affect the right to register and vote.” The resolution also declares: “We believe that we can and must have three million colored voters in the South by 1956.”

There was spirited participation also in the workshop on Problems in Housing, — especially by delegates from northern industrial areas. Moreover, the technical experts leading the discussion displayed a mastery of the problems which delegates found very helpful.

The Convention resolution on housing “reiterates our policy that members of all minority groups should be able to live in the place and location of their choice and economic status”; condemns discriminatory practices of “real-estate brokers, home builders, banks and other lending institutions”; raises a number of concrete demands, directed to federal housing agencies. It is evident that here is a major civil rights issue around which N.A.A.C.P. branches are conducting widespread struggles.

POLITICAL ACTION

This was a highly political Convention; and repeated calls for independent political action were sounded throughout—from the keynote speech of Channing Tobias to the concluding address by Roy Wilkins.

During recent years N.A.A.C.P.

conventions have been the occasion for leaders of the Association to laud the current President of the United States. At St. Louis in 1953, for example, the then Executive Secretary Walter White called for complete confidence in and support of the Eisenhower Administration, hailing the Chief Executive almost as the Great White Father from whom all civil rights blessings flow. It was much the same at last year's Dallas Convention, meeting in the wake of the historic May 17 victory in the Supreme Court; and so it had been at previous conventions during the Truman Administration.

But a radical change was registered at Atlantic City. There the main spokesmen of the Association very deliberately hurled sharp criticisms at President Eisenhower because of his expressed opposition to the N.A.A.C.P.-sponsored anti-discrimination amendment which Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. had had incorporated in the National Reserves Bill then pending in the House, and to similar amendments proposed for pending federal-aid-to-education bills.

Dr. Tobias, for example, declared—with considerable emotion—that if the President wants to criticize these so-called “riders,” “let him put his finger on those [*i.e.*, the Dixiecrats] who cause the riders; we won't accept the criticism until he does.” Thurgood Marshall rejected the charge that N.A.A.C.P.'s campaign for the anti-discrimination amendments is “holding up the defense ef-

fort,” pointing out that the rabid segregationists prefer “no army” and “no education” if operated on a basis of racial equality, and demanding that critics “put the responsibility where it belongs.” Clarence Mitchell, Director of the Association's Washington Bureau, replying to a question from the floor about the President's opposition to the “riders,” exclaimed: “Not even the Chief Executive of the United States has the right to strike below the belt—and that's what was done!” And Roy Wilkins countered Vice President Nixon's call for reliance upon “education and persuasion” with the charge that both the Democrats and the Republicans are betraying the fight for civil rights, adding that if the Republicans, seeking allies in the South, “continue to talk like Dixiecrats, and vote like Dixiecrats, they will not have to infiltrate the South, it will have taken them over.”

This anti-Eisenhower mood was shared very generally by the delegates, as was clear from their comments from the floor and in the corridors. It was further deepened by the President's inept greeting to the Convention, calling for “perseverance, knowledge and forbearance,” and expressing the hope “that in the decade ahead your organization will display both wisdom and patience as it continues to bear its share of the responsibility for the betterment of the country as a whole.” One suspects that reports of the Convention's critical attitude toward the President were transmitted quickly

to the
House
tion at
dent N
an inv
able to
As
dress b
at this
only at
but lik
very si
Mitche
the sta
Democ
san pr
rights
Fourth
the eff
hind t
their fa
out th
tive Ce
Kilgore
Magnu
are sitt
that “n
sentativ
souther
House
FEPC
In or
mate t
Mitchel
ference
sons at
directly
in getti
member
rights.”
clared,
warning

to the political mentors of the White House, resulting in the mid-Convention announcement that Vice President Nixon, who had turned down an invitation to speak, would be able to appear, after all.

As noted in the concluding address by Roy Wilkins, sharp criticism at this Convention was directed, not only at Eisenhower and the G.O.P., but likewise at the Democrats. The very significant address by Clarence Mitchell, for example, began with the statement that "Republicans and Democrats have united in a bi-partisan program of smothering civil rights legislation in the Eighty-Fourth Congress." He challenged the effort of Democrats "to hide behind the South when explaining their failures on civil rights," pointing out that New York's Representative Celler, West Virginia's Senator Kilgore and Washington's Senator Magnuson all head committees which are sitting on civil rights bills—and that "northern and western Representatives and Senators outnumber southern members on the Senate and House Labor Committees where FEPC is bottled up."

In order "to meet the present stalemate that we face in Congress," Mitchell called for "each state conference president to appoint two persons at this conference who will work directly with the Washington Bureau in getting the support of individual members of Congress for civil rights." It is "imperative," he declared, to "organize a system of warning so perfect that overnight we

can blanket the country with information on what individual members of Congress are doing about civil rights bills or amendments that are either in committee or on the floor."

This was the setting in which the Convention adopted its very fine resolution on Political Action. Criticizing the President and Congress for "betraying" the fight for civil rights—"neither of the major political parties has kept a single platform pledge on civil rights legislation"—the resolution endorses the lobbying apparatus proposed by Clarence Mitchell and calls "upon the National Office and Board of Directors to use the most dramatic and effective methods with the second session of the 84th Congress to bring civil rights legislation before the Congress for passage and before the conventions of the major political parties for consideration in the 1956 platforms."

In short, the Convention, very forcefully, declared the N.A.A.C.P.'s political independence from the Eisenhower Administration—a big advance over previous years; and it called for concerted pressure now on both major political parties for progressive legislation—which is precisely the best policy it could adopt in preparation for the national elections of next year.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY

N.A.A.C.P. is probably more highly conscious than any other Negro mass organization of the decisive importance of trade-union support in

the fight for Negro rights; and this fact was demonstrated anew at its 46th Annual Convention.

The Association's emphasis in the fight for integrated schools, until recently centered on legal battles in the courts, is now being shifted, of necessity, to mass struggles in the local communities. Thus it is that many speakers from the platform and delegates from the floor expressed the need for developing allies of the Association in this and other aspects of its fight for civil rights—the churches, miscellaneous civic groups, and especially the trade unions.

This recognition of the need for labor support was reflected in Labor Secretary Hill's pre-Convention letter to many trade unions, inviting them to send fraternal delegates to participate in the workshop on Organizing Labor and the N.A.A.C.P. It was spelled out even more clearly in his prepared speech on "The Role of Organized Labor in Effecting School Integration." Hill characterized the unions as "a significant power group" to aid in the fight for desegregation, stressing their importance in "helping to resolve conflicts and tensions within the general community." He urged trade unions to issue public declarations in support of school integration, especially in the South, and "to invoke disciplinary action against members who take part in public demonstrations against desegregation."

The Convention resolution on Labor and Industry is even more fully

expressive of N.A.A.C.P.'s very positive orientation toward the labor movement; and it reflects a high degree of maturity on this question. The opening section "reaffirms" the Association's "support of democratic trade unionism and the principle of collective bargaining," pointing out that "hundreds of thousands of Negro workers [more accurately, nearly two million] belong to labor unions in every part of the country." It goes on to list the many gains labor has won through collective bargaining and declares: "Negro workers and the entire Negro community have directly benefitted from these victories won by organized labor, and, therefore, the N.A.A.C.P. vigorously supports the purposes of organized labor, including the union shop, in a union with open membership and non-discriminatory policies." Then follows this truly advanced call for the necessary two-way approach to building the Negro-labor alliance:

We urge our branches and state conferences wherever possible to seek the support of responsible trade unions for measures that we favor, and in turn give our support to such measures supported by organized labor as are consistent with our policy and program.

The second section of the Labor and Industry resolution is on the A. F. of L.-C.I.O. merger. It "endorses the historic merger agreement"; asserts that "a strong and united labor movement represents a

power
end
train
work
eration
to or
South
The
ificati
the A
Comm
merg
of org
right
equal
in th
dorse
claus
agree
menti
provis
Const
the A
crimin
of L.
merg
appar
Conve
merg
cern i
tion's
C.P. f
be no
tion o
locals,
white'
or wa
lines o
The
headc
munis
the A.

powerful weapon in the struggle to end racial discrimination in the training and employment of Negro workers"; and calls "on the new Federation to launch an intensive drive to organize the unorganized in the South especially."

The resolution also expresses "gratification that the recommendations of the A. F. of L.-C.I.O. Joint Merger Committee contain as a principle of merger between the two great bodies of organized labor a clear and forthright statement recognizing the equal status of all minority groups in the new Federation." This endorsement of the anti-discrimination clause in the early Joint Committee agreement—pointedly failing even to mention the seriously watered-down provisions of the more recent Draft Constitution — undoubtedly reflects the Association's anxiety lest the discriminatory policies of certain A. F. of L. unions be carried over into the merger. Leaders of the Association apparently wished to avoid a direct Convention criticism of the proposed merger constitution; but their concern is clearly implied in the resolution's declaration that: "The N.A.A.C.P. firmly believes that there must be no place in the merged Federation or its affiliates for 'segregated locals,' 'colored auxiliaries,' 'lily-white' clauses in union constitutions, or wage differentials and separate lines of progression based on race."

The third section of the resolution, headed "Non-Cooperation with Communist-Controlled Unions," reaffirms the Association's "official policy that

no branch or state conference of the N.A.A.C.P. will endorse, participate in, or cooperate with Communist-controlled unions or with unions dominated by underworld racketeering elements." It makes clear that reference is "particularly . . . to those international unions expelled from organized labor for being under Communist control or under racketeering control *and still under that control**"; and asserts that support given to or accepted from such unions "will not help but rather will hinder our efforts to win adoption of our program." Several delegates expressed vigorous opposition to this statement of policy; but it was adopted by an overwhelming majority—and without any really substantial debate.

As reported out by the Resolutions Committee, the wording of this ban on cooperation with the independent unions expelled from C.I.O. is identical with that of the 1954 Convention resolution—with two significant exceptions. *First*, this year's resolution, by adding the qualification ". . . *and still under that [i.e., Communist] control,*" seemingly opens the door to N.A.A.C.P. cooperation with formerly banned unions which have effected mergers with other, politically more acceptable, internationals. *Second*, the 1954 Convention resolution stated that "the prohibition against working with Communist-controlled unions shall also include the National Ne-

* Emphasis here added.

gro Labor Council, because it is completely Communist-dominated. . . ."; but this item was left out of the Resolution Committee's report at the 1955 Convention. Upon being queried about this omission, the Chairman of the Committee explained that it was deliberate, based on "advice of counsel"; and when pressed for further explanation, he stated that the provision might be construed by the courts as "libelous." On motion from the floor, and again with only inconsequential protest, the prohibition against cooperation with N.N.L.C. was incorporated in the resolution.

Thus, N.A.A.C.P. again embraced as its own the C.I.O. policy of opposition to the expelled independent unions. In so doing, it once more endorsed the Big Lie now incorporated in the Brownell-Butler provisions of the Communist Control Act, about which even the anti-Communist sections of the labor movement are becoming increasingly concerned.

It is doubtful that a score of the voting delegates at the Convention could name the unions proscribed by this resolution, or that they had any real interest in the trade-union policy struggle which lies at the root of this question. They voted for the resolution because it was proposed by leaders in whom they have confidence, and because they had no special reason for opposing it—especially in the anti-Communist political climate of this period. The leaders of the Association were prob-

ably motivated chiefly by a desire to hold firm their close relations with C.I.O.—even at the expense of a truly independent policy for N.A.A.C.P. But it seems to this observer that a dispute which arises *within* the ranks of labor and which does not involve issues of Negro rights should be fought out in the labor movement, not in the organizations of the Negro people. The N.A.A.C.P. would be well advised to end its intervention in this intra-labor conflict, because such intervention represents only a drag on the whole Negro freedom movement.

In other sections, this omnibus Labor and Industry resolution "strongly deplores" company efforts to use Negro workers as strike-breakers; calls for government action to relieve the plight of migrant workers; endorses the \$1.25 minimum wage, with coverage broadened to include agricultural and sales workers; urges labor and governmental agencies to help eliminate discrimination in apprenticeship and other job-training facilities; and demands "fuller employment of Negro and non-white artists, technicians and all other personnel" in radio, television and films.

The resolution also advocates a "comprehensive system of social insurance," with the inclusion of professional workers in the old-age benefit program; calls for amendment of state unemployment compensation laws "so that they will fit into the guaranteed annual wage pattern"; and demands "that President

Eisenho
through
Compin
crimina
in man
the pla
Energy
private
govern
ther, it
to-Work
restricti
action b
all N.A.
conferen
isting s
and enc
paign o
This
dustry
endorse
and its
sented
gate Ch
rector o
vice Div
ties N.A.
with lab
and the
trade un
sociation
There
few wh
at the C
in additi
such nat
liam Ol
of Steel,
Mill, Jo
and Lou
gether w
from loc

Eisenhower take effective steps through the Government Contract Compliance Division to stop" discrimination against Negro workers in many federal projects—especially the plants operated by the Atomic Energy Commission—and in many private industrial plants holding government defense contracts. Further, it condemns anti-union "Right-to-Work" laws, and also "state laws restricting the freedom of political action by organized labor"; calls on all N.A.A.C.P. branches and state conferences to help implement existing state and city F.E.P.C. laws; and endorses the Union Label Campaign of organized labor.

This comprehensive Labor and Industry resolution, with its strong endorsement of the labor movement and its economic program, was presented to the Convention by delegate Charles Webber, Assistant Director of the C.I.O. Community Service Division. It reflects the growing ties N.A.A.C.P. has been developing with labor during the past decade, and the increasing participation of trade unionists in the life of the Association.

There were many Negro and a few white trade unionists present at the Convention. They included, in addition to Randolph and Weaver, such national labor leaders as William Oliver of Auto, Boyd Wilson of Steel, Asbury Howard of Mine-Mill, John Dial of Amalgamated, and Louis Manning of Transport, together with scores of representatives from local unions. The *Amsterdam*

News (July 9), for example, lists 47 representatives of 20 unions in the New York area alone. A handful of these labor leaders were official delegates; but most of them came as observers or fraternal delegates, and hence did not have access to Convention committees or to the floor. They participated in the big and vital Workshop on Organizing Labor and N.A.A.C.P., which was chaired by New Jersey C.I.O. Civil Rights Director Arthur Chapin; but they did not emerge as a force actively influencing policy in other aspects of the Convention program.

Recent annual conventions of N.A.A.C.P. have been addressed by top white leaders of the labor movement—for example, Patrick Gorman in 1953, and James Carey in 1954; but there were no such leaders at Atlantic City. A. F. of L. Secretary - Treasurer William F. Schnitzler was scheduled to address the public mass meeting Wednesday evening, along with Thurgood Marshall; but he did not appear. Moreover, no announcement was made to the delegates explaining his absence.

Thus, this Convention revealed somewhat of a contrast between the strongly pro-labor policy and program of N.A.A.C.P. and the limited direct participation of labor leaders in the affairs of the Association. This may be due, in part, to hesitancy on the part of N.A.A.C.P. leaders to open up channels which would contribute to more than a "fraternal" relationship with leading trade

unionists. Unquestionably, however, the chief reason is labor's continuing underestimation of the importance of building the Negro-labor alliance.

CIVIL LIBERTIES AND FOREIGN POLICY

There was very little discussion at Atlantic City of the Cold War erosion of the Bill of Rights or of the struggle for peace; but the Convention did adopt, with little or no debate, a series of significant resolutions on these questions. The policies asserted are, for the most part, progressive; but there are also important limitations—and they operate to weaken the Association's advanced position in the fight for Negro democratic rights.

There are several notably progressive policy statements in the civil liberties field. The resolution on Academic Freedom, for example, opposes "any and all efforts to suppress freedom of thought and objective learning," and particularly condemns "the discharge of teachers on the basis of charges by 'nameless informers.'" The resolution on the Federal Security-Loyalty Program demands "that all persons accused of being a security risk shall have the right to know the nature of the charges against them, the source of the charges and the right to be confronted by the accuser and to cross-examine the witnesses against them," and condemns as "odious" the Federal Government's use of "paid professional informers."

The resolution on Congressional Investigations asserts that "many innocent persons have been charged with treasonable or subversive conduct and given no opportunity to know the evidence against them or to defend themselves or their reputation with the consequent loss of their employment," and calls "on the Congress and the legislatures of the several states to enact rules of fair play" for the conduct of such investigations. The resolution on the McCarran-Walter Anti-Immigration Act calls "for revision . . . to eliminate the national origins quota system and other racist-based provisions, and to liberalize its procedures in accordance with fair and equal treatment for all immigrants and prospective immigrants."

The Convention was silent, however, on the civil liberties violations entailed by the Smith Act, the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Communist Control Act of 1954. Moreover, in formal endorsement of the Big Lie which operates as the premise for precisely those violations of civil liberties which the Association condemns, the Convention again adopted, without discussion, its resolution reaffirming "our rejection of Communism as an anti-democratic way of life," and calling on all branches "to be constantly alert against attempts of Communists and their sympathizers . . . to infiltrate and gain control of any units of our organization."

The Convention also shied away from certain key issues on which

with
progr
vance
of ci
Supr
right
right
early
has s
eral
for
Robe
short
eral
memb
Boar
dissen
fraud
of Co
of th
venti
tions;
comf
liberti
cists—
"Anti
operat
trolle
Eve
that s
tion
baitin
from
the r
featur
from
ning
speech
ter W
the A
speech
was e

with little danger of appearing "too progressive," it might well have advanced its position on the question of civil liberties. For example, the Supreme Court declaration that the right to travel abroad is a "natural right" was handed down during the early days of the Convention, and has subsequently been used by several Negro newspapers as the basis for editorial demands that Paul Robeson be granted a passport. Also, shortly before the Convention, Federal Judge William H. Hastie, a member of N.A.A.C.P.'s National Board of Directors, wrote an historic dissenting opinion which exposes the fraud inherent in the imprisonment of Communists for alleged violation of the Smith Act. But the Convention ignored both of these questions; and at the same time it gave comfort to the main enemies of civil liberties—always the most rabid racists—by reaffirming its policies of "Anti-Communism" and "Non-Cooperation with Communist-Controlled Unions."

Even so, it is important to note that the proceedings of this Convention were markedly free of red-baiting, either from the platform or from the floor. In sharp contrast to the 1954 Dallas Convention—which featured virulent anti-Communism from the keynote address of Channing Tobias to the concluding speeches of Ralph Bunche and Walter White—not one national leader of the Association made a red-baiting speech at Atlantic City; and there was extremely little of it from the

delegates. This fact, coupled with the Resolution Committee's deliberate omission of a recommendation for non-cooperation with the National Negro Labor Council, suggests that the N.A.A.C.P. leadership may be taking a second look at the contradiction between its generally advanced position on civil liberties and its endorsement of the Big Lie of anti-Communism.

The Convention resolutions on foreign policy, except on the colonial question and related issues, tend to lag behind the advanced positions taken on most other questions. The statement on Foreign Economic Aid urges "larger appropriations for economic as compared with military aid." The resolution on Apartheid in South Africa condemns "the dangerous racist policies of the Union of South Africa," and calls "on our government to press for prompt action by the United Nations on the complaints which have been brought against the Union of South Africa on behalf of both Africans and Asians."

The resolution on Peace and Imperialism notes the "millions of Africans . . . still denied self-government and equality of political status," and calls "on our government to urge our allies to move swiftly in the direction of complete self-government and independence for all their colonies." Included in the resolution is the statement that "the recent Mau Mau uprisings in Kenya dramatically highlight the dangers inherent in longer suppressing the legi-

timate grievances of the African populace." This formulation represents a significant shift from the 45th Convention's equal condemnation of both "the extreme methods of the Mau Mau" and "the terrorist methods used against the Mau Mau," an issue over which there was heated debate and a very close vote at Dallas.

The resolution on the Bandung Conference commends the position of the Asian-African Conference "for its declaration to the world that the economic, political and social rights of Asian and African people must be fully recognized," but also—with a glaring distortion of the Bandung Declaration—"for its opposition to both western and communistic imperialism and colonialism." On motion by a delegate from the floor, there was incorporated in this resolution a recommendation to the National Board of Directors that the Association send an official observer to next year's Asian-African Conference in Cairo, Egypt.

The resolution on the United Nations salutes that international organization for its "decade of progress in welding the nations of the world into one form designed to eradicate the evils of war," and particularly commends "the economic and social role of the UN's specialized agencies . . ." It expresses the need, however, for "speedier action by the United Nations in the implementation of the human rights provisions contained in its charter."

Finally, there was a resolution on Peace and Collective Security, which gives qualified endorsement to the "power blocs" and "positions of strength" policy of the State Department.

In response to a motion from the floor, the Convention incorporated in this resolution a greeting to the "Big Four" Conference scheduled for late July, together with a call for negotiations there to consolidate peace.

As with certain key questions in the civil liberties field, the Convention did not discuss or take any action on such concrete issues in the fight for peace as the situation around Formosa, the seating of China in the United Nations, the unification of Germany or the banning of nuclear weapons.

One gets the impression that the N.A.A.C.P. is following a "cautious" and rather opportunist policy in these fields. Whereas the Association asserts a bold and independent position in the fight for civil rights—which it properly regards as its main business—it acts with seeming deference to the Eisenhower Administration on questions of civil liberty and foreign policy, especially the latter. Where special "Negro interests" are directly involved, N.A.A.C.P. tends to assert advanced policies, even critical of the Administration. But on many other "hot" issues it tends to remain silent, or to make general gestures of obeisance to the powers that be—largely "for the record."

A P

T

N.A.

litica

and c

ly aff

as a

in p

these

Atlan

we a

force

gles

What

progr

In

N.A.

the

right

the s

and t

More

heavil

the co

impor

legisla

and t

local

velop

lines

tiveness

questi

organ

Seco

memb

ably

needs,

the dy

prestig

flected

rent r

A POLITICAL ESTIMATE

The 46th Annual Convention of N.A.A.C.P. met in the context of political developments on the world and domestic scenes which profoundly affect the welfare of our country as a whole and of the Negro people in particular. In what ways were these developments reflected in the Atlantic City Convention? How shall we appraise the N.A.A.C.P. as a force in the important political struggles which lie immediately ahead? What tasks are entailed for the labor-progressive movement as a whole?

In the *first* place, it is clear that N.A.A.C.P. is determined to press the fight for Negro democratic rights in a big way, especially around the schools question, jobs, housing, and the right to vote in the South. Moreover, while continuing to rely heavily upon its talented lawyers and the courts, the Association is giving important new emphasis to organized legislative action focused on Congress and to mass people's struggles in the local communities. The further development of its program along these lines will surely enhance the effectiveness of N.A.A.C.P. as, without question, the foremost civil rights organization of the Negro people.

Second, the growth of N.A.A.C.P. membership seems to lag considerably behind its potentialities and needs, especially when one considers the dynamic program, the mounting prestige and the difficult tasks reflected at this Convention. The current membership of around 250,000

is very substantial; but it is little more than half the total of a decade ago, and the decline is only partially explained by the increase of the membership fee.

It would seem to be quite possible to build an N.A.A.C.P. of 1,000,000 or more members under the objective conditions of this period; but to do so will require a more thoroughly democratic policy in the conduct of the Association's affairs than was reflected at the Convention. The rules of procedure, for example, seriously limited participation from the floor, with but little of that full and rounded discussion and debate essential for maximum understanding of the Association's program and enthusiasm for building the organization. This Convention, like its predecessors, was tightly controlled from the top.

In this connection, there were many evidences at the Convention that the development of youth work is being seriously neglected—if not actively discouraged—by leaders of the Association. Yet, considering the increasing ferment among young people on a wide range of social questions, there is no doubt that N.A.A.C.P., with little effort, could build a vital and extensive network of youth councils and college chapters, and thus greatly stimulate the growth of the Association and enhance its effectiveness generally.

N.A.A.C.P. can be built into a much larger and far more powerful civil rights organization; and the tasks it now faces urgently require

that this be done. The main thing needed, in the opinion of this observer, is for leaders of the Association to unleash the initiative of its many members and supporters below, and to rally them in truly mass struggles for the achievement of its goals.

Third, the Convention registered a radical and very important shift of the Association away from support of the Eisenhower Administration and toward a more independent course in domestic affairs.

Certainly, the Atlantic City Convention revealed a definite stiffening of the Association's attitude toward the President and the G.O.P.; and it was accompanied by sharp criticism of the compromising northern Democrats in Congress. There was no clear indication of the present orientation of N.A.A.C.P. leaders toward the coming national elections; but if they implement the Convention's call for vigorous independent political action during the next fifteen months, they will surely contribute much to the electoral strength of the democratic forces in 1956.

Fourth, the Convention reaffirmed and in some respects strengthened the Association's already progressive policy on civil liberties—especially around the security-loyalty question and the Government's use of paid informers; and it made some slight steps forward on the question of foreign policy—notably in relation to the Asian-African Conference and the Geneva meeting of the "Big

Four."

The continuing serious limitations of the Association's policy in these fields must be understood chiefly as a reflection of the present relations of forces in our country. On the question of "anti-Communism," for example, it would have been unrealistic to suppose that any explicit change of position could be registered at Atlantic City. Although the Negro people, because of their own oppression, do tend to be more sensitive than the general population to all kinds of undemocratic measures, still, given today's political climate, we could hardly expect the N.A.A.C.P. now to undertake a task which even the labor movement thus far eschews.

Fifth, the Atlantic City Convention re-emphasized the fact that N.A.A.C.P. is the key to building the Negro-labor alliance. Not only did the Convention call for labor's help in the fight for Negro rights; it also endorsed practically all of labor's current economic demands and defended labor's right to engage in independent political action. When one considers, further, that C.I.O.'s Walter Reuther is a member of the Association's National Board of Directors, that there is an increasingly active Labor Department in the National Office, that the two-years-old Labor and Industry Committees are beginning to play a vital role in the local branches, and that scores of unions consider it important to send fraternal delegates to the Annual Conventon, it is probable that no

people's
Negro
and ory
the lab
N.A.A.
advance
labor al
It is
is eager
tions wi
The fon
gration
good gr
been de
the rec
of N.A.
be true
organiz
and mo
support
the lab
find it
praise t
a part
Sixth,
the big
labor-pr
ment it
people
with
N.A.A.
ways in
progress
trade un
end.
They
bership
ranks o
for exa
unionist
cruited
N.A.A.

people's organization in America, Negro or white, has so conscious and organized a relationship with the labor movement as does the N.A.A.C.P. Here, surely, is the most advanced expression of the Negro-labor alliance on the current scene.

It is clear that the Association is eager further to develop its relations with labor—as, indeed, it must. The fond reformist conceit that integration can be achieved through the good graces of the ruling class has been dealt some shattering blows in the recent period; and the leaders of N.A.A.C.P.—as is beginning to be true of other Negro people's organizations—are forced to look more and more to the working class for support. In this quest for allies in the labor movement, they will also find it necessary, in time, to reappraise their relations with the Left as a part of the working class.

Sixth, the Convention highlighted the big opportunity now before the labor-progressive movement to cement its ties with the whole Negro people through closer cooperation with the key and influential N.A.A.C.P. There are many concrete ways in which white and Negro progressives, especially those in the trade unions, can contribute to this end.

They can help to build the membership of the Association in the ranks of the unions. It is reported, for example, that one Negro trade unionist in the New York area recruited more than 300 new N.A.A.C.P. members during the re-

cent membership campaign of his branch. His role could well be emulated by hundreds of trade unionists throughout the country.

They can help to develop the N.A.A.C.P. Labor and Industry Committees into even more vital and influential units, and thereby to involve the Association increasingly in direct cooperative relations with the trade unions.

They can encourage their unions to make financial contributions to the Association's Freedom Fund, and to take out Life Memberships for union officials.

They can influence their unions to give active support to the legislative demands of the Association, and especially to cooperate with local branches in the fight for school integration, for non-discrimination in housing, and for the right to vote in the South.

The most important task progressives in the unions can now undertake is to win trade union support for the Atlantic City Convention's call on the coming merged labor Federation "to launch an intensive drive to organize the unorganized in the South." Nothing could contribute more during this period to strengthen labor's ties with the whole Negro people than for the new Federation to carry through a massive campaign to organize many millions of southern white and Negro workers. Nor is there any other single task which could now contribute more toward building the national trade-union movement and strength-

ening the entire democratic coalition.

One of the main historic tasks confronting our nation is to democratize the South. Here is the key area of Big Business super-exploitation undermining the living standards of the whole country. Here is the main center of legislative attacks upon the labor movement. Here is the ready-made base of pro-fascist, pro-war political reaction. Here is the core of white-supremacist oppression of the Negro people. Here are the disfranchised millions of white and Negro citizens whose votes are essential to effect a progressive change in the political life of the United States.

Truly large-scale trade-union organization in the South would seriously weaken the whole rotten structure of the Wall Street-Dixiecrat alliance. It would enormously strengthen the influence of labor in American life, and greatly advance the civil rights goals of the Negro people. Progressives in the labor movement should do everything they can to influence the A. F. of L.-C.I.O. merged Federation to undertake and fight through the job which C.I.O.'s ill-fated "Operation Dixie" abandoned nearly ten years ago. This is the most fundamental task of labor and the Negro people that was highlighted in Atlantic City.

Finally, in the light of develop-

ments revealed by this analysis, one must conclude with an over-all positive estimate of the 46th Annual Convention of the N.A.A.C.P.

The Convention did reveal significant weaknesses in N.A.A.C.P. policy and program, especially in its continuing "anti-Communism" and its reluctance to tackle certain very important, concrete issues in the fight for peace and freedom. Notable also in this regard is the Association's continuing failure to develop any program on the basic land question in the South. These limitations flow in large measure, from the reformist ideology which dominates the middle-class leadership of the Association. The necessary corrective lies in developing a stronger base of active trade unionists in the organization, together with much more substantial support of its program by the labor-progressive movement.

There can be no doubt that in the context of the changing political scene, and given much more substantial support by the labor movement—a task for which progressives in the unions have a special responsibility—the N.A.A.C.P. will continue to move forward as an increasingly powerful force in the fight for the civil rights of the Negro people and also in the broader struggle for democracy and peace. The Atlantic City Convention made important contributions to this end.

By J

can
It is
alwa
ques
here

Wor
the s
cently
have
opme
set fo
tivity
for a

The
Party
persp
have
tive
Wof

The
tical
broad
jority
gress
quire
again
amor

* V
ber, 1

Youth and the Struggle for Peace and Democracy

By Julian Lowitt

"The measure of the experience and maturity of any social movement can be accurately measured by its attitude toward the youth of its country. It is significant, therefore, that in all countries the capitalist class . . . is always very highly 'youth conscious.' Nowhere in the postwar world is the question of the political leadership of the youth more vital than it is right here in the United States."*

Work among the youth has been the subject of much discussion recently in our Party. The discussions have undertaken a review of developments among the youth and have set forth a general guide for the activity of the Party in preparation for a national conference in the Fall.

The immediate objectives of the Party as concerns the youth and the perspectives for the 1956 elections have been reaffirmed. These objectives were summed up by Leon Wofsy last year when he stated:

There can be no new democratic political majority that does not embrace broad masses of youth. A political majority that can bring about "a new Congress and a new Administration" requires nothing short of a majority against McCarthyism and against war among the youth of America. ("For

Democratic Youth Unity," *Political Affairs*, September, 1954).

While recognizing that the fight for the youth is one of the major phases of the general struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, it has been noted that today the fate of the young generation is emerging as a social and people's issue of prime importance. This is manifest in the special pressures mounting from the camp of reaction to influence and capture the youth; it can also be seen in the way that the pro-democratic forces, slowly and with all kinds of vacillations, are joining the battle for the youth.

In every area of the democratic struggle — politics, labor, Negro rights, peace, etc., the fight for the youth occupies a vital relationship. If the youth question is a decisive question for the nation and the working class, then new responsi-

* Wm. Z. Foster, in *Political Affairs*, October, 1947.

bilities are posed before the Party and the adult Communists to participate energetically in the struggle to win the youth for peace, democracy and progress.

* * *

Even a cursory examination of the status of youth today underscores their prominence in the life of our country. Thus, for example, there are more than 25 million young people between the ages of 16-24. If the voting age were lowered to 18, six million new voters would be added. Some 12 million young people are in the labor force; three million are on farms and eight million in schools and colleges. Almost 3 million are Negro youth. The armed forces contain about 2 million youth.

A number of important changes have occurred among the youth since 1940. Today there are 2 million 14-17 year-olds at work or seeking work, *twice* the 1940 figure. In 1940, only 310,000 in this category were at school, while today 1,282,000 are working *and* going to school and of these one-third work more than 22 hours per week. Today, some 30% of 18 year-olds are enrolled in college as compared to 18% in 1940. The number of marriages among the youth has increased, and occur at earlier age levels.

Bourgeois apologists assert that such statistics prove that youth have "never had it so good," and even that the difficulties which youth face are due to "too much money, too much good living, too much educa-

tion." But government statistics reveal the truth to be otherwise.

During the 1954 economic decline, about 13% of youth of 14-19 were unemployed compared to about 5% for the labor force as a whole. Youth still form a disproportionate percentage of the unemployed in spite of relatively high employment in many areas. This is particularly true in such mass production industries as electrical, textile, etc., where, as a result of automation or crisis or both, youth are not absorbed.

Unemployment among Negroes is 50% higher than among whites, while Negro teen-agers are even more sharply affected. As for Negro young women, 60% can look forward only to employment as domestic or service workers. It should also be noted that each year up to a million new workers, mainly youth enter the labor force. These young people without work experience are not even considered among the labor force and government unemployment figures!

As for "too much education" we have the word of U. S. Commissioner of Education Samuel Brownell that the nation lacks some 340,000 schoolrooms and 72,000 teachers, and that almost half the students who reach the fifth grade are unable to finish high school!

* * *

The ruling class is unsparing in its efforts to mold the youth in its reactionary image, and these efforts have not been without some success.

A new
togeth
of col
partici
Korea.

Ther
and w
grow
with a
taintie
profess
to men
of cyn
in the
inevita

The
throug
plified
M. Fr
or Her
vised:
cause
he is a
men h
it is al
aside
against
1952).

The
the yo
up wit
gressio
sion."
a peri
labor
"heroe
has be
in a t
quisiti
been s
an ex
youth,

A new feature is the peace-time draft together with the general atmosphere of cold war, war preparations and participation in "local" wars as in Korea.

There is hardly a young man—and woman, too—who does not grow up in the shadow of the draft with all the accompanying uncertainties as concerns an economic, professional or family future, not to mention the ideological pressures of cynicism, futility and defeatism in the face of what is asserted as the inevitability of war.

The objective of brutalization through the war program is exemplified by the statement of Dr. M. M. Frolich, Selective Service Director Hershey's top psychiatrist. He advised: "Make the man feel that because he is in uniform and because he is an integral part of a group of men he likes and respects, somehow it is all right to join them in setting aside one's lifelong inhibitions against killing." (*Colliers*, Nov. 8, 1952).

The era of the cold war has caused the youth to be pounded without let-up with the Big Lie of "Soviet aggression" and "communist subversion." The young generation lives in a period when the informer and labor spy are held up as national "heroes." It is a generation which has become part of the community in a time when youth's natural inquisitiveness and desire to learn has been stifled. McCarthyism has left an extremely sharp imprint on youth, even causing a curtailment

of youth's natural eagerness to join with other young people in established organizations.

This generation is largely unaware of the great depression and the militant struggles of that period. It has not lived through the period of dynamic growth of the labor movement, including the building of the CIO. In certain respects, it is especially subject to the illusions of "permanent prosperity" under capitalism.

Youth today are beset by the most overwhelming outpouring of corruptive influences from Hollywood, TV, comic books and outright pornography on a huge commercial scale.

The New York City Mayor's report, "Perspective on Delinquency Prevention, 1955," sums up the situation:

We live in times of world conflict and threat of war. Wherever the child turns there is violence and talk of violence. To a stranger, crime and sex might almost seem the sinister preoccupation of our people. The child grows up in a world of tension, not of his own making.

* * *

The youth of America, however, are far from won to reaction and fascism. On the contrary, important sections of the young people and their organizations are aligning themselves with the new upsurge for a peaceful and democratic solution to national and world tension.

Some of the most notable expressions in the organized youth movement on the peace question have come from the Christian Youth movement. The YWCA Convention in New York, April, 1955, stressed the role of the UN and peaceful methods for settling disputes and called for reduction of trade barriers and a wider informational exchange among nations.

The United Christian Movement played a prominent role in the Congressional Committee hearings on UMT. In addition forty of its members lobbied the 1954 National CIO Convention and helped bring about passage of an anti-UMT resolution.

In September, 1953, the Young Adult Council held a United States Assembly of Youth with representation from all major youth organizations. Important democratic currents on domestic and foreign policy were revealed among the youth. A series of local brotherhood programs were initiated last year highlighting, among other things, the need for speedy implementation of the Supreme Court desegregation decision. Local Young Adult councils have been initiated in a number of cities.

Now a call has been issued for a second U.S. Assembly of Youth to convene September 7-11, 1955, at Oberlin, Ohio, under the theme, "Freedom in the Balance."

* * *

Among students, the struggle against McCarthyism and segrega-

tion has reached new heights. The most important student contribution to the fight for peace was the sweeping movement for international student exchange which forced the State Department to rescind its original ban on the visit of Soviet youth and student editors. Although the State Department resorted to the McCarran Act and finger-printing to cancel the visit, the movement for exchange continues to grow, while many students plan to visit the Soviet Union this year.

Another area of stirring developments is seen among Negro youth in the fight for Negro rights. Notwithstanding a step-up in chauvinist propaganda, due to Wall Street's aggressive war program, a strong counter-force is emerging among the youth as a result of victories (even if partial) won by the Negro liberation movement and its allies.

Today a considerable number of Negro youth are in industry and unions working alongside white youth. Increasingly Negro and white youth study together in desegregated school areas, while there is an increasing breakdown of jimcrow in the armed forces. A vast amateur sports set-up brings Negro and white youth together in numerous church, company, union, community and school teams. Established white youth organizations more and more are incorporating varying aspects of the fight for equal rights in their own programs, while Negro youth are enhancing their role within the

Negro

A his
the est
NAAC
ence in
Confere
brought
all over
D. C.,
anti-Mc
with pr
islativ
flected t
Negro
force in
ment as
moveme

The
the stru
be seen
white y
organizat
ACP Y
portanc
Council
program
in doze
in whic
local yo
Negro-
grams,
U. S. Y
in its
conferen
ing the
unions.
Youth
ing act
electora
ences in
In C.

Negro liberation movement.

A high point in this regard was the establishment of the annual NAACP Youth Legislative Conference in February, 1954. The Second Conference, in February, 1955, brought some 700 young people from all over the nation to Washington, D. C., who elaborated a pro-peace, anti-McCarthy, civil rights program with proposals for political and legislative action. The conference reflected the maturing of independent Negro youth activity as a growing force in the Negro people's movement as well as in the general youth movement.

The new stage among youth in the struggle for Negro rights may be seen in the large attendance of white youth from major youth organizations and unions at the NAACP Youth Conference, in the importance which the Young Adult Council attaches to its brotherhood programs as a major event each year in dozens of cities, in the manner in which all youth unity movements, local youth councils, etc., high-light Negro-white unity in their programs, and the fact that the official U. S. Youth movement has included in its delegations to international conferences Negro youth representing their organizations and trade unions.

Youth have also displayed increasing activity and initiative in the electoral arena, as attested by experiences in a number of states.

In California, they have recorded

an impressive record of political action, including the "surprise" election of a young woman to the Los Angeles City Council in 1953. This development was sparked by a militant 18-year-old vote movement which involved many youth organizations, including prominently the Young Democrats. In the 1954 elections, a series of youth committees were formed around various candidates, particularly around the candidacy of Edward Roybal for Lt. Governor. These committees, representative of both youth organizations and unions, concentrated on youth issues and forms of electoral activity.

Another measure of youth's maturing role in political action has been the growth in numbers, size and influence of Young Democratic organizations in New York, Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit and California.

One of the most significant electoral developments last year was the Youth-For-Diggs movement in Detroit. Begun in the course of the primary fight for Charles C. Diggs Jr.'s nomination for Congress, the Youth-For-Diggs movement reflected powerful forces at work for Negro representation in Michigan. Its initiating forces came from the leading organizations of Negro youth, and the NAACP youth councils in particular. It grew quickly into a fighting, popular movement, involving churches, social clubs, unions and political organizations, introducing

issues, and sparking the entire campaign. A culminating feature of its work was a "victory" dance which attracted more than a thousand young people. Congressman Diggs, Gov. Williams and other leading figures of the Democratic Party were among those present, paying high tribute to the work of the youth in the Diggs campaign.

As a result of these experiences, the Youth-For-Diggs movement voted to continue after the elections. Under their new name of the Michigan Young Citizens Committee they have already played a prominent role in the victory of Judge Wade McCree in the recent Detroit city elections.

* * *

Even this limited description of the currents and movements among the youth testifies to the constructive, united and increasingly militant action of the young people themselves in the mounting offensive against reaction. But it is the task of the people's movement, and *labor* in particular, to provide leadership in the solution of the youth question as a social question.

The crisis of juvenile delinquency has helped dramatize the social character of the youth question. One can see here more starkly than in many other areas of American life the struggle between the democratic and fascist, McCarthyite, outlook.

By and large, the McCarthyites and the "get-tough" school advocate the "night-stick" approach, and

use the crisis to enforce racism, slander Negro and Puerto Rican youth, push universal military training, and break down child labor laws. Simultaneously, they foster anti-democratic and racist tendencies and brutalization among the youth as a weapon against the labor and progressive movements.

The crisis of juvenile delinquency needs to be examined in fuller perspective than space permits here.* Some Left and progressive individuals and even Communists, in their proper desire to defend youth against lies and slander, tend to underestimate the seriousness of the crisis. Still others, victims of headline mentality, conclude that the youth indeed (perhaps through no fault of their own) are a lost generation, thus conceding the youth to the forces of reaction and McCarthyism.

There is no doubt that crime by young people *has* increased. Is this not a logical consequence of the bourgeois pressures already described above? However, the "statistics" on juvenile delinquency are exaggerated by the wholesale arrests of Negro and Puerto Rican youth by bigoted cops in periodical "crackdowns."

On the other hand the publicized figure of 3% delinquency tends to conceal the dangerous effects of the cold war atmosphere on *all* young people. The pressures which move the 3% into unhealthy channels are

* See: Aaron Weissman, *Juvenile Delinquency*. New Century Publishers, 1955.

also at v
help ma
of crisis
demago
Until
Carthyis
nated th
however
Carthyis
forces a
cy. For
ago the
go was
knecht
woodsh
constru
people
"Search
ference
the Coc
Council
The
helped
into ce
movem
quate, s
this sc
The A
progran
quency
decent
clude j
cation
cial we
City C
labor s
venile
At t
(Chica
labor
gates f

also at work on all of the youth and help make them susceptible in time of crisis to the worst forms of fascist demagoguery.

Until the '54 elections, the McCarthyite "solution" largely dominated the scene. Since the elections, however, with the setbacks to McCarthyism, more humanitarian forces are moving into the ascendancy. For example, a couple of years ago the main voice heard in Chicago was that of State's Attorney Gutknecht calling for a "return to the woodshed." But in June, 1955, a constructive approach to young people was the main note of a "Searchlights on Delinquency" Conference held under the auspices of the Cook County Sheriff's Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency.

The juvenile delinquency crisis helped catapult the youth question into certain sections of the labor movement. While far from adequate, some of labor's expression on this score is extremely important. The AFL has set forth a five-point program to combat juvenile delinquency and help provide jobs and a decent family life. The demands include jobs, housing, recreation, education and extensive health and social welfare services. The New York City CIO Council has called for a labor sponsored conference on juvenile delinquency.

At the important Cook County (Chicago) conference cited above, labor was represented by delegates from the CIO Council, UAW

and packinghouse workers. Unfortunately however, these labor representatives did not play an active role, leaving programming and follow-up to the social agencies, police, political leaders, etc.

In this struggle, as in all others, the leadership of labor is essential. A labor movement that champions the needs of the youth in the shops, schools, in the communities and in the national and local legislatures is the key to winning the youth to the working class and fulfilling their urgent needs. The fact is, however, as concerns the present young generation, the labor movement does not yet lead in the fight, nor has it even played a consistent or sustained role in this battle.

Comrade Foster has repeatedly emphasized, as in the already cited article, that: "The capitalist class . . . seeks to inculcate in their [the youth's] minds a loyalty to the capitalist order of society. Its industrial system always places as a special point in its activities the ideological corruption of the working-class youth." Despite all these activities it cannot be said that working-class youth by and large have succumbed to ideological corruption.

Today more youth are organized in the labor movement than in any other kind of organization. The Young Adult Council of the National Social Welfare Assembly in a recent survey estimated that five million people under thirty were unionists. A new feature is the large num-

ber of young Negro workers who are in industry and in unions.

In economic struggles the young workers have identified themselves with their trade-union organizations and have conducted themselves splendidly in most cases. Among recent examples may be cited the Square D strike in Michigan, Kohler in Wisconsin, and American Safety Razor in Brooklyn. In these strikes, the youth rejected company pleas to "go through the picket line for a job." In the recent actions around contract negotiations in auto, young workers in many plants sparked stoppages which helped net further gains.

But this natural militancy and fighting spirit cannot be taken for granted. This problem is most acute with the great majority of young workers who labor for the minimum wage (and less, where the companies can get away with it) and who by and large are *not* organized. These youth will readily respond to trade-union campaigns for upping the minimum wage and will lend tremendous support to any drive to organize the unorganized—if the unions seek them out.

There have been sporadic undertakings to win teen-agers, particularly the sons and daughters of unionists. Most prominent among these are: the teen-age program adopted by the warehouse union in California, which involved over 1,000 young people and a similar program for teen-agers in District 65 RSDWU in New York. The children of striking

Kohler workers formed a Junior Strikers League. Their activities included picket line duty and a full program of sports and recreational activities.

An important resolution on youth passed at the last California State CIO convention at the end of 1954 reflects what is needed from labor. This resolution urged in part:

That the greater CIO Council support and project conferences for youth to deal with: (1) the problems facing youth; (2) what unions can do to support and fight for the needs of youth, and (3) how youth can help build our unions . . . That the . . . trade unions embark on an educational program—such as visiting the organizations of youth—to discuss union history and union contracts.

Resolutions of a similar nature, although not nearly as all embracing were passed at the last convention of District #1 United Packinghouse Workers and at an electrical Union Local in New York.

These barest beginnings must be greatly extended if the labor movement, in its own interest, is to assert its leadership over and forge an alliance with the youth movement. The moves toward a unified labor organization will enhance the position of the organized labor movement in direct contact with great masses of youth, not to speak of the millions yet to be organized. Objective developments cry out for the establishment of a *trade-union* youth program playing its historic role among

youth
of lab

The
of the
it does
the str
a re-ev
work a
particip
people'
and je
tives a
gram.

That
has a
content
that th
Comm
third of
tion. A
the Yo
cois Bi
tral Co

The
strength
is movi
men an
national
It is qu
particip
become
sible. T
always
of the fi
for the
underest
moveme
policy of

Clear

youth at large under the leadership of labor as a whole.

* * *

The new significance of the fate of the young generation, arising as it does out of the critical juncture in the struggle against fascism, calls for a re-evaluation by our Party of its work among the youth. Lack of participation in this vital sector of the people's movement means to weaken and jeopardize the general perspectives as set forth in the Party *Program*.

That the fight for the youth today has a new, more urgent historical content may be seen from the fact that the last Congress of the French Communist Party devoted fully one third of its sitting to the youth question. A report "On the Question of the Youth" was delivered by Francois Billou, a secretary of the Central Committee, who declared:

The present dominant task is to strengthen the front of struggle which is moving to encompass all French men and women who wish to regain national independence and sovereignty. It is quite clear that without the participation of the youth, victory would become more difficult, if not impossible. To have youth at its side has always been one of the political tests of the first order for the working class, for the Communist Party. Neglect, underestimation, disdain for the youth movement are obstacles to the national policy of the Communist Party.

Clearly, lack of involvement in

the "Battle for the Youth" means to isolate our Party not only from the youth, but from the *people's* movement which influences and is directly affected by developments among the youth. In fact, as was noted, important unity activities are already developing among the youth and on the youth question which will have great bearing on 1956 electoral developments. One might look back to the 1952 elections when Eisenhower's demagogic appeal to the youth was a major factor in his election. And only last month, Eisenhower alerted Young Republicans to the significance of the youth vote by his emphasis that more than seven million new voters will participate in presidential elections for the first time next year. The Democrats are also taking a new look at the youth question.

Many new opportunities, then, present themselves provided that the Party brings into play *every* force it has available and can influence in the battle for the youth. This requires a revamping of our work in forging a united young generation in alliance with labor in the following primary directions: to influence the democratic forces, especially the labor movement, to seize the initiative on the youth issue, and to help unite the young generation on a democratic, pro-peace program.

Wide sections of the people's democratic movement are already involved in programs and struggle directly involving youth, such as labor-

economic activities, PTA struggles for better educational facilities, the fight to implement the desegregation decision, FEPC and job opportunities and training for Negro youth, church anti-discrimination and peace activities, etc.

A large number of adult Communists are also involved in these activities, but the fact is that they are rarely conscious of their important relationship to work among the youth, nor are they provided leadership in this area by the Party which too often relegates "youth" work to special, limited forces. As a result of this situation, important mass opportunities are frequently missed.

An example of this divorcement from the overall youth question was seen recently in Illinois. There, the State Legislature was considering four vital youth issues—the 18-year-old vote, a bonus for Korean vets, an extension of the free state university to Chicago and the extension of minimum wage coverage to working minors. These issues were sponsored by various veterans, educational and other organizations—indeed a broad movement. But the Party by and large remained aloof from these developments. It should be noted that while the first three issues lost, the vets bonus was defeated by only *two* votes!

This experience underscores further the fact that any re-evaluation of the work of the Party among the youth must take as its starting point that youth work is not the province

of a particular sector of the Party, but of the *whole* Party. Every body of the Party which guides a crucial phase of mass work—labor, Negro, electoral, etc.—must be fully informed of youth developments, must have a correct estimate of the situation among the youth, and must have direct contact with the youth movement in their area of work.

Further, such a re-evaluation would be immeasurably aided if the Party itself, in each District, singles out a concrete mass youth issue around which the Party is mobilized. Notwithstanding local variations, the problem of juvenile delinquency and the building of teen-age movements (where rapid growth and organization is *already* being experienced) provide urgent and fruitful opportunities in relation to the needs of the youth as well as the rapidly growing adult progressive coalition. Here the Party can help bring into play many Left and progressive elements with great experience in the labor movement, educational work, social work, settlement groups and centers, etc.

While concentrating on influencing the democratic forces, especially the labor movement in the battle for the youth, it is important to observe that in the last year there has been both a quantitative and qualitative growth in the fight-back movement among the youth themselves.

The primary task here is to help move the majority of youth and their organizations on the level of broad-

est des
most P
and t
mum
tions.

a prog
as exp
youth
political
fornia,

Here
class l
movem
sive an

among
such y
develop
and car

trends,
outlook
be full
service

Youth
vancing
youth t
Speak
Marxist

Betty C
Party's
that "B
Marxist

the you
but a c
ing the
to-day
LYL in
importa
through
stream

training

est democratic struggle around the most pressing issues facing the youth and the nation with the aim of maximum participation in the 1956 elections. We must assist in building a progressive, pro-labor trend such as expresses itself through broad youth involvement in independent political action in Michigan, California, etc., already described.

Here, the main force for working-class leadership *within* the youth movement must come from progressive and Marxist youth. This is so, among other reasons, because only such youth can be in the center of developments in youth organizations and can best reflect their moods and trends, illuminated with a Marxist outlook. For this reason there must be full recognition of the tremendous service performed by the Labor Youth League in recent years in advancing the cause of democratic youth unity.

Speaking of the independent Marxist youth movement, Comrade Betty Gannett in her Report to the Party's 14th Convention, stressed that "Basing itself on the science of Marxism-Leninism, the education of the youth must not be a class-room, but a class-struggle concept, educating the youth in the process of day-to-day struggles." In this spirit, the LYL in the past two years has made important advances in breaking through its isolation from the mainstream of the youth movement, and training young people in the science

of Marxism-Leninism. It has also given leadership in the development of an independent, popular youth publications program including *New Challenge*, *Campus Sense*, and the *West Coast Youth Recorder*.

The LYL has championed the most patriotic aspirations of American youth for a peaceful, democratic life. No wonder the McCarthys and McCarrans have levelled such sharp attacks on this relatively new and yet small youth organization. Its valiant offensive before the McCarran Board has brought praise and support from wide areas of the general youth movement. Communists have a special responsibility to bring broad progressive and labor support to the defense of the LYL as a prerequisite for the defense of the rights of all youth organizations.

Moreover, the building of LYL is the task not only of Marxist youth, but is a particular responsibility of Communist parents and all advanced workers to whom the future of the young generation is dear.

In the battle for the youth, our Party can make a special contribution to the people's movement as we approach the 1956 elections. A new concern coupled with the necessary organizational measures will not only enrich the youth movement and the broad people's movement, but will enhance the fighting spirit and quality of the Party itself and add new strength to the struggle for a peaceful and secure future.

On the Fight Against Keynesism

By William Z. Foster

KEYNESISM IS THE BASIC ECONOMICS of monopoly capital in the period of the general crisis and decline of the world capitalist system. As such it presents a strong challenge to Marxism-Leninism, both in theory and practice. Unfortunately, however, this truth does not appear to be grasped fully by Marxist-Leninists on a world scale. Consequently, their fight against Keynesism has been very sketchy, in fact, grossly neglected. Of course, there have been numerous articles against Keynesism in the international Left-wing press, but by no means has there been the sustained and concentrated fight against the Keynesian menace that is warranted. A marked exception to this rule, however, was the book by John Eaton of England, *Marx Against Keynes*, which thoroughly exposes the illusions and fallacies of Keynesism. Then there were a few articles on the question in the USSR and the studies on this general question made by the various writers in our Party; but all this is very far from the treatment the important question of Keynesism deserves.

In view of the widespread neglect in this general field, it is gratifying

to have appear during the present period Hyman Lumer's book, *War Economy and Crisis* (International Publishers, 1954), and Mary Norris' articles in the March and June numbers of *Political Affairs*. These powerful writings handle current American economic and political war-policies from the realistic standpoint of their Keynesian background, and both writers have done a very good job. They have raised the analysis of monopoly economics in the United States to a new high level. Such studies our Party and the Left-wing generally have needed for a long while past. During recent years there has been a considerable discussion of Keynesism in our Party, but this is the first time that there has been a searching analysis of it as it expresses itself in American economic and political policy.

The book by Lumer and the articles by Norris should be followed up by further studies along the same line. Americans are particularly responsible to lead in the fight against Keynesism because, although that system as a theory was born in Great Britain, the main home of Keynesian practice is in the United States. Every feature and phase of danger-

ous
lyzed
imper
cessfu
dang
Lenin
On
length
plexit
further
includ
"the
propo
ator
factor
state,
mana
the el
low r
portat
clarif
vario
conce

DAN

Pro
"Key
capita
propo
liqui
afraid
in cl
and r
plove
tion,
capita
of S
savin
terver
dustr

* s.

ous Keynesism must be fully analyzed and combatted. To do this is imperative if we are to fight successfully against this latest and most dangerous opposition to Marxism-Leninism.

One might list at considerable length the many illusions and complexities of Keynesism that need further elucidation. This list could include such Keynesian questions as "the multiplier," "the marginal propensity to consume," "the accelerator principle," the psychological factor in economics, "the welfare state," "progressive capitalism," "the managed economy," and so on. But the elementary points dealt with below represent a few of the most important questions that now need full clarification—in order to combat various current illusions and misconceptions of Keynesism.

DANGERS IN KEYNESISM

Professor Seymour Harris says: "Keynes' mission in life was to save capitalism, not destroy it."* Keynes proposed to preserve capitalism by liquidating its cyclical crises. He was afraid that these crises, ever deeper in character and producing more and more gigantic masses of unemployed, might well lead to revolution, and thus to the abolition of capitalism and to the establishment of Socialism. Keynes' panacea for saving capitalism is government intervention in and stimulation of industry — by manipulating taxes,

credits and interest rates; but especially by large-scale government expenditures. These governmental shots-in-the-arm to flagging industry are calculated to stimulate production, thereby abolishing, the Keynesians claim, or at least greatly alleviating, the recurrent cyclical economic crises. Keynesian reasoning goes like this—if there are no cyclical crises, there can be no general crisis, and therewith also no revolution and no Socialism. The general result of this Keynesian line is a big intensification of the development of state-monopoly capitalism.

The first danger that stands out from all this is that Keynesism constitutes a direct challenge to the most basic economic and political concepts of Marxism-Leninism—the most serious attack, in fact, it has ever had to face. This challenge must be actively accepted and defeated at all points. The Keynesians boldly carry their attack right into the labor movement, and not without a dangerous amount of success.

The menace of Keynesism is especially emphasized when it is realized that it forms the essential economic basis of the policies of all the leading capitalist powers (as well as of the United Nations). These governments, it is true, do not accept the entire body of Keynesian economic jugglery as such, and their leaders frequently repudiate Keynes by name; nevertheless they apply the heart of his policies, which is the stimulation of industry by means of government spending (as well as by

* S. Harris. *John Maynard Keynes*, p. IX.

various tax, credit, and other financial maneuvers on the Keynes pattern).

The Keynesian danger is further stressed by the fact that Keynesism, in practice if not always in name, is also accepted by the Social-Democrats all over the capitalist world—including the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. leadership. Everywhere these elements base their economic perspectives upon the theory that full employment can be practically achieved under capitalism primarily by government spending. This is the basis of their illusions about the present capitalist regime being the "welfare state," that the existing system is "progressive capitalism," that their program constitutes a "managed economy," and the like. Not Marx, but Keynes is their economic mentor. Worse yet, large numbers of workers are also infected with Keynesian illusions. That all this is gravely dangerous to the working class is dramatically illustrated by the fact that since the advent of Rooseveltian Keynesism in the mid-1930's, the advocacy of Marxian Socialism in American trade unions, formerly very active, has now become almost obliterated.

Keynesism also provides a dangerous element in consequence of its role in the war danger. This is expressed by the fact that, in developing their enormous military machine and war perspective, the Wall Street warmongers, besides having in mind the building of great armed forces for their goal of world conquest,

also consider the huge government spending for armaments as a basic means for preventing a serious economic crisis and for keeping their present monster maximum profits rolling in. To make matters worse, large numbers of workers and the great bulk of the trade-union leaders walk into this incipient capitalist trap by considering that munitions-making is indispensable if masses of workers are to escape unemployment. Keynesism, in laying this make-work foundation under munitions-making, provides dangerous impulses and justifications for war. There are some who deny any Keynesism in armament production; but on this point, they could profit by consulting the opinion of Keynes himself. The latter definitely saw in a war economy even the ideal application of his theories. He said: "It is, it seems, politically impossible for a capitalist democracy to organize expenditures on the scale necessary to make this grand experiment which would prove my case—except in war conditions."*

Still another currently dangerous aspect of Keynesism develops because the Keynesians make much use of the fact that there has been no major American economic crisis following World War II, despite the prophecies of many Marxists and others that such a crisis in the early post-war peace was bound to take place. The Keynesians hail this as a decisive victory for their policies,

* *The New Republic*, N. Y., July 29, 1940.

asserting
practical
crisis an
by Key
conclusi
dare n
lenged.

In vie
with K
major c
monopo
world
Marxist
cudgels
practical
should
an occa
two he
as is n
they m
ously a
That t
virtue
articles.

KEYNE
OF M

In v
should
Keynes
capital.
to corr
ranks t
the eco
sections
geoisie,
and tha
to it. S
false.
charact
danger

asserting it shows that they have practically mastered the cyclical crisis and that Marx has been beaten by Keynes. This, of course, is a conclusion that Marxist-Leninists dare not allow to pass unchallenged.

In view of the foregoing situation, with Keynesism the policy of the major capitalist governments, of the monopolist warmongers, and of the world Social-Democrats, obviously Marxist-Leninists must take up the cudgels against this theoretical and practical menace. In doing this they should not content themselves with an occasional complacent article or two here and there on the subject, as is now too much the case, but they must fight Keynesism vigorously and consistently at all points. That they do just this is the great virtue of Lumer's book and Norris' articles.

KEYNESISM, THE ECONOMICS OF MONOPOLY CONTROL

In writings upon Keynesism it should be made very clear that Keynesism is the economics of big capital. This is necessary in order to correct current confusion in our ranks to the effect that Keynesism is the economics of the non-monopoly sections of capital, of the petty bourgeoisie, and of the labor bureaucracy, and that monopoly capital is opposed to it. Such a conception is basically false. It obscures the reactionary character of Keynesism, hides its dangers, and confers upon it some-

thing of an aura of progressivism.

Eaton, Lumer, and Norris, however, write from the clear standpoint that Keynesism is basically the economics of the monopolists, and so do the Soviet economists who have paid attention to the subject. Bliumin says that, "All discussions among economists during the recent period have revolved primarily around the works of Keynes."* And the new Soviet work on economics, initiated by Stalin, in attacking Keynesism, states that, "Unlike the bourgeois economists of the era of pre-monopoly capitalism who glorified free competition as a basic condition of social development, the contemporary bourgeois economists usually stress the necessity of state intervention in the economic life."**

In this general connection, it is also very necessary to point out the clear relationship of Keynesian economics to fascism, as Eaton and the American economists referred to, have done. It would be an absurd contradiction and denial of economic reality to refuse to show the acceptance of Keynesian policies by the Hitler and other fascist regimes, which were wholly dominated by finance capital. Keynesism is an integral part of state monopoly capitalism in all its forms.

Keynesism is not only the economics of monopoly capital in the present period, but it also dovetails perfectly with Stalin's law of maxi-

* I. G. Bliumin, *Political Affairs*, July, 1948.

** *Political Economy*, Chapter XXI, p. 307.

imum profits, which is the moving principle of big business. This is a fact that we must become very conscious of. Stalin defines the law as, "the securing of the maximum capitalist profits through the exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbing of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and lastly through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits."*

This is a perfect picture of the present pro-war economy of the United States, in which Keynesian concepts play so important a role. Never were profits after taxes so high in this country—1938-39: \$4.1 billions; 1940-45: \$9.2; 1946-50: \$18.6; 1951-53: \$19.4. Arms production, based on government appropriations, furnishes the very cream of this maximum profits orgy. Moreover, if the Eisenhower Administration applies its Keynesian measures to the \$101 billion road program, or to others of the \$200 billion in public works projects that it is said to be holding in reserve, "to combat a possible depression," we may rest assured that all this will be organized upon a "private enterprise" basis that will attempt to guarantee the participating monopolists and big capitalists the most lavish profits. To do this is in the very nature of

the Wall-Street beast now so fully in control of the government.

Here it may be well to recall some of the experiences of the Roosevelt regime. It is a fact that the spokesmen of big business bitterly attacked Roosevelt's economic measures as "boondoggling." It is also a fact that in doing this, most of their ire was directed against the W.P.A. (Works Progress Administration), in which the local, state, and national governments hired workers directly and the sacred profit motive was largely eliminated. The monopolists, however, had a much more tender attitude towards the P.W.A. (Public Works Administration), in which contracts for public works were let out to private contractors at a "reasonable" profit. In a future crisis, if they are in control of the government, the monopolists will be sure to try to see to it that the make-work program is carried out primarily upon the P.W.A. model, and with the maximum profits idea thoroughly in mind. Eisenhower's so-called anti-depression program is a grandiose plan for maximum profits on a huge scale.

THE QUESTION OF DEFICIT FINANCING

The writers on Keynesian theory and policy also need to pay much closer attention to the whole question of deficit financing, because therein lies both the heart and the fundamental failure of Keynesism. These elementary facts can be made

* J. V. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 32.

to stand forth only upon the basis of a continuing and intensive Marxist economic analysis.

The basic flaw in the capitalist system, as Marx demonstrated over a century ago, the major reason for the creation of its deadly market problem and its cyclical economic crises, reduced to its most elementary terms, is the robbery of surplus value from the workers in the shape of profits, interest, and rent. The workers, consequently lacking purchasing power, are unable to buy back what they produce, with the ultimate result of periodic economic crises, which tend to grow worse with the development of the general crisis of capitalism. Keynesism, being a bourgeois system of economics, does not disturb the basic production relationship of capitalists and workers, with the former exploiting the latter. Therefore, it does not, and cannot, reduce the "profit gap" between what the workers produce and what they are able to buy back, which is the basic cause of capitalist economic crisis. Therefore, also, Keynesism cannot cure the capitalist system of its elementary tendency towards cyclical crisis.

The Keynesians, however, in their various measures, above all in their subsidization of industry through wholesale government spending, are able temporarily to alleviate and partially to postpone and delay the onset of the cyclical crisis. This is because they are thus able to create, for the time being at least, an artificial market for the products of in-

dustry and agriculture. The most effective means for doing this, as we have seen, is by arms production, which for the capitalists has the important advantage, in addition to the building of their war machine, of being a perfect medium to bring them in maximum profits. It presents also no marketing problems whatever. But arms production is not unique in this respect—road-building, flood-control, and other public works, in a lesser degree, may also possess similar potential advantages for the capitalists.

The Keynesian economists perform the hocus pocus of creating a market where there is no real market by their program of deficit financing. They get the necessary capital for their huge projects of government spending primarily by government borrowing. Tax gathering also enters into it on a large scale; but the essential thing is the borrowing, the creation of new oceans of government credit. Deficit financing is a much broader process, however, than merely balancing the federal budget upon the basis of increasing the national debt, important though this may be. The same principle is also heavily applied in other directions, including by private capitalist concerns. Thus, we see the expansion of state and city debts, the "financing of the buyer" by the vast development of installment payments, the broad expansion of bank credits to businessmen of various sorts, the huge growth of home mortgage debts, the extensive over-

building of industrial plants, and, to find an international outlet for profit-hungry capital, the wholesale subsidization of foreign trade through loans, gifts, and "aid" of various sorts. Here it is important to note that the capitalists use Keynesian practices not only in local, state and national governmental affairs, but also in their industrial-financial business.

In consequence of this program of financing the deficit by borrowing not only in government expenditures, but also in cultivating the market generally by huge credit practices, the United States has in recent years built up a fabulous and crazy structure of debt, principally internal. Between 1945 and 1954, the total of net public and private debt in the United States has soared from \$406.3 billion to \$605.5 billion. Within this general debt framework, some of the specific debt increases are: net debt of city and state governments up from \$13.7 billion to \$33.3 billion; net debt of all corporations from \$99.5 billion to \$208.7 billion; that of non-corporate debt from \$85.2 billion to \$176.5 billion; non-farming mortgage debt from \$30.7 billion to \$105.2 billion; farm mortgages from \$5 to \$8 billion; bank credits up from \$167 billion to \$211 billion; installment buying credits up to \$30 billion. During the 1945-54 period industry invested about \$200 billion to expand its plant and equipment in order to fit itself to the orgy of government "defense" spending, with the result that it is now about 25 per

cent over-extended with regard to the market possibilities. To all this, add the \$50 billion that the United States has sent abroad since the end of the war (Marshall plan, military aid, Point Four, etc.), largely to finance U.S. foreign trade.* All this is Keynesism on a gigantic scale.

The creation of these enormous debts, or credits, has given industry and business a whole series of major shots-in-the-arm and has also sent profits skyrocketing to record levels. Its general trend is inflationary. Obviously this Ponzi-type of financing cannot go on indefinitely. Already in various cases the debt-credit structure has reached the danger point. This wholesale deficit financing has helped delay the onset of an economic crisis of major proportions, but clearly it is merely postponing the crisis; it is sowing the whirlwind. Underlying the whole rapidly swelling debt structure, the profit gap between production and the consuming power of the market, the fatal cause of economic crisis is ever widening. The current borrowing from Peter to pay Paul is heading the country towards a major eventual industrial and financial crash, based upon overproduction and wholesale debt repudiation, despite the so-called built-in "protections" against economic crises. As Norris and Lumer point out, many active crisis factors are now evident in the American economy.

* Figures from *Labor Fact Book* #12, *Federal Reserve Bulletin* May, 1955, and U. S. Dept. of Commerce, *Survey of Current Business*, Mar, 1955.

Mea
tion
run n
upon
of cre
sultan
cessitie
worke
which
mous
ing th
the av
ers in
so-call
about
have t
ing th
the sw
autori
parasit
est-eat
tains o
Thus,
which
figure
ing (\$
can p
banks
the bu
ally,
profits
class o
The sa
out th
Genera
coupon
sharks
among
workin
The
major
upon

Meanwhile, the massive debt-creation process is having serious long-run negative economic consequences upon the workers. The surging flood of credit is inflationary, with its resultant of high prices for living necessities. This tends to depress the workers' real wages, a tendency which is accentuated by the enormous increase in worker-taxes during the past few years. Since 1945 the average real wages of the workers in the United States, despite the so-called prosperity, have declined about 5 percent. Farmers' incomes have tumbled about 25 percent during the same period. And worse yet, the swiftly growing credit structure automatically generates hordes of parasitic and ultra-reactionary interest-eaters—for upon all the mountains of debts, interest must be paid. Thus, to "service" the national debt, which has now reached the fantastic figure of \$281 billion and is still rising (\$5 billion last year) the American people are paying out to the banks and corporations who own the bulk of it over \$5 billion annually, or more than the total net profits reaped by the whole capitalist class on the eve of World War II. The same principle applies throughout the whole vast debt structure. Generally, the huge new body of coupon clippers and glorified loan sharks that is being created are among the worst enemies of the working class.

* * *

The present "prosperity" of the major capitalist countries is based upon four main elements: a) the

reparation of the gigantic property damages created by the war; b) the filling of the commodity shortages (housing, etc.) also caused by the war; c) the gigantic preparations that are being made for a third world war; and d) the vast Keynesian-like expansion of credit, as indicated above. Despite all these artificial, and basically unhealthy, supplements to the normal demands of the capitalist market, there have been, as Norris remarks, three minor economic crises since the end of the war, and signs are now multiplying of another and more serious one in the offing.

In combatting Keynesian illusions, it is necessary, by a close-up economic analysis, based upon Marxist principles, to establish clearly, just why Keynesism cannot accomplish what it purports to do—to keep the industries in full and steady operation—and how it is laying the basis now for a major economic crisis. This we have not yet done sufficiently. It is distinctly not enough, as some Marxist economists seem to conclude, merely to state general Marxist economic principles and then to stand around and wait until the inevitable crisis bursts upon the capitalist world. The workers must be taught, as events develop, just what is happening here and now in an economic sense in the capitalist world, particularly with regard to economic crises. This is indispensable if they are to be freed from dangerous economic illusions, and if the labor movement is to proceed upon a sound basis of policy.

THE TWO KEYNESIAN VARIANTS

Another important element of Keynesism that should receive early and more thoroughgoing attention from Marxist-Leninist economists is the complex question of the two variants of Keynesism. This is necessary in order to clear up the confusion of those who would limit Keynesism simply to the labor bureaucracy, the petty bourgeoisie, and the non-monopoly section of the bourgeoisie. It is needful also for those who, with their eyes fastened simply upon monopoly capital's Keynesian practice, with a wave of the hand denounce all Keynesians as reactionaries. Both of these tendencies are harmful to the struggle against reaction in this country.

As for the first group of these confusionists—those who refuse to see that Big Business is Keynesian—we have dealt with this above, having shown that monopoly capital is, in fact, pronouncedly Keynesian. Hence there is no need to repeat this. As for the second trend—those who throw all Keynesians into one pot of reaction—their essentially false contention requires further analysis. It is true, as the latter say, that Keynesism is basically reactionary. As we see it applied, even by labor leaders, Keynesism makes no attack upon monopoly capital's maximum profits; it supports the imperialist war drive of Wall Street, which is the very heart of reaction; and it bases itself upon a flamboyant ac-

ceptance of the capitalist system. But when all this is said, it is still only a half truth to condemn all Keynesians as reactionary. In reality, within the general conglomerate of policies now labeled Keynesism there are two sharply conflicting economic and political currents, from which very different conclusions must be drawn and which form the economic basis of the so-called two variants of Keynesism.

The first of these economic currents is the so-called "trickle down" theory and practice of monopoly capital. This term, evolved during the Hoover 1929-33 period, fully expresses the Keynesian line of the Eisenhower Administration. Charles Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, recently stated it perfectly when he said that, "What is good for General Motors is good for the American people." The substance of the Hoover-Eisenhower "trickle down" policy is that the government, by various fiscal means—taxes, tariffs, etc., but especially by huge federal, state, and local expenditures—undertakes, in good times and bad, to see to it that the financial interests of the corporation are well taken care of. If this is done, then the prosperity of the capitalists is supposed also to "trickle down" to the people. This trend may be called "true Keynesism," and it must be fought as an enemy ideology.

The second broad current within the general framework of what is characterized as Keynesian economic policy is the "increase-the-purchasing-power-of-the-work-

ers" ap
line of
in the
and it
approa
ment
grams.
stress,
sures,
higher
broade
educat
as spe
wide
works,
ema to
The
should
still br
gram
deman
people,
elemen
concep
gram
cation.
This
worker
progra
progre
is dem
fact th
Left an
cally su
spite t
ever, t
A.F. of
weight
thinkin
ary ele
ized l
armam
of the

ers" approach. This was largely the line of the Roosevelt Administration in the later stages of the New Deal, and it is also the present general approach of the trade-union movement in its various economic programs. This means to place the stress, as remedial economic measures, upon shorter working hours, higher wages, lower worker taxes, broader social insurance, health and educational systems, in addition to, as specific anti-crisis measures, a wide program of general public works, nearly all of which is anathema to the monopolist Keynesians. The workers' economic program should, of course, be the core of a still broader people's anti-crisis program, expressing also the economic demands of the farmers, the Negro people, and the small middle-class elements. Here we use the narrower concept of workers' economic program only for purposes of simplification.

This second current, for a workers' and people's anti-crisis program, obviously has a strong progressive element in it. This is demonstrated in practice by the fact that Communists and other Left and progressive forces energetically support large sections of it. Despite this progressive element, however, the economic programs of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. remain heavily weighted with reactionary Keynesian thinking and policies. This reactionary element is represented by organized labor's support of the war-ammunitions drive; by its acceptance of the bourgeois contention that

capitalists are entitled to profits (in this case maximum profits); and by its general acceptance of the Keynesian conception of "progressive" capitalism. This whole trend represents a diluted, or mixed, Keynesism.

Tactically, the Left and progressive forces must take radically different stands regarding these two variants of Keynesian policy, which have different objective and historical antecedents. Towards the "trickle down" policy of Big Business their attitude should be one of direct opposition, as this is the class policy of the enemy. In condemning the "trickle down" theory in practice they must also condemn Keynesism in principle, of which this theory is the basic practical expression. On the other hand, the Left and progressive forces should discriminate sharply in dealing with the second Keynesian variant. While fighting vigorously against all its reactionary features as indicated above, they should give active support to all its tendencies to "increase the purchasing power of the workers." Their aim must be to strip organized labor's economic program of its reactionary pro-capitalist Keynesian features and to transform it into a program fully representative of the interests of the working class.

THE ECONOMIC PROGRAM OF THE WORKERS

It is one of the elementary characteristics of the labor movement in this period, above all in the United

States, that the workers need elaborate economic programs especially designed to protect them from the ravages of the recurring capitalist economic crisis.

It is a fact that the workers' economic program has historical roots antedating Keynesism by many decades. For the past 150 years, during economic crises, the workers have more or less systematically demanded unemployment relief, the maintenance of wage rates, public works, and other ameliorative measures, all of them anathema to the employers. This was true of the early trade unions in Great Britain; in the French Revolution of 1848, the big government workshops to employ the masses of jobless were a most important development, and as early as the economic crisis of 1837 in our country, workers demanded government public works, etc. Similar demands were raised during other severe American crises, as in 1873, 1894, etc. However, the elaboration of the broad and sweeping anti-crisis programs such as trade unions now commonly have is something relatively new in labor history. They are a product of the general crisis of the capitalist system and also of the growing strength of the labor movement. Obviously the workers' economic program, which has as its central purpose the protection of the workers from unemployment and the other economic hazards under rotting monopoly capitalism, is basically different than the employers' Keynesian program, which is designed to protect the in-

terests of the capitalists at the expense of the workers.

Marxist-Leninist economists must give closer theoretical attention than they have yet done to the essential character of the workers' economic program and the fundamental antagonism it bears to Keynesism as such. There has to be drawn a sharp distinction theoretically, as well as in practice, between the former and the latter. Whereas Keynesism, in its essence, is pro-capitalist, the workers' program is, or must be, essentially anti-capitalist. Full theoretical and programmatic conclusions must be drawn from this fundamental difference.

The elementary practical difference between the Keynesian employers' program and the workers' economic program lies in the fact that whereas Keynesism, as we have seen, definitely protects and enhances the capitalists' profits, especially monopoly's maximum profits, the workers' program makes a head-on attack against these profits. Its aim is not only to "increase the purchasing power of the workers," but also, imperatively, to reduce the profits and controls of the capitalists. That means that the workers' program must aim definitely at slashing the "profit gap" between what the workers produce and what they receive in wages, which is the fundamental cause of capitalist economic crises. It means further, concretely, that all the major points of the workers' economic program must be directed at increasing the workers' income at the expense of the em-

ployer
the cri
is no
way.
Such
ent st
while
profits
the sa
shove
talists;
rates
upon
moun
now b
nesian
and of
produ
minim
mum
to bro
curity
ploym
at the
develo
works
degree
mum
strong
the co
war p
crisis
shoul
spirit,
basic
of the
the C
needle
upon
nesian
Key

employers' profits. This is striking at the crisis problem at its roots. There is no other effective working-class way.

Such a program implies a consistent struggle to raise wage rates, while fighting to restrict capitalist profits; to shorten the work day, at the same time as raising wages; to shove the tax burden upon the capitalists; to cut to the bone the interest rates upon the national debt and upon the many other aspects of the mountains of big credits that are now being built up under the Keynesian policies of the government and of big industry; to abolish arms production, or to reduce it to a minimum, and to slash the maximum profits that now go with it; to broaden out the entire social security system (health, education, employment, etc.) as fully as possible, at the expense of capitalist profits; to develop the necessary broad public works program to the maximum degree upon a non-profit, or minimum profits base; to encourage a strong East-West trade in spite of the contrary needs of Wall Street's war program. The other counter-crisis measures that are adopted should also be conceived in the same spirit, always bearing in mind the basic need to slash into the profits of the employers. The *Program* of the Communist Party, which it is needless to recapitulate here, is built upon these anti-capitalist, anti-Keynesian lines.

Keynesian economic policies are

fundamentally class collaborationist; they lead to the increase of capitalist profits, to the subordination of the workers by the employers, and to the general protection of the capitalist system; whereas the workers' economic program is based upon the class struggle, is basically anti-capitalist, and brings the workers into increasingly sharp collision with the employers. This is the course of action which, developed politically, leads not only to the maximum strengthening of the workers fight against economic crisis, but also to strengthening of the workers' fight for peace, to independent working-class political action, to the building of a great coalition of the workers, the Negro people and other democratic forces, eventually to capital levies and the nationalization of industry, and, in the long run, to people's democracy and Socialism.

The fight for the workers' economic program demands a great sharpening up of the ideological-political struggle by the Communists and other progressive forces. What is particularly needed in this respect is a concentrated Marxist-Leninist assault upon all the Keynesian class collaborationist conceptions of the "welfare state," "progressive capitalism," "managed economy" and the other illusions initiated and cultivated by Keynesism. It is high time that the Communists came to real grips with the Keynesians. The writings of Lumer and Norris are a long stride in this direction.

Walter Lippmann and Democracy

By Herbert Aptheker

BACK IN 1933, the editors of *The Nation*, in introducing a series of four articles devoted to Walter Lippmann remarked that he was "probably the most influential [American] journalist of our time." A similar estimate is true for our own day both in terms of the extensive audience reached by his columns (they appear in about 140 U.S. newspapers, 17 Latin-American, 9 Canadian, and in Australian, Greek, Japanese and other papers throughout the world) and in terms of the special seriousness with which so much of his audience studies his opinions.

This year there has appeared Mr. Lippmann's twentieth book, *Essays in The Public Philosophy*,* which for weeks has been among the nation's best-sellers, and reached additional thousands through nearly complete re-publication in a single issue of the reactionary organ, *United States News & World Report*, and in several issues of the liberal *Atlantic Monthly*. This offers a good occasion for a critical evaluation of the work of Mr. Lippmann.

* * *

In the extensive literature about Walter Lippmann a recurrent theme

is his alleged ambiguity. One repeatedly finds such questions as those posed a generation ago by Amos Pinchot: "Has he the liberal and democratic view, or . . . is he the prophet . . . of big-business fascism?" The simultaneous publication of extracts from his latest book in the *Atlantic* on the one hand and *U.S. News* on the other, indicates the same quality, as do the book's reviews by two writers in the *New Republic* who find opposite lessons.

The same duality appears in Max Freedman's review of *The Public Philosophy* in *The Nation*. He begins by saying: "Few things would be easier than to caricature this book and make out that Walter Lippmann is an enemy of the democratic tradition." Easier or not, Mr. Freedman feels it best "to take Mr. Lippmann at his own evaluation" and for this he quotes Lippmann as saying, early in the volume: "I am a liberal democrat . . ." Yet, before Mr. Freedman is half through with his own review, he is discussing Lippmann's "condemnation of the democratic process"—peculiar conduct for a liberal democrat who is a friend of the democratic tradition.

Related to this apparent duality is

* Little, Brown, \$3.50.

another
ature.
the da
Mr. L
young
editor
World
of his
comm
scribed
what
cal vic
the "f
A ge
lic col
ed a I
it to
and ju
Cross
Public
Loses
mann
"snapp
years o
experti
syndica
man
Others
Heinz
offered
what t
times
mann's
Lipp
rather
lem: "
a lifeti
and a
wealth
fashion

* Davi
em Univ

another striking feature of the literature concerning Lippmann. Since the day, over thirty years ago, that Mr. Lippmann left the then very young *New Republic* to join the editorial staff of the *New York World* to the day of the appearance of his latest volume, writers have commented upon what they described as Lippmann's change in what *had been* liberal or even radical views. Mr. Lippmann is forever the "former liberal."

A generation ago, his *New Republic* colleague, Herbert Croly, reported a Lippmann shift and attributed it to "unpardonable opportunism"; and just the other day, R. H. S. Crossman headed his piece on *The Public Philosophy*, "Mr. Lippmann Loses Faith." In this case the Lippmann shift was attributed to the "snapping of his patience" after years of "throwing the pearls of his expertise before the swine of a vast syndicated readership" (*New Statesman & Nation*, June 11, 1955). Others, including Carl Friedrich, Heinz Eulau and Max Lerner, have offered varying explanations for what they have viewed at different times as sharp changes in Lippmann's position.

Lippmann's biographer devotes a rather sharp sentence to this problem: "The subtle [?] influences of a lifetime of middle-class comfort and a growing ambition to achieve wealth and fame helped to re-fashion Lippmann's convictions."*

We shall not enter into the game of guessing Mr. Lippmann's motivations because we do not know him or them; because we are interested in his ideas, not his psyche; and because, therefore, his personal motivations are irrelevant to our inquiry.

We have, however, indicated the prevalence and range of the guessing to show the nearly unanimous assumption that notable inconsistency has marked Mr. Lippmann's career. This, we think, is wrong. Mr. Lippmann, with the exception of his extreme youth, has always been anti-democratic; his latest book confirms and sharpens his anti-democratic outlook.* This is said despite Lippmann's insistence in the book that he is "a liberal democrat" and despite Mr. Freedman's warning that such a characterization as I have offered is actually a caricature of the man's views. It is not a caricature. Mr. Lippmann is, and has been for at least thirty years, a systematic opponent of democracy because he has been a principled proponent of monopoly capitalism.

It is true, of course, that Lippmann's banner has fluttered with the breeze—and nearly bowed to an occasional storm—but the heart of the matter is that even his semantically most liberal works contain an anti-democratic essence. For the past generation and more this essence has been scantily disguised; with *The Public Philosophy*, issued in the

* David E. Weingast, *Walter Lippmann* (Rutgers Univ. Press, 1949), p. 13.

* This point is made in the discerning review of *The Public Philosophy* by Prof. H. H. Wilson, in *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, June 27, 1955.

midst of a "New Conservatism" upsurge, the essence is distilled and boldly presented.

There are, however, certain attributes special to Mr. Lippmann which explain his mountain-top position. These account for so astute an observer as Henry Steele Commager declaring Lippmann to be "the most sagacious of American publicists" (*The American Mind*, Yale Univ. Press, 1950, p. 221).

Style is not unimportant, and Mr. Lippmann's literary craftsmanship is great. Essentially it adds up to a tone of authoritative consideration, so that even his remarks which in content may be extremely tentative in impact seem to close debate. Lippmann's learning is formidable (though his scholarship is careless) and the nature of his experiences are extraordinary (before he was thirty, to go no further, Mr. Lippmann had been secretary for the Socialist mayor of Schenectady, assistant to Lincoln Steffens, an editor of *The New Republic*, and confidant of President Wilson).

Perhaps of greatest consequence are the concentration and sobriety that Mr. Lippmann has brought to his work. Apparently his powers of self-discipline are unusual and he has bent these single-mindedly for several decades to the study and elucidation of central political and social questions confronting the American ruling class. Early in his career Lippmann commented that "the price of respectability is a muffled soul bent on the trivial and the mediocre." He

must answer for the condition of his own soul, but the fact is that he has concentrated on the vital and the significant, and this gives to his indubitable respectability a special consequence. Always his point of departure has been that of the American ruling class, and his origins, contacts, friendships have been almost entirely limited to that class, or to comparable elements abroad.

* * *

The basic features of our historical epoch—the moribund nature of imperialism and the inevitability of its replacement by Socialism—have been apprehended, partially and in distorted form, by Walter Lippmann. It is the impact of this process of decay and the challenge of this process of growth which his writings mirror, and since his viewpoint is that of the doomed, his prose is filled with foreboding. Thus, in 1914, in his second book (*Drift and Mastery*): "We have lost authority . . . We drift . . . All weakness comes to the surface. We are homeless in a jungle of machines and untamed powers that haunt and lure the imagination." In 1939: "The American people have no vision of their own future . . . they are seized by deep uncertainty . . . [are] making themselves sick with nervous indecision" (*Life Magazine*, June 5). Today, in his latest book, referring to "Western society": "What we have seen is not only decay—though much of the old structure was dissolving—but something which can

be cal
Som
has
posed
imper
"New
pear
mann
before
in 18
Govern
day of
chang
breed
guide
To
eratin
has d
not h
are st
enhan
1939
sion i
sum
as an
Tra
lectua
ford a
of the
imper
will p
presen

Lip
do at
of hir
deed,
cialist
ticle, i
gazine
be "th

be called an historic catastrophe."

Something of the problem that has been harassing Lippmann was posed in the early days of American imperialism by the leader of that "New Freedom" which was to appear attractive to the young Lippmann. Woodrow Wilson, speaking before the Virginia Bar Association in 1897 on the subject, "Leaderless Government," said: "This is not a day of revolution; but it is a day of change, and of such change as may breed revolution, should we fail to guide and moderate it."

To the effort at guiding and moderating—and thwarting—Lippmann has devoted his life. The result is not heartening—the powers of 1914 are still untamed and now greatly enhanced; the deep uncertainty of 1939 is deeper, the nervous indecision is greater; the past fifty years sum themselves up for Lippmann as an historic catastrophe.

Tracing the remarkable intellectual career of Lippmann will afford a panoramic view of the path of the best thought of which U. S. imperialism has been capable, and will help explain the nature of its present position.

* * *

Lippmann begins, as quite a few do at the same period, by thinking of himself as a Socialist, and is, indeed, president of the Harvard Socialist Club. His first published article, in the *Harvard Illustrated Magazine*, for 1909, held Socialism to be "the coming thing," deplored the

ignorance of so many students concerning "this supremely important subject," and urged its inclusion in college curricula.

Until 1912 he holds to this allegiance and his writings of the period identify him with the Left-wing of the Socialist movement. Indeed, he resigned his post, on May Day, 1912, as secretary for the Socialist Mayor of Schenectady because he said the Mayor was more reformist than Socialist. In April, 1912, he had anticipated this action by declaring in *The Masses* that a bold Socialist program was needed and that it was necessary to keep Socialism distinct from reformism, otherwise "the movement would be impregnated with half-baked people who don't understand Socialism." In *The Call* of June 1, 1912, he returned to the theme of the need to make the Socialist Party not a reformist organization, but "a party of genuine radicals."

With that, however, Lippmann's fling was over. Despite these early espousals of radicalism Lippmann seems to have spoken truly when he told his biographer, in 1949, that he was "never a Marxist" and that "he had never accepted the idea of the class struggle."

Certainly, from 1913 on Lippmann has conducted a vigorous and lucrative* campaign to vindicate his

* His biographer writes: "He is believed by friends to be a thrifty person who has made good investments. *Time* on one occasion (Sept. 27, 1937) said that his yearly income was \$54,329. Others have placed the figure very much higher."

youthful change of mind and heart. All of his political activities and intellectual endeavors since then have been directed towards preserving monopoly capitalism by bringing to the rich responsible thinking geared to their interests, by urging upon them a "reasonable" approach and by attacking democratic concepts and practices.

It is not often that one can catch some Lippmann prose that is not leather-bound and vacuum-packed. This makes the exceptions all the more valuable. An outstanding exception is the speech he delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association of National Advertisers, held in November, 1945, and published by the Association in pamphlet form "for circulation among business executives." Speaking on "The Need for Enlightened Business Leadership" to fellow professional servitors, Mr. Lippmann was strikingly direct and simple.

The "need," he said, was acute because the challenge was grave. The businessmen's future, he warned, "is certain to be dark, turbulent, and tragic if they are not strongly led by men who take seriously, and take regularly, honest and wise advice on the world they are living in, the character of the age to which they belong . . ." He went on to remind his listeners

that whereas 50 years ago, even 25 years ago, the system which we call free enterprise was universal among all economically developed countries,

today the United States is the only big industrial country now committed to the perpetuation of free enterprise.

Lippmann kept hammering away at the need for "an enlightened public policy"; he insisted that nothing could be "settled by saying the hell with the New Deal, the hell with labor unions, the hell with the Russians." Of course, was the clear implication, we would all like to see these monsters consigned to hell, but wishing for it would not accomplish it; they were not goblins to be dissolved by imprecations, but were real forces requiring "enlightened public policy."

If businessmen ignore the enlightenment they will be "acting exactly like all other governing classes who throughout history were on their way down and on their way out." They must not follow the model of the French aristocrats who "clung so grimly and stupidly to their privileges that they lost their power"; no, the model is the British rulers who change form with splendid elasticity and retain substance with notable tenacity. Lippmann said there was "nothing so pertinent to the peculiar position of American businessmen in the years that lie ahead" as this French-British contrast. With that came the noble exhortation that no doubt quickened the sensitive hearts of the assembled advertising executives: "Let the captains of industry be captains indeed, and go forward unafraid into the days to come."

It is not unfair to suggest that when Lippmann told these advertising tycoons of the businessmen's critical need of "honest and wise advice," he and his audience assumed that the man addressing them was a shining example of such a counsellor.

This advice has had perhaps half a dozen central threads that weave in and out of Lippmann's work, to reappear as a finished pattern in his most recent volume. These main themes will now receive our attention.

* * *

Lippmann has always insisted on the overwhelming importance—from the imperialists' viewpoint—of crushing Socialism. A considerable section of his very early book, *Drift and Mastery* (1914) is devoted to demonstrating "the inadequacy of Marx for the present age." As befitted the time, this demonstration was enveloped in compliments concerning Marx' great vision. But the garlands were distributed in order to camouflage the knife-thrust: "Marxians are out of touch with the latent forces of this age"; they are, in fact, "largely sterile." The substance of Lippmann's arguments as to this point need not detain us here. It is due him to say, however, that they contain all the arguments advanced by him or by anyone else in the course of the subsequent forty years' campaign to show how out-moded Marxism really is.

When the Bolshevik Revolution demonstrated Marxism's "sterility,"

Lippmann applied himself to the noble task of "choking the infant in its cradle." In this behalf he was a chief author of Wilson's Fourteen Points, issued in January, 1918. This was an effort to offset the impact of that Revolution and the public release by the Bolsheviks of the terms of the secret treaties which were the reality behind the imperialists' slogan of "Peace Without Victory"—also coined by Lippmann. In this connection, too, did he view the conception of a League of Nations.

At the Paris Peace Council, where Lippmann played a role, he felt the United States was *the* barrier against the Bolshevizing of Europe. He reported early in 1919 that "Lenin and Liebknecht sit in the Council at Paris, and their voices are heard in every discussion." Lippmann insisted that, "It is with them the world is negotiating today for its own preservation," thus very early consigning Soviet Russia to some other planet.

At the negotiations of the victorious imperialist powers Lippmann was troubled by the squabbles and differences amongst themselves and their vindictiveness towards the defeated nations, for he felt that everything should be subordinated to a united coalition—a sort of premature NATO—to destroy Bolshevism. It was the failure to solidify this as firmly as he wished that caused Lippmann to resign his services and return to the United States.

In the *Political Scene*, published in 1919, Lippmann warned:

The reason why Lenin may succeed is that the victors do not take seriously enough what he represents. They are frightened to be sure, they are even panicky, but they are not serious enough about the menace to be willing to subordinate every other consideration to the creation of a Europe which will be sterile to Bolshevism.

Lippmann called for "not a sanitary cordon, but a sanitary Europe," including a revived Germany, and this sanitary Europe, "under the ægis of the League is preliminary to the final problem of dealing with Lenin." He thought such a program—plus internationalizing the European and Pacific ports of Russia—rather than armed intervention, with all its risks, might end Bolshevism. He glimpsed something of the mass release that Bolshevism represented and called it "primitive, formless." Hence he held that conventional military repression would fail, for the conquest of Bolshevism was an altogether different kind of a problem from that of "occupying a capital and a few strategic points."*

From that time to the present Lippmann has sought incessantly and conscientiously to devise a foreign policy that would destroy the USSR. And, to the same end, he

* It is in the context of this opposition to military intervention that one is to read the magnificent editorial in *The New Republic* of January 28, 1920, denouncing the lies about Soviet Russia in the *New York Times* and other commercial papers as "the father of lies." These were deceits promulgated to bolster an impossible and stupid program, doomed to failure—an irresponsible blunder which to Lippmann, then and now, is inexcusable.

has tried to discover some magical device that would tear out of capitalism the roots of its replacement by Socialism. Fabianism, Fordism, Keynesism have beguiled him in turn—the latter with lasting impact—but these he has viewed as more or less useful tactical devices. The main enemy was Democracy itself, the sovereignty of the people, and against this idea as being at the nub of the challenge to "free enterprise," Lippmann has waged a many-sided assault, culminating in the all-out attack in his latest volume.

The relationship of Socialism and democracy is, as Lenin has said, organic; the most determined enemies of both have also recognized in their own distorted fashion, this relationship. This is, indeed, a main theme of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Hence, there it is written:

Democracy of the West today is the forerunner of Marxism, which would be inconceivable without it. It is democracy alone which furnishes this universal plague with the soil in which it spreads.

Again:

The parliamentary principle of decision by majority, by denying the authority of the person and placing in its stead the number of the crowd in question, sins against the aristocratic basic idea of nature.

Dozens of such quotations may be culled from Hitler. The idea in them is central to the thinking of

other fa
cism, a
Mosca
fluentia
first pul
with L
how str
Mosca
that his
as a re
out wh
escaping
cialism.

Social
wrote)
onstratic
fest the
(i.e., M
ing visi
of reali
this cor
only, w
the infl
form an

Lippi
over a
the diff
tachment
democr
sulted
implem

In a
Lippm
of a re
cism of
ings h
void, w
not fri

* Gaer
1939), p
ible stud
the Elite
& Society

other fascists or precursors of fascism, as the Italians, Pareto and Mosca. Indeed, the latter's very influential work, *The Ruling Class*, first published in 1923, should be read with Lippmann's latest opus to see how strikingly similar they are.

Mosca stated in so many words that his system of élitism was offered as a refutation of democracy, without which refutation there was no escaping the inexorable logic of Socialism.

Socialism will be arrested only (he wrote) . . . if the discovery and demonstration of the great laws that manifest themselves in all human societies (i.e., Mosca's élitism) succeed in making visible to the eye *the impossibility of realizing the democratic ideal*. On this condition, and on this condition only, will the intellectual classes escape the influence of social democracy and form an invincible barrier to it.*

Lippmann has been insisting for over a generation that the source of the difficulties of our era lies in attachment to the erroneous idea of democracy, which has necessarily resulted in disastrous efforts at its implementation.

In an essay published in 1922, Lippmann announced "the absence of a really friendly and drastic criticism of democratic ideas." His writings have been filling this alleged void, with the emphasis on drastic, not friendly. Indeed, his book pub-

lished that same year — *Public Opinion* — is such a criticism. For its theme is that democracy assumes the existence of an informed and rational public opinion, while in fact the assumption is quite false. As a result, the truth is that any community which is large and has heterogeneous interests will have to be governed and is really governed "only by a specialized class whose personal interests reach beyond the locality."***

Moreover, he went on, "this class is irresponsible" and that is how it must be. The origin of power is of no consequence, only the use of power matters, he maintained. And, though Lippmann did not say this, his position clearly assumes that there is no relationship between the source of power and the use to which it is put. Here, then, the mythical entity of Power serves to destroy class and make questions like democracy or autocracy or oligarchy unreal catch-phrases for election time or bed-time. Present, too, in this classlessness that so well serves Lippmann's anti-democracy, is another idealist construction that runs through all his political writing. Not only is Power divorced from any social reality, but also the State is quite divorced from any class definition, that is, has no relationship with any real State that has ever existed.

Lippmann has attacked, in books

* Gaetano Mosca, *The Ruling Class* (N.Y., 1939), p. 327, italics added. See the very valuable study by Raymond Barkley, "The Theory of the Elite and the Methodology of Power" in *Science & Society*, Spring, 1955.

** Implicit here is a valid insight, explicit in Madison and Calhoun, that only in a homogeneous society — one without exploiting classes — could there be a fully democratic, non-oppressive state.

going back to the 'twenties—like *Men of Destiny* and *American Inquisitors*—what he calls “the dogma of majority rule” from another angle—that of so-called “liberalism.” In the name of liberty, democracy is assaulted. Here is an example of this approach taken from the latter book (1928):

The advancement of human liberty has as a matter of practical politics consisted in building up centers of resistance against the absolutism of the reigning sovereigns . . . Whoever the sovereign, the program of liberty is to deprive him of arbitrary and absolute power. In our age the power of majorities tends to become arbitrary and absolute.

Again observe how the myth of Power—divorced from class origins and functions—serves to bolster the power of the ruling class. This, too, serves to obscure the fact that “the advancement of human liberty” has come as the result of mass struggle against reactionary ruling classes, something which Lippmann avoids in all his earlier writings, and denies in his later work. Further, it hides the fact that this advancement has come with and has meant the enhancement of the rights and powers of more and more of the people, reaching its highest point, in theory, in the conception of sovereignty as inhering in the people. This idea of the sovereign people negates, of course, the original idea of sovereignty—that is the omnipotence of the Sovereign *over* the people.

Of course, in origin, liberty to the

bourgeoisie meant the liberty of accumulating property and inequality in property ownership was a hallmark of such “liberty.” Lippmann, advocate par excellence of the bourgeoisie, repeats this word for word a century and a half after its progressive potential, relative to feudalism, has been squeezed dry: “Private property,” he wrote in *The Method of Freedom* (1934), “was the original source of freedom” and “it is still its main bulwark.”

What is bothering Mr. Lippmann is that of which the Founding Fathers already had a sharp premonition when creating our Constitution. Madison, for example, in the Convention, June 26, 1787, put the matter clearly:

In framing a system which we wish to last for ages, we should not lose sight of the changes which ages will produce. An increase of population will of necessity increase the proportion of those who will labor under all the hardships of life, and secretly sigh for a more equal distribution of its blessings. These may in time outnumber those who are placed above the feelings of indigence. According to the equal laws of suffrage, the power will slide into the hands of the former. No agrarian attempts have yet been made in this country, but symptoms of a leveling spirit, as we have understood, have sufficiently appeared in certain quarters to give notice of the future danger.

These are the deeper meanings of the cries of the Convention delegates concerning the need to check “democracy,” of democracy’s “horrors” and

“dange
the fa
centur
Pain,
though
limited
now t

The
bourge
feudal
needin
trive a
private

tributi
publici
tion, t

The c
leadin
18th c
limiti
lished,

imper
centur
mann.

tradit
togeth
now a

And
demo
capaci

idea o
lar ca
attack
falls.

Agg
pated.
curren

inher
tional
resign

tude
postur

"dangers." To this is to be added the fact that even advanced 18th century political scientists — like Paine, Madison, Alfieri, etc. — thought of the "People" in almost as limited a sense as some individuals now think of "Society."

The solution for the 18th century bourgeoisie — seeking victory over feudalism and/or colonialism, and needing mass support—was to contrive a government which protected private property and its unequal distribution while maintaining the republican form—that is, their solution, then, was bourgeois-democracy. The contradiction already sensed by leading bourgeois-democrats in the 18th century and already very much limiting the "democracy" established, becomes overwhelming to imperialist theoreticians of the 20th century—including Walter Lippmann. Their resolution of the contradiction is to deny democracy altogether the better to preserve the now aged bourgeoisie.

Another facet of the attack upon democracy is to deny the people's *capacity* to govern. Organic to the idea of popular sovereignty is popular capacity, and if the latter can be attacked successfully then the former falls.

Again, Mr. Lippmann has anticipated, in his earlier writing, the vast current outpouring relative to the inherent evil of humanity, its irrationalism and its rottenness making resignation the only responsible attitude and contrition the only moral posture.

Adherents of democracy, he wrote back in 1925, "encourage the people to attempt the impossible"—that is, to exercise sovereignty, and this can only result in their "interfering outrageously with the productive activities of the individual." This must at all costs be avoided "so that each of us may live free of the trappings and the roar of a bewildered herd." Even earlier, in his *Public Opinion*, Lippmann seized on the behaviorism of J. B. Watson (his book, *Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist* appeared in 1919) to bulwark his attack on democracy. For the mechanical behaviorist view of thinking as pure stimulus and response—of the human brain as a mere switchboard—was the source for Lippmann's invention of the concept of mental "stereotypes." With this, Lippmann reduced the "reality" of democracy to the manipulation of the "herd's" mind by the propagandistic conditioning conducted by the elite. Similarly, psychoanalysis and pragmatism appealed to Lippmann—as did eugenics for a time—as scientific demonstrations of the irrational and amoral nature of man, as clinchers that the masses, in Mencken's phrase, were the "booboisie."

In his *Preface to Morals* (1929) Lippmann announced men to be at last "free" and *therefore* corrupt. "There are," he proclaimed, "no conventions, no tabus, no gods, no priests, princes, fathers, or revelations which they must accept . . . The prison door is wide open. They

stagger out into trackless space under a blinding sun." The freedom is intolerable, for the free are incapable and so the liberated one "put on manacles to keep his hands from trembling." It is these members of the bewildered herd who "drug themselves with pleasure . . . who have made the moving pictures and the popular newspapers what they are."

The unrestrained language reflects the emotion of an offended and frightened snob, but more consequential is the never-never land that Lippmann must construct to make reasonable his vicious attack on the masses. "The prison door is wide open," indeed. "Free to make their own lives," indeed. Such travesties are beneath refutation. They are indulged in lest the prison doors really be opened. They are part of Lippmann's systematic slander of the masses—the reverse side of his theory of the elite.

We suffer, wrote Lippmann in his attack on the New Deal disguised under the title, *Inquiry into the Principles of Good Society* (1937), from "The Illusion of Control" which must have been news to the thirteen million then unemployed. The fact is, at any rate, he insisted, that "there is no possibility that men can understand the whole process of social existence." Forgetting "the limitations of men" has been our central error. Men cannot plan their future for "they are unable to imagine it" and they cannot manage a civilization, for "they are un-

able to understand it." To think otherwise, to dare to believe that the people can and should govern themselves, that they can and should forge social systems and governments enhancing the pursuit of their happiness here on earth—this is "the gigantic heresy of an apostate generation."

Hence, Lippmann's *Principles of a Good Society* came down, after all the elevated language, to the "rugged individualism" spelled out by its personification, Herbert Hoover, in his *The Challenge to Liberty* (1934).

* * *

That Lippmann believes in the incapacity of the mass and the heretical nature of the movement to make democracy fully meaningful does not mean that he closes his eyes to the urgent reality of that movement. This is why, as we have seen, Lippmann views Socialism as a central question of our day and has labored to make the bourgeoisie comprehend the fullness of its challenge.

Thus, another important aspect of Lippmann's thinking is his correct insistence that the modern world is marked by a decisive change as compared with previous epochs. That decisive change lies in the fact that capitalism has created a technology capable of freeing men of want, poverty, illiteracy and even, very largely, of disease. It has also produced the working class which can transform the social order so that the technical possibilities of devel-

oped
ized
enhar
ploita
war
the fi
and, i
nation
of th
that
Lip
press
he ser
presen
book,
wrote
purpo
I bel
that h
histor
conten
chang
Prefac
peculi
is that
are co
origin
As
mann.
though
deliver
fornia
said,
should
has ta
themse
is in t
termin
held,
the ma
dered
So,

oped capitalism may be fully realized and—with Socialism—infinately enhanced. The elimination of exploitation, oppression, poverty and war becomes, then, in our era, for the first time, a practical possibility and, indeed, the process of the elimination of the old and the creation of the new is the characteristic of that era.

Lippmann, of course, does not express the change in these terms, but he senses its quality. This is already present in his pre-World War I book, *Drift and Mastery*, where he wrote that "men have to substitute purpose for tradition: and that is, I believe, the profoundest change that has ever taken place in human history." Even where he is most contemptuous of the masses, this change is on his mind. Thus, in *A Preface to Morals* he found, "The peculiarity of our modern situation is that multitudes instead of a few, are compelled to make radical and original adjustments."

As so often happens with Lippmann, the clearest expression of this thought occurs in a speech—this one delivered at the University of California in March, 1933. The idea, he said, "that a social order can and should be planned and managed, has taken root among the people themselves and the sovereign power is in their hands." Hence, "the determining element of this age," he held, was "the conscious effort by the mass of men to produce an ordered society."

So, while Lippmann views this

as heretical, he sees it as real and potent. He doesn't like it, but he never forgets it.

This reality leads Lippmann to emphasize the need for style, finesse, deftness on the part of the rulers. He wants a refined exploitation. In his first book, *A Preface to Politics* (1913), he warned:

There is something pathetic in the blindness of powerful people when they face a social crisis. Fighting viciously every readjustment . . . they make their own overthrow inevitable . . . When far-sighted men appear in the ruling classes—men who recognize the need of a civilized answer to this increasing restlessness, the rich and the powerful treat them to a scorn and a hatred that are incredibly bitter . . . (It) is enough to make an observer believe that the rich of today are as stupid as the nobles of France before the Revolution.

Even in his bitter attack against the New Deal, as formulated in *The Good Society*, where he explicitly agrees with the Tory thinking of Herbert Spencer, he disagrees with Spencerian tactics. He does not want moss-back reactionary attitudes which may encourage "the common ruin of property." This has been and remains a constant ingredient in Lippmann's thinking, though he limits the area of permissible concession as imperialism grows older.

This leads Lippmann to urge that the bourgeoisie bethink themselves of the usefulness of benevolence. Indeed, Lippmann is a pioneer in pro-

pagandizing for the idea of the "industrial statesman" rather than the capitalist, for the idea of the tycoons as "creators of national growth" rather than robber barons. In his earliest book, the independently wealthy young man appealed for businessmen "released from the stupid fixation upon the silly little ideals of accumulating dollars." He went on:

Instead of telling business men not to be greedy, we should tell them to be industrial statesmen, applied chemists, and members of a craft. Politics can aid that revolution in a hundred ways: by advocating it, by furnishing schools that teach, laboratories that demonstrate, by putting business on the same plane of interest as the Health Service.

By his next book, *Drift and Mastery*, published a year later (1914), Mr. Lippmann announced the realization of his proposal, and anticipated the kernel of Burnham's *Managerial Revolution*. Wrote Lippmann:

The real news about business, it seems to me, is that it is being administered by men who are not profiteers. The managers are on salary, divorced from ownership and from bargaining. They represent the revolution in business incentives at its very heart. For they conduct gigantic enterprises and they stand outside the higgling of the market . . . The motive of profit is not their personal motive. That is an astounding change.

Astounding—yes, and somewhat

prematurely announced. Twenty years later, Mr. Lippmann was writing on "Big Businessmen of Tomorrow" (*The American Magazine*, April, 1934) which proposed for that "tomorrow" what Mr. Lippmann had found already to be fact in 1914. Still, in 1934, he felt it was certain for that tomorrow. Then, he was sure, businessmen would see their positions as places of public trust, not as sources of private accumulation. "They will work for honor, distinction, for promotion, for the interest and excitement and satisfaction of the work itself."

The theme recurs in later writings by Lippmann; he has labored hard to get across the "stereotype" of the sacrificial businessman to the thundering herd, but with little success. He faces an insurmountable obstacle to which he alluded—also in 1934—when he was somewhat impatient with what he thought was the *naiveté* afflicting some New Dealers. Recovery, he wrote, could come only if the government encouraged large-scale investments by capitalists. And, he bluntly pointed out:

They will not do it to earn a Blue Eagle. They will not do it for patriotism's sake or as an act of public service. They will do it because they see a chance to make money. That is the way it works. (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, July 13, 1934).

It is worth noting that with all of Lippmann's verbiage about the need for elasticity in ruling, his own record is markedly unimaginative

and ri
minim
the W
tion P
Mellon
a sales
to raise
zation
1944 in
He ha
ism an
idea o
eign P
around
weaker
achieve
perialis
these
needed
Comm
basic
that is
as we
War I

Lipp
democ
recent
phy. I
of the
geois-c
the era
tialism
Lamor
gratitu
at a d
ultima
always
utterat
constr
Mr.
ices in

and rigid. He was opposed to a minimum wage law, and denounced the Wagner Labor Act. His taxation policy has been about that of Mellon, and he has generally favored a sales tax. He was one of the first to raise the demand for the illegalization of the Communist Party (in 1944 in his book, *U. S. War Aims*). He has always supported colonialism and repeatedly denounced the idea of self-determination. His foreign policy has generally revolved around the theme of how best to weaken the Soviet Union and achieve the hegemony of U. S. imperialism. It is in connection with these policies that Lippmann pioneered in proposing an "Atlantic Community" (his phrase)—an idea basic to the Cold War and one that is rooted in policy he projected, as we have seen, right after World War I.

* * *

Lippmann's lifelong assault upon democracy is systematized in his recent *Essays in the Public Philosophy*. Its appearance is a hallmark of the increasing rejection of bourgeois-democracy that characterizes the era of intensified monopoly capitalism. The Morgan partner, Thomas Lamont, in proposing a resolution of gratitude for Lippmann's services, at a dinner held in 1931, offered this ultimate accolade: "Big business has always respected Mr. Lippmann's utterances. They have always been constructive."

Mr. Lippmann continues his services in his latest volume by present-

ing in his most civilized manner and as persuasively as his great talents and experiences permit, a *rationale* for declaring democracy defunct.

Naturally, at this time in this country, in the press that "matters" his work has been generally hailed. A professor of philosophy finds it "a classical model of diagnosis," the head of a history department in another college says Lippmann "speaks as a wise prophet," the head of a Catholic university hopes "that one hundred years from now it may be recognized as the opening gun of a powerful movement in political philosophy." Hopeful, however, and a sign of the turn against extreme reaction that has marked the past several months, some professors, notably H. H. Wilson of Princeton and Oscar Handlin of Harvard, have written strong criticisms of the volume.

The enemy, writes Lippmann, is "the Jacobin heresy" and that heresy is the one we have already encountered in his earlier works—*i.e.*, the belief that humanity can and should produce on earth a society of abundance, equality, freedom, and peace. This heresy is common to Jacobinism and to Leninism; it must be excised, else the "civilities" will cease. "The misrule of the people" explains "the decline of the West"; let us stop flattering them and admit to ourselves and convince them that their sovereignty is absurd and unworkable and, indeed, sinful.

Certainly, writes Lippmann, my philosophy "will impose a regime

that is hard," but "the results of rational and disciplined government will be good." The emancipated herd is "lonely" (using Riesman) and "proletarianized" (using Toynbee) and actually seeks tradition and stability and order and our philosophy will provide all these. Disfranchisement is not advocated—no crudity, please — but representation should be "virtual," such as existed in 18th century England (and against which the American colonists rebelled, but of *that* source of the "heresy" we will not speak).

Popular opinion is and must be opposite to the public interest—this miraculous public interest contrived by Mr. Lippmann, though never really defined. But then Mr. Lippmann, being of the elite, knows the public interest when he sees it, and the one thing he is sure of is that his public interest is as public as the rich Englishman's public school—that is to say, it is private. Mr. Lippmann has extended the myth of the classless state of his earlier writings to the myth of a classless public interest which is knowable only to a private, minute elite.

All is geared to the stability of private property. That stability needs flexibility, not rigidity, Lippmann still insists, and it entails duties—governing for instance—as well as rights, such as the wherewithal to live well, as befits the elite. In terms of flexibility, Lippmann rejects the tactical approach of the McCarthyites as being untimely, crude and unnecessary *at this juncture of events*. He has written, in one of his

columns, that "the real trouble with the so-called Right-wing Republicans" is that they do not sufficiently take account of "the modern realities" and that "they are at odds with the history of the times they live in." (January 10, 1955.)

When Lippmann becomes specific as to the "errors" that popular sovereignty has produced in the past, he is positively ludicrous, of course. And he is ludicrous for two reasons: 1) The people really did not rule in his Western countries, as he well knows; 2) Policies followed by these Western countries were formulated by monopolists and to the degree that those policies were not modified by concessions to opposing public opinion, to that degree were they fully disastrous. This is true from the "rugged individualist" criminality of the elite Mr. Hoover and his gang to the foreign policy of the Cliveden Set—not to speak of the absolutely undiluted elitism of the Hitler-Mussolini-Hirohito Axis. It is not irrelevant to recall that it was John Foster Dulles—not a Jacobin heretic—who wrote, in 1939: "Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplates war upon us."

Actually, the full implications of Lippmann's *Public Philosophy* were spelled out by him in certain columns that he was writing while doing that book. In October, 1954, he was in Italy, and he was appalled by the strength of the Left. He reported the Communist Party of Italy, "dominates the labor unions, is a growing power among the vil-

lagers
great
middle
tinued

The
control
the bu
the po
told, st
the Co
the cou

This
party n
to be,
over th
lence.

He
in his
he sa
about
and
length

We
state t
them
stances
votes.

We
state t
gally.

answer
of cou
tions v
of our
men
fascists
danger
of our

Lipp
princip
And I
Wit

lagers in southern Italy, and it has great support and influence in the middle class." Mr. Lippmann continued:

The non-Communist parties are in control of the apparatus of the state, of the bureaucracy, the armed forces and the police. They will not, I have been told, surrender their sovereign power to the Communists if they fall behind in the count of heads . . .

This decision within the governing party means, if it is as firm as it appears to be, that the Communists cannot take over the government without great violence. (October 19, 1954).

He returned to the same question in his next column. He had spoken, he said, with an eminent Italian about this question of democracy and Communism. The result is lengthy, but worth full quotation:

We have decided not to surrender the state to the Communists, not to allow them to take power even if circumstances were to give them the legal votes.

We shall use the whole force of the state to prevent their taking power legally. That in the last resort will be our answer to Communist propaganda. But of course the answer will require actions which will in fact put in charge of our affairs soldiers, policemen and men who are temporarily akin to fascists. So we avert the Communist danger but the price may be the loss of our democracy and our liberties.

Lippmann comments that "in principle this is the right decision." And he adds:

With weak democratic government

there is a great danger that the democrats would simply be brushed aside, would abdicate their responsibilities, and would leave the dirty work to be done by a minority. If that is so, the great question arises as to whether the basic decision should not now be brought into the open, and publicly declared and its principle openly discussed and vindicated. (Oct. 21, 1954; italics added).

In *The Public Philosophy*, the language is not quite this explicit—it does not mention "the dirty work," for example—but the same program of the illegalization of "subversion," of the "heresy," in fact, is offered. It is the program, of course, of Brownell at home and of Dulles abroad with his "internal aggression" clauses in his Asian and Latin-American pacts. It is a program to justify the domination of the world by an ultra-reactionary, coordinated, "sterilized" United States.

* * *

There is an additional element in Lippmann's recent writing that requires attention. In accordance with his effort at responsible and sober reportage for his employers, Mr. Lippmann has been emphasizing in recent columns the reality of the world-wide mass demand for peace. He has also noted that in most of the world, because of her anti-war and anti-colonial stand, the U.S.S.R. does "stand forth as the champion of what the peoples want."

These pronouncements are to be read in the light of Lippmann's anti-democratic convictions and his be-

lief that popular policies are invariably "bad" policies. When read in this light they carry additional weight, for Lippmann is telling his masters—pro-war and anti-Soviet as they are—to tread lightly and to move cautiously. He is reporting where the overwhelming direction of mass opinion is, and he knows as a practical matter something of what this means in terms of power. He therefore is in fact acknowledging the marvelously salutary influences of that mass opinion which Lippmann professes to despise. This, itself, is a decisive refutation of his *Public Philosophy*.

* * *

Lippmann's views of the masses and of their role is diametrically opposed to that of Marxism, which is the philosophy of the liberation of the masses by themselves. "When it is a question of a complete transformation of the social organization," wrote Engels in his introduction to *The Class Struggles in France*, "the masses themselves must also be in it, must themselves already have grasped what is at stake, what they are going in for with body and soul . . . no lasting victory is possible for them [Socialists] unless they first win the great mass of the people."

And as for these masses, Marxists evaluate their character, too, in a way quite opposite from Lippmann. "The workers and peasants," said Stalin in 1933, "who work without fuss and noise . . . who create all the good things of life, who feed and clothe the whole

world—they are the real heroes and the creators of the new life."

But one does not have to subscribe to Marxism to reject Lippmann's system of reaction. To Lippmann the great heresy is the idea of the masses having the capacity for building and maintaining a healthy social order, but Thomas Jefferson spoke of a different heresy: "the political heresy that man is incapable of self-government." "I am not," said Jefferson, "among those who fear the people. They, and not the rich, are the dependence for continued freedom."

Abraham Lincoln, too, put the same thought with characteristic simplicity and must be numbered among Lippmann's heretics. Speaking to his friend, Richard Oglesby in 1858, Lincoln said: "Remember, Dick, to keep close to the people—they are always right and will mislead no one."

There is a kinship in the words of Jefferson and Lincoln with those of Engels and Stalin because the liberation of the working class and of all humanity—the victory of Socialism—is in direct line with, an extension of, a leap forward from the limited liberating results of bourgeois-democracy.

The ideas of Lippmann are akin to those of enemies of democracy from Carlyle to Mosca to Hitler. They are contemptuous of the masses and threaten the interests of the masses. Their defeat in life requires mass unity and activity, in defense of democracy, of equality, and of peace.

By Pa
Gener

WH
curren
One m
weekly
lines o
politic
the un
tical o
presen
Wh
politic
terizes
that f
Govern
not th
sort o
lems f
our co
new e
tion is
wagin
comm
into th
the G
the fi
hullab
vain a
of the
volved
In I
bloc n
for the
most p

On Building Unity in Italy*

By Palmiro Togliatti

General Secretary, Communist Party of Italy

WHAT IS THE DOMINANT FACT in the current political situation in Italy? One need only turn to the daily and weekly press, or glance at the headlines of any newspaper, whatever its political line, in order to perceive the uncertainty, confusion and political disorder characteristic of the present moment. . . .

What then, is the reason for this political confusion which characterizes the present moment? It is that from the moment the present Government was formed it made not the slightest attempt to find any sort of solution for the grave problems facing the working masses and our country as a whole. The only new element in the political situation is that the batteries of the forces waging the anti-democratic and anti-communist struggle have come out into the open a little more, and that the Government took advantage of the fire of those batteries and the hullabaloo raised around it, in a vain attempt to crawl out of the filth of the scandals in which it is involved.

In Italy today an anti-communist bloc means an anti-democratic bloc, for the Communists are the people's most powerful opposition force, the

greatest organized force of the working class and one of the biggest organized forces of the peasant masses, the working people and the progressive sections of the middle class. There is no other means of fighting the Communists than by attacking democracy and trampling underfoot the principles inscribed in the Constitution of the Republic.

Thrust aside were all the real problems: those arising from the ever-growing want in the countryside, which affects not only the small farmers, the farm laborers and the sharecroppers, but also a section of the prosperous peasants; the serious problem of the increasing pressure brought to bear by monopolist industrial groups upon the entire economic and political life of the country; the ever-present problem, which has today become even more serious than yesterday, of work for a very large number of Italian citizens.

It is this that is responsible for the dissatisfaction which continues to be so widespread and which is already attended by a feeling of bitterness which can even give rise to

* Reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, April 29, 1955, text slightly condensed.

disillusionment among broad sections of the population, unless we ourselves, aided by all the democratic forces, succeed in remedying the situation by achieving concrete results or by means of struggle that leads the working masses and all democratic forces towards a profound change in the present situation. . . .

I

What is the general orientation of Italy's present-day policy-makers? What is their aim? What do they want? Behind everything that has been happening since the present Government was formed—or at least during this year—lies the desire of the present ruling group of the Christian Democratic Party to prepare and carry through another reactionary operation directed against the democratic forces. They cannot admit this intention openly for today that would give rise to profound contradictions between the Christian Democratic Party and an immense section of public opinion. In other words, the time has passed when it was possible to make a quick change and set up a front of the Christian Democratic Party with the monarchists and fascists. The leaders of the Christian Democratic Party themselves admit that an operation of this kind would today be too dangerous for them.

But these leaders are not giving up their reactionary scheme. They

are merely trying to cloak and camouflage it, to carry it through by round-about means, and that causes still more confusion.

On the basis of all this we consider it possible to draw the conclusion that these forces are scheming to try new means of achieving the aim the Christian Democratic Party failed in with its fraudulent electoral law. The frank purpose of that law—as we quite correctly pointed out—was to give the Christian Democratic Party a permanent political monopoly, in fact and in law, by means of a constitutional *coup d'etat*. Once it had this monopoly it intended gradually to reduce to nought the democratic gains guaranteed by the Constitution and thrust upon Italy a regime of the clerical type, resembling that of Salazar or Franco.

By our victory in the elections of June 7, 1953, we prevented this *coup* and consequently defeated the schemes of the Christian Democratic Party.

The offensive against the Communists serves the ruling circles as a cloak for the preparation of what they intend to be their decisive attack, the one that would enable them—this time by other means than through a constitutional *coup*—to achieve the same aim of definitively obtaining a complete political monopoly.

In the main, there are two salient factors in this reactionary offensive. Firstly, the state authorities and reactionary employers are resorting to

illegal
in orde
cratic
organiz
pressur
Democr
to esta
Righter
monarc

Such
the tas
only us
al forc
perceiv
in the
domina
econom
princip
the pol
tian D
wise is
June 7
appreci
now w
so it is
we ens
effectiv
of Ital
movem
their e
cratic f
the de
strengt
the pol
We l
and str
minist
haps th
deed t
force, t

illegal and anti-democratic measures in order to weaken the Left democratic forces by bringing to bear organized, methodical, reactionary pressure. Secondly, the Christian Democratic Party does in fact plan to establish an alliance with the Rightist forces in Parliament—the monarchists and fascists.

II

Such being the situation, what is the task that confronts us, and not only us, but all democratic and liberal forces in general, all those who perceive the grave danger inherent in the fact that Italian society is dominated by the most backward economic and political forces? The principal task is to fight to destroy the political monopoly of the Christian Democratic Party. That likewise is the task we posed in the June 7 elections. If we then achieved appreciable results in this respect, now we must achieve more. To do so it is necessary, above all else, that we ensure ever more extensive and effective participation of the masses of Italian people in the resistance movement and the struggle to defend their economic interests and democratic freedoms, by putting forward the demand that democracy be strengthened and developed in both the political and economic spheres.

We know that in this movement and struggle of the masses, the Communist Party is the chief and perhaps the decisive factor. We are indeed the most firm and cohesive force, the party of the working class,

the party that is looked to with confidence by all those who, although not Communists or Socialists, are nonetheless sincere democrats and desire the progress, liberty and independence of the country. To date, we have already issued 2,100,000 new Party cards. In recent months 103,000 working people joined the ranks of the vanguard party of the working class.

Bearing in mind the conditions under which our activity is carried on, these facts assume particularly vital importance now. They mean that the basic force of the Party has remained intact and is growing; and as long as that force exists the enemies of democracy, peace and social progress in our country will be unable to carry out their schemes.

Another positive factor is the everyday contact which, in spite of everything, we are able to establish, on a broader scale than ever before, with new people and new groups that are not affiliated to the forces traditionally linked with us and, what is more, are traditionally linked with the government camp.

We have indications from all regions showing that a large body of cadres in Catholic organizations is no longer evading contact with us, but is more frequently seeking it, desiring joint discussion and orienting or beginning to orient itself in ways that can hardly please the leading group of the Christian Democratic Party.

Hence, not only our organized force is gaining in strength, but our

ideas too are extending and advancing along the path they ought to take.

However, shortcomings are not yet eliminated, and we should not blind ourselves to these, but calmly examine and study them. For example, we must take note of the apparent failure of the workers' forces in the elections of the factory committees at the FIAT works. We must take into account and study seriously the conditions and reasons for this lack of success.

Certainly, we must in the first place focus attention on the conditions under which the struggle was carried on; and this needs to be done, not so as to find extenuating circumstances or justification, but so as to bring to light some factors affecting present-day political and social life in Italy. Here the main fact which is becoming evident is that the big industrialists, supported by the state, church and a big foreign imperialistic power, are now openly making the provision of jobs contingent on trade-union affiliation and political orientation, and tomorrow, maybe, on the ideological conviction of workers, of working people.

We remember that one of the most outrageous facts of the period of fascist rule was that it was necessary to have a membership card of the fascist party in order to have the right to eat. Fascism was guided by the same principle as is now adhered to by the industrialists and clerical rulers, who want to secure a semblance of support among the work-

ing masses. In Turin, to this was added the systematic oppressive and tyrannical control exercised over the masses of electors at the FIAT factories, which went so far that spies were set to watch every working man or woman, not only at the factory, but even outside, at home. The purpose of this control was to deprive the workers of the possibility of giving free expression to their will in the elections to factory committees.

We would have made a very great mistake if we had kept silent regarding these facts, and we must seriously warn those who upbraid us for showing their real essence. We very well know, and it is general knowledge, that reactionary pressure, when it is exercised under certain conditions, can, at a given moment, cause a retreat and even a break in the front of struggle for democracy and Socialism. But we are exposing these facts because they are a sign of the deep, widespread and dangerous degeneration of the whole of Italian society. Following this path, the reactionary forces would actually like to liquidate the regime of normal democracy, *i.e.* of normal relations between employers and workers, between the government and the working masses of our country, and hence to restore a regime of tyranny.

There is naturally the other aspect of the question: if it is true that reactionary pressure has its consequences, and cannot but have them under certain circumstances, then

we
nece
these
and
vang
work
unio
the
W
of th
vote
to th
bor,
tions
mun
Party
dres
gani
ticism
time
guar
unaw
pecia
alysis
first
policy
tories
gener
FIAT
must
quest
are th
dres
organ
of the
and t
In ad
tentio
the ca
factor
ous
cadres

we must criticize our work. This is necessary because the extent to which these consequences are significant and dangerous depends on how the vanguard of the working class works and how the political, trade-union and factory organizations of the working people function.

We do not reproach the workers of the FIAT factories who did not vote for the trade unions affiliated to the General Confederation of Labor, but we want to put some questions to the leaders of the Communist Party organizations and the Party members constituting the cadres of the Turin trade-union organization, and subject them to criticism. It must be admitted that this time we, as the Party and the vanguard, allowed ourselves to be caught unawares. We must, therefore, especially concentrate our critical analysis on certain features, and, in the first place, on how our trade-union policy was carried out in the factories among the working masses in general and the workers at the FIAT factories in particular. We must, in a critical way, look at the question of how firm and extensive are the bonds between the leading cadres of the political and trade-union organizations and the broad masses of the working people, their families and those among whom they live. In addition we must focus our attention on the political orientation of the cadres in trade-union, Party and factory organizations, for the erroneous political orientation of these cadres can lead to unfavorable conse-

quences and loosen our ties with the masses.

We must be able to establish what were the conditions, shortcomings and weaknesses in our organizational and propaganda activities which prevented us from maintaining unity, breadth of action and enthusiasm among this section of the working class. . . .

The strength of our Party is the prerequisite for the successful carrying through of the policy of working-class unity, for the unity of all popular and democratic forces, for the development of constant political activity, as well as the prerequisite for bringing about a change in the whole policy of Italy.

III

At the recent Congress of the Socialist Party a great deal was said about working-class unity and we welcome the fact that this Congress, from what was said and what decisions were taken, was a Congress of working-class unity. It is important that this unity be preserved and consolidated by means of joint demands and struggle to direct the policy of the nation again along the path of progress, political and economic democracy, peace and national independence.

As for our exchange of views with the Catholic masses, we can only welcome the fact that this is now arousing widespread interest. We cannot but be pleased at this because it was we who proposed this policy. All that we said about this,

and about the possibility of establishing contact between Communists and Catholics, remains valid; but we especially maintain what we previously stressed: if this exchange of views is to take place it must prepare the ground for common action to effect a general unification of forces for concrete aims which at first can be limited, but must in any case be in the interests of the broad masses of the working population of our country, democracy and peace.

There are many questions on which agreement and contact can be and is being reached with the Catholic working masses and the intermediate sections of other orientations. But the most important sector of our work now is the fight for peace, *i.e.* the problem of achieving the broadest cooperation of diverse groups of Italian citizens of all ideological trends with the object of preventing the existing real danger of war.

Therefore it is essential to avoid mistakes and uncertainty in our orientation. The basic feature of our orientation is the concrete struggle to prevent the carrying out of the war policy, to frustrate this policy now being effected by the big imperialistic powers; it is to make the unleashing of a third world war impossible by counterposing the unification of the popular forces to the war manoeuvres of the imperialists, and to secure the prohibition of atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons. It must be absolutely clear that if

this is our orientation, it is not only because we consider the threat of war a very serious one, but also because we consider the struggle to remove this threat to be an effective one, which can and must accomplish the aim we set. . . .

Under the present circumstances the struggle for peace waged by the Soviet Union, People's China and the people's-democratic countries, the resistance of the Asian countries to imperialistic policy, and the fight for peace by the people's forces the world over are being continued and fresh successes have been achieved therein. Ours is the duty of enlarging the contribution of the Italian people to this struggle.

In my opinion, neither the concrete work of exposing the atomic danger nor the concrete mass movement as yet corresponds to the serious nature of the problem and of the threatening danger. True, the number of signatures thus far collected in our country to the Vienna Appeal is greater than that of any other European capitalist country. That is good. But the number of signatures collected by us falls far short of our potentialities and does not meet the need. It is possible that we are hindered in our work by the opinion that whatever our efforts, developments will in the long run take their course. This is a fatalistic and utterly erroneous trend of opinion, similar to that which prevailed in Italy between 1935 and 1941 when fascism had openly taken the path of war. At that time there were people even

in our own ranks who said: "Let war come! . . ." This tendency acted as a brake on our entire anti-fascist activity and particularly on our entire struggle against the war, which later resulted in the overthrow of the fascist regime itself.

Certainly, a war in which atomic weapons were employed would end in the downfall of the capitalist regime on a world scale. But we want mankind to be spared an atomic war. We want the capitalist regime to disappear, for it brings mankind countless calamities. But we want capitalism to disappear as a result of the development of the struggle of the working class, the working masses and the peoples for their prosperity, freedom and independence. We want the capitalist system to come to an end as the result of a revolutionary victory of the working class and its allies. That is what we want!

IV

As regards questions of domestic policy, we can say that to establish contact with those masses which have up to now been far away from us, is more difficult, and up to the present this contact has not been adequately achieved. It is not only because we are coming directly up against the stand taken by our enemies in this respect, but also because of our own fault, since we still fail

clearly to explain to everyone what is the meaning of our struggle for freedom and what are the real and concrete dangers which now threaten the democratic rights of every citizen. . . . This is what we have failed to do; and we must welcome the initiative of trade-union organizations to launch a large-scale campaign at all places of work in defense of trade-union democratic rights which are part and parcel of the democratic liberties of the citizen in the modern state.

We must be able to bring home to everyone recognition of the fact that the striving to impose an outright clerical monopoly on the whole of Italian life is a threat not only to the political but also to the social organization of our country, that it is necessary therefore to unite, organize resistance and wage a common struggle. The Catholic and Christian Democratic working people must join us in this struggle, for the realization of the designs of the ruling groups would put an end not only to many of the illusions of these masses, but also to many concrete things with which their very existence is bound up.

Therefore, we call on all democratic forces to unite to do away with the monopoly of political power by the Christian Democratic Party, and doom to failure its leaders' reactionary schemes.

A Happy Publishing Event!

Announcing for September Publication

I SPEAK MY OWN PIECE!

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF "THE REBEL GIRL"

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

Here at last is the long-awaited autobiography of America's greatest living woman who, to the undying shame of our nation, will reach her 65th birthday on August 7 behind the iron bars of a prison cell. Compressed into the record of this one lifetime—very far from ended—is a history of the labor and socialist movements of the past fifty years, told with all the drama, warmth, intimacy and authority of a first-hand participant and central character.

Just scanning through the more than ninety chapters is an exciting experience: "First Speech—1906"; "I Mount the Soap Box and Get Arrested"; "James Connolly—Irish Socialist"; "The I.W.W. 'Stirreth Up the People'"; "I Met Tom L. Johnson"; "Mother Jones—Labor Agitator"; "My First Conspiracy Trial—1910"; "Giants of Labor—Haywood and Debs"; "The Lawrence Strike of 1912"; "The Ettor-Giovannitti Trial"; "The Paterson Silk Strike—1913"; "William Z. Foster and Tom Mann—Syndicalists"; "Labor Defense in 1913-1914"; "Joe Hill—Martyred Troubadour of Labor"; "The Mooney Frame-Up"; "The Everett Massacre"; "Frank Little Lynched"; "The Palmer Raids"; "Charles E. Ruthenberg—'Most Arrested Man in America'"; "The Legion Attacks—Centralia, 1919"; "The Irish and Soviet Republics"; "When Americans First Heard of Lenin"; "1919 and the Great Steel Strike"; "Sacco and Vanzetti."

Thousands of individuals, groups and organizations, who love and revere this noble daughter of the American working class, by helping to spread her book far and wide, can make it a powerful weapon for the freedom of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and all others imprisoned for their political views and activities.

Popular \$1.75; Cloth \$2.75

PLACE YOUR ADVANCE ORDER TODAY

at your local bookshop or

MASSÉS & MAINSTREAM • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

st
er
ed
of
he
nd

ng
Ar-
the
";
nd
";
n-
ba-
ank
lost
9";
n";

and
g to
the
their

N. Y.