

✓

political affairs

DECEMBER 1955 • 25 CENTS

Nov



R

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|---|
| ALBERT E. BLUMBERG
AND ROB HALL | [1] | Congress and '56 |
| WILLIAM Z. FOSTER | [14] | Thoughts on Elizabeth Gurley
Flynn's Autobiography |
| NEMMY SPARKS | [27] | The Yugoslav-Soviet
Rapprochement |
| EDWARD E. STRONG | [35] | The Till Case and the Negro
Liberation Movement |
| L. M. KAGANOVICH | [52] | The Great Socialist Revolution |
| | [64] | Index for 1955 |

3 new books

THE HERITAGE OF GENE DEBS

by Alexander Trachtenberg

Selections from the most important writings and speeches of one of America's greatest labor figures, reissued on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of his birth with a critical essay by Alexander Trachtenberg on Debs' role and contribution.

(INTERNATIONAL) PRICE. \$.40

THE EDUCATION OF JOHN REED

by John Stuart

Representative selections from the writings of the great journalist, poet and essayist, including vivid accounts of Pancho Villa's role in Mexico's civil war, the Patterson silk strike, the fighting on the battle fronts in World War I, and his reporting of the historic Russian Revolution of 1917. With a biographical essay by John Stuart.

(INTERNATIONAL) PRICE: PAPER \$1.75; CLOTH \$3.00

WOMEN AGAINST SLAVERY

by Samuel Sillen

Sketches of sixteen outstanding women who made vital contributions in fight against Negro slavery, including Harriet Tubman, Lucretia Mott, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Lucy Stone, Susan B. Anthony, Sojourner Truth, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and others. A story of inspiring heroism and courage.

(MASSES & MAINSTREAM) PRICE: PAPER \$.75; CLOTH \$1.50

Distributed by

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



Vol. XX

A

By A

The
Congr
is frei
for the
Not on
be in
month
to the
ber; it
meeting
opened
settling
through
first s
Decem
A. F.
a unite
strong-
when
arouse
protest
ror in
their a
other
pressin
deman
rights
From
that wh
setting
ors retu

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Congress and '56

By Albert E. Blumberg and Rob Hall

The second session of the 84th Congress which convenes January 3 is freighted with special importance for the labor movement and its allies. Not only is it the session which will be in progress during the crucial months of the campaign leading up to the 1956 elections next November; it is the first session since the meeting at the summit in Geneva opened up a new perspective for settling international disputes through negotiation. It will be the first session of Congress after the December merger convention of the A. F. L. and C.I.O. has produced a united labor movement 16 million strong. It will convene at a time when millions of Negro people, aroused to a new pitch of anger and protest by recent acts of racist terror in the South, and supported by their allies in the trade union and other people's organizations, are pressing upon the government their demand for the full constitutional rights of citizenship.

From these facts it should be clear that while in Washington the stage setting is familiar and the same actors return to their accustomed roles,

it is very unlikely that we shall witness only a repeat performance of last season's show. For while the Administration spokesmen and the majority leaders have prepared a script reminiscent of the 1955 session, they have no guarantee that the *dramatis personae* will stick to their lines. On the contrary, the new elements, the new conditions, make certain that there will be changes. How far these changes will go in the direction of producing legislation helpful to the people depends on the extent to which labor and the progressives recognize and take advantage of these new opportunities.

THE RECORD OF THE FIRST SESSION

To appreciate the new possibilities of the second session, it would be well to examine both the shortcomings and the achievements of the first. When the 84th Congress convened January, 1955, its members had before them a mandate written large by the American voters in the 1954 elections.

The American people spoke out, [said CIO president Walter Reuther],

against favors for the special interests, against a program that turned its back on the people's needs. They spoke out for better social security, a fair tax program, improved unemployment insurance, help for the small business man, a sound economic policy, strengthened civil liberties and a fair civil rights program and a concern for the general human welfare.

And, we would add, they spoke out unmistakably against Sen. McCarthy and the war against ideas and association identified with that senator's name, defeating in most instances those candidates they recognized as the most flagrant McCarthyites.

Measured against that mandate, the first session of the 84th Congress was certainly not, as Senate Democratic leader Lyndon Johnson claimed, "a Congress of achievement." Its failures were glaring, especially in the field of civil rights, and as for the "evils of McCarthyism," they were not, as Reuther stated, "eliminated as a serious threat to our free institutions."

On the other hand, we would certainly take issue with those who can find no achievements to record. Achievements there were, responding to the sentiments expressed by the voters in the '54 elections. But they were for the most part confined to broad general areas, reflecting changes in attitudes and in political atmosphere, rather than resulting in specific legislation. But such changes can be significant if they produce a legislative climate

favorable to the enactment of useful laws during the coming session.

Take, in the first place, the first session's contribution to the struggle for peace. It made this contribution mainly as it was compelled to mirror the surging peace sentiments of the members' constituents. Although Congress adopted the White House resolution authorizing the President to carry on undeclared war from Formosa, Quemoy and Matsu, and although it ratified Eisenhower's military assistance treaty with Chiang Kai-shek, more than twenty Senators voiced the people's alarm at the belligerent and dangerous course which the State Department's policy indicated. The debate produced the Morse-Lehman resolution and popular support for this position was so pronounced that the Administration did not dare act on the authority of the paper victory it had won. In the House on two occasions, first in March and later on the eve of Geneva, a bloc of thirty or more Democrats issued a statement and spoke on the floor, although in a confused way, urgently expressing the demand for peace and for negotiations as an alternative to war.

Significantly, it was Chairman Walter George (D.-Ga.) of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who, in response to the people's peace sentiment, took the initiative in calling for the Big Four conference at the summit and the subsequent talks between the U. S. and Chinese ambassadors.

N
the
war
bud
lion-
viou
ation
than
in o
plan
22,00
asked
bomb
of la
and
milit
way
versa
Or
said
Cart
since
no la
ham
port
statin
the b
the r
84th
There
durin
took
Senat
with
report
nifica
laugh
Eve
his h
again
opene
the st

Nevertheless, the first session of the 84th Congress retained its cold war approach to legislative and budgetary affairs. It voted \$32 billion—\$3 billion more than the previous year—to finance military operations, and voted \$46 million more than the Administration asked for in order to reverse the President's plan to cut the Marine Corps by 22,000 men. It added another unasked \$356 million to build B-52 bombers. Finally, over the protests of labor, church and farm groups and the Negro people, it adopted a military reserve bill which opens the way for a complete system of Universal Military Training.

On the positive side, it can be said that the shadow of Joe McCarthy, which had loomed so large since 1951, had shriveled to a size no larger than that of the Senator's hammy fist. Perhaps the CIO *Report on Congress: '55* was not overstating the matter when it said, "In the battle against McCarthyism and the recent wave of hysteria . . . the 84th Congress made *real* progress." There was one dramatic moment during the session when McCarthy took the floor and charged a fellow Senator with somehow conniving with the Reds. The *New York Times* report of the incident concluded significantly: "The Senator only laughed."

Even Speaker Sam Rayburn tipped his hat to the growing revulsion against McCarthyism when he opened the session in the House with the statement: "We are not going

to indict people *en masse*. We are not going to say that just because we do not like somebody politically he is soft on communism."

That pledge, of course, was not kept. Sen. James O. Eastland (D.-Miss.) as chairman of the Senate Internal Security Committee (formerly known as the Jenner Committee) was permitted to roam the country making the old McCarthyite charges against progressives individually and against the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The House Un-American Committee persisted in its Un-American activities (without however receiving its accustomed share of front-page publicity) and its chairman, Rep. Francis Walter (D.-Pa.), attempted a familiar smear of J. Edward Corsi, former Commissioner of Immigration, which resulted in Corsi's expulsion from his post in the State Department.

And outside of Congress, Attorney-General Brownell continued to indict, prosecute and imprison men and women for their political beliefs (under the Smith Act) and to harass trade unions and progressive organizations (under the McCarran Act) and to deport foreign-born progressives (under the McCarran-Walter Act).

Yet while Congress made no move to repeal repressive and unconstitutional laws, it enacted no new legislation proscribing the constitutional rights of the people, and refused to adopt a bill sponsored by Sen. John M. Butler (R.-Md.), a McCarthyite,

subjecting workers in defense-related industries to loyalty screening.

Instead, the Senate voted \$50,000 to its Sub-Committee on Constitutional Rights for an investigation to determine whether individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution are being undermined. This committee, headed by Sen. Thomas Hennings (D.-Mo.), began its hearings last month.

The emergence of the new Democratic majority in the first session of the 84th Congress made it possible through the investigatory machinery of the Senate and House to throw a spotlight of publicity on some of the dark places of the Big Business-dominated Administration. It made some exposure of the looting of the public wealth by the Eisenhower "team."

The loot of these men may be puny compared to the billions in "legitimate" profit taken by the big corporations under contract with a government operated by a cabinet of big business men. But these revelations have created a climate more favorable for legislation necessary to put a crimp in the GOP's vast giveaway program.

As we stated above, however, when one compares the record of the first session with the specific legislation demanded by the labor, farmer's and Negro people's movements, he can reach only one conclusion—that its achievements were indeed meagre.

On the plus side, the minimum wage was raised to \$1.00 an hour,

which is 25 cents below what labor had a right to and did demand, but 10 cents above what President Eisenhower offered. The coverage of the Wage-Hour Law however was not extended to millions of workers still unprotected.

But on the minus side of the ledger:

No Congress ever did less in the field of civil rights. The end of the session found no legislation on the floor, and even such hearings as were finally held came at the very end of the session.

In spite of the desperate and daily increasing need of the nation's children for school rooms, no school construction program was enacted.

Despite favorable action in the House, no tax relief for the low- and middle-income families was voted by Congress.

No action was taken to repeal or even amend the Taft-Hartley law, section 14-B remaining unchanged as an invitation to reactionary state legislatures to adopt so-called "right-to-work" laws.

No farm relief was adopted, despite a House vote providing for 90 percent parity price supports on certain farm commodities.

The Davis-Bacon act was not amended to guarantee union wages on all government supported construction projects, despite the visit of 1,400 representatives of AFL building trade unions to Washington.

ROOTS OF THE FAILURES

In view of the fact that both the House and the Senate had, technically, Democratic majorities, and in

view
jority
to be
exch
this
sion?
Th
Big
ating
lac C
wealth
resen
corpo
ders
the C
often
fact t
party
Th
was
Senat
House
imme
the Jo
to shi
ness
illusi
people
with
"bi-pa
ship"
The
claime
unity,
Southe
a cam
coaliti
The r
surren
Democ
civil r
eviden

view of the platform pledges a majority of these Democrats had made to labor and to the Negro people in exchange for their votes, how explain this failure of the 84th's first session?

The major factor was the GOP-Big Business Administration, operating through Eisenhower's Cadillac Cabinet, comprising some of the wealthiest men in America and representatives of the most powerful corporations. Carrying out the orders of this cabinet in Congress was the GOP-Dixiecrat coalition, which often had a majority, despite the fact that technically the Democratic party controlled both Houses.

The second most important factor was the misleadership exerted by Senate majority leader Johnson and House Speaker Rayburn and their immediate lieutenants. The role of the Johnson-Rayburn leadership was to shield the Eisenhower Big-Business Administration from the disillusionment and antagonism of the people, a role which they cloaked with such hypocritical phrases as "bi-partisanship," and "statesmanship" and "loyal opposition."

They were motivated, they claimed, by considerations of party unity, but their unity was with Southern reaction and their slogan a camouflage for surrender to the coalition of Dixiecrats and the GOP. The most glaring example of this surrender was in the betrayal of the Democratic party's pledge to enact civil rights legislation, but it was evident in many other phases of the

session's record. And while their "bi-partisanship" originated in the area of foreign policy (meaning their equal acceptance of the cold war line required of them by Big Business) it inevitably encompassed many important domestic issues.

In an interview with *U. S. News & World Report* (Sept. 30) Lyndon Johnson expressed his "philosophy" of "statesmanship" as follows:

We didn't resort to personalities, we didn't resort to petty partisanship, we didn't try to slander or smear or destroy the confidence of the people in the Chief Executive. I received some criticism because I didn't do that. The ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) on three or four occasions denounced our leadership, as did some of the other extreme [sic!] groups.

But I think it's the opposition's duty to carefully consider and weigh every recommendation the Executive makes and support those that can be supported in good conscience and oppose those that can't, and when they are opposed, to oppose them on principle and in a principled manner.

But the facts were that the principles of Johnson and Rayburn were extremely flexible when the matter before Congress was the desires of the Cadillac Cabinet, which almost invariably received their blessing, and were extremely rigid and uncompromising when the issue was a demand by labor or the Negro people to fulfill campaign pledges.

Upon the Johnson-Rayburn leadership therefore lies a portion of the blame, second only to that of the

GOP-Dixiecrat coalition, for the failures of the first session of Congress.

And still another portion of the blame must go to certain leaders of the liberal, labor-supported wing of the Democrats, especially Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.) and Sen. Paul Douglas (D-Ill.).

Sen. Humphrey was recently described by Robert Riggs, Washington correspondent of the *Louisville Courier Journal* as holding the "unofficial post of liberal adviser to Johnson." (*New Republic*, Nov. 14). And Douglas prides himself as representing a "voice of moderation" in liberal circles.

This is not to say that the liberal wing, with its 20 to 25 votes in the Senate, could dictate the outcome of most votes. But if this liberal group were to speak out vigorously for those things which their backers demand and initiate legislation and promote debate and circulate facts, they could bring such pressure to bear upon their party leadership and upon Congress that opponents of the people's will would be exposed and ultimately defeated.

Failing to act for progress, this bloc and especially certain of its leaders often become actual instruments of reaction.

A case in point was the failure of the liberal bloc on the opening day of the Senate in January, 1955, to propose a change in Senate rules and thus provide a curb to filibusters. Their failure to act on that day was disastrous because it was the

only time when a rules change could be brought about by a simple majority vote.

The decision of the liberals was made on the urging of Sen. Humphrey in deference to Majority leader Johnson's plea for "party unity." And in deference to that plea no civil rights legislation was adopted throughout the session, thus encouraging the racists of Mississippi and other Southern states in their virtual reign of terror to deny the right to vote to Negroes, and to defy the Supreme Court ruling against jim-crow schools.

The lone voice of dissent within this group was that of Sen. Herbert Lehman (D-N.Y.) who criticized the liberals for abandoning the civil rights fight back in January. In mid-November he returned to the attack, accusing his colleagues of placing party unity above civil rights.

A triple play similar to that which stymied civil rights legislation limited the gain in the minimum wage fight. Sen. Paul Douglas brought out a bill raising the minimum only to \$1.00, despite Democratic pledges of \$1.25, thereby performing a service for Big Business which Lyndon Johnson, not to speak of Eisenhower, could not have performed unaided.

Leaders of the A. F. L. and CIO are not without their share of blame. Both labor wings are singularly silent about the role of Johnson and Rayburn, not to speak of Humphrey and Douglas, in sabotaging labor's legislative program. *In the CIO's report on the 1955 Congress*

there
of the
and
statem

Fin
bor a
organ
tions
could
progr
ing r
Build
vaded
the jo
paign
wage.

THE
RAY

Alre
son-Ra
its pro
acted
the 84
their p
York
they c
which
law.

"The
the T
ent, "u
sues as
—for f
discrim
and rep
Taft-H
And
leaders
with t
the De

there is not one word of censure of the Johnson-Rayburn leadership, and the same is true of A. F. L. statements on the first session.

Finally, it is unfortunate that labor and the Negro people failed to organize the kind of mass delegations and face-to-face lobbying which could have won victories for their program. The only exceptions during 1955 were the 1,400 A. F. L. Building Trades workers who invaded Washington last spring, and the joint A.F.L.-CIO lobbying campaign for a raise in the minimum wage.

THE JOHNSON— RAYBURN PROGRAM

Already in October, the Johnson-Rayburn leadership announced its program of legislation to be enacted during the second session of the 84th Congress. But as one reads their plans, as reported by the *New York Times*, Oct. 27, it is clear that they consist mainly of legislation which was *not* to be enacted into law.

"There is every intention," said the *Times* Washington correspondent, "to avoid, if possible, such issues as compulsory civil rights bills—for federal sanctions against racial discrimination in hiring and so on—and repeal or basic alteration of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act."

And the major conflict of that leadership apparently is not to be with the opposing GOP but with the Democratic party's own liberals.

"One of the great efforts of the session, in fact," says the *Times*, "will be an attempt by the Democratic hierarchy to restrain the party liberals from insisting on action in such matters as these."

But the Johnson-Rayburn leadership will find it difficult to ignore the pressure of the people for the very legislation which this leadership has announced it will not consider.

This confident prediction is based upon an analysis of the new factors which will be at work during the second session, factors which were not present during the first session, and which herald a new mood among the American people.

Chief among these, of course, are the achievements of the Geneva conferences, especially the first one at which the Big Four chiefs of state renounced force and stated their resolve to settle differences by negotiation. The conference of the Big Four foreign ministers last month, although Administration circles and most of the press hastened to label it a "failure," had an impact here and abroad that will not be lost on the people, and therefore will also affect the second session of the 84th Congress. For it revealed the continued preoccupation of the people with the problem of achieving peace. At the same time it exposed this Administration's responsibility for the failure of the conference to reach agreement on specific issues by its stubborn insistence on the rearming of Germany and its inclusion of

such a Germany in NATO.

Administration demands for continued cold war measures at the old level will, as William Z. Foster stated, "confront an increasing demand at home from the mass forces making for a program of peaceful co-existence. These forces will embrace not only workers and other democratic elements, but also important sections of the bourgeoisie, and even of monopoly capital itself. The domestic opposition will more and more challenge the aggressive policies of American imperialism in every field—financial, economic, political and ideological." (*Political Affairs*, Oct. 1955)

The relaxation of tensions resulting from the spirit of Geneva has already caused grave concern to those Wall Street forces which wish to keep arms production at the same high levels. It was no doubt in response to their chiding that the Administration in late August sought, as the *New York Times* then said, to "put a brake on the Geneva spirit."

This was carried even further at the Foreign Ministers conference, as Secretary of State Dulles refused to retreat an inch from rigid positions which he knew would make fruitful negotiations impossible.

As Walter Lippmann said in his column of November 15:

The terms that Mr. Dulles took to Geneva would have been excellent if the Soviet Union had surrendered unconditionally. His terms ignored en-

tirely the true spirit of Geneva which was that since nothing can now be settled by force, it is necessary to maneuver and to bargain and to trade. The Western terms at Geneva had in them no room for maneuver, no material for bargaining, no chance for trading.

But can the GOP, which owes its election mainly to its peace slogans in 1952, consistently apply the brake to the Geneva spirit? Can the Democrats, who at this writing are reportedly planning to exploit the "failure" of the second Geneva, so ignore the people's peace sentiments as to continue preaching funeral orations over the non-existent grave of the spirit of Geneva?

The relaxation of tensions in the world today is a fact, not a theory.

Thus the demand for reduction in the military budget will increase, together with a demand for greater appropriations for schools, hospitals, roads and other public works so tragically neglected during the cold war years.

Similarly, the cry for tax reductions for the low-income families will gather in volume, especially as corporation profits soar, and as the gap between wages and consumer prices is more seriously felt.

But it will not only be in the field of budget-making and taxes that the effect of Geneva will be demonstrated. As Claude Lightfoot wrote in September *Political Affairs*: "The easing of war tensions systematically makes more difficult the destruction of constitutional liberties."

The testimony of important public figures before the Hennings committee during November, critical of the repressive anti-Communist measures on the statute books, foreshadows popular pressure for the repeal of the Smith, McCarran and McCarran-Walter acts.

Another new and powerful factor on the scene during the second session of the 84th Congress will be the merged federation of A. F. L. and CIO union with a strength now estimated at 16 million. Both A. F. L. president George Meany, who will head the merged organization, and CIO president Walter Reuther, have stated that the merger will result in increased political activity by the labor movement. With their common objective of ousting the Cadillac Cabinet and breaking the GOP-Dixiecrat grip on Congress in November, 1956, new impetus can be expected in labor legislative activity during the second session. Certainly Big Business has applied sharp spurs, calculated to shake off any persisting apathy on labor's part, by Brownell's indictment of the United Automobile Workers and the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, the Indiana state administration's use of troops against the Perfect Circle strikers, the NLRB's rigging of an election in that plant, and GOP Senator Goldwater's avowed plan for discrediting and undermining labor leadership's influence among trade-union members.

Labor unity, however, will bring into sharper focus two key obstacles

which stand athwart of labor's legislative path in 1956. The first is the anti-Geneva line of Meany and the A. F. L. executive council, which if continued would undermine labor's political action program by counterposing the needs of the cold war program to the needs of the people. The second is the general policy in the labor movement of tagging after the Democrats and failing to express labor's independent position either on legislation or in the choice of candidates in the primaries. This policy, which permits labor to be taken for granted, robs the trade-union movement of its rightful influence on Congress. And it actually facilitates the Goldwater formula of appealing over the heads of the labor leaders to trade unionists disillusioned because of the failure of their officials' policies to pay off in legislation benefitting the working class.

The uniting of the two major wings of the labor movement is no automatic cure-all for the shortcomings of one or both of these wings, and these shortcomings will be overcome only as the progressive and militant forces within the unions wage battle against them.

But the expanded arena for that struggle carries with it a potentially vaster victory when won. And the vigor of that fight will itself have an impact on Congressmen whose ears are attuned to labor developments within their districts and states.

THE NEGRO LIBERATION EFFORT

An exceptionally important factor which has changed the political climate since members of Congress left Washington at the end of last summer is the mass movement of the Negro people and their allies to win full citizenship under the Constitution. This movement has been accelerated by the lynching of Emmett Till and the acquittal of those charged with his kidnapping.

The number and size of the protest meetings in the Till case constitute a political phenomenon almost unprecedented. One has to go back to the bonus and hunger marches, to the world-wide protest organized in defense of the Scottsboro victims, and the outpouring of bankrupt farmers during the 1931-33 depression for comparable demonstrations. The movement has surged further with each new racist crime, with each new rebuff from Washington or Southern officials.

As a result of the mass movement, a number of Congressmen have identified themselves with some of its demands. About fifteen members of the House have, at this stage, agreed to support the proposal of Rep. Charles Diggs (D.-Mich.) to enforce section 2 of the 14th Amendment and cut the Congressional representation of Mississippi which disenfranchises half its citizens.

The international executive board of the United Automobile Workers union has issued a vigorous state-

ment allying itself with the demands of this movement and calling on all its locals to demand of their Representatives the immediate enactment of a federal anti-lynching law and other civil rights legislation. The United Packinghouse Workers and other unions have also given this movement their support.

In almost every urban center of the North candidates and prospective candidates have been challenged on their position by the Negro people's movement and office holders have been showered with resolutions, letters and telegrams. At this writing the Governor of Illinois (a Republican), the Pennsylvania state legislature, numerous city councils and local Democratic and Republican committees have felt it necessary to speak out.

*During the early days of the second session of Congress a powerful mass mobilization, called by the NAACP and supported by the UAW and other unions, not to mention scores of church, fraternal, and other organizations, is scheduled for Washington to demand federal action, including civil rights legislation, without delay.**

Space does not permit more than the barest mention of such other developments as the widespread farmers' revolt against declining incomes, etc.

And all of these factors, new and

* As this is written, Congressman Powell announces the formal organization of a civil-rights bloc in the House, co-chaired by Rep. Diggs, James Roosevelt (D., Cal.), and Hugh Scott (R., Pa.).

old,
Cong
are g
tion.
of th
(exce
wher
to vo
the v
them
at th
Th
farm
awar
nize
strug
gram
bers
sensit
sider
when
burg
didat
Th
only
to th
a pec
lusion
more
sure
more
more
which
prosp
TASE
Fro
in w
84th
clusio
Left-p
try.

old, are operating in a session of Congress during which preparations are going ahead for a national election. This is a time when one-third of the Senate and all of the House (except in those Southern states where a majority is denied the right to vote) are especially sensitive to the wishes of the voters. Most of them can ignore those wishes only at their peril.

The organizations of labor, the farmers and the Negro people are aware of this fact and will recognize it as the opportune time for struggles for their legislative program. And the rank and file members of these organizations are more sensitive to politics and political considerations during those months when newspapers, radio and TV are burgeoning with discussions of candidates and platforms.

The outlook, therefore, is not only for a Congress more responsive to the demands of the people but of a people on the march, more disillusioned with hypocritical excuses, more angry at their betrayal, more sure of the justice of their demands, more confident of their strength, and more certain that the world in which they live can be a peaceful, prosperous and happy one.

TASKS OF THE LEFT

From this analysis of the situation in which the second session of the 84th Congress convenes, certain conclusions arise as to the tasks of the Left-progressive forces in our country.

Clearly the main goal in Congress and out is to help fulfill the promise of Geneva in the broadest sense, strengthening the advance of peace and the further relaxation of tensions, developing a wide interchange, including trade, between East and West, and insuring the recognition of People's China and of its right to a seat in the United Nations. The implications, of course, go far beyond issues of foreign policy, for the fulfillment of Geneva on the domestic front would mean the application of a peacetime economy, providing the schools, hospitals, houses, libraries, parks and highways which were casualties of the decade of cold war. It would mean the restoration of the Bill of Rights and the enforcement of the rights of the Negro people guaranteed in the Constitution.

The struggle for this fulfillment must go on in all popular organizations, especially the trade unions, seeking the expression of this broad aim in speeches, in resolutions and in delegations to Washington.

Related to this broad objective, are a number of issues pending before the 84th Congress on which labor and people's organizations are already acting or are prepared to act. Here the task of the Left-progressives is to support these movements and step up the sort of activity which can win concessions in the forthcoming second session.

These issues, which are among the key links between the present readiness of labor and the people

to struggle and the broader objective of the fulfillment of Geneva, are:

1. The reduction of taxes on low- and middle-income families. The movement which secured a favorable House vote for the Democratic bill providing a \$20 credit for every taxpayer and every member of his family during the first session can be revived and strengthened to win this year in both Houses.

2. The Enforcement of Civil Rights: (a) A vote by Congress for federal intervention to secure justice in the kidnap-lynching of Emmett Till and in other cases of racist violence in Mississippi and other Southern states; (b) enactment of civil rights legislation, especially a federal anti-lynching law and measures to protect the right to vote; (c) the enforcement of the second section of the 14th Amendment reducing representation of states which deprive Negroes of the right to vote; (d) attaching desegregation provisions to all social welfare legislation.

3. Taft-Hartley and Labor's Rights, including the repeal of Section 14-B of Taft-Hartley, the provision under which state legislatures are empowered to pass "right-to-work" laws and similar union-busting measures.

4. Farm Relief: Enactment of a bill similar to HR 12 which passed the House in May, 1955, strengthened to provide price supports at 100 per cent of parity on major farm commodities. Provision of cheap

credit for family-sized farmers.

5. Public Works and Welfare: Adequate appropriations for federal aid to non-segregated schools, low-rent public housing; a federal health program including aid for the construction of hospitals; highway construction, and parks, playgrounds and other recreational facilities to discourage juvenile delinquency.

6. Minimum Wage: A renewed effort to raise the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and to extend coverage.

7. End the Giveaway: An offensive through Congressional investigations as well as legislation to stop the handouts to wealthy corporations of our natural resources and national facilities.

8. Repeal of the McCarran-Walter immigration law.

9. Civil Liberties: Action by Congress in line with the 1955 CIO convention resolution calling on that body to "revise and review" so-called anti-subversive legislation. The current Hennings Committee investigation into the erosion of the Bill of Rights should be extended. It should examine the denial of constitutional rights to labor, to the Negro people, and to political minorities, especially the Communists. Congress should hear increasing demands for repeal of the McCarran Internal Security and the Smith Acts.

To achieve victory on these specific issues, however, requires a new and higher level of legislative activity by the organizations of labor and the people. The situation calls for the

type
into
to t
it is
fort
cal
gres
lead
and
S
larg
ton
such
by
othe
in J
of t
year
V
now
cess
M
acti
tion
scale
peop
In
ties
the

type of leadership which the UAW international executive board gave to the union in the Till case when it issued a letter to all locals setting forth in detail action which each local should take in pressuring Congress for civil rights legislation. Such leadership is necessary in all unions and on all issues cited above.

Similarly the situation calls for large mass delegations to Washington in support of these objectives, such as the mobilization sponsored by the NAACP, the UAW and other organizations on the Till case in January, and like the mass lobby of the building trades unions last year on the Davis-Bacon Act.

Visits to individual Congressmen now at home during the current recess should be organized.

Major conferences on legislative action should be held not only nationally but on a state and local scale, involving labor, the Negro people, farmers, peace groups, etc.

In the arena of legislative activities in preparation for and during the second session, the Left forces in

labor and the people's movement have an almost unprecedented opportunity to create unity and to participate in achieving goals of vital importance to the people.

This legislative struggle will have enormous importance for the outcome of the primary and final elections of 1956. For it will focus attention on the real issues before the people and thus help to generate pressures behind labor-backed candidates to adopt a progressive and militant position upon these issues. It will help develop and strengthen unity within labor and between labor and its allies. It will provide the Left, including the Communists, an opportunity to demonstrate once again its vigor and devotion to the true interests of labor, the people and the nation. The legislative struggle of the people in the second session of the 84th Congress is, therefore, a weapon which, if seized with energy, can help administer defeat to the GOP-Big Business Administration and its anti-labor henchmen in November 1956.

Thoughts on Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's Autobiography

By William Z. Foster

THE LONG-AWAITED autobiography of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn has finally appeared. Its title is *I Speak My Own Piece** and it covers Comrade Flynn's life and activities from her birth in 1890 down to the post-World War I period of 1920-27. It will be followed eventually by another volume, which will deal with her later role, especially her experiences as a Communist fighter and leader. The present very important and moving book appears while Comrade Flynn is serving a three-year term in the Federal Women's Reformatory in Alderson, West Virginia, a frame-up victim under the infamous Smith Act. The book is written in the typically clear, warm, colorful style of our Comrade Flynn and shows her unquenchable fighting spirit. It is a vital document of the American class struggle.

Comrade Flynn's book is a grassroots account of a front-line fighter in one of the most important eras in the history of the working-class movement in this country. It makes no elaborate statistical or theoretical presentation of the period, but instead takes the reader right onto the blazing firing line of the class struggle. The book contains a wealth of

valuable human and historical material, written by one who was a very active participant in the many bitter struggles described and analyzed. It is a book which should be read by all worker-fighters, especially by the young, and particularly in this period when so many misleaders of labor are trying to confuse the workers into believing that the class struggle has virtually ceased to exist in the United States.

I Speak My Own Piece has as its basic structure the life and work of Comrade Flynn, and it is built upon the foundation of the bitter American class warfare of the period. In its larger aspects it is the story of the making of a Communist leader in the furnace of the class battles of the working class.

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who is one of the great labor women of America, comes of a proletarian Irish family with a long record of struggle in the old country. Indeed, many of the finest passages in the book relate to the national revolutionary movement in Ireland. Elizabeth took naturally to the struggle of the

* Masses & Mainstream, Inc., New York. 332 pages. Cloth \$2.75, paper \$1.75.

American workers. Already at the age of 16 she had become a brilliant and well-known labor speaker and had embarked upon her principal work in the working-class struggle. Almost immediately, she blossomed forth as one of the most effective orators and agitators ever produced by the American labor movement. Beautiful, eloquent, glowing with fighting spirit, and infused with a boundless revolutionary enthusiasm, Comrade Elizabeth was a real inspiration and a power in all the strikes and other struggles of the workers in which she participated. She was indeed "The Rebel Girl," as Joe Hill called her. Over the period dealt with in the book she had a most effective setting for her activities in the heroic Industrial Workers of the World, of which she was long a member. It was the writer's good fortune to meet her for the first time in 1909, during the hard-fought free speech fight in Spokane, Washington, in which she played an active role.

Among the most important features in Comrade Flynn's new book are the many vivid pictures she paints of the great strikes of those times. With her warm and vibrant personality, she has caught the true working-class spirit of these struggles, and with great skill she has pictured them faithfully in the pages of her book. Her portrayal of such epochal strikes as those of Lawrence, Paterson, McKeesport, and elsewhere, of the many bitter free speech

battles, and of the heroic fight of the I.W.W. against World War I, are unforgettable pictures of the workers' indomitable struggle against cold-blooded and ruthless American capitalism.

Other high points in the book are the many detailed and colorful studies which Comrade Flynn presents of working-class leaders in the crucial period of labor history with which she is dealing. Such brave and effective figures as Bill Haywood, Gene Debs, Vincent St. John, Frank Little, Joe Hill, Mother Jones, Mother Bloor, Tom Mooney, James Connolly, Jim Larkin, Anita Whitney, Daniel De Leon, Charles E. Ruthenberg, and many others, come alive again in her book and carry on their vital work. Miss Flynn's volume is one of the very best sources for the young workers of the present times to come to know, to appreciate, and to understand these fighters who did so much to build the American labor movement.

The present article makes no attempt at being a formal or detailed review of Comrade Flynn's book. It aims rather to estimate generally the period with which the book deals, to analyze the position of the labor movement at the time, to sum up the work of the militant fighters, among whom Elizabeth Flynn was such a shining figure, and to indicate the extent to which the labor movement of today has solved the problems which then occupied the attention of the working class.

AMERICAN LABOR PRIOR TO THE WORLD WAR I PERIOD

The period of 1905 to 1927, roughly the years covered by Elizabeth Flynn in her book, was one of stormy and ruthless advance by American imperialism. From the mid-nineties, the big trusts had been growing rapidly, pushing aside small business, smashing down the rebellious farmers, and subjugating the working class to the most ruthless exploitation and oppression. During World War I, American monopoly capital, the only real victor in that war, took another long leap ahead toward its goal of domination of the world, to which it was already bending its attention. This deceptive path it was to follow with increasing avidity and aggressiveness, until it ran into its first major obstacle in the great world economic crisis beginning in late 1929.

In this drive ahead for international mastery, American imperialism had definitely set as an objective to keep the American working class and other toiling elements thoroughly disorganized, confused, and repressed. This was a time when the open-shop drive was going on at full blast, the basic, trustified industries were almost completely unorganized, and the trade unions, blasted by the courts with injunctions, attacked by hordes of strike-breakers, company unions, company gunmen and undercover spies, and betrayed by reactionary leaders, embraced only the more skilled fringes of the working

class. Upon the eve of the United States entering World War I, in April, 1917, the A. F. of L., Railroad Unions, I.W.W. and Independents, all told, totaled less than 3,000,000 members.

The two decades covered by Miss Flynn's book were crowded with bitter and fiercely fought struggles: strikes, organizing drives, labor defense cases, political campaigns, and anti-war struggles. She deals eloquently with many of the most outstanding of these class battles, including such memorable fights as the fierce struggle of the Chicago Teamsters in 1905, the semi-civil wars of the metal miners of the West between 1895-1910, the bloodily repressed strikes of the coal miners of Colorado, Alabama, and West Virginia all through this period, the great Lawrence strike of 1912 and the big Passaic and Paterson strikes of textile workers shortly afterward, the historic four-year strike of the workers on the Harriman Lines, beginning in 1911, the many wartime strikes, and the big series of strikes in the years immediately following World War I, in meat packing, steel, auto, railroads, printing, textile, building trades, clothing, etc. During the war, by active struggle, the unions ran their total membership up to some 4,500,000 members; but in the big 1918-1922 attempt of the open-shop employers to destroy the labor movement, they lost almost all of their wartime gains. In this massive class warfare, no organization covered itself with more glory than did

the I.W.A., in which Elizabeth Flynn was a prominent fighter.

In this period the industries were veritable slaughterhouses, with safety precautions at a minimum. The workers in the basic industries, overwhelmingly foreign born, hard-driven and underpaid, were treated little better than working cattle. Against these frightful conditions, they fought back in many great strikes, with a courage and determination which set the tone for the whole labor movement. The American class struggle of the time was extremely violent, with the employers sticking at nothing to crush labor.

The most brutally outraged section of the people were the Negro masses, who were overwhelmingly sharecroppers and common laborers. Almost daily, reports came of Negroes being lynched in the South—shot, burned, or hanged. The shameful Jim Crow system prevailed all over the country in its crassest forms, worst of all in the South. And the tragedy was that the trade unions generally did not realize that all these outrages against the Negro people were also the basic concern of the white workers. As Comrade Flynn says, they did little or nothing to combat and to correct the whole monstrous situation. Especially the I.W.W., the United Mine Workers, the Left wing in the A. F. of L. unions in meat packing, and, during the twenties, the developing Communist movement, fought to protect the trade union and other rights of Negro workers.

THE MILITANT FIGHT OF THE LEFT WING

One of the most basic aspects of the labor movement during the period described by Elizabeth Flynn was the vigorous and relentless struggle conducted by the broad Left wing against the corrupt and reactionary Gompers bureaucracy, which dominated the labor movement throughout these years. The Gompers clique, whose blatant and open corruption amazed and shocked the labor movement of all countries, was locked in class collaboration with the bosses, and was a definite part of the employers' machinery for dominating and exploiting the working class.

Already at the turn of the century, the monopoly capitalists had become quite aware that if they were to keep the working class weak and demoralized, they must incorporate the treacherous trade-union leadership into their service. Their first big organized step in this direction was the formation of the National Civic Federation, launched in 1896 in Chicago. The plan was to cripple organized labor by enveloping the union leadership in a network of its committees, which would preach the stifling doctrine of "the identity of interests of capital and labor," and would strive to strangle every manifestation of working class militancy. Mark Hanna, August Belmont, and many other big capitalists backed the new organization. Sam Gompers became its vice president,

while John Mitchell and numerous other key union leaders also walked into this trap for the working class.

The broad Left wing for many years carried on the sharpest struggle against the Gompers machine, the worst expression of which was its affiliation to the hated Civic Federation. The Socialist Party, particularly its more Left-wing elements, fought the Gompersites tirelessly. This fight reached a high point in the 1912 Convention of the A. F. of L., where Max Hayes, the Socialist candidate against Gompers for A. F. of L. President, polled 5073 votes against 11,974 for Gompers. With the rise of the Communist movement in 1919, the Right-wing Socialists abandoned their "fight" against the Gompers machine and made their peace with that corrupt clique. Thenceforth, the struggle against the Gompers machine was led by the Communists, and by the Trade Union Educational League—a body with a Syndicalist origin, but which worked cooperatively with the Communists.

The I.W.W. was one of the most vital aspects of the general Left-wing war against Gompersism, both organizationally and ideologically. This fight was also directed, not less militantly, against the Right Socialist allies and appeasers of the Gompers outfit. The I.W.W., however, took the sectarian line of trying to eliminate Gompersism and its craft unionism, by launching a new labor movement based upon industrial unionism, thus making a head-on attack upon the A. F. of L. and other reactionary craft unions and leaders.

The I.W.W. waged many heroic struggles along the lines of this general program. These Elizabeth Flynn portrays in her new book, and she makes the characteristic indomitable spirit of the I.W.W. pulsate through her pages. But all its heroism could not make the I.W.W. succeed in the face of its powerful enemies and especially of its own basic mistakes in policy, which were generally of a Leftist character. By the early 1920's, that organization was no longer a real factor in the American labor movement.

The I.W.W. was the chief American manifestation of the strong Syndicalist trend which developed upon a world scale during the first two decades of the twentieth century. This movement received its clearest expression at the 1906 Amiens congress of the General Confederation of Labor of France. Following the marked successes of that organization, the Syndicalist trend spread to many countries, including the United States, where it decisively shaped the doctrines of the I.W.W. and also deeply influenced the Left wing of the American Socialist Party.

Historically, the Syndicalist trend tried to replace the reactionary Right Social Democracy, which then dominated the world labor movement. Syndicalism set as its ultimate revolutionary goal a trade-union state, and it proposed to achieve its goal by the general strike. But in its drive for world working-class leadership Syndicalism failed, a victim of its many semi-anarchist failings, including a gross underestimation of political ac-

tion, centralization, discipline, general method of movement, nationalities, world democracy, Syndicalism based on great faith of the Communist Significance, experience, ending, thus Communist twenty-ties. the Communist was to be drawn in the conclusion of Syndicalism over the writer

PROG
LA:
Ant
Flynn
may be
briefly
been
during
since

tion, its dual unionism, a lack of centralized organization and firm discipline, its reckless handling of the general strike weapon, its sectarian methods of dealing with the question of religion in the labor movement, and its various other deviations and shortcomings. The eventual successful Left challenge to world-wide Right-wing Social Democracy came not from Anarcho-Syndicalism, but from Communism, based upon the teachings of the great Lenin. This is attested to by the fact that today the big majority of the world's labor movement has Communist leadership.

Significantly, in summing up her experiences down to the years of the ending of her book, Comrade Flynn thus explains her affiliation with the Communist Party. She says, "My twenty-one years of previous activities . . . led me irrevocably to join the Communist Party in 1937." This was the correct basic conclusion to be drawn from her life experience in the class struggle. It was the conclusion arrived at by vast numbers of Syndicalists and Left Socialists all over the world, including the present writer.

PROGRESS OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Anticipating somewhat Comrade Flynn's eventual second volume, it may be fitting for us to review here briefly the general progress that has been made by the labor movement during the generation that has elapsed since the time at which she ends

her first volume. This will enable us to measure the harvest, in the shape of labor's advances, that has come from the militants' sowing of the seed during that period of struggle of 1905 to 1927, which Elizabeth Flynn has covered in her book. The progress achieved has been primarily a victory of the Left-wing forces over Right-wing trends in the labor movement.

During the past thirty years the labor movement in this country has registered very important progress. But this has by no means been even and uniform in character; upon some fronts of the movement, organizational and ideological, there has been much greater progress than upon others. Nor has the progress been a steady growth; rather it has developed in fits and starts, with some lesser periods of retrogression, as during the late 1920's, sandwiched in between. The basic progress was made during the years of 1933-46, in tune with the current world struggle of the workers against menacing fascism. At present, despite the approaching A. F. of L.-C.I.O. merger, however, the advance of the labor movement is proceeding at a relatively much slower pace.

The most important progress of organized labor in this country during the past generation has been in the matter of the organization of the unorganized. During the period so vividly portrayed by Comrade Flynn, this was the most urgent and heart-breaking of all labor questions, with only a tiny fraction of the working class organized. But since then the

movement has leaped up numerically from about 3,000,000 to 16,000,000, a spectacular increase. The company union, a menace a generation ago, is now a relatively minor evil. This vast trade-union growth is all the more significant because it brought about the organization of the great open-shop, trustified industries, and because it linked together in organization the skilled and unskilled masses, including large numbers of Negro and women workers. It has also virtually solved, for the time being at least, the knotty question of industrial unionism, over which the Left wing—typified by Haywood, Debs, and De Leon—fought for forty years against the reactionary Gompersite craft unionists.

Along with the enormous growth and consolidation of the labor movement, there has also grown a new conception of working-class solidarity. During the period portrayed by Comrade Flynn, one of the worst of all evils was the Gompersite doctrine of the "sacredness" of trade-union contracts, a reactionary conception, which caused one set of unions in a given industry to remain at work while other related unions were striking. This "union scabbing" cost the workers the loss of hundreds, if not thousands, of strikes. One of the most valuable manifestations of the new industrial solidarity is the widespread refusal of union workers, despite their own separate contracts, to cross the picket lines of striking workers. This is rank and file industrial unionism

on the firing line. During this period, strike tactics have been also much improved, with mass picketing, involvement of the strikers' families, worker-singing, and the like, all of which methods, common today, were anathema to the Gompersite bureaucrats of a generation ago.

One of the greatest steps forward by organized labor during the past generation has been its more enlightened attitude toward the Negro people, although there is still room for much improvement in this sphere. As Comrade Flynn indicates, during the period with which she deals, the Gompersite and Right Socialists were callous to the bitter oppression and intensified exploitation to which the Negroes were being subjected. They even systematically barred Negro workers from industry and from most of the unions. But the labor movement of today presents a much-changed and more favorable picture. Over 1,500,000 Negroes are now members of trade unions. Trade union Jim-Crowism, expressed in color-bar constitutional provisions and the like, has been largely broken down. A new, brotherly, class spirit has developed between Negro and white workers. After tremendous struggles Negroes are newly entering into one industry after another, a beginning has been made in their entry into skilled trades, increasingly they are occupying official union positions, and the labor movement is becoming more sensitive to defending the Negro people against Jim Crowism of all

sorts. Of course, a great degree of advance is still necessary and yet to be won, and the attacks of the bosses are increasing, but the fact is that the credit for the big improvement in labor's solidarity is due primarily to the work of the Left-wing and the progressives; first of all, to the Communists. It has been won only in the face of systematic opposition and sabotage from the conservative top bureaucratic leadership.

The advance of the labor movement during the last generation has also registered itself in substantial economic and political concessions, wrung from the employers and their government. The most important of these has been the shortening of the workday from about 50 hours a week to about 40 hours. There has also been real progress in developing the system of social security and health and accident legislation; to most of which the reactionary Gompers machine, during the period covered by Comrade Flynn's book, was flatly opposed. There has also been an increased recognition by the employers and the government of the workers' right to organize. In the matter of real wages the workers, although they have at least maintained their ground, have not been able to curtail nor diminish the fabulous flow of profits into the pockets of the parasitic exploiters, who are now literally reeking with stolen wealth.

One of the fronts upon which, however, the workers have distinctly less progress to record has been in the creation of a more progressive

working-class leadership. This was one of the most militant fighting efforts of the Left wing and the mass of workers, in their never-ending struggle against the corrupt Gompers machine leaders of the time. These corrupt elements freely and openly peddled away strikes, robbed the union treasuries, ruled the unions at the point of the gun, often had open gangster affiliations, took bribes from employers, conspired with the companies to keep the workers unorganized, sabotaged the struggles of the unskilled, Negro and women workers, violently opposed the propagation of class consciousness and Socialism among the workers, assailed independent working class action, and left no stone unturned to hold the workers firmly under the control of the reactionary Republican and Democratic parties.

In this leadership sphere, too, there has undoubtedly been some progress, but not much. It is hard to discover any improvement in a Meany of today over a Gompers or a Green of yesterday. However, some of the worst, gangster-like features of the Gompers officialdom have been mitigated, and in at least some unions there is now definitely more trade-union democracy than before.

In any case, the demands and needs of the membership can no longer be ruthlessly ignored nor sold out as brazenly as before, particularly where economic struggle is concerned. These advances are largely due to the influx of the great masses of unskilled workers into the unions

and to the continual fight of the Left-wing and other progressives for union democracy. The trade-union movement, however, is still in the grip of reactionary officials, many of them actually capitalists. They are violent enemies of Socialism and ardent defenders of capitalism. Class collaboration is still the dominant philosophy of this top labor leadership. True, no longer is there such a crass exposition of the Gompersite doctrine of the "identity of the interests of capital and labor," nor the formation of such crude organs of capitalist control over the workers as the National Civil Federation of a generation ago; but the present close class collaboration tie-up of the imperialist-minded top A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leadership with monopoly capital, on the basis of an active support of Wall Street's drive for imperialist expansion and world domination, even at the cost of a world war, is no less dangerous and disastrous to the workers' basic class interests. Negative features of the generally progressive merger now taking place between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. are the reactionary clauses in the proposed constitution, which would still further strengthen the hold of the Meany labor bureaucracy.

THE QUESTION OF WORKING CLASS POLITICAL ACTION

One of the spheres where American organized labor has the least progress to show over the situation of a generation ago is in the related

areas of working-class ideology and class political action. The United States is, in fact, the only major capitalist country in the world where the workers have not yet developed a powerful anti-capitalist consciousness and where the working class still has not produced its own mass class political party. In this vital respect, the intense campaign carried on by the militants of a generation ago for Socialism and for a broad working class party, as portrayed in Elizabeth Flynn's book, has borne only stunted fruit.

The present ideological-political backwardness of the American working class is due primarily to the economic factor. It is mainly a reflection of the restraining influence upon the workers of the rise of American imperialism, which expresses itself in relatively higher wages, in steadier employment, and the like. These influences, while affecting most deeply the upper, skilled aristocracy of labor, also react upon the less favored categories of workers. The whole working class is adversely affected by imperialist "prosperity" in both a material and an ideological way. That is, as the workers secure certain economic concessions without serious struggle, they lose much of their militancy and class consciousness, and begin to absorb paralyzing bourgeois illusions. Marx and Engels long ago noted these negative effects of imperialism upon the British working class. During the 1840's the English workers, in their historic Chartist movement, displayed a strong, revolutionary fighting spirit;

but in
curren
periali
its lea
fighti
look.
Engel
of the
The
now
simila
tempo
ism.
countr
nomic
of the
class p
er is t
the pr
politic
never
class o
come
(Key
about
society
ably t
propa
the tr
ready
ers th
stitute
Marxi
be no
comba
seriou
ism in
A c
ened
in the
recent
onstra

but in succeeding decades, with the current upward swing of British imperialism, their labor movement and its leadership lost very much of the fighting spirit and proletarian outlook. This passing period was what Engels called the forty years sleep of the British working class.

The American working class is now passing through a somewhat similar experience, based upon the temporary rise of American imperialism. While the workers of this country undoubtedly have much economic militancy, and a strong sense of their class power and of their class position in society, and no longer is there to be heard among them the primitive Gompers' slogan, "No politics in the unions," they have nevertheless lost much in militant class consciousness and they have become deeply infected by bourgeois (Keynesian - Rooseveltian) illusions about capitalism being a progressive society. Forty years ago unquestionably there was a far more extensive propagation of Marxist principles in the trade unions and a much more ready reception of them by the workers than there is today. All this constitutes a dangerous setback for Marxism-Leninism, one which must be noted, studied, understood, and combatted. Keynesism is the most serious challenge ever faced by Marxism in this country.

A dramatic expression of the lessened receptiveness by the workers in the United States to Marxism in recent years has been especially demonstrated by the slow growth of

Marxist political organizations. The Socialist Party, which was once the Marxist party, dried up and disintegrated until now it has practically disappeared. And the real workers' Marxist organization, the Communist Party, whose very foundation in 1919 represented a great step forward by the workers, has had a relatively slow growth. The Socialist Party failed to defend the working class, and the Communist Party made many sectarian mistakes and it has been bitterly persecuted by the government. But these factors of themselves could not have brought about the disintegration of the former party, and the retarded pace of the latter. The underlying cause has been the corrupting influence upon the working class of American imperialism.

POLITICAL WEAKNESS OF WORKING CLASS

The political weakness of the American working class is especially dramatized by its failure to produce a broad mass Labor-Farmer Party. Forty years ago this situation was usually explained upon the grounds that the American working class was too feebly organized in the trade-union field, that the working class was lacking in solidarity, being made up of workers speaking different languages, from all over the world, and that millions of these workers, foreign born, were without the vote. But in the interim since that time these negative conditions have been practically overcome—the

workers have built powerful trade unions, the foreign-born toilers have in the main learned English and have also secured the vote—but still there is no mass Labor-Farmer Party.

After about 1907 a strong working-class political movement was developed under the leadership of the Socialist Party which, with Debs as its Presidential candidate, eventually polled 919,551 votes in 1920. This movement was later topped when the Conference for Progressive Political Action, made up of trade unionists, farmers, and middle class elements, rolled up 4,822,323 votes for LaFollette in 1924. However, these movements were largely washed out by the counter influences of rising American imperialism, aided, as always, by the opposition of their capitalist aides, the reactionary trade-union bureaucracy.

But signs indicate that the American working class will soon step up its political progress to a scale comparable with its marked trade union progress of the past two decades. This new political movement manifests itself by the organization and activities of labor and other progressive forces inside the old parties, particularly the Democratic Party. The development of this movement is being brought about basically because of the steadily worsening position of American imperialism. The latter's program of world domination through war is obviously bankrupt and its economic situation is displaying signals of fatal disease. These

signs indicate that the American economic and political system is becoming more and more entangled in the coils of the fatal general crisis of the world capitalist system. The current American "prosperity" is based upon sand. Despite its imposing and seemingly solid facade, American imperialism is stricken with fundamental weakness.

The general crisis of capitalism, implying a progressive breakdown of that world system, began to manifest itself with the outbreak of World War I in 1914 and the onset of the great Russian Revolution. This universal capitalist crisis has two major aspects, organically related. The first of these is the enormous intensification of all the internal contradictions of capitalism—that is, strikes, colonial revolts, economic crises, dog-eat-dog competition, and imperialist wars; and the second aspect is the world growth of the Socialist nations which have split away from the orbit of the international capitalist system. Both of these forces combined are growing fatal to world capitalism, of which American imperialism is a part.

CAPITALIST AND SOCIALIST SECTORS

What is being witnessed in the world at the present time is, on the one hand, a rapid decline of world capitalism, marked by the splitting away of many countries from the system and the breaking down of the capitalist colonial system; and

on the other hand, a swift increase in strength of the Socialist sector of the world. Already it is being discussed as to which of these two world sectors is now actually the stronger.

Capitalism, of course, still is very strong, and it controls considerably the greater portion of the world's territory, of its population, and especially of its industrial output—that is, if we include in its score the big colonial and semi-colonial lands, which, however, are tending more and more away from capitalism. It would be the gravest error to underestimate this great capitalist strength and with it the workers' continuing hard struggle against that system.

On the other hand, the Socialist world is also very strong and it would be no less a serious blow to fail to take this strength fully into account. The Socialist countries, embracing about 900,000,000 people and occupying some one-third of the earth, now have much stronger economic systems intrinsically and also far more solid political governments than have the countries of capitalism. The peoples within the nations of the Socialist world are closely knit together ideologically, in contrast to those of the capitalist world, which are ravaged with class antagonisms and hostilities. In the military arena, too, so strong have the Socialist countries now become that, undoubtedly, were decadent capitalism to force the outbreak of a world war, the Socialist forces would emerge from it the victors. The Socialist peoples also

have a real solidarity among themselves upon an international scale, whereas the capitalist lands are honeycombed with innumerable contradictions and conflicts. And their ideological support of Socialism is far more solid than is the allegiance of the peoples under capitalism toward the social system under which they are living.

What is more vital to understand is that the relationships of strength in all these world spheres—regarding territorial extent, number of population, size of industrial output, political stability, strength, international cohesion, and ideological unity and firmness—the balance is swinging ever faster to the side of the Socialist sector of the world. And when the capitalist world becomes involved in the great economic crisis which is now brewing, and to which the Socialist countries are immune, the swing of the world's peoples toward Socialism will become even more accentuated.

As the social system of capitalism goes down, the other world system, Socialism, goes up. Just how and when the passing point between the two systems will be reached, in their constantly shifting relationships, and at what stage Socialism will become definitely the world's dominant social system, is still a matter of speculation. But it has now, nevertheless, become a question for practical political consideration. Marxists will have to give this important matter increasing attention. Certainly, the point where capitalism will sink in-

to the minor position, in respect to its general strength, will soon be reached. Only when this new center of world political gravity has obviously shifted to the Socialist side will it be possible properly to evaluate historically such important events as the ending of the Korean war by popular pressure and the enforced laying aside of the war threat of American imperialism at the July, 1955, conference of the Big Four at Geneva.

Once world Socialism passes the "summit," or balance point of strength, in its historical relationships with world capitalism and it moves, so to speak, into the "downhill pull," its rate of progress will be greatly stepped up. From then on the world will witness even faster shifts in the ratios between the two systems in all spheres. The workers in the capitalist countries, facing the hardships of a decaying system, will become irresistably attracted to Socialism. At the same time solidarity of the underdeveloped countries with the Socialist lands will constantly increase. We must contemplate important changes in working-class strategy and

tactics in such a situation. By the same general token, ideological decay in the capitalist countries will increase, and every feature and phase of the general crisis of capitalism will be deeply intensified. Kaganovich, Soviet Communist leader, said recently, "Whereas the nineteenth century was the century of capitalism, the twentieth century is the century of the triumph of Socialism and Communism."

* * *

It has taken the international Socialist world about a century, since Marx and Engels, in the *Communist Manifesto*, first gave the movement form, program, and consciousness, to reach its present status of development; but once the "summit" of its task is passed, it will take far less time, only a fraction of it, in fact, to accomplish the rest of the job. We are probably much closer than we calculate to the full realization of the great goal, towards which the brave men and women in Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's book were so gallantly struggling in the face of seemingly impossible odds.

By N

THE
ment
peace
tures
sive
to co
of w
of th
early
treaty
the b
Germ
rapid
steps
made
howe
any I
Conf

AN

Th
the ri
ber o
cause
broke
lianc
Turk
feat
ing
worl
ampl
sibili

The Yugoslav-Soviet Rapprochement

By Nemmy Sparks

THE YUGOSLAV-SOVIET rapprochement was a powerful influence for peace. It was one of the major features in the stepped-up peace offensive mounted by the Soviet Union, to counteract the increased danger of war resulting from the signing of the Paris pacts to rearm Germany early this year. The Austrian peace treaty, the Yugoslav rapprochement, the bid to resume relations with West Germany, following each other in rapid succession, were significant steps on the diplomatic front that made it impossible for the Eisenhower Administration to postpone any longer the long-awaited Summit Conference at Geneva.

AN AID TO PEACE

The Soviet initiative in healing the rift with Yugoslavia made a number of specific contributions to the cause of peace. First it virtually broke up the Eastern NATO Alliance of Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey and thus administered a defeat to Wall Street's policy of building military blocs throughout the world. Second, it gave a classic example to all other states of the possibility of relaxing tensions. Third,

by demonstrating the great flexibility of the Soviet Government, it served as a dramatic preliminary to Geneva and helped to insure Geneva.

In the words of the editorial in *Pravda* of July 16th:*

It is perfectly obvious to both countries that hostility and estrangement between them only play into the hands of the foes of our peoples, benefit only the enemies of people. . . . There can be no doubt that the Soviet-Yugoslav talks will serve the interests of all peace-loving peoples, the interests of working people in all countries, who welcomed with approval the announcement that the talks had brought positive results.

There can be no doubt that the rapprochement was also widely welcomed among Americans, particularly in progressive circles. Some, however, have evinced disappointment that the Soviet press has not proceeded to give a thorough analysis of the history of the break and the succeeding years, etc. But with reconciliation the chief aim, it is not to be wondered at that the Soviet press has concentrated on stressing

* Published in full in *Political Affairs*, Sept., 1955.

the positive values in the Yugoslav situation.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union showed unprecedented moral courage in the public self-criticism voiced on its behalf by Nikita S. Khrushchev in his speech at the Belgrade airport; and as is usual with those who practice self-criticism, it demonstrated thereby its own political strength. But the CPSU showed great wisdom not only in making its own public self-criticism but also in not proceeding immediately to "self-criticize the other fellow." Nor could it do so thereafter. We can likewise assume that the CPSU is primarily concerned with making the rapprochement work, far more than with straightening out the history of the past.

* * *

It is another thing, however, when among progressives in our own country we find such misconceptions as indicated in comments like "Khrushchev's speech implies Tito was right on all questions." There is no reason, therefore, why we should not take a look at the issues involved and attempt to answer some of the questions that have been raised.

BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM

What were the chief errors charged to the C.P. of Yugoslavia in 1948?

First, that it held to a theory of the lessening of the class struggle in the country, and viewed the peas-

antry instead of the working class as the foundation of the system.

Second, at the same time it carried on a greatly exaggerated program of industrialization.

Third, it submerged the C.P. in the Fatherland Front.

Fourth, it carried on a foreign policy that, to say the least, was somewhat adventurous, leaning markedly towards individualism and separatism, jeopardizing its national security and sovereignty, and thus increasing the difficulties of the people's democracies and of the USSR.

The common denominator of all these errors is *bourgeois nationalism*, and thus it would seem that the judgment of 1948 was correct which said, "The C.P. of Yugoslavia has taken the path of nationalism." This is further to be noted in the *Pravda* editorial discussing the rapprochement which says, "Socialist internationalism is fundamentally opposed to all manifestations of bourgeois ideology, nationalism included."

What then was the error of the CPSU for which it criticizes itself? First, that it allowed itself to be misled by Beria. In some circles there is a tendency to brush aside the role of Beria. But it is necessary to remember that Beria not only exercised great influence as a member of the Political Buro, but had also built himself up as a specialist on the national question and was personally involved in the discussions regarding the C.P. of Yugoslavia. There is no question that

Beria was in a position to exercise great influence on the course of the controversy. Does this mean that everyone else was absolved from the error? Of course not. There was no necessity for Khrushchev to repeat what everyone knows is a basic principle of Communist organization: that the collective leadership bears collective responsibility for errors as well as for achievements.

What was the political character of the error? It seems to us that it was underestimation of the extent of the grip of bourgeois nationalism on the leading circles of the CPY and on the Yugoslav people and the failure to find a sufficiently flexible way of dealing with it.

Nationalism had been heightened in Yugoslavia, in particular by the Nazi occupation and by the victorious partisan resistance and war. And the C.P. of Yugoslavia had been rendered less capable of fighting off the penetration of nationalism by the great losses of the original Communists in the war; 12,000 having fallen in the fighting, out of the 15,000 members before the war.

MARXISM AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION

From the early days of Marxism, Marx had to fight against the Proudhonist conception that national differences will disappear, or can be ignored in the struggle for socialism. It is unnecessary to review here the fight carried on by Marx

and Engels, and especially since the development of imperialism, by Lenin and Stalin, against underestimation of the national question.

The fact that a country (in this case, Yugoslavia) regained its national independence under the leadership of its Communist Party, established that party in power and adopted the path of building socialism does not mean that the problem of bourgeois nationalism in that country disappears.

As the *Pravda* editorial reaffirms, bourgeois nationalism can be overcome only through the fullest application of socialist internationalism:

The course of the Soviet-Yugoslav talks and their results strikingly reflect the line of foreign policy charted by our Party and based on the unshakable principles of Leninism, upon respect for the sovereignty and equality of all countries, large and small.

"Our experience," Lenin teaches us, "has firmly convinced us that only the closest attention to the interests of the different nations removes the ground for conflicts."

It is precisely the close attention to the interests of different nations that is a major feature of socialist internationalism, which is fundamentally opposed to all manifestations of bourgeois ideology, nationalism included.

Soviet Communists hold it their sacred duty to set an example in the application of the principles of socialist internationalism as befits representatives of a multinational socialist country where the national question has been solved in a consistent manner on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory.

YUGOSLAVIA'S EXPERIENCE

Some people have asked: How is it that Tito and the leading circles of the Yugoslav Party, after breaking with the Soviet Union and proceeding along the line of their nationalist deviation, did not, as happened so often in the past, degenerate into imperialist puppets and go down the road to fascism?—for certainly it was an error at any time to designate them as “fascists.” In the first place the people of Yugoslavia had just gone through a victorious war of liberation, and as *Pravda* points out: “The working people of Yugoslavia did not take power into their own hands only to give all the wealth of the people back again to internal and foreign oppressors.” In addition, widespread admiration for the USSR as their great ally which had achieved socialism and smashed the Nazi fighting machine undoubtedly persisted among the masses.

The question of accepting aid from imperialist countries was not in itself a matter of principle. For example, the USSR willingly accepted lend-lease aid during the period of the anti-Axis war alliance without any violence to its principles or its socialist integrity. Of course, in the case of Yugoslavia the aid given was to be used for building “positions of strength”—Wall Street’s euphemism for war plans—against the USSR. The idea that such aid could be used to build socialism in Yugoslavia soon came up against the realities: first of all that imperialist

powers will never agree to really industrialize any agrarian country; second, we know that the type of demand that Wall Street makes for aid in real quantities to non-industrialized countries is the turning over of the decisive natural resources and whatever basic industries exist to the oil trust, steel trust, etc., and the establishment of Wall Street military bases. Third, despite the reality of Tito’s break with the USSR, in this country where for the past few years anti-Communist hysteria was every cheap politician’s road to office, Yugoslavia remained definitely suspect. Thus, no economic future was to be found through Wall Street.

The basic industries of Yugoslavia remained in the hands of the government and were not turned over to foreign imperialists nor to the old capitalists nor to any new group created for that purpose.

YUGOSLAVIA AND SOCIALISM

Was Yugoslavia during these years of the break (1948-55) moving towards socialism? In our opinion, no. Certainly the military alliance of Yugoslavia with Turkey and Greece was hardly a pact for peace and social progress. Moreover, Lenin’s principle of the possibility of achieving socialism in one country did not say in *any* one country. Stalin emphasized during the great debate of the '20's that socialism could be achieved in one country only if it was of large size, such as

the USSR, possessing all the decisive natural resources, with a large population able to support itself and to defend the country against imperialist intervention while building socialism. But to build socialism in a small country lacking these characteristics is possible only with the help of a great socialist country—the USSR.

The carrying out of an appropriate socialist foreign and domestic policy and the expansion and consolidation of political and economic ties and co-operation with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are of great importance for Yugoslavia's further advance along the path of socialist construction. (*Pravda*)

Thus, during the period of its break with the USSR, Yugoslavia could not have been making significant progress towards socialism, but at the best was postponing the decision that it would have to make in the long run: either to degenerate into an economic and political dependency of imperialism or to achieve a rapprochement with the USSR and proceed towards socialism. The second alternative which, to the great satisfaction of all adherents of socialism, is now being realized in Yugoslavia was made possible because the bases for socialism were retained in the hands of the government. Thus, *Pravda* points out:

... public ownership of the basic means of production predominates in Yugoslavia in the spheres of large-scale and medium industry, the transport ser-

vices, the banking system, wholesale trade and the greater part of retail trade. The principal classes in Yugoslavia are the working class and the working peasantry.

The state structure of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia is determined by the fact that power belongs to the working class and the peasantry. Yugoslavia has preserved her national independence and withstood the attempts of foreign capital to infiltrate her economy.

THE DJILAS DISCUSSION

Were there any preliminary signs of the readiness of Yugoslavia for a rapprochement? Of the meager material available in this country, perhaps the most significant was the discussion in the Communist League of the articles of Milovan Djilas which took place in November 1953 to January 1954. All previous developments in the CLY seemed to be leading it further away from Marxism-Leninism. However, in the articles of Djilas, the leadership of the CLY found itself confronted with decisive alternatives. The articles of Djilas* contain seven major points as follows:

1. Communism will come about in Yugoslavia spontaneously, regardless of or even in spite of, the Communist vanguard.
2. The CLY should stop placing Communism as the goal as it diverts attention from the current struggle.
3. Not only Stalinism but also

* Thomas Taylor Hammond, "The Djilas Affair and Yugoslav Communism," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1955.

Leninism contains within itself the seeds of despotism.

4. The class struggle in Yugoslavia has been successfully brought to an end, except that despotic officials re-create it artificially.

5. The chief enemy in Yugoslavia today is not the bourgeoisie but the Communist bureaucrat; not capitalism but bureaucratic despotism.

6. To achieve democracy, the Communist League must be completely reorganized with discipline greatly relaxed.

7. Therefore the CLY should be converted into a loose educational organization and the appearance of an additional party of socialism should be encouraged.

Thus, Tito and the Yugoslav leadership found themselves publicly confronted before the eyes of the Communist membership and the people, with the ideological projection of the path that had been taken: the reconstruction of Yugoslavia into something really acceptable to American ambassadors and Wall Street agents—even including the two-party system! The articles were rejected by the Executive Committee and a major discussion took place at the Plenum of January 1954. Djilas' line was overwhelmingly rejected and he was removed from all offices. In the discussion Tito concentrated on Djilas' call for liquidation of the CLY. He said: "The Communist League of Yugoslavia will be necessary as long as it is necessary to wage the class struggle. Democracy of the western type—

formal democracy—would be going back to old forms rather than going forward." Kardelj pointed out that the line of giving up the goal of communism was nothing else than a repetition of the old slogan of Bernstein revisionism, "The goal is nothing, the movement everything."

CHANGES IN THE WORLD SITUATION

Why did the rapprochement not take place earlier? One could, of course, answer with the general principle that historical events take place when they are possible and necessary. The break took place in 1948 under the shock of the beginning of the cold war when the world relationships were expressed in the formation of the two camps—the camp of peace and the camp of war. Since that time tremendous changes have taken place. First and foremost was the epoch-making victory of the Chinese revolution and the example of the firm adherence of the Chinese Communist Party to Marxism-Leninism and to a policy of unshakable friendship with the USSR. Second, the continued increase in strength of the USSR, its ability to equip itself with atomic and hydrogen weapons and to defeat all war provocations. Today, besides the general advances of the movement for peace in all countries of the world, there has been the development of the neutralist countries headed by India and the growth of neutralism in other countries.

All of these developments contributed to the atmosphere leading up to Geneva, in which the rapprochement took place. In addition Yugoslavia apparently had to convince itself that it had no future for national independence and economic advance except in friendship with the USSR. Finally, the rapprochement was *necessary* for peace.

THE NATURE OF THE RAPPROCHEMENT

Those who view the rapprochement as simply a tactical or diplomatic maneuver are underestimating its importance and nature. It is a many-sided agreement between the two peoples. It is an agreement on the government level for friendly relations. It is an agreement on the economic level for Soviet assistance towards the building of socialism in Yugoslavia.

Does it include fraternal relations between the CPSU and the Communist League of Yugoslavia, as parties leading their respective governments? During the actual negotiations the American press implied that this was not the case and the actual agreement contained only a very general statement. However, the *Pravda* editorial reports:

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union considers it desirable that contact and closer relations be established between the CPSU and the Communist League of Yugoslavia on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The first results have now been achieved

and the conditions created for the establishment of such contact and closer relations. It may be hoped that closer relations with the Communist League of Yugoslavia will be continued and developed on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This accords with the interests of the peoples of both the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Some people have asked: How can the CPSU re-establish friendly relations with the Yugoslav leaders when the division had been so sharp? But what is involved in Yugoslavia is the struggle for peace and for socialism, which is an affair primarily not of leaders, but of the masses of people who are striving for these aims. In this struggle attitudes of subjectivism can never serve as a guide. While it is true there has so far been no public self-criticism on the part of the Yugoslav leaders, nevertheless it is altogether probable that the ideological needs of the Yugoslav Communist League in its further development will bring about such action.

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONALISM

What is the basis of the present and future relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia? It lies in the relations of socialist internationalism.

It is on the granite foundation of socialist internationalism that relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are being built up. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always readily shared its

rich experience with all fraternal Parties. At the same time it is up to Soviet Communists to study closely and apply all the advanced contributions made by the People's Democracies in the spheres of national economy, science, engineering, etc. (*Pravda*)

Pravda reaffirms the long established Leninist principle of combining the general and the specific in each country's path to socialism. First, in relation to those countries where the people already hold power:

The historic experience of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies shows that, given unity in the primary and fundamental matter of safeguarding the victory of Socialism, different countries can employ different forms and methods of dealing with the concrete problems of socialist construction, depending on their distinctive historical and national features.

And second, in its application to all countries:

As Lenin pointed out, all nations will come to Socialism, that is inevitable; but they will not all come to it in quite the same way. Each will make its own specific contribution to one or another form of democracy, to one or another variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to one or another rate at which

the socialist transformation of various aspects of social life is effected.

This again emphasizes what our Party has always pointed out: *There is no blueprint for the path to socialism.* There are, in fact, as all history teaches, infinite variations. Therefore, the lesson remains: to continue to devote attention to the *specific* features of one's own country, to the *specific* features of a nation's development in the light of the *general* principles of Marxism-Leninism—which means without falling into national exceptionalism. As Lenin exhorted: "To investigate, study, seek out, divine, grasp that which is specifically national in the manner in which each country approaches the general task." (*"Left Wing" Communism*, p. 72).

* * *

The closing of the rift with Yugoslavia not only strengthens the cause of peace throughout the world but also shows that for Marxism there need be no irrevocable errors, and that historical necessity directs countries seeking the national independence, economic welfare and the social liberation of their peoples away from the camp of imperialism and along the road to socialism.

By E

PERIOD
tory, a
illumina
relatio
things
and th
was li
sippi
teen-ye
a cons
we ma
has be
of the

AN O

First
to see
and na
istence
pressed
of the
trary o
by the
imperia
in Mis
other s
the co
of a n
inhabit
ning a

The Till Case and the Negro Liberation Movement

By Edward E. Strong

PERIODICALLY IN THE evolution of history, a spark flashes across the sky, illuminating all social processes, the relationship between classes, how things stand between the oppressed and their oppressors. Such a spark was lit with the murder in Mississippi of the young Negro boy, fourteen-year old Emmett Louis Till. As a consequence of this terrible crime, we may very well ask, what light has been shed upon the problems of the embattled Negro people?

AN OPPRESSED PEOPLE

First of all, it is revealed, for all to see once again, in its most brutal and naked form, the continued existence in our country of an oppressed people. Notwithstanding all of the volumes written to the contrary over the past twenty-five years by the servants of the American imperialist system, the recent events in Mississippi, South Carolina, and other states of the Deep South reveal the continued unabated oppression of a nation of Negro people, who inhabit nearly 200 counties, running across several states, constitut-

ing a majority in this area, as they do in Mississippi, but without a basic voice in the conduct and operation of the government that rules over them. So, in Mississippi today where over a million Negro people live, only 19,000 are registered voters—and this is less than was true a decade ago.

Also in this state the semi-feudal economic relationships of the plantation system still hold sway, as has been the case since the days of Reconstruction. Thus, tens of thousands of Negro people are working the soil, breaking their backs picking the cotton as sharecroppers, tenant farmers, and day laborers as their fathers and forefathers before them. Notwithstanding alterations here and there in this plantation system of economic relationships over the past twenty years (*e.g.*, a certain growth in industrialization, a minimum mechanization in agriculture, a certain development towards independent small farming among Negroes, etc.), this system of backward semi-feudal relations remains intact in all essential respects.

In short, the fundamental explanation for the recent lynchings in Mississippi, and the growing anti-Negro terror and racist danger in our country, must be sought in the fact that the bourgeois-democratic revolution was never completed in the South, that the poison of the semi-feudal plantation system remains deeply imbedded in the South, spreading its political influence over the American Congress, over both the Republican and Democratic parties, and the life of the entire nation.

A COUNTER OFFENSIVE BY REACTION

But the fact of the continued existence of the Southern jim-crow system is not by itself a full explanation of the recent crimes committed against Negroes in the South, as well as the North. The crimes reflect a desperation felt by the Bourbons in the face of the mighty struggles waged by the Negro people, with the growing support of their white allies, as well as the support from the Communist movement both within this country and on a world scale, over the past twenty-five years. The Negro liberation movement has grown, has won great victories, culminating in the May 17, 1954 decision of the Supreme Court. In fact, it has reached the stage of militancy and power where American big business, the owners of industry and the plantation system, are increasingly worried as to the possibility of maintaining intact the jim-crow system.

Consequently, it is important to remember that the anti-Negro frenzy of the American ruling class, of which the Mississippi events are but the most open expression, represents a major counter offensive on their part against the Negro liberation movement. It is designed to cancel out the hard-won gains made by the Negro people over the past two decades, to strike a mortal blow against the movement and to maintain the South as a depressed non-union region for the industrial magnates who rule America. This is the fundamental explanation for the silence of the Eisenhower Administration, the policy of collaboration with the lynchers being currently pursued by the Department of Justice, the failure of Stevenson, Harriman, Truman, and other leaders of the Democratic Party to speak out on the Till lynching.

ROLE OF NORTHERN BIG BUSINESS

American big business has billions of super-profits tied up in the semi-feudal jim-crow system, which continues to hold sway in the deep South. Big business sees billions at stake in an unorganized South; it owns the industry now spreading into the South. It is such textile magnates as Stevens, formerly Secretary of the Army, who see in the growth of Negro-white unity in the South, a threat against their super profits extracted from the white textile workers in this area. It is the Harrimans and their Wall Street colleagues who

own the banks and railroads in the South. It is the men of the trusts, with headquarters in Wall Street, who own the Georgia Light and Power Co., Southern Bell Telephone Co., Tennessee Coal and Iron in Alabama, the Louisville and Nashville Railroads, etc. It is the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, the big chain grocery stores such as the A & P, that are buying up plantations, and increasingly taking over Southern agriculture. It is the big banking houses, through their local outlets, that maintain the credit system upon which the plantation economy so heavily depends.

From these facts it is understandable why Eisenhower was supported in the South in the 1952 elections by industry, the most rabid Dixiecrats, and big plantation owners. If, therefore, leading political voices who should be heard in respect to the murder of young Till remain silent, this is the basic reason. If the *New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune*, Wall Street's two mightiest mouthpieces, have treated the lynching of young Till most gingerly, the basic explanation is to be found in the economics of Negro oppression in the Southern Black Belt region.

THE BASE OF THE NEGRO QUESTION

Thus, the developments around the killing of young Emmett Till, illuminate once again the underlying factors of the Negro question in America. This is the continued existence in the Black Belt area of the

South of a semi-feudal plantation system, a geographical area inhabited by more than 5,000,000 Negro people, the vast majority of whom live in semi-slavery. As this article is being written, in November, 1955, any observer can travel through dozens of Black Belt counties from Virginia through the eastern part of Texas. These are counties where a majority of Negro people live as sharecroppers, tenant farmers, agricultural day laborers (pay, 35 cents an hour), small independent farmers, sugar cane workers, saw mill and lumber workers, domestics, semi-proletarians, etc.

The dominant economy in this area is the semi-feudal plantation system. The dominant political characteristic of this area is the absolute dictatorial control of all instruments of government, that is, the courts, the boards of education, the police system, the legislative bodies, the County Commissions, jails, mayors, city councils, etc., by a minority white ruling class who maintain iron-fisted rule over the Negro majority in the area as well as over the vast bulk of impoverished whites. The dominant racial pattern is that of segregation, segregation in the schools, in housing, in public facilities of all kinds, in the churches, etc. The dominant civil rights pattern for the Negro people in this area is the one already made clear by the wave of anti-Negro terror now sweeping the South, that is to say, a pattern in which the Negro people are without civil rights. The

dominant ideology which still holds sway in this area is the ideology of the white supremacists.

ESTIMATING THE ADVANCES

Volumes have been written during the past twenty-five years relative to the gains made by the Negro people. There is no doubt whatever that the militant Negro movement, with new support from labor, and the ever more powerful factor of world socialism, has achieved tremendous victories during this period. The confusion which exists, within America, however, arises not from the indisputable existence of such important gains, but from *false* and *misleading estimates* as to the implication or conclusions flowing therefrom. The American ruling class takes these gains, these concessions forced from them, publicizes them to the world, and says: "Look, the Negro question is being solved in our country; moreover, it is being solved without fanfare, and in another few years will be solved entirely." Now this rubbish has been picked up and assiduously spread by liberals throughout the country, but particularly since the publication of the Myrdal study on the Negro in 1944.* The *objective* result of this estimate is to deny, and hide the nakedness of Negro oppression in the Black Belt, thereby *objectively* giving support to the oppressors, as well as comfort to the belligerent foreign

* Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy* (Harpers, N. Y.); see the critique of this work by Herbert Aptheker, *The Negro People in America* (International Publishers, 1946).

policy pursued over the past ten years by our government.

One can easily catalogue an impressive list of victories won by the Negro people over the past quarter century. However, in regard to this, two conclusions are not only in order, but need to be established as the working base of any assessment of this question. The first conclusion is that the vast bulk of these gains are outside of the Black Belt. The second conclusion is that notwithstanding important changes within the Black Belt itself during the last quarter-century, there has been no fundamental change whatever in the oppressed status of the Negro people in this area: the essential ingredients of Negro oppression in the Black Belt remain unaltered as already outlined above. All gains made by the Negro people in the Black Belt area have been ameliorative in nature, and the historic necessity of achieving the fulfillment of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South must remain the strategic aim of the Negro liberation movement, as well as a central task of the American labor movement as a whole.

Thus, in respect to the Till lynching, we are confronted with not just another slaying, but rather with a steadily mounting counter-offensive of the ruling class against the Negro people, taking place simultaneously with and inter-related to, concessions currently being won from the ruling class by the Negro people.

Thus, in summary, the murder of

young
certain
questi
seen
tire
barbar
indust
count
the er
this c
throug
tory a
taking
tions
the N
the c
ness
again

ASSE:

The
young
from
nation
the p
The
was p
which
Indep

The
mett l
a wav
16,000
has b
during

Out
Emme
ing r
their
Unite
The s
have
hopef
for fu
in thi

young Till focused attention upon certain fundamentals of the Negro question in a way that has not been seen since the early '30's. The entire world is asking how such barbarism is possible in an advanced industrial and bourgeois-democratic country like the United States. And the entire Negro people are asking this question. It is being debated throughout the country. A satisfactory answer to this question requires taking into account the inter-relationships between the jim-crow system, the Negro liberation movement, and the counter-offensive of big business and its plantation stooges against the Negro people.

ASSESSING THE OUTRAGE

The answer to the lynching of young Till was not long in coming from the Negro people. Across the nation they arose in unity to demand the punishment of the murderers. The reaction of the Negro people was portrayed vividly in an editorial which appeared in the *Philadelphia Independent*:

The lynch-murder of 14-year-old Emmett Louis Till in Mississippi has sent a wave of feeling sweeping across the 16,000,000 Negroes of this nation that has been without parallel of its kind during the past quarter of a century. . . .

Out of the unfortunate murder of Emmett Till, there has grown a shocking realization among Negroes that their rights as human beings in the United States remain far from secure. The sufferings and death of a small boy have given new life to the Negro's hopeful instincts and determination for full freedom and equal opportunity in this country.

As time passed following the murder of young Till, the Negro liberation movement increasingly reflected a high level of understanding as to the basic factors involved in this inhuman outrage. This understanding grew in terms of the class forces involved, the nature of the system out of which the murder had come, the role and responsibility of the federal government, the program and forms of struggle required to achieve victory, and the international aspects of the question. This important trend towards a common assessment of the major factors involved was reflected in the huge demonstrations and protest meetings held throughout the country, in the Negro press, as well as in articles and speeches of leading personalities, such as Dr. T. R. Howard, Congressman Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Roy Wilkins and Paul Robeson.

Dr. Howard, Mound Bayou physician, and the leading spokesman of the Negro people in Mississippi, clearly showed the depth of Negro oppression in Mississippi as well as the new level of the militancy of the Negro movement in an historic speech delivered before 2,500 people in Baltimore. Dr. Howard stated:

I registered two years ago to become a voter in Humphrey County and that's *one of the 60 counties in Mississippi where colored people have not voted since the days of reconstruction.* We have decided in Mississippi, that we are tired of dying for something on Heartbreak Ridge in Korea that we can't vote for in Belzoni, Mississippi.

... I wish that you could go with me back in the swamps on the plantations of Mississippi and see these eager young colored people who come forward to shake a hand and say, "Dr. Howard, I'm with you, I'm with you."

CLASS CHARACTER OF THE MOVEMENT

An important aspect of the Till movement has been its development along all-class lines—inclusive of the major Negro organizations in the country—in the direction of greater cohesiveness and unity, and with a minimum of red baiting, notwithstanding certain divisive statements by Dr. Channing Tobias, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, and A. Phillip Randolph. Of great significance in the development of this all-class movement is the new and growing role of the Negro industrial proletariat, alongside of the heroic role of the most oppressed sectors of Negro agricultural workers in the South, and particularly in Mississippi. There can be no doubt but that the militancy of the Negro middle class and professional leadership in the Till case is, to a great extent, the direct result of the ascending struggles in all parts of the South of the sharecroppers and tenant farmers and the new role of militancy in Negro life of Negro packinghouse, auto, longshore, electrical, and steel workers. In this connection it is understandable that the highest levels of struggle achieved thus far by the movement have been

in Mississippi, the stronghold of the plantation system, on the one hand, and in such industrial centers as Chicago and Detroit, on the other.

THE NEGRO WORKING CLASS

A tremendous new impetus to the advancing role of the proletarian element within this all-class movement is coming from the Negro caucuses now developing in various parts of the country around problems facing Negro workers in relationship to the new American labor federation. The Negro caucus movement emerges at this juncture in the history of the Negro freedom fight as a force of tremendous significance, in relationship to such issues as the Till fight, de-segregation, the right to vote movement, as well as the economic problems of the Negro workers. The immediate period ahead is destined to witness the rapid maturing of the role played by the nearly 2,000,000 organized Negro workers in the Negro liberation movement as well as in the new labor federation. The power, unity, militancy, organizational discipline and experience, class perspective, and rising national consciousness of this great force give the Till fight a depth of content never before attained in the history of the Negro people.

The emergence of the Negro proletariat into new positions of strength in the liberation movement offers a powerful guarantee that the Till movement is not a transitory, spontaneous, single-issue protest, but

rather, that the struggles around the Till murder will propel forward the Negro freedom movement towards its strategic objectives. Likewise, this militant Negro proletariat will give strength and confidence to the more far-sighted of the Negro professional and middle-class leaders, while placing major objectives in the way of that section of this leadership, which is inclined to waver and temporize.

THE NEGRO PETTY-BOURGEOISIE

The Till movement is a solid confirmation of the correct estimate by American Marxists of the progressive potential still inherent within the Negro petty-bourgeoisie; that events within the country would bring increasing class conflict between the Negro petty-bourgeoisie and big monopoly capital, rather than unity between them; and that the Negro people's struggle must emerge as an all-class struggle, with the Negro proletariat playing an increasingly important role, emerging over a period of time as the leading force in the movement as a whole. The relationship of class forces within the Till movement proves that events are already shaping up along this line, and that the period ahead will witness a continuation of this course of development. It is of prime importance that this course of development be understood by Marxists, as one of their central tasks in respect to the Till movement is to assist this process in every possible

way, fighting for the all-class unity of the movement, greeting the heroic and courageous leadership of the Dr. Howards, while at the same time consciously working at every step to advance the leading role of the Negro proletariat.

THE NAACP AND THE TILL CASE

As a result of its generally militant position in the Till fight, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has consolidated still further its pivotal position among the Negro people, achieving among them deeper respect and confidence. Simultaneously with its strengthened position among the Negro people have come new attacks upon it from the white supremacists. In all states of the Deep South, in varying forms, the political and economic power of the ruling class is being marshalled to destroy the effectiveness of this basic organization. The attorneys-general in several of these states are either contemplating or have already taken legal steps against it. Local and state officials, along with the White Citizen's Councils, are searching high and low for NAACP membership lists, lists of the Board of Directors, and signers of de-segregation petitions, with the view of taking action against these Negro citizens. Extensive investigations of the NAACP are being made by the Eastland Committee of the Senate. The foundations for legal action to outlaw the NAACP in the state of

Georgia are being laid by the State's Attorney General. Already the organization is being forced to function in a semi-legal manner in a whole series of areas in the South. In some areas, for all practical purposes, it is already illegal. This criminal conduct on the part of the ruling class, unless it is speedily checkmated, may very well lead to a situation in the South similar to that which existed in India for years where the British outlawed the Indian National Congress, or in Morocco, where the French colonialists still refuse to grant legal existence to the Isticlal, the Party of the Moroccan majority.

Thus, a new question arises out of the de-segregation fight, the right-to-vote movement, and the struggles around the death of the Negro boy, Emmett Till. That question has to do with the defense of the legal existence of the NAACP, the Elks, Negro churches, and other Negro institutions associating themselves with this movement. Clearly the counter-offensive of big business against the Negro liberation movements is as many-sided as it is total. A most dangerous side of this offensive is the arrogant attacks against the NAACP now being made throughout the South. If the Attorney General of Georgia can declare that the NAACP is "part and parcel of the Communist conspiracy," does this not also threaten the Negro Elks, or the Negro church, or any organization, Negro or white, that speaks up in support of the rights of the Negro people?

One can hardly say, unfortunately, that the implication of these attacks upon the NAACP and its leadership in the South is fully grasped by the Negro movement, organized labor, and the large circle of liberals and civil rights fighters in the country. Even the national spokesmen of the Association have been slow in reacting to this very dangerous development. There is a strong tendency to underestimate the possibility of the success of these attacks. But there should be no illusion on this score. Southern reaction is in deadly earnest. Therefore, nothing short of the most resolute fight to defend and safeguard the NAACP will be sufficient to stay the hand of reaction on this front. A most vigorous response on the part of labor and white Americans generally is in order.

THE TILL CASE AND THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

The *New York Times* (Oct. 22) carried a release from the American Jewish Committee to the effect "that United States prestige abroad had been 'seriously damaged' by the Till case. . . . The report . . . asserted that European condemnation had been 'swift, violent and universal.'" In all parts of the world the "not guilty" verdicts in the Till case were given major press coverage. Simultaneous with the critical appraisal abroad of America's "leadership of the free world," Dr. Howard was declaring in New York "that the United States had no right to go to

Gene
Germ
such
the
plato
States
echoe
peopl
In
our c
over
Reed,
ture,
boro,
ber o
deleg
assess
peare
of th
quest
Sovie

I s
tion.
discr
U.S.S
crimin
sons
the
where
the p
colore
the S
differ
white
are no
attend
churc

"FRE

It
that
ered
eign

Geneva and propose free elections in Germany as long as there were no such elections in Mississippi." In the Negro press and from public platforms throughout the United States this estimate was being echoed and re-echoed by the Negro people.

In the midst of the upheaval in our country and around the world over the Till Case, Dr. William E. Reed, dean of the school of agriculture, A. and T. College, Greensboro, North Carolina, and a member of the American agricultural delegation to the Soviet Union, was assessing, in an article which appeared in the September 10 issue of the *Afro-American*, the national question as he witnessed it in the Soviet Union. Dr. Reed wrote:

I saw no signs of racial discrimination. I think it is fair to say that racial discrimination is non-existent in the U.S.S.R. I observed no religious discrimination. . . . There are colored persons holding responsible positions in the Uzbek and Kazakh Republics where they represent the majority of the population. I was told there were colored people serving as members of the Supreme Soviet Council. I saw no difference between the way colored and white people live in the USSR. They are not segregated anywhere; those who attend church worship in the same churches; they attend the same schools.

"FREE ELECTIONS"

It was against this background that Secretary of State Dulles delivered his closing speech to the Foreign Ministers' Conference on Nov-

ember 16th. Dulles took this occasion to disgrace once again American democratic opinion and to insult the intelligence of the peoples of the world by advocating "free elections" for Germany. Increasingly the Negro people are joining other oppressed peoples in understanding that by "free" Dulles has in mind Mississippi-type elections for Germany. This would mean elections in which German reactionary interests, the remnants of Hitlerite scum, German revanchists and nationalists, would extend their control over Germany as a whole.

Thus, the mighty movement of protest which has arisen as a result of the Till murder has intensified still further the contradictions between the Negro liberation movement, on the one hand, and American imperialism on the other. With the growth of this contradiction, the movement for justice in the Till case becomes a mighty blow against imperialism and a tremendous force for peace. Added impetus to this estimate is given by the disgraceful role played in the United Nations during the past months by our delegation in respect to the Human Rights Covenant, the South African, Algerian, and Moroccan questions. The Till movement today merges with the struggles of the South African, Algerian, Moroccan and oppressed peoples everywhere; it constitutes an inseparable part of the mighty anti-imperialist currents reflected in the Asian-African Conference.

WORLD-WIDE ALLIES

To insure a break-through in the Till fight and to realize the freedom objective of the Negro people, closer fraternal ties are needed between the Negro people's movement in the United States and the national liberation movement in other parts of the world. The day has passed when Negro leadership can afford to apologize for putting our case before the bar of world opinion. Liberation movements in all countries today are conscious of the need for allies in opposing common imperialist oppressors. These movements had their representatives at Bandung; they leave no stone unturned in having their case placed before the United Nations. A recognition of this need for allies was a cardinal guiding principle with the great Frederick Douglass. Such a principle needs to be vigorously pursued today by the leaders of the Till fight. This is an important aspect of insuring the transformation of this movement from one that is objectively anti-imperialist to one that is consciously anti-imperialist. Thus far the Till movement is still hampered and limited by narrow-minded provincial influences, with many leaders seeking to isolate this struggle from world currents and developments. The interests of the movement dictate a broader outlook, an outlook of conscious alignment and solidarity of the Negro liberation movement with the national movements of Africa, with the struggles for national independ-

ence and development in People's China, India, Indonesia, and Burma. Along this path lies the greatest guarantee of a break-through in the Till fight and the successful realization of the objective of full freedom for the Negro people.

THE PROGRAM OF THE
TILL MOVEMENT

Over the past three months the Till movement has gone through a transformation in terms of programmatic orientation. Initially the movement was hampered by a series of disorientating proposals such as the march on Mississippi and that all Negroes should migrate from Mississippi, etc. By and large these harmful proposals have been discarded and the movement generally united around the following immediate demands: intervention by the Department of Justice to put an end to the anti-Negro terror; action in the January session of Congress to unseat the Mississippi delegation; an all-out national movement to win the franchise for the Negro masses in the South; the adoption in the January session of Congress of anti-lynching, anti-poll tax, and other civil rights legislation. Thus the major arena of struggle is to force action by the Eisenhower Administration, and the coming session of the 84th Congress.

The movement has also focussed upon the need for a mammoth civil rights mobilization in Washington during the months of January or February. Thus far there

has been no official announcement from the national office of the NAACP relative to a specific date for the projected mobilization, although a communication from the international office of the UAW to all local affiliates indicated that such a mobilization will be convened.

In order to insure that the Till movement and the de-segregation fight gain new momentum, maximum efforts are required to mobilize the Negro people, the labor movement and other sections of the population in support of the immediate demands. Notwithstanding the high level of militancy achieved thus far, the fact remains that no breakthrough has been gained. Indeed the movement has not yet succeeded in forcing any leading federal official to speak out against the murder of young Till. If this is to be achieved hundreds of thousands must be moved to new levels of struggles. There remain thousands of organizations in the country that have yet to pass resolutions on the Till murder, but which would do so if the question were raised, and there are innumerable other opportunities every day, wherever American people meet, to raise the Till question.

Another key aspect of insuring action when Congress convenes in January is the task of reaching Congressmen. In a number of Congressional Districts, this has been done, with some few Congressmen speaking out and publicly committing themselves to support the passage of civil rights legislation. But this

vital task is not being pursued with the necessary concreteness and planning warranted by the crucial nature of the coming Congressional struggles. In far too many areas it has not been tackled at all.

The heart of the Till fight has increasingly been shifted to the arena of political action. As a result, it most probably will become, in one form or another, a vital issue in the 1956 elections. Notwithstanding the conspiracy of the leaders in both the Republican and Democratic parties to eliminate civil rights and the Negro question as key issues in the 1956 elections, they will most certainly fail if a vigorous struggle unfolds on this question in the United States Congress. The basic steps in the fight to arrest the anti-Negro terror in Mississippi must be along the lines of an all-out political mobilization. This will be an important factor in determining the position of the Negro people in the crucial presidential election now at hand.

ORGANIZED LABOR AND THE WHITE ALLIES

No section of Americans, excepting, of course, the Negro people, have a greater stake in the outcome of the Till fight and the issues involved in it than the working class. In an urgent sense the immediate and long range fate of the organized labor movement in our country is immediately tied up with this struggle. Over the past decade the very costly implications of the continued control of Congress by an alliance

of the Dixiecrats with reactionary Republicans and Democrats in the North have begun to dawn upon the labor movement. With the passage of Taft-Hartley and other repressive anti-labor legislation, with the defeat of major housing, education and all social legislation in the Congress, with the defeat of labor's objective of the \$1.25 minimum, alongside of the defeat of all civil rights and other major legislation vitally affecting the lives and living standards of the working people—together with the absence of any tax relief—labor has begun to see in a more fundamental way the excessive power of the Dixiecrats.

At the same time big business unfolded the policy of spreading their plants into the small towns and rural areas of the South, thus placing in immediate jeopardy the wage scale of Northern workers. Labor began to move to answer this threat by organizing, although in a rather halting manner, in the South. Here, once again, labor has met face to face with the power of Dixiecratism, for it is finding that it too, like the Negro movement, has few rights which the Dixiecrats are prepared to respect. So, today in the South, we witness a rising offensive on the part of big business and Dixiecratism against labor, as well as against the Negro people.

LABOR AND THE DIXIECRATS

The labor movement in our country has currently tied its political fate to the Democratic Party. But

here again the influence and objectives of labor are continuously defeated as a result of, among other factors, the reactionary role of the Dixiecrats. On every hand labor meets the power of this pernicious force. Clearly, the social, political, and economic advance of the working class requires a crushing defeat for Dixiecratism; without such a victory over the Dixiecrats it is difficult to envision in the United States any major forward social advance of the labor movement. Seen in this light the Till struggle becomes of crucial importance for the labor movement since it is designed to destroy Dixiecratism, the bitter foe of both labor and the Negro people. But labor has an important stake not only in the immediate outcome of the Till and de-segregation fights but in the successful completion of the uncompleted bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South, a categoric imperative if Dixiecratism is to be rooted out of American life. Thus, it is required that labor begin to examine in a more basic way the scope of the issues arising in the South as a result of the right-to-vote movement, the de-segregation, and Till fights.

At the same time, it must be seen that the simultaneous attacks in the South upon the labor and Negro movements are designed to further the division between Negro and white, thereby making more difficult the task of organizing the unorganized in the South. The entrance of the labor movement into the struggle around the Till case be-

come
white
the
are
tion,
strate
vast
gener
in pa
outra
and
reign
vadin

LABO
TH

Th
for i
in su
gation
fight
parts
many
ment
Ame
lution
Civil
(CIO
the w
pi"; a
lato i
eral
murd
mobil
Ame
protes
of Ar
Reuth
and t
murd
sent b

comes, therefore, a fight for Negro-white unity and a requirement if the divisive aims of the ruling class are to be defeated. In this connection, recent events have demonstrated beyond question that the vast bulk of white Americans, in general and, in the labor movement in particular, are disgusted with the outrageous murder of young Till and are unequivocally against the reign of anti-Negro terror now pervading the South.

LABOR AND THE TILL CASE

The organized labor movement, for instance, is already on record in support of the May 17th de-segregation decision and is pledged to fight for its implementation. In all parts of the country there have been many reactions in the labor movement to the murder of Emmett Till. Among these reactions are: a resolution passed at the Dayton, Ohio, Civil Rights Conference by I.U.E. (CIO) condemning "the action of the white supremacists of Mississippi"; a strong editorial by Carl Stelato in *Ford Facts*, along with several other articles, against the Till murder and calling upon labor to mobilize to end this blight upon American democracy; statements of protest from the U. S. Steel Workers of America; statements from Walter Reuther in behalf of the U.A.W. and the C.I.O. condemning the Till murder. Also, the communication sent by the U.A.W. International to

all affiliated locals calling for financial and other types of support to the N.A.A.C.P. campaign on Till. This communication urged the participation of all U.A.W. locals in the national Civil Rights mobilization.

Additionally, may be noted the militant stand taken by the last convention of the United Electrical and Radio Workers of America. The U.E. convention formulated a fully developed program in support of the Negro people's struggle against racism and for justice in the Till case. Vigorous action around Till has come from the United Packinghouse Workers. The Packinghouse Workers have been of decisive importance in bringing about Negro-labor unity in Chicago around the Till fight. Observe, also, the joint protest picket line thrown around Chicago's City Hall with the support of the CIO and other sections of the Chicago labor movement. This picket line was designed to focus attention upon the failure of Chicago public officials to act upon the terror in the Trumbull Park housing development and to demand action on Till. In the garment center of New York City the jointly sponsored Labor-Negro protest rally was held with 20,000 Negro and white workers participating. This proved to be one of the largest and most militant demonstrations witnessed in New York in recent years. Also of importance was the protest resolution passed by a number of locals of the United Textile Workers of America (CIO) in New England.

THE NEGRO QUESTION AND THE AFL

Notwithstanding these important developments in the labor movement—and there were many others—the organized labor movement as a whole is seriously lagging. Particularly is this so of the American Federation of Labor, as well as a majority of internationals in the country, both A. F. L. and C.I.O. By and large the majority of the top trade-union leaders have not spoken out on Till. Their failure to do so becomes particularly important in the light of the C.I.O.-A.F. of L. merger, and the deep concern of the Negro workers regarding the stand that the new federation will take on the Negro question. These workers have in mind the fact that there has been over the past twenty years a discrepancy between the more advanced position of the C.I.O. on the Negro question as compared with that of the A. F. L. It is understandable, therefore, that anxiety has arisen at the slowness with which the A. F. L. leadership has entered into the struggle around the Till case.

This slowness to react is in sharp contradiction to the efforts on the part of the A. F. L. to spread trade-union organization in Africa and among colonial peoples around the world. The representatives of the A. F. L. are going to the African people and placing themselves on record as being against imperialism and the oppression of colonial peo-

ples. Undoubtedly, the workers in Africa and in all colonial or semi-colonial countries will be interested in knowing the position of the A. F. L., the international affiliates of the A. F. L., and the various state A. F. L. bodies on the Till case. They will want to know, particularly, the position of the state federation in Mississippi. Unfortunately, this report will have to be negative since the Mississippi Federation of Labor is jim-crow from top to bottom. Undoubtedly, the backward position of the Mississippi Federation of Labor on the Negro question is a negative factor in the A. F. L. as a whole on the Till question. But the American Federation of Teachers has already indicated the path for the solution of this type of problem. They passed a resolution at their last convention prohibiting jim-crow locals in the South, and serving notice that all American Federation of Teachers' locals in the South must open their doors to Negro teachers on the basis of an integrated, interracial program.

There is no doubt but that an important lag exists between the level of the Negro liberation movement in respect to the Till case and that of the labor movement. This lag, if not eliminated, can become a negative factor upon the liberation movement as a whole, since it is impossible for its objectives to be realized without maximum intervention and support by the labor movement. In this connection it would be well to recall the fact that as a

result
Negro
issues
tion v
tively
But r
labor
erted
ventic
ventic
civil r
from
questi
is dec
In a
the su
strugg
of all
try—t
ganiza
major
organi
Ameri
of you
ever sh
nue to
The r
filled
letters
ing th
ters re
among
city. T
great
that ex
the pop
their
these s
tivity. I
and ad
direct t
to close

result of the unity of labor and the Negro people around the civil rights issues, the 1948 Democratic convention was compelled to adopt a relatively strong civil rights position. But no such fighting unity between labor and the Negro people was exerted upon the 1952 Democratic convention, with the result that the convention adopted a watered-down civil rights plank that was a retreat from the 1948 position. Thus, the question of allies in the Till fight is decisive.

In addition to the support of labor, the successful prosecution of the Till struggle requires the maximum aid of all democratic forces in the country—the youth movement, the organizations of the Jewish people, the major women's, religious and church organizations. In short, every white American who deplors the murder of young Till for any reason whatever should find one or another avenue to make this sentiment known. The metropolitan press has been filled during the past months with letters from white citizens protesting the murder of Till. These letters reflect the widespread revulsion among the white masses to this atrocity. The problem, however, is the great gap between the indignation that exists among large sections of the population and specific action on their part which would translate these sentiments into organized activity. It is essential that progressive and advanced forces in the country direct their attention toward helping to close this gap.

THE ROLE OF THE MARXISTS AND THE LEFT

The first task of Marxists in respect to the Till movement is to exert our maximum influence in furthering the fighting unity of the Negro people. But in order to play a leading role in this direction, Marxists and Left forces must be in this movement, a part of the mass organizations that are leading it, and strengthen their ties with it in all possible ways. There can be no doubt but that the perspective of strengthening the mass ties between Marxists and the Negro people's movements is far from being fully realized. An orientation towards furthering the unity of the Negro movement can be effectuated in life through strengthened mass ties with the Negro liberation movement.

Another primary task of Marxists and the Left is to aid in bringing maximum support of the labor movement and the white masses to the struggle. This means, among other things, to resolutely challenge white supremacy and other ideological road blocks that hamper moving labor and the white masses around the Till question. The high status attained by the Communist Party among the Negro people during the 30's came largely as a result of the fact that the Communists mobilized white masses around the Scottsboro and Herndon cases, the unemployment struggles, etc. Thus, a distinctive contribution in the Till fight must be along this line.

Marxists also have the task of

helping to deepen this movement in a number of directions. This is especially true in regard to international aspects of the fight as previously indicated; to the necessity of moving in the direction of independent political action; and in terms of strengthening the movement programmatically. For example, the movement does not yet see clearly the relationship between the land question and the Till murder, nor the fact that it has to begin to embrace an economic program to meet the specific problems of the sharecroppers and tenant farmers in Mississippi. Marxists can help, too, in terms of the relationship between the immediate fight and the strategic objective of the Negro movement of full and complete freedom, to explain how this objective can be realized and to show the relationship between the immediate demands and the requirements of fulfilling the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South.

TO REALIZE "FREE BY 63"

We must show that the logic of the Till fight and the inevitable direction of it is towards placing on the order of the day the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South. In fact, the level of the struggle, the program being advanced, coupled with other developments, already begins to place objectively the question of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, although the present leadership of the Till movement in the South does not

yet see this process. But, unless the movement consciously begins to see the link between the immediate struggles and the overall tasks connected with achieving the fulfillment of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South, then this movement remains without a strategic concept of how to achieve complete freedom, or to realize the slogan, "free by '63."

Marxists and the Left must fight not only for the unity of the movement but for consistency in the movement. Again, in order to realize this, the tie between the immediate and strategic objectives increasingly must be placed. We must bring our support to this movement with great modesty, avoiding arrogance and know-it-allness. In the final analysis, we cannot boast about our concrete aid to the Negro people in Mississippi, for instance. Within the framework of this approach, we must firmly express our conviction that Negro liberation in America as well as an immediate victory around the Till case, is impossible without the strength and influence of the Marxist movement both within the country and on a world scale.

Despite all assertions to the contrary, it remains a fact that the victories achieved over the past twenty-five years by the Negro people would have been impossible without the strength brought to the Negro liberation movement by the Communists. A. Phillip Randolph argues that Marxists must be excluded from the movement. But this idea is ludicrous in the light of the

triu
in
year
Neg
cou
the
tory

RO
O

T
the
gani
Neg
idea
of g
Benj
foot,
ston,
creas
dard
Neg
ples

triumphant victories of socialist ideas in the world during the last hundred years. To believe, therefore, that the Negro people's movement in this country can develop in isolation from the decisive currents of world history is at best naive.

ROLE OF NEGRO COMMUNIST LEADERS

There is no doubt but that during the last five years, when the organized base of the Left among the Negro people has been reduced, the ideas, prestige, and general strength of great Marxist Negro leaders like Benjamin J. Davis, Claude Lightfoot, James Jackson, Henry Winston, and Claudia Jones have increased. They have set a new standard of leadership for the oppressed Negro peoples. Their heroic examples are increasingly being recog-

nized and acclaimed. Only those who have eyes and refuse to see can fail to recognize this fact. So far from excluding the Ben Davises and Claude Lightfoots from the Negro liberation movement, these outstanding Marxists represent and speak for the movement's future, as that movement itself needs the widest possible unity.

Marxism is winning on a world scale; socialist ideas are increasingly becoming a part of the consciousness of all progressive humanity, and the oppressed everywhere who fight to be free. The embattled Negro liberation movement in our country stands urgently in need of the science of Marxism-Leninism. To bring to the Negro liberation movement socialist thought and ideas is to equip this movement with an invincible ideology and to assure its inevitable victory.

The Great Socialist Revolution

By L. M. Kaganovich

. . . LENIN, THE brilliant strategist of the proletarian revolution, creatively developing scientific Communism in conditions of the victorious October Revolution, worked out a great, bold, scientifically sound plan for building Communism. History has borne out the correctness of this plan.

The Party relied first and foremost on internal resources and on the forces of the liberated people themselves. It could not count on help from without: at that period the only thing the imperialists exported to Soviet Russia was intervention, and money they supplied lavishly only for counter-revolution.

The electrification of the country was one of the most important aspects of Lenin's plan for building Communism. He called the famous GOELRO plan the "second party program." "Communism," he said, "is Soviet rule plus the electrification of the country as a whole." By the electrification of the country Lenin meant the creation of the material base of Communism, the development of large-scale and, above

all, heavy industry on the basis of advanced techniques and high productivity of labor. It was with this that Lenin's plan for the cooperation of millions of small peasant households and the realization of the cultural revolution was linked.

Lenin, the architect of this plan, was not destined to live to see it carried through to completion. Following his death, the Bolshevik Party he had created successfully worked, under the leadership of his loyal comrade-in-arms, the great Stalin, to put Lenin's plan into effect.

Our country was one of the most backward in the generation of electric power. Today it holds second place in the world. The output of electric power is being increased 84% under the fifth Five-Year Plan. . . .

THE TRIUMPH OF LENIN

We shall continue to develop electrification on a still greater scale. The next five-year period will see the first units of the "Bratsk" hydroelectric station—the largest in the world—built and put into operation on the Angara River.

* Reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, Nov. 11, 1955; abridged text.

It is interesting to recall in this connection what H. G. Wells, the British author, wrote in 1920. He said that Lenin, although repudiating, as an orthodox Marxist, all "Utopias," had in the end got into an electrical Utopia himself. He was supporting with all his might a plan for organizing giant electric stations in Russia. Could one fancy a bolder project in this vast flat country with its endless forests and illiterate muzhiks, with its scarcely developed technique and dying industry and trade? It was only by the greatest stretch of imagination that one could dream of electrification being applied in Russia. Wells said that he for one could imagine nothing of the kind.

A respected author of entertaining Utopian novels, Wells was capable of writing fantasies about Mars but proved incapable of visualizing the future on actual Russian soil. How limited these gentlemen appear to be now and what a titan of scientific revolutionary thought and great revolutionary daring is our genius, our ever beloved father, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, towering over the ages!

All this should give considerable food for thought to those who today look down upon the efforts of the Chinese people and their Government to industrialize and electrify the whole of their country. We are certain that these supercilious gentlemen will make as great a laughing-stock of themselves as those who used to scoff at us. Under the guidance of the Communist

Party, headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the great Chinese people will achieve the victory of Socialism just as the Soviet people have done.

Lenin's prediction has come true. What was produced in a whole year in 1920 is put out in a matter of days in 1955: electricity—in one day; pig iron—in a day and a half; coal—in eight days; oil—in twenty days; sugar—in seven days.

The Leninist plan of building Communism has become the militant program of our Party and the Soviet people and is being successfully carried out. The Soviet people are meeting the thirty-eighth anniversary of the October Revolution by fulfilling the fifth Five-Year Plan ahead of schedule.

The level of industrial production in 1955 will be 184 per cent of that in 1950 and 318 per cent of that in 1940; the production of the means of production will be 189 per cent of that of 1950 and production of consumer goods 176 per cent.

TASKS AHEAD

However, in summing up our successes, we must remember the behest of Lenin, who said that "the best way to celebrate the anniversary of the Great Revolution is to concentrate attention on its unresolved tasks." These unresolved tasks have been set us in a number of decisions of the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

With regard to agriculture, the C.C. of our Party has, through the

reports of Comrade Khrushchev, criticized shortcomings in this sphere at a number of its plenary meetings and adopted a number of important decisions.

With regard to industry, a report by Comrade Bulganin was discussed last July, and a detailed decision taken exposing the basic shortcomings preventing our industry from making more rapid progress, and important measures were adopted for improving its work. . . .

Since the October Revolution created new socialist relations of production, the main problems of advancing our economy have been the ensuring of technical progress and better organization of production and labor. . . .

To fall behind in the present epoch of rapid scientific and technical development would mean to fall behind in economic competition with capitalism. Only by making rapid and extensive use of the latest achievements of home and world science and technology can we achieve that higher degree of labor productivity, as compared with capitalism, which is essential for the victory of Communism. . . .

Our socialist agriculture is meeting the thirty-eighth anniversary of the October Revolution with new victories. The collective farm peasantry is working hard to fulfill the tasks set by the Communist Party.

In recent years the Party has adopted important decisions and taken intensive measures to advance agriculture, the results of which have already made themselves felt.

Including the 30-odd million hectares of newly-cultivated virgin soil, the crop area in the USSR has increased 27 per cent as against 1950. The area under maize has increased more than fourfold as compared with 1954. Stockbreeding is pushing ahead. . . .

Every effort must be made to eliminate existing shortcomings. It is necessary first of all to raise yields of grain and industrial crops per hectare, to ensure an advance in stockbreeding and to make better use of machinery. This will ensure greater prosperity for the collective farmers and satisfy the growing requirements of the country for raw materials and foodstuffs.

We are convinced that our mighty collective farm system can cope with these tasks.

This year, as in the past, our Party and Government have striven to satisfy the material and cultural requirements of the Soviet people. Along with the growing purchasing power of the population and the lowering of prices, trade in the country also expanded. The five year plan for retail trade has been fulfilled in four years.

But shortcomings in the work of the trading organizations, for instance, inadequate study of the requirements and needs of the working people and the tardy delivery of goods to the consumers, stand in the way of a better supply of goods to the population. The real wages of factory and office workers in industry are this year 39% higher than in 1950 and 91% higher than

in 1947
working
than in
in 1947

State
cultural
scholar
and h
and pa
than 3
Our
versary
with fi
of cult
ber of
numbe
ary an
lishme
art an
eviden
progre
ishing

We
plan, t
are sti
by the
econom
reason
machin

The
dissolu
with th
ing pe
the pe
the all
ing th
spect a
a still
by the
who h
work
gloriou
know

in 1940; the peasants' incomes (per working person) are 50% higher than in 1950 and 122% higher than in 1940.

State appropriations for social and cultural services—free tuition and scholarships, free medical assistance and health resort accommodation, and paid holidays—have risen more than 3.5 times since 1940. . . .

Our country greets the 38th anniversary of the October Revolution with fresh achievements in the field of cultural development. The number of schools is growing and the number of those attending secondary and higher educational establishments is on the increase. Soviet art and literature, the most striking evidence of the general cultural progress of the people, are in a flourishing state.

We now stand before the new plan, the sixth Five-Year Plan. There are still greater tasks to be solved by the state in the field of national, economic administration. For this reason the operation of the state machinery must be improved.

The maintenance of constant, indissoluble bonds with the people, with the wide masses of the working people and the participation of the people in running the state are the all-important means of improving the state machinery. In this respect a big part is being played and a still greater part must be played by the trade unions, by the women, who hold an important place in our work of construction, and by our glorious youth who have never known capitalism in our country

but who know very well how to build Socialism successfully.

It is necessary for us to strengthen our state in every way if both our internal and our external tasks are to be carried out successfully. The countries of people's democracy are benefitting from its experience, from its practical work. Our economic relations and trade with these countries are being extended.

THE SOCIALIST AND CAPITALIST SECTORS

Our contacts and relationships are built on the new principles of comradesly mutual assistance and on co-ordination of economic development plans coupled with mutual respect for the sovereignty and equality of the peoples.

We must improve the system and the practice of co-ordinating the plans of national economic development. This is particularly important from the standpoint of competition on the part of the countries of the socialist camp with the countries of the capitalist camp. Not only the Soviet Union but all the countries of people's democracy, too, are unswervingly following the road of a new powerful economic advance. A new system of world socialist economy is taking shape and gaining in strength.

We are convinced that it is the more progressive system of socialist economy that will be victorious in the competition between the two systems. We do not doubt that Lenin's plan of building Socialism

will be fulfilled in all the countries of the socialist camp.

The results of our national economic development are a striking demonstration of the immense advantages of the socialist system over the capitalist one. The indices of the economic development of the two systems are poles apart.

In 1954 the industrial production index of the capitalist world, taking 1929 as 100, stood at 176. In the same year the industrial production index of the USSR was 1,785 as compared with 1929, *i.e.*, nearly 18 times as high.

The average annual rate of growth of industrial production in the Soviet Union was, throughout those years, more than 5 times greater than that of the capitalist world during the same period. As a matter of fact, incidentally, out of those 38 years our development covered only 20 years because 18 were swallowed up by the wars that were imposed upon us and in subsequent recovery. We know that we are, for the time being, second in the world to the United States for general volume of industrial production, that we lag behind the United States in many respects; but we feel certain that with our rate of development we will, once we have eliminated the existing shortcomings, fulfill the behest of Lenin—we will overtake and outstrip it economically too, that is in per capita production.

The Soviet socialist economy is developing according to plan, uninterruptedly and without crises, without unemployment; the United

States is rich, it has a powerful industry, but capitalist economy develops in fits and starts, from crisis to crisis.

The capitalist system has experienced three world crises during the past 38 years: in 1920-21, 1929-33 and 1937-38. Since the Second World War there have been crisis phenomena in the United States' economy in 1948-49 and in 1953-54. It is true that these crisis phenomena have not become world wide; but even today there is no reason to speak of the serious restoration of a certain equilibrium.

The increase of industrial output in capitalist countries after the Second World War is explained first and foremost by such factors as the militarization of the economy, which is without precedent in peacetime, and the arms drive. The sum total of direct military expenditure of the NATO countries rose from 18,500 million dollars in 1949 to 65,000 million dollars in 1953. Prior to the Second World War the very same countries spent only 3,400 million dollars on armament, that is, only one-twentieth of the sum expended in 1953.

Such measures are not a salvation from crises, they drive them deep inside and sharpen all the contradictions in the capitalist world, above all, the class contradictions. It is no accident that since the Second World War the strike movement has been at a much higher level than before the war. . . .

Life shows that no panaceas can alter the laws of development of

capitalism, or remove the ever-sharpening contradictions inherent in capitalism, especially in its imperialist stage.

That is why the most reactionary and rabid elements of imperialism look for "a way out" in the aggravation of the international situation, in military gambles. It is these elements that have exerted, and in one degree or another continue to exert, influence on the policy of the Western capitalist powers. The result was the exceedingly tense situation in 1953 and 1954, which was fraught with danger.

Suffice it to recall only a few facts of these two years: the Paris agreements on the remilitarization of Western Germany and its integration in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc; the establishment of the SEATO aggressive alignment in South-East Asia; the conclusion of the Turkish-Pakistani military treaty which has now become a bloc of five countries, including Iran, Iraq and, strange as it may seem, Britain; the military agreements between the United States and South Korea, between the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek clique which has taken cover, under the wing of the American navy, on Taiwan, which belongs to the People's Republic of China, and also the agreements between the United States and Japan on the acceleration of Japan's militarization.

THE POLICY OF STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

True to its policy of struggle for

peace and coexistence of different social and political systems, the Soviet Union, together with the great People's Republic of China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, has cut right across these developments which threatened peace. Steps designed to ease international tension have been taken one after another. Today it is generally admitted that important results have been achieved. The cessation of hostilities in Korea and the end of the war in Indo-China were the first serious steps in this direction.

Let us recall the most important measures taken by the Soviet Government and the governments of the countries of people's democracy this year alone:

The historic proposals of the Soviet Government on May 10, 1955, on the reduction of armaments, the prohibition of atomic weapons and the removal of the threat of another war;

The restoration of friendly and fraternal relations between the Soviet Union and People's Yugoslavia and the further successful development of these relations in all spheres—political, economic and cultural—all this is of great importance not only for Soviet-Yugoslav relations but also for strengthening the cause of peace, democracy and Socialism;

The conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty;

The visit to the Soviet Union of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India and the consolidation of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of India;

The visit to the Soviet Union of Prime Minister U Nu of Burma and the further consolidation of the good relations between the Soviet Union and Burma;

The conclusion of the treaty on the development of relations between the sovereign friendly states—the USSR and the German Democratic Republic; the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the German Federal Republic;

The prolongation for twenty years of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and Finland;

The withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Port Arthur naval base and also the abolition of the Soviet Naval Base in Porkkala Udd.

These are not merely diplomatic actions of the usual type but real and important deeds of the Soviet Government, of our Leninist Party and its C.C. in the struggle for peace.

The broad masses, not only in our country but also far beyond its borders, apparently approve this policy. It is a continuation of the policy of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

We have done and are doing everything for peace and, of course, not out of weakness, as the trumpeters of imperialism claim, but because

we are aware of our growing strength and might. We do not advise anyone to test our strength, especially those who have already tested it.

We are more than ever confident of the indestructible, ever-growing might of the Soviet Union and the whole camp of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Today we can say that the forces of peace have grown. The force of the peoples is the decisive one and the peoples, including those in the imperialist countries, do not want to lay down their lives and suffer for the interests of imperialists. That is why the wisest section of the bourgeoisie, sensing that their policy is arousing the increasing resistance of the peoples, have agreed to a certain easing of international tension.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Whereas until recently it was impossible to ascribe to the Western powers any really serious steps for the relaxation of international tension, today we can with satisfaction put down to the credit of the governments of the United States, Great Britain and France their effective and beneficial participation together with the Soviet Union in the Four-Power Conference of heads of government in Geneva last July. We consider it our patriotic duty to stress the particularly outstanding part for peace played at the Geneva Conference by our Soviet delegation, which discharged with credit the mandate of our people.

The
ence
big a
tiona
porte
tion.
Bu
Conf
by its
Gene
exam
reduc
by 6
pants
from
ter, e
the sp
We
viou
able
peace
Conf
stage
the en
distur
people
The
opinio
Power
ence i
ment
lective
import
ence.
The
right t
taken
to ens
pean
those
lerite
of the
Wha

The Geneva Four-Power Conference of heads of government was a big and important event in international life as a whole. All peace supporters acclaimed it with satisfaction.

But whereas after the Geneva Conference the Soviet Government, by its deeds, gave substance to the Geneva spirit—we can mention, for example, the important measure of reducing the strength of the army by 640,000 men—the other participants in the Geneva Conference, far from taking serious steps in the matter, even carried out retreats from the spirit of Geneva.

We are of the opinion now, as previously, that although a more favorable situation for the struggle for peace has emerged after the Geneva Conference, it does not represent a stage of tranquil existence, in which the enemies of peace are unable to disturb the peaceful life of the peoples.

The attention of world public opinion is now focussed on the Four-Power Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva. The Soviet Government considers the question of collective security in Europe to be an important issue facing this Conference.

The peoples of Europe have the right to insist that practical steps be taken at last to prevent new wars, to ensure the security of all European countries and, first of all, of those who suffered from the Hitlerite invasion. This is just the aim of the Soviet proposals.

What have the representatives of

the three Western Powers had to say to these proposals? Strange though it may seem, they proposed that the first thing was to restore militarism throughout the whole of Germany and to incorporate a unified, remilitarized Germany in the North Atlantic bloc, which is spear-headed against the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy. The Soviet Government has rejected such proposals and will continue to do so.

The entire Soviet people will stand as one behind their Government and say: It was not in order to rebuild German imperialism with our own hands, to the detriment of all peoples, including the German people, that we and other peoples of Europe shed our blood and routed German imperialism in the Great Patriotic War.

We stand for the re-establishment of the unity of Germany as a peace-loving and democratic state. This is the firm position of the Soviet Government and we shall not budge an inch from it. We have agreed that the discussion of the two questions should be linked, but linking does not mean subordinating the more important question of European security to the German question, as the representatives of the three Western Powers would like to have it at Geneva.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic has set out, in its statement in connection with the Geneva Conference, its views and suggestions regarding the ways and means of solving the German prob-

lem. The Soviet Government supports this program.

The reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons is today one of the most urgent demands of the peoples in their struggle to strengthen peace. The proposals of the Soviet Government are known. Representatives of the United States are urging that things should be confined to the establishment of control over armaments.

We stand for control over disarmament and not for control over continued armament. We cannot give up the proposal for putting an end to the arms race and banning atomic weapons.

It is not words but deeds, not declarations on disarmament but real disarmament and the prohibition of atomic weapons that the peoples are waiting for. We feel that the peoples of the whole world will give us their active support in our struggle for disarmament. We will be supported not only by the peoples of Europe but also by those of Asia and Africa, who are playing an ever-greater role in world politics.

NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS

The October Revolution and victory in the Second World War played a historic role in the development of the national liberation movements and the liberation in colonial and dependent countries of the East.

Since the Second World War many of the countries of Asia and

Africa have gained independence for the first time. The Bandung Conference of 29 nations of Asia and Africa played an important role in the struggle for strengthening universal peace. The Soviet Union and our Party have always stood by the peoples of those countries in their struggle for freedom and independence and have given and will give them their moral and political support.

It is our conviction that the forthcoming visit of Comrades N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchev to great India, to Burma and Afghanistan will contribute to the further consolidation of the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union with the peoples of India, Burma and Afghanistan, and with the peoples of the East in general.

The experience of the development of international relations in 1955 has shown that the line taken by the Soviet Union that differences between nations should be settled through negotiation has been justified.

There are all the possibilities in the world today for ending the cold war and establishing lasting and stable peaceful relations. If this is to be achieved the reactionary imperialistic forces must be forced to retreat still further and governments must in reality ensure peace for the peoples.

The balance sheet we are drawing up as we celebrate the 38th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution attests to the impressive achievements gained in the

battle for peace and for coexistence of the two systems. The peace movement is growing in scope. The peoples are cementing their unity in the fight for peace.

However, those who prize peace and friendship of the peoples know that there is no cause for complacency, that the struggle for peace calls for vigilance, for exposure of aggressive policies, for strengthening the front of peace.

The peoples and working folk of all countries can rest assured that the Soviet state, brought into being by the October Revolution, is, as it always has been, a reliable bulwark of peace, friendship and brotherhood of the peoples of the whole world.

The Great October Socialist Revolution has raised our homeland to an immense height on the world scene. It has elevated it in the eyes of the whole world and turned it into the leading revolutionary force, into a bright beacon which illumines for mankind the path to the building of a new society, free from oppression, enslavement and exploitation.

That is precisely why the October Revolution was and is of the greatest international significance. It continues to exert an increasingly decisive influence on the course of world events, on the historic destinies of mankind, and first and foremost of the working class. Today hundreds of millions of common people throughout the world wholeheartedly perceive the grandeur and historic significance of the October Revolution.

Soviet men and women are patriots who love their country, and at the same time will never cease to be proletarian internationalists. That is why no one will ever succeed in breaking the close ties binding the Soviet people with the broad masses and with the working class of all countries.

"EXPORTING" REVOLUTION

This, of course, does not mean that our state, brought into being by the October Revolution, interferes in the internal affairs of other states. Those who spread such allegations ought to know what our great teacher Lenin had to say about "the export of revolution": "There are people who believe that the revolution can break out in a foreign country to order . . . These people are either mad or they are provocateurs." (Russian Ed., Vol. 27, p. 441.)

Exposing those who from "Left" positions argued that we should wage a "revolutionary war" Lenin wrote as far back as in 1918 that "such a 'theory' would mean a complete break with Marxism which has always denied the 'impelling' of revolutions, which develop as the class contradictions, engendering revolution become more acute." (Russian Ed., Vol. 27, p. 49.)

The impelling force of revolutions is imperialism itself, as the class contradictions grow sharper within each country the working class and the laboring peasantry cement their unity, national leaders are brought to the fore—*national*

leaders and not "exported" from elsewhere, as the slanderers claim—and the advanced force of the class, the revolutionary party, becomes organized and tempered in the struggle.

Revolutionary ideas recognize no boundaries, they travel all over the world without visas and without being fingerprinted.

When Marx and Engels issued the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" there was neither radio nor telephones nor planes. But the immortal ideas of Marx and Engels penetrated to all corners of the world and into the minds of the working masses of all countries. All the more so now, in the twentieth century, the great ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which have gripped the masses, have triumphed and will triumph.

Whereas the nineteenth century was the century of capitalism, the twentieth century is the century of the triumph of Socialism and Communism.

It is the force of these ideas that explains why in October 1917 our Party, which had only 240,000 members, a drop in the ocean of people, led the millions of workers and peasants to the victorious assault on capitalism.

The working class and the whole of our people know very well to what inspiring and organizing force they are indebted for victory in the October Revolution and for all their victories. They know that this force is the great, heroic Communist Party of Bolsheviks.

The experience of our revolution has demonstrated that if the centuries-long struggle of the oppressed and exploited working people could not be victorious without the proletariat, then even with a working class there could be no victory without a revolutionary Communist Party, armed with advanced Marxist-Leninist theory and closely linked with the masses.

The strength of our Party lies in its adherence to principle, in that it has always been with the workers, with the working people in their sorrows and joys, that it has taught the working people, and learned from them. It required an iron will, indomitable faith in the justice of its cause, a faith based on scientific Communism and the greatest devotion to the working class and the whole people in order to traverse in some 50 years such a glorious, triumphant path as our own Party has done.

That is why the whole Soviet people speak of our Party in the words of the great Lenin: "We believe in it, in it we see the mind, honor and conscience of our era."

If we recall the hard lot of the working man throughout the centuries, what the ordinary man was like, how it was taken for granted that he was a "drudge" so created by God and doomed to remain that way for all time; if we look at our Soviet man who has become a cultured forward-looking master of the country, imbued with a sense of his own dignity and pride in his beloved socialist homeland, it will be

com
peop
ou

T
XX
peop
occa
ciali
its

the
T
are
the
rally
vict

T
batt
is a
and

T
peop
ple,
the
and
peop

come clear why all the common people so ardently love and revere our great Communist Party.

* * *

The Party is approaching its XXth Congress. The whole of the people are preparing to mark the occasion in a worthy fashion. Socialist emulation of the people in its honor is spreading throughout the Soviet Union.

The people, the Party and its C.C. are confident that the decisions of the XXth Congress will inspire and rally our people for fresh glorious victories of Communism.

The Party, headed by its wise and battle-seasoned Central Committee, is approaching its Congress united and monolithic.

The unity of the Party with the people, the unity of the Soviet people, the fraternal alliance with all the countries of people's democracy and the friendship of the working people of all countries—here is a

mighty force which is afraid of no enemy, which will crush all obstacles in its path to the victory of peace and Socialism.

Comrades, the October Revolution is a vivid, powerful manifestation of the colossal strength of the people accumulated throughout the centuries, which will radiate energy for centuries to come. And, reviewing every year the path of struggle traversed, we draw from this deep well-spring of the people's energy, creative endeavor and wisdom, fresh strength for the further struggle, for the future, for the coming victories of Communism.

Under the banner of the Great October Socialist Revolution, under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, under the leadership of the Communist Party and its Central Committee we have won and will continue to win victories, we have marched and will continue to march forward to the complete victory of Communism!

Index, 1955

- Aptheker, Herbert**—The Emancipation Proclamation, Feb., 56; The Informer System and Democracy, Apr., 28; On Foster's "History of the Three Internationals," May, 1; Patriotism and the Nation, July, Aug., 42; "Crusaders" (Book Review), Nov., 63.
- Buck, Tim**—The Dilemma of Canadian Capital, June, 41.
- Blum, Emanuel**—The Steel Settlement and a Look Ahead, Sept., 48.
- Blumberg, Albert E.**—Labor, Congress and the '56 Elections, Jan., 33; (with A. B. Magil)—Peace and the 1956 Elections, May, 9; (with Bob Hall)—Congress and '56, Dec., 1.
- Brewster, Frank** (with Mark Logan)—Automation: Abundance For Whom? I, Oct., 44; (with Mark Logan)—Automation: Abundance For Whom? II, Nov., 31.
- Bulganin, N. A.**—Speech on Appointment as Premier, Mar., 1.
- Central Committee, C.P. of Argentina**—The Military Uprising in Argentina, Nov., 55.
- Davis, Benjamin J.**—Abolish Jim-Crow Prisons!, Feb., 27.
- Debs, Eugene V.**—On the Russian Revolution, Nov., 4.
- Editorial**—Lenin and Peaceful Co-Existence, Jan., 1; Remember Guatemala!, June, 1; Put An End to Lynching!, Oct., 1; On the 38th Anniversary of the Great Socialist Revolution, Nov., 1.
- Fleischer, Louis**—Adolf Berle's "Capitalist Revolution," June, 50.
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley**—Comrade Israel Amter: In Memoriam, Jan., 27.
- Foster, William Z.**—"History of the Three Internationals" (Table of Contents), Jan., 44; The Perspectives for a Labor-Farmer Party in the U.S., Feb., 3; On the Release of the National Committee Members, Apr., 1; Eisenhower and Keynesism, Apr., 19; Notes on the Struggle for Negro Rights, May, 20; Steve Nelson's "The 13th Juror," June, 20; The General Law of Trade Union Progress, July, 12; On the Fight Against Keynesism, Aug., 30; Geneva: Post-ground and Perspectives, Sept., 9; Post-Geneva: The Fight for Peaceful Co-Existence, Oct., 3. Thoughts on the Autobiography of Elizabeth G. Flynn, Dec., 14.
- Friedman, Robert**—"Fire in the Ashes" (Book Review), Jan., 63.
- Ganley, Nat**—On the Coming 15th Convention of the United Auto Workers, Mar., 41; The UAW Convention and Coming Struggles, June, 3; (with Saul Wellman) The Auto Workers Advance, Oct., 31.
- Garcia, Pablo M.**—The Puerto Rican People Against Colonialism and McCarthyism, Nov., 22.
- Gerson, Simon W.**—The Battle Against the McCarran Act, Oct., 15.
- Ghosh, Ajoy**—The Bandung Conference, June, 13.
- Hall, Rob** (with Albert E. Blumberg)—Congress and '56, Dec., 1.
- Hastings, Frederick C.** (with Charles P. Mann)—For a Mass Policy in Negro Freedom's Cause, Mar., 7.
- Kaganovich, L. M.**—On the Great Socialist Revolution, Dec., 52.
- Letwin, Alita**—New Stirrings on the Campus, Oct., 54.
- Lightfoot, Claude**—The Struggle to End the Cold War at Home, Sept., 23.
- Logan, Mark**—Mount the Counter-Offensive Against McCarthyism, Feb., 42; (with Frank Brewster)—Automation: Abundance For Whom?, I, Oct., 55; (with Frank Brewster)—Automation: Abundance For Whom?, II, Nov., 31.
- Longo, Luigi**—For a Move to the Left in Italy, Oct., 22.
- Lowitt, Julian**—Youth and the Struggle for Peace and Democracy, Aug., 19.
- Magil, A. B.**—On the Struggle for Peace in the United States, Jan., 4; (with Albert E. Blumberg)—Peace and the 1956 Elections, May, 9; "U.S. Over Latin America" (Book Review), Oct., 64.
- Mann, Charles P.**—(with Frederick C. Hastings)—For a Mass Policy in Negro Freedom's Cause, Mar., 7.
- Morris, George**—The AFL-CIO Merger, Mar., 30.
- National Committee, CPUSA**—The New Jailings of Communist Leaders, Feb., 7; The Meaning of Geneva, Sept., 7.
- Norris, Mary**—The Nature of the Present "Recovery," Mar., 52; Is the Economic Cycle "Under Control"?, June, 24.
- Perry, Pettis**—The Farm Situation in the U.S., Feb., 20.
- "Pravda," an Editorial From**—On Friendly Relations Between the USSR and Yugoslavia, Sept., 60.
- Prestes, Luis Carlos**—On the Program of the Communist Party of Brazil, Apr., 55.
- Readers, Letters from**—July, 65; Sept., 64.
- Richmond, Al**—Anita Whitney—Communist, Apr., 44.
- Sennett, William**—The Chicago Elections and 1956, July, 41.
- Seymour, Alfred N.**—On Biology and Dialectics, June, 59.

Shepilov, D.—The General Line of the CPSU and Vulgarizers of Marxism, Apr., 34.
Soviet Historians—On the Study of the Modern History of the Capitalist Countries, Jan., 52.
Sparks, Nemmy—The Yugoslav-Soviet Rap-
 prochement, Dec., 27.
Stevens, Andrew—The Fight Against White
 Chauvinism, May, 43.
Stone, Marthu—A New Stage in the Fight
 for Peace, July, 1.
Strack, Celeste—Economic Laws and "Anti-
 Depression" Programs (A Reply to the
 Tabitha Petran Series), Nov., 7.
Strong, Edward E.—The Lynching of Em-
 mett Till, Dec., 35.
Svetchnikov, G. A.—The Struggle Against
 Indeterminism in Contemporary Physics,
 Nov., 43.

Swift, John—Some Thoughts on Indepen-
 dent Political Action (A Discussion of the
 "National Guardian's" Call for a Third
 Party), Apr., 4.
Thorez, Maurice—Mystification and Reality:
 The Economic Situation in France, July,
 54.
Tilden, Phillip M.—A Comment on the
 Svetchnikov Article, Nov., 53.
Togliatti, Palmiro—On Building Unity in
 Italy, Aug., 59.
Wellman, Saul (with Nat Ganley)—The
 Auto Workers Advance, Oct., 31.
Wilkerson, Dorey A.—The 46th Annual Con-
 vention of the NAACP, Aug., 1.
Williams, Walter—On the Fight Against
 White Chauvinism, Feb., 31.
Williamson, John—To My Comrades, July,
 34.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY
 THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code,
 Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULA-
 TION OF

POLITICAL AFFAIRS, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1955.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor, V. J. Jerome, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only)

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1955.

MANUEL LICHTENSTEIN

Notary Public, State of New York
 (My commission expires March 30, 1957)

(Seal)

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER on

I SPEAK MY OWN PIECE

Autobiography of "The Rebel Girl"

By ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

This grass-roots account of a front-line fighter in one of the most important eras in the history of the working-class movement in this country, takes the reader right onto the blazing firing line of the class struggle. . . .

I Speak My Own Piece has as its basic structure the life and work of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and it is constructed upon the foundation of the bitter American class warfare of the period. In its larger aspects, it is the story of the making of a Communist leader in the furnace of the class battles of the working class. . . . Elizabeth took naturally to the struggle of the American workers. Beautiful, eloquent, glowing with fighting spirit, and infused with a boundless revolutionary enthusiasm, Comrade Elizabeth was a real inspiration and a power in all the strikes and other struggles of the workers in which she participated. She was indeed "The Rebel Girl" as Joe Hill called her. . . .

Among the most important features in Comrade Flynn's new book are the many vivid pictures she paints of the great strikes of those times. . . . Other high points in the book are the many detailed and colorful studies of working-class leaders and heroes in the crucial period of labor history with which she deals. Such brave and effective figures as Bill Haywood, Gene Debs, Vincent St. John, Daniel De Leon, Frank Little, Joe Hill, Mother Jones, Mother Bloor, Tom Mooney, James Connolly, Jim Larkin, Anita Whitney, Charles E. Ruthenberg, and many others, come alive again in her book and carry on their vital work. Miss Flynn's volume is one of the very best sources for the young workers of the present time to come to know, to appreciate, and to understand these fighters who did so much to build the American labor movement in one of its most difficult periods.

POPULAR \$1.75 • CLOTH \$2.75

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

End

E

the
ent
line

ork
ion
ger
the
ook
ent,
olu-
and
ich
lled

new
kes
any
oes
uch
cent
nes,
nita
gain
e is
sent
nese
ment

k 3