

political affairs



SEPTEMBER 1957 • 35 CENTS

**NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
CPUSA**

[21] Resolution on Agricultural Policy

[26] An Evaluation of the "Daily Worker"

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[46] On Joll's "History of the Second International"

JIM WEST

[53] On the Party's Vanguard Role

HYMAN LUMER

[60] "The Politics of Industry"

[63] Letters from Readers

THE ANTI-H-BOMB MOVEMENT
By Eugene Dennis [1]
ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY
By Bob Thompson [14]

THE EDITOR

[34] "Ideas in Our Time"

JUST PUBLISHED!

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTEENTH NATIONAL
CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.**

This 352-page volume gives a full picture of this widely-reported Convention, including the contributions of every speaker in the discussion on the various hotly-debated resolutions, motions, issues, etc., as well as the Main Political Resolution, the new Constitution, Draft Plan of Work, Statement of Observers, greetings, and other vital material.

PRICE \$2.75

**MAIN POLITICAL RESOLUTION OF THE
16th NATIONAL CONVENTION, C.P.U.S.A.**

50¢

**CONSTITUTION OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.**

15¢

NEW International BOOKS

PHILOSOPHY IN REVOLUTION, by Howard Selsam \$2.00

LABOR FACT BOOK 13, prepared by Labor Research Ass'n \$2.00

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, by Samuel Lilley \$3.75

Order from your local bookshop or

.....
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: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 35 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

H-Bomb Testing and Our National Interest

By EUGENE DENNIS

At the latest quarterly meeting of the National Committee, CPUSA, held during the end of July, Eugene Dennis, Secretary for National Affairs, delivered a Report, accepted by the Committee, dealing with the central task confronting mankind—its own preservation. We bring to our readers the full text of this analysis.—Ed.

MY REPORT, which is limited in scope, will be confined primarily to an examination of some aspects of the growing anti-H-bomb movement in our country. It will also touch on certain questions pertaining to what can be done to help expand and reinforce this powerful mass effort to halt nuclear weapons tests and the atomic arms race.

I would like to preface my main remarks by some observations on the international situation. Our last National Committee meeting took place right after the adoption of the Eisenhower Mid-East Doctrine. Since then a number of developments have occurred which shed additional light on the dominant trend in world relationships, as well as on

the immediate prospects and tasks in the struggle for peace.

One of the first consequences of the promulgation of the Eisenhower Doctrine was the brazen interference of the American government in the internal affairs of Jordan, which severely undermined the security and national independence of that country.

About the same time there was the Conference of Prime Minister Macmillan and the President in Bermuda, at which agreement was reached to furnish the armed forces of Great Britain with U.S. atomic missiles. Subsequently there were the announcements by Gen. Norstad that the NATO council was stepping up its atomic war preparations

and that US guided nuclear-missile task forces were to be stationed in West Germany.

Shortly thereafter, Washington rejected the appeal of the Japanese government for a cessation of the Nevada tests, and Congress ignored the proposal of the Supreme Soviet to establish an inter-parliamentary committee to explore the ways and means to prohibit the testing, manufacture and use of nuclear weapons.

Meanwhile the conference of the UN Disarmament Subcommittee commenced its important deliberations in London. While world opinion viewed this gathering with great hope and expectancy, and while it looked forward to certain initial, if limited, accords to facilitate disarmament — especially in view of the flexible proffers advanced by the USSR—Dulles, Radford and Strauss reiterated their skepticism concerning the value of any East-West negotiations. They have sought and seek by procrastination and complicating conditions to thwart even the beginning towards effecting a partial disarmament agreement. And they declared, in a series of statements, (including Dulles' speech of July 22nd) that the United States would continue its atomic arms build-up through NATO, SEATO, and other channels.

In this connection, it was not accidental that during Adenauer's recent visit to Washington, he secured virtual veto power over a number of key propositions under negotiation

in London, and that several weeks later the U.S. Command in South Korea abrogated the armistice truce and began to "modernize" its military capability there with atomic weapons.

All these related facts underscore that the danger of war still exists and that world peace continues to be jeopardized by the imperialist policy of military and economic "aid" and expanded atomic war preparations. But recent events also make clear, despite the see-saw in developments, that *the main trend* in international relationships, continues in the direction of lessening world tensions.

The peace camp—buttressed and inspired by the initiatives and solidarity of the USSR, China, and the other socialist countries, and encouraged by the peaceful collaboration of the major Bandung nations of Asia and Africa with the lands of socialism—is evermore creating a situation *in which the imperialist war bloc is being compelled to accept or accommodate itself to some of the vital conditions of peaceful co-existence.*

During the brief period under review, a period in which the movement to ban nuclear tests has assumed colossal world-wide proportions, a number of positive and interacting developments took place:

Great Britain, Japan and several other countries acted to nullify the U.S.-dictated ban on severely restricted trade relations with China. The fact that these steps took place

right
Wash
plan
serves
not ex

At t
cultu
consu
sociali
count

Bandu

Also
well as

virtual
lic opi

to the
mas I

gether
Germa
Labori

agreem
weapon

The
of spe

submit
decade
and w

new p
Confere

tests. I
monitor
propose

India a
the UN

that the
on A- a

Follow
ter-revol
adventu
Anglo-F
Egypt,

right on the heels of the moves by Washington and Wall Street to supplant Britain's former exclusive preserves in the Mediterranean area is not exactly accidental.

At the same time closer diplomatic, cultural and trade relations were consummated between several of the socialist lands and the Scandinavian countries, as well as with various Bandung nations.

Also the British Labor Party, as well as the Japanese government and virtually all sectors of Japanese public opinion, came out in opposition to the H-bomb tests in the Christmas Islands and in Nevada. Together with the Vatican and the German Social Democrats, the Laborites urged an international agreement to suspend all nuclear weapons tests.

The USSR, in line with the score of specific proposals which it has submitted to the UN over the past decade to outlaw nuclear weapons and warfare, advanced a series of new propositions at the London Conference for suspending atomic tests. These included provisions for monitoring facilities as previously proposed by the Western powers. India and Japan also proposed to the UN and to the Atomic Powers that they agree to a universal ban on A- and H-bomb tests.

Following the rebuffs to the counter-revolutionists and the imperialist adventures in Hungary, and to the Anglo-French-Israel aggressors in Egypt, the solidarity and voluntary

cooperation of the socialist countries have been strengthened, as have the relations of the socialist camp with India, Indonesia, Burma, Finland, and a number of other countries.

The latest developments in the CPSU, in which Molotov, Kaganovich, and Malenkov were removed from leading Party and Soviet posts, indicate that the unfolding of the historic decisions of the XXth Congress of the CPSU, which has already achieved great results in all spheres, foreign and domestic, will now proceed at an even more rapid tempo. As a consequence, the struggle for the rectification of past mistakes and for reinforcing the unity and progress of all the socialist countries will go forward apace. And with this, the fight for peaceful co-existence will be advanced.

Furthermore, despite the machinations of the State Department, the government of Indonesia has weathered several reactionary military coups; Egypt, Syria, and Ghana have enhanced their national independence and sovereignty; and the national liberation movements in Algeria and Nigeria continue to develop.

Within our country there has been not only a marked upsurge of a nationwide movement to ban H-bomb tests—inclusive of both popular and conservative forces—but also there has been increased support for at least a limited disarmament agreement at London.

Because of the scope and power

of this anti-H-bomb sentiment, a number of leading Democratic Party spokesmen, like Senators Mansfield and Morse, have recently joined Adlai Stevenson in urging a suspension of all atomic weapons tests. And some, like Senators Magnuson and Mansfield, have proposed a review and a revision of trade relations with China and the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe.

At the same time, within the Eisenhower Administration there have emerged divergent views regarding economic and trade policies with the East, as well as on the approaches to the London conference. At this point it would be useful to pause a moment and touch on the nature and extent of these differences.

Periodically, during the past months, the press has referred to the differences between Stassen and Dulles, especially in respect to the London negotiations. While much of this is speculative, as well as planted, there is more than a germ of truth involved.

Early in the London conference, Stassen expressed the view that it is possible to carry on practical negotiations with the Soviet Union; that it is possible to effect a moratorium on nuclear tests, irrespective of the progress of talks on German reunification; and that it is possible to reach a limited agreement on certain aspects of disarmament, prior to a major accord affecting all issues at stake. These views are at variance

with those brought forward by Dulles.

An explanation widely advanced for these differences is based on the conflicting interests of various financial groups. It goes as follows:

Stassen, and to some extent others, such as Humphrey and Herter, are considered to be closely identified with the Cleveland, Chicago, and Boston circles of monopoly capital. The main financial and industrial interests of these groupings are presently centered in Canada, England, and France, although their international ties are by no means so limited.

Dulles, Radford, Strauss and Knowland are among the chief spokesmen for the oil interests, especially Rockefeller, and for those U.S. monopolies having decisive investments and cartel arrangements in West Germany.

Both monopoly groups and their political representatives in the GOP, as well as their counterparts in the Democratic Party, pursue similar imperialist objectives. However, the Rockefeller, Chase-Manhattan, National Bank combine, by virtue of their capital investments and spheres of interests abroad, especially in oil, are the most brazen and reckless exponents of an aggressive and expansionist course in foreign affairs. They were the chief advocates of the Eisenhower Doctrine and are among the most adamant against the maintenance or resumption of normal diplomatic and trade relations with

the U
Demo

Syria

As

terests

presen

policy

East-V

somev

peace

Whate

prove

some

the an

Be t

presen

war pe

noted:

and Co

their p

ever w

explosi

counte

ing fro

been b

have o

then V

pelled t

certain

laxation

Yet,

the Pen

Street c

reductio

For in

would l

for a ris

lose the

NATO

would s

the USSR, China, and the People's Democracies, as well as with Egypt, Syria and Indonesia.

As for the chief Big Business interests for whom Stassen speaks, presently they have a more flexible policy in regard to some aspects of East-West negotiations and trade relations. And in this context they are somewhat more responsive to pro-peace pressures on the home-front. Whatever the exact alignments may prove to be, it is undoubtedly in some such division of interests that the answer is to be sought.

Be this as it may, in respect to the present moment and the entire post-war period the following should be noted: Whenever Dulles, Radford and Co. have succeeded in pursuing their policies to the "brink," whenever world tensions have reached an explosive point, and whenever the counter moves and activity emanating from the world peace camp have been brought actively into play and have exerted stronger pressures—then Washington usually is compelled to accept certain compromises, certain measures conducive to a relaxation of world tensions.

Yet, Washington, and especially the Pentagon and the leading Wall Street circles, are fearful of a major reduction in international tensions. For in such an eventuality they would lose their pretext for calling for a rising arms budget; they would lose their pretense for maintaining NATO and SEATO; and they would suffer even greater setbacks

as the self-anointed leader of the "free world."

Hence, every time there is a serious lessening in world tensions, or the promise of such a development, the most bellicose and expansionist circles of monopoly capital move heaven and earth—through such means, among others, as the UN subcommittee on Hungary—to try to create new tensions.

Thus it is that powerful sections of monopoly supporting the Eisenhower Administration, as well as leading spokesmen within the Administration itself, want the international situation to remain aggravated, yet cannot allow it to become too tense. Thus it is that the Administration is frequently compelled to accept a temporary reduction in tensions, but balks at action to effect a protracted period of agreement, and vacillates continuously between the alternatives of "getting tough" and negotiating partial peaceful settlements.

Obviously, to the extent which the peace movement in our country expands and registers its political influence, it will be possible to help alter this state of affairs—to help influence the course of our government in a way beneficial to the national interest and the cause of world peace. And such a movement is now in the process of unfolding around the vital question of ending the tests and use of nuclear weapons.

* * *

Several months ago a marked

change took place in the country in respect to the average American's attitude toward the danger of nuclear testing and warfare. Indicative of this change was the fact that a Gallup poll released in mid-May revealed that 63% of all Americans favored a universal ban on H-bomb tests as against only 24% in October 1956.

What is it that explains this shift in public opinion, this nationwide, mass apprehension regarding the continuing, gigantic atomic arms experimentation and buildup?

This is due in the first place to the growing popular concern over the damaging effects of peacetime radioactive fallout. Important in this connection are the recent disclosures by outstanding scientists that the hazards of radioactivity from weapons testing are particularly acute in the North Temperate Zone and are assuming ever more dangerous proportions, including the deadly rise in the concentration of strontium-90 in the soil and water supplies.

This fact alone has aroused tens of millions of Americans. Many are beginning to share the view of the Japanese, the Indians, and others who not only are opposed to the catastrophe of a nuclear holocaust but who also see nuclear weapons testing a form of peacetime annihilation carried out against their will and without their sanction, polluting the atmosphere within their borders in violation of their human and sovereign rights.

This new public and social awareness of the clear and present danger presented by nuclear tests also has been intensified by the eloquent appeal of Dr. Schweitzer, by the plea of Pope Pius XII, as well as by the statements of many British and German scientists. It has been stimulated by the recent proposals of the USSR to suspend all tests for a 2-3 year period, and by its insistent offer to effect an international agreement to prohibit the manufacture, stockpiling and use of all nuclear weapons. The recent proposals of the governments of India and Japan on this question likewise have had a salutary effect.

There are, moreover, the effects of the recent announcements: that Washington is expanding its nuclear weapons program; is sending an atomic missile task force to Taiwan, and intends to train a West German and other NATO guided missile task forces, and to provide them with nuclear weapons. All this has heightened public apprehension over the continuation of nuclear weapons tests, as well as over the dangers inherent in the atomic arms race.

Contrariwise, the recurrent charges of a Radford or a Knowland regarding the alleged menace of Soviet "aggression" are being further confounded by the main course of world events, and no longer evoke the fears and hysteria of former years. Now, too, millions of Americans, no less than the Russians and other peoples, want to break the

dea
for
the
Her
mov
the
mus
and
T
take
of a
orga
alrea
Prom
leade
churc
wom
many
sent
prog
In
needs
of t
Quak
Leagu
well
Metho
well a
tain C
joined
H-bom
the cal
Jackson
Baptist
million
the tes
for the
ference
world
figures
this bat
as Adl

deadlock on disarmament and hope for a beginning in this direction in the current London conference. Hence it is no wonder that the movement within the USA to end the hell-bomb tests is beginning to mushroom, both at the grassroots and in higher echelons.

This spreading movement, which takes on diverse forms and methods of activity and embraces citizens and organizations from all walks of life, already has become nationwide. Prominent among its advocates and leaders are thousands of scientists, churchmen, pacifists and leaders of women's organizations, as well as many Negro, labor and farm representatives of both conservative and progressive persuasions.

In this connection, special note needs be taken of the crusading role of the scientific workers, the Quakers, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, as well as of many Unitarians and Methodists. Other Protestants as well as various Rabbinical and certain Catholic spokesmen have also joined in the battle to shackle the H-bomb. Especially noteworthy was the call, made July 1, by Dr. J. H. Jackson, leader of the National Baptist Convention, representing five million Negroes, for the banning of the testing of nuclear weapons and for the holding of world-wide conferences to assure the prevention of world war. A number of public figures have added their pleas to this battle for human survival, such as Adlai Stevenson and Mrs. Roose-

velt, Senators Mansfield, Morse and Kennedy, and Gov. Freeman of Minnesota.

While the anti-H-bomb movement is developing everywhere, the extent of the organized activity engendered is very uneven, and varies considerably from state to state.

The most extensive mass activity generated up till now has been around the petitions circulated by the American Friends Service Committees and the WILPF, as well as the round-robin statement of the 2000 scientists who responded to the plea initiated by Dr. Linus Pauling. It is conservatively estimated that in the last month or two nearly 500,000 individuals have signed these or similar petitions, or have written individual letters or postcards to the President.

In addition, the advocates of a ban on nuclear tests have initiated a series of advertisements in the local press in such cities as Philadelphia and Detroit. They have obtained free time on local and state TV and radio networks, as in Minnesota. They have organized a number of conferences and institutes, such as those sponsored by the Quakers at Geneva, Wisconsin. They have introduced into several state and municipal legislative bodies—for example, in the state of Washington—resolutions memorializing the President or Congress to take appropriate action to help effectuate a ban on nuclear testing. In a few areas, proposals have been made urging that City or State health and agricul-

ture departments take necessary measures to check the effects of radioactive fallout. And here and there it is reported that broad committees of an all-inclusive nature are in the process of being formed to help coordinate and expand anti-H-bomb activity on a sustained and expanded scale.

It is significant that while a majority of the many individuals, committees and organizations that have expressed themselves publicly call for an international treaty to effect the banning of all nuclear weapons tests, a number of influential religious and pacifist groups demand that the United States act unilaterally to suspend its tests program. They proceed from the premise that the U.S. was the first nation to manufacture and employ atomic weapons, and that our country should be the first to end or suspend its tests.

Moreover, they claim that any nation which ceases and desists from nuclear weapons testing will automatically compel the other nuclear powers to take similar measures. In this connection it seems to me, while we Communists should resolutely encourage mass support for a universal program to ban nuclear weapons and tests, we should likewise render support to the above proposal wherever it is sympathetically viewed in the mass organizations, as, for example, in the case of the resolution recently introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman C. Porter.

Another feature of the widening movement to prohibit nuclear tests is the fact that more and more individuals and organizations are linking this demand with an appeal to outlaw atomic warfare. And various proposals are being advanced by some, urging the consummation of an initial over-all disarmament agreement, accompanied by recommendations that the Big Powers or the UN outlaw the use and stockpiling of all nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, as well as prohibit their manufacture.

Even though the movement in our country to quarantine H-bomb tests and warfare does not yet compare with the scope and vitality of comparable mass movements in Japan and India, or even in Great Britain, nonetheless it is a serious political force. For the dimensions and vigor exhibited by this all-inclusive front for peace already have compelled the Administration to retreat and maneuver in respect to the propositions the Department of State originally submitted at the UN subcommittee conference at London. In fact, the power of this movement has been a potent factor in helping keep the London conference alive, in facilitating a basis for continuing East-West disarmament negotiations despite Dulles, Radford, and Strauss, and, perhaps, for helping effect the beginnings of a limited agreement.

The sweep and potential of this movement has likewise impelled a sector of the Democratic high com-

mand, whip i
with
and to
at som
foreign
past C

More
nation
charact
ment h
nuclear
nuclear
political
The str
undoub
the cou
ics and
for ma

To
the un
nuclear
manufa
of nucl
to give
questio

(1) M
to the p
activity
this con
measur
submit
the Pro
energet
mented

There
research
to cope
of radi
tions in

mand, including the Democratic whip in the Senate, to associate itself with Stevenson's October position, and to begin to take a "second look" at some of the fundamentals of our foreign policy as developed over the past Cold-War decade.

Moreover, the emergence of the nationwide and general democratic character of the anti-H-bomb movement has made the struggle to ban nuclear tests and to end the use of nuclear weapons a central moral and political issue in national affairs. The struggle over this vital question undoubtedly will greatly influence the course of local and national politics and realignments in 1958, and for many years to come.

* * *

To reinforce and help broaden the unfolding movement to end nuclear tests, and to prohibit the manufacture, accumulation and use of nuclear weapons, it is worthwhile to give greater consideration to such questions as the following:

(1) More attention needs be given to the problem of how to unfold this activity *locally and in the states*. In this connection, some of the concrete measures and political proposals we submitted in June in our Letter to the President should be taken up energetically and should be supplemented by additional local demands.

There are needed local and state research, health and safety programs to cope with the menacing questions of radioactivity, as well as resolutions in city councils and state leg-

islatures requesting the President and the Congress to effect a moratorium on tests and to join in an international compact to abolish nuclear weapons and warfare. And it is necessary to secure wider expressions of public opinion, insisting that a serious start be made toward effectuating a disarmament program *now* at London, in the sphere of *both* nuclear and conventional weapons.

(2) While women, especially mothers, are very much in the forefront of the anti-H-bomb activity, the largest women's organizations, local and national, are not yet sufficiently mobilized. The influential position of the WILPF, and the stand taken by the recent national Congress of the PTA, show what a tremendous role the women of our country and their mass organizations—inclusive of women's civic clubs, fraternal, church, and trade-union groups and auxiliaries—can play in this crucial struggle.

(3) Likewise far too little attention is being given to involving the main mass organizations of the Negro people, who have a most direct stake in outlawing nuclear warfare and who are exceptionally responsive to the anti H-bomb appeals of the leaders of the Indian, Indonesian, and Japanese people.

(4) Insofar as organized labor is concerned, the top officialdom of the AFL-CIO, as well as most of its organizations, has been disinclined to exert the necessary leadership—

with Meany, Lovestone, and Co. doing all in their power to enlist labor for the Dulles-Strauss-Radford position.

However, during the past few weeks a certain change has begun to take place. Reuther, Carey, Beirne, Gorman, and Rosenblum have associated themselves with a broad movement petitioning the President to initiate a ban on all nuclear tests and warning that an atomic war could only have catastrophic results for our country and all mankind. This is a promising development which, if popularized and carried into the shops and local unions, could help enlist the active support of millions of trade unionists.

To the extent that the most consistent labor advocates of peace combine their efforts to ban nuclear weapons tests and warfare with the struggle for reducing the arms budget and taxes, with the mobilization for a new round of wage increases and for the 30-hour week, and with advancing a program to cope with the economic effects of disarmament on sections of the working class—to that extent bigger sections of organized labor will commence to swing into action and make their influence felt more effectively, nationally, on the H-bomb issue.

(5) Another aspect of the anti-H-bomb crusade that needs to be explored is how to link, more concretely, the mass movement to halt nuclear tests with the demand to outlaw the use of all atomic and

thermonuclear weapons.

Thus far our government has steadfastly rejected all proposals, whether from the USSR, India, or elsewhere, to conclude an international treaty pledging the renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons.

Washington hedges and procrastinates while reorganizing the military forces of the U.S. on the basis of nuclear weapons and strategy. And it counters proposals for such renunciation with irrelevant and delaying propositions for complicated and fantastic inspection and control systems, and with other impossible conditions whose fulfillment are contingent on the reunification of Germany on Adenauer's terms, that is, as an integral part of NATO and armed with the most modern, i.e., nuclear, weapons.

In this connection, and in order to help cut through the gordian knot, it is advisable to popularize the covenant reached in the Hague in June, 1925, in which all the signatories pledged themselves to renounce the use of gaseous and bacteriological warfare.

The fact is that while the Soviet Union signed this accord and the U.S. Senate never ratified this treaty, it was generally adhered to and enforced, even during World War II, and with no inspection or control station or team. Among the reasons for this, an important one was that the moral and political climate was such that no state dared try to obtain a momentary military advantage by

unleashing these cannibalistic weapons, fearing mass revulsion and political retaliation by most of humanity.

Here is the text of this brief accord:

The undersigned plenipotentiaries in the name of their respective Governments:

Whereas the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, has been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world; and

Whereas the prohibition of such use has been declared in Treaties to which the majority of Powers of the world are Parties; and

To the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of International Law, binding alike the conscience and the practice of nations:

DECLARE:

That the High Contracting Parties, so far as they are not already Parties to Treaties prohibiting such use, accept this prohibition, agree to extend this prohibition to the use of bacteriological methods of warfare and agree to be bound as between themselves according to the terms of this declaration.

One thing is clear: If the double-edged nature of these deadly weapons, the respective military potentials and the world climate of the post-war World War I period sufficed to honor the enforcement of this treaty, which was devoid of any inspection or control system then the consummation of a similar treaty pledging all nations to ban the use of nuclear

weapons in the event of war would, under present international relationships, virtually ensure its universal enforcement.

* * *

Further, a major sustained ideological offensive needs to be mounted to expose the sinister aims of the advocates of the so-called "clean" bombs—whose objective is to rationalize and legitimize the continued testing of "improved" but no less deadly nuclear weapons.

Apropos of this, it is well to bear in mind the pointed remarks of Francis Perrin, the High Commissioner of Atomic Energy of France, who commented on July 19th regarding President Eisenhower's press statement on a minimum-fall-out H-bomb. According to the *New York Post* of July 20th, Perrin declared:

American statesmen have spoken of the possibility of developing "clean" thermonuclear bombs of high explosive power but without wide scattering of fatal radioactive dust.

The choice of the adjective "clean" to describe these arms, which remain arms for mass destruction and for massacring civilian populations on a grand scale, is shocking and its official use is disturbing, for it seems aimed at diminishing the justified anguish of peoples facing atomic war.

One must not believe that the manufacture of "clean" bombs would sensibly diminish the horror of an atomic war or the scope of the catastrophe which would result for humanity and especially for our country. . . .

It is also imperative to refute the contentions of Dulles and Radford that nuclear weapons, intercontinental missiles, etc., are a "deterrent" to aggression. As history demonstrates, the so-called "deterrents" of new and more destructive weapons have always proved to be an illusion, as well as an implement of the vested exploiting interests for waging an "advantageous" war of surprise, aggression and conquest.

It is necessary to explain again and again that under contemporary conditions the only real "deterrent" to war is peaceful co-existence and policies designed to realize this. And here it is essential to emphasize that despite the bellicose and avaricious wishes and intent of the Rockefellers, duPonts and Dulleses the course of world relationships favors and promotes the trend towards increased trade, cultural relations, amity and co-existence among *all* nations.

This is the big, the cardinal lesson of the period since 1945. This is the consequence of the development of socialism as a world system, the continuing disintegration of the old colonial empires, and the emergence of the leading Bandung nations in Asia and Africa as a new and mighty force for national liberation and peace.

As for Radford's renewed and malicious assertion that "we can't trust the Russians," suffice it to say that the American people can't trust the Radfords, nor the Adenauers, the Chiang Kai-sheks and the

Syngman Rhee to whom the Admiral seems willing to entrust the H-bomb and the fate of our national security.

* * *

In the struggle to straitjacket the H-bomb and outlaw atomic warfare, many of the Left, and not least we Communists, played and are playing a modest, though an active and constructive role. And, despite the weaknesses and unevenness of our activity, the efforts and contributions of our Party nationally, and in a number of states and communities have been quite effective. This is true in Philadelphia, St. Louis and Detroit, in Minnesota, Southern California and New Jersey, and in certain other areas. This is also true of the positive and crusading role performed by the *Daily Worker* and the *Worker*.

Yet, after all is said and done, the fact is that our activity and that of most other organizations, is far too limited and has only begun to scratch the surface. Thus far there is too little appreciation that the struggle to ban the tests, and eventually the use of nuclear weapons, is *not* a transitory campaign. Resolute, protracted and long-range plans and political mass activity are required in order to achieve success, irrespective of the ebb and flow of the negotiations in London.

Insofar as the Left and progressive forces are concerned, especially in regard to the activity of our Party, everything should be done—in a

careful and responsible manner—to multiply the scope and effectiveness of the contributions of our members and friends in mass organizations in support of the petitions currently being circulated by the Quakers and the WILPF.

In addition, we should give further consideration as to how to help extend and multiply all united front and H-bomb activities. And we should give systematic attention to helping stimulate the demand that our country subscribe to a universal pledge renouncing the use of nuclear weapons.

Moreover, we should boldly espouse the desirability and feasibility of the public ownership and operation of all nuclear research, production and facilities. Recognizing, under present conditions, that such government ownership and operation is not the equivalent of socialization and will not “take the profits out of war,” nor ensure that atomic energy development necessarily will be used primarily for peaceful pursuits—we do understand that such a demand and move would facilitate curbing the monopolies. It could help weaken the power of duPont, Union Carbide, Westinghouse, and Bell Laboratories, and others over the control of nuclear energy development. And it could enhance the degree and effectiveness of public influence in this critical

field in the sphere of the peaceful application of atomic energy, as well as in the direction of helping shape foreign policy.

At the same time, it is incumbent on us Communists to widely explain that only under a socialist system of society—in which the common folk of America, led by labor, will fully shape their destiny and run the country—will it be possible for the American people to obtain the full fruits of nuclear energy research and development for the general welfare, for exclusively peaceful purposes and the public interest.

But right now, and for the immediate period ahead, it is imperative that mass attention and activity be centered on the pressing issue of *banning all nuclear tests—and without any strings attached.*

This burning issue has captured the imagination and heart of the great majority of the American people. *It is a limited, yet a most urgent objective in itself.*

And the struggle to realize this demand can appreciably advance the over-all movement for ending the atomic arms race, for promoting universal disarmament and peaceful co-existence. Likewise it can greatly enhance the popular trend toward a new political alignment, toward an anti-monopoly coalition—a labor-farmer-Negro peoples democratic alliance.

On the Communist Party: Some Problems and Perspectives

By BOB THOMPSON

Bob Thompson, formerly Chairman of the New York State Communist Party, and presently a member of the National Committee of the Party, was recently released from imprisonment, on a contempt of court conviction, by the U.S. Supreme Court. He is presently on bail, awaiting a re-trial before the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Bob served a three-year Smith-Act sentence, and then, as a political refugee, was sentenced to another three-years for contempt.

Bob Thompson, a veteran of the Lincoln Brigade in the Spanish Civil War, was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism under fire in World War II. The harassment of himself and of his family, during the heyday of McCarthyism, was especially brutal and very nearly took Bob's life. Now free—if still on bail—and back in the Party's struggle, Bob's indomitable will symbolizes the indestructibility of the idea of Socialism and of the Communist Party.

We bring to our readers, below, the first extended public remarks by Bob Thompson since his release. These were made to an audience of nearly two thousand people gathered at Carnegie Hall, in New York City on July 24, to pay tribute to him and others recently freed.—Ed.

YOU KNOW PRISON LIFE develops its own special vocabulary. Everything that exists outside the 30 ft. high walls, without any distinctions or gradations, is the free world. Let me just this once be very loose in my vocabulary and say that it is good to be back in this free world—good to be back amongst you, my very dear friends and comrades.

It is an especially warm and nice thing to be able to greet many of my old friends who have been scat-

tered about federal prisons these past several years. I have only one sharp regret—that Henry Winston, Gil Green and Irving Potash are not with us here tonight. I know that each of you shares my determination that this shall be changed.

* * *

There are many fresh breezes in our land. I thought the one that blew in from Chicago this past weekend—I am referring to the stories in the press about the won-

derful independence and spirit of those young people who are putting over the World Youth Festival there—is typical of these new and better-for-our-country winds.

I am sure that you who have been living in this fresh atmosphere of a roll-back of the cold-war hysteria, have learned much these past few years. You have been grappling with new problems—trying to find a way forward in new situations and no enterprise could be more rich and more rewarding than that.

Now, as all of you know, prison is a poor place to absorb fresh atmosphere. I tell all of you quite frankly, I haven't been out among you long enough to absorb much that is fresh in the atmosphere, much that is new in the problems you have been grappling with, much that is new in the perspective unfolding before the working class of our country. But of course I do have certain views—certain deeply held convictions. I want to speak briefly of some of these to you here tonight.

I want to speak to you of them in an atmosphere which it seems to me is developing among Left and socialist-minded people—an atmosphere I consider most helpful—an atmosphere in which ideas and policies can be debated sharply on their merits with a minimum of frozen attitudes and an absence of venom and rancor.

To my many friends—and though I consider them deeply mistaken I still regard them as friends—who

have dropped away from the Communist Party in this last period, I especially ask that you help in cultivating this atmosphere permitting of friendly debate and discussion.

In the days since coming out of prison, I have been greatly inspired by many things, and deeply disturbed by a number of other things.

It is of course inspiring to emerge from prison at a time when our country is emerging out of, not entering into, a decade of rampant cold war hysteria and severe political repression.

A country in which the working class is emerging out of this period, not as a defeated class, but on the contrary, as a class which has become organizationally more united, and in this respect, more powerful.

A country in which there is boiling up such a powerful Negro people's movement with such strong allies in the ranks of labor and elsewhere that for the first time since the Reconstruction days, the democratic transformation of the South is being placed on the order of the day.

A country which still has a Communist Party, true, a party that has been knocked, buffeted and torn, but a party nevertheless which at its 16th National Convention retained the potential of yet playing on the American scene an important and indispensable role.

But it is deeply disturbing in this favorable and in many respects, inspiring situation, to find many of

my friends carrying about with them the longest and most doleful countenances that have ever graced the sidewalks of New York. More disturbing than the countenances however, are some of their ideas. Now these ideas I am referring to certainly deserve a place in a free-ranging discussion and debate on questions of ideology and theory that must arise in the ranks of the Communist Party—and elsewhere among Left and socialist-minded forces—for they deal with matters of genuine concern to the working class and are vital to its future.

No one need fear such a free-ranging, freely held discussion and debate on problems of working-class theory. Such a debate can powerfully aid in routing the dangers of stagnation and isolation. What does need to be feared is any avoidance of open discussion and debate of such problems. What does need to be feared is the creating of a climate inside or outside of our Party which makes such discussion and debate difficult or impossible.

* * *

Now I want to discuss with you some of these ideas affecting theory and ideology which disturb me.

If in so doing, I sound to some of you a bit like Rip Van Winkle walking out into a changed world—I can only ask that you not get too excited or disturbed by it—I know in this situation of no way of avoiding an element of this.

The first and foremost of these

disturbing ideas that I have in mind has to do with this talk about how there is only a past and there is no future for the Communist Party and the science of Marxism-Leninism. I have in mind this idea which says that that which is new in the present situation is that the trade-union movement of this country has become quite capable of developing its own original socialist consciousness and theory and that therefore a body of science such as Marxism-Leninism is no longer needed. And of course, if Marxism-Leninism is no longer needed the Communist Party is no longer needed. This is the idea that out of the experiences of the trade union movement, out of its economic and political struggles there will arise spontaneously, a new socialist theory and science.

Now a great many things, much that is good, arise out of the experiences of the unions in their struggles both economic and political. The one thing that by its very nature cannot arise out of this experience is a scientific socialist ideology and theory. Of and by itself, the trade union movement on the basis of its struggles and experiences can give to the working class the theory and practice of Gompersism, or the theory and practice of John L. Lewis, or the theory and practice of a George Meany, or the theory and practice of Walter Reuther or even a far more far sighted and militant trade union theory and practice. But this experience cannot give to

the w
thous
ness
with
itself

The
scien
to th
fused
out o
strugg
to giv
to th
inhere
sponta
the C
Marxi
ogy, T
Comm
a tran
the wo
is not
This i
must
be buil

I am
am ref
nizes t
workin
socialis
goes or
entific
other t
idea u
with a
in this
starts f
premise
that in
ment, c
come c

the working class in 10 years or ten thousand years a socialist consciousness or a body of scientific principles with which it can transform both itself and society.

The ideology and principles of scientific socialism must be imparted to the labor movement, must be fused with the experiences arising out of the economic and political struggles of the unions, must serve to give a consciousness and direction to these struggles that they are inherently incapable of developing spontaneously. This is the role of the Communist Party with its Marxist-Leninist science and ideology. This is why a party such as the Communist Party has a historic, not a transient place in the ranks of the working class. This is why there is not only a past, but also a future. This is why the Communist Party must not only be retained—it must be built.

I am referring to another idea. I am referring to the idea that recognizes the need for imparting to the working class a body of scientific socialist thought, but which then goes on to say that this body of scientific thought must be something other than Marxism-Leninism. This idea usually comes in a package with a few other ideas. Very popular in this package is a thought which starts from a correct premise. This premise is that the world develops, that in the course of this development, certain scientific concepts become obsolete, that new scientific

concepts arise to take their place. From this correct premise, the thought then proceeds to take off into the wild blue yonder. It goes off like this: You know, Newton had a concept of gravitation that replaced older concepts; then Einstein came along with new concepts that replaced those of Newton. Therefore, because all phenomena in the world are subject to the same general laws, something must now come along to replace Marxism-Leninism.

Well, this neat little formula over-looks a mighty big fact. That is, that when you speak of the science of Marxism-Leninism you are not speaking of this or that isolated concept of social or natural phenomena. You are speaking of a concept of the world, its history, its motive forces, and its direction of development as seen from the standpoint of the immediate and historical interests of the working class.

Now of course, specific concepts within the great body of Marxist-Leninist thought do become outmoded. This is particularly true in a epoch of great changes such as this. Being human, each of us, and every Communist Party has a tendency to hang on to these outmoded concepts. A struggle has to be carried on against such tendencies, and that is exactly the kind of struggle that is being mounted today by Marxists everywhere. This is a struggle to bring the great creative science of Marxism-Leninism fully abreast of

the sweeping changes that have taken place in the world and in each individual country. This is the problem we American Marxists confront. It is a task that involves boldly analyzing the many important changes that have occurred since and largely as a result of the great struggles of the 20's, 30's and 40's. It involves the aggressive and confident seeking out of the new ways in which, in these changed times, the Communist Party can play—in the historic sense—its vanguard role under new and changing conditions. But the very thing it does not involve is the abandonment of the most dynamic instrument of change the world has ever known—the creative science of Marxism-Leninism.

There is no body of scientific thought in the world so alien to outmoded concepts, so dynamic and creative as is Marxism-Leninism and to depart from it under the name of need for change and adaptation to new conditions is a theoretical absurdity of the first order. I am referring to certain ideas with respect to the use of that important weapon of Marxist-Leninist theory—criticism and self criticism. I have great confidence in the capacity of the Communist Party. Why I even think we will learn in time to use the powerful weapon of criticism and self criticism as Marxists should in a party, the members of which share in common a devotion to the working class. Now the reason I haven't already launched into a lot of critic-

ism and self-criticism is not that I am not an authority on mistakes. Lord knows, I have made enough of them to be an authority.

The reason is simple—that I am inhibited. You see, many years ago, when I was organizing in the logging camps, and for the IFM in the railroad shops, I made a number of mistakes. This was long before I joined the Communist Party and I'll be darned if I have yet figured out a way to blame the party or Marxism-Leninism for them. But the problem is bigger than this. I haven't even figured out a way I can blame the party and Marxism-Leninism for some of the serious weaknesses and mistakes in my work while I was chairman of the party in New York. As a result, I have been forced to the conclusion that by and large these weaknesses and mistakes were not a product of any built-in deficiency of the party or Marxism-Leninism but that they were more a product of certain deficiencies of Bob Thompson. But let me tell you, I don't feel too badly about this. Any individual, or for that matter if need be an entire leadership in our party, can be criticized right out of leadership, and if the criticism is sound and constructive and we all learn from it, our party and the working class will be strengthened, not weakened.

The reason for this is that criticism and self-criticism is in the first place a weapon to correct people; in particular it is a weapon to correct and if need be to replace leaders.

The
enhar
and
to su
fluenc
one
what
ism
comes
drags
of th
becom
destro
the cl
can o
ignobi
distort
I an
with
tween
try, in
sectors
ism on
For
ment
it is esp
of pris
leaders
guided
cialism
phase
Now
probabl
Americ
rather
whether
should
by not
portant
importa
\$100,000,0

The purpose of this weapon is to enhance and strengthen the prestige and role of the Communist Party, to strengthen and enhance the influence of scientific socialism. No one need fear such a weapon. But what then is one to say when criticism and so-called self-criticism becomes something that degrades and drags in the mud the historic role of the Communist Party—when it becomes something that sullies and destroys confidence in the science of the class, Marxism-Leninism. What can one say? Well, I say it is an ignoble, a shameful, warped and distorted thing, a monstrosity.

I am referring to certain ideas with respect to the relationship between the working class of our country, in particular its socialist-minded sectors, and the rising tide of socialism on the world scene.

For one dedicated to the achievement of socialism in his own land, it is especially gratifying to come out of prison at a time when—under the leadership of Communist parties, guided by Marxism-Leninism—socialism on the world scene is in a phase of bouyant advance.

Now it may well be true and it probably is that not many people in America today are discussing this rather remarkable question of whether or not their grandchildren should choose socialism. This is really not very important. What is important is something else. What is important is that the vitally alive 300,000,000 strong system of socialist

lands is having an impact *here and now* on the way of life in our country, that it is changing the complexion of major problems faced by our people in their daily lives.

More schools, more teachers, better courses in the sciences higher school budgets—the chief criteria and a major goad to progress on such matters has already become the competitive role of the blossoming educational system of the USSR. Isn't this a powerful aid to the struggle of the American people, of American labor, for better educational systems in our land?

Integration and the busting up of the Jim Crow system in the South! Will it take a few years or a few decades? Read that section of the southern press that favors giving ground to the rising power of the Negro people and their allies. How do they justify their changing position? They say we have got to change our beloved "South of the Mason-Dixon line" way of life, or lose to Communism two-thirds of mankind which is of colored races. Isn't this a powerful assist to the mighty movement getting strength in our country to effect the democratic transformation of the South?

Atomic energy for the production of electric power and the good and useful things of life—the monopolies say "no," and if they ran this world they would make this NO stick. If they had their way, there is not a man, woman or child, the length and breadth of this land who would ever

taste in his lifetime the fruits of this historic advance of man in the conquering of his environment. Well, the monopolies ceased to run this world on November 7, 1917. The USSR is using atomic energy for the production of the good things of life and the people of other socialist lands are or will be building atomic power stations. Capitalism can't let socialism have a monopoly of the use of atomic energy for peaceful productive purposes. It is this, the existence of a system of socialist states, that is opening up the real possibility in our country for giving a new direction to this new and most vital element in our country—a direction which will enable the people to profit from it. Isn't this a powerful assist to the gathering forces of a powerful anti-monopoly coalition in our country?

You know the imperialists here in the United States are a funny lot. They open up a big factional struggle among themselves—drive the isolationists in their own ranks into hiding—and then raise a big hue and cry that the American labor

movement, even its socialist sectors, should isolate itself from its most natural and powerful friend, the great system of socialist states arising in the world. Well, no one can do the impossible. The socialist-minded sectors of the American working class live on the planet in which the rising tide of socialism on a world scale is occurring, and they are themselves a part of this tide. It is this fact which gives them the right to speak out freely and clearly when need arises against negative developments anywhere in the socialist world—as for example, in the case of the important violations of socialist democracy, or mistakes in the handling of the Jewish minority problem in the Soviet Union or elsewhere. But it also means, and this is the most important thing, that they can well afford to take deep pride in the fact that it is this rising power of socialism on a world scale which is largely responsible for the new horizons and possibilities for social gains and progress which are unfolding for the working people of our country.

In our October issue will appear the best theoretical analysis we have been able to find of the problems to be solved under the new regional economic councils of the U.S.S.R. This is the article by L. Itin and S. Kamenitzer entitled "New Forts of Industrial Management," appearing in the Russian-language magazine, Problems of Economics, Nov. 5, 1957.

—Ed.

By

The
icy is
farm
the c
Adop
enabl
into
versy
with
Per
books
clarat
Some
servin
of the
quick
adequ
ing ag
Here
for M
of poli
would
move
have n
into th
factual
would
answers
ing wi
unique
United

An Agricultural Policy for the United States

By NATIONAL COMMITTEE, CPUSA

At the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party, a Resolution on farm policy was referred for final consideration and approval by the incoming National Committee. That Committee adopted, by referendum vote, on June 20, 1957, the Resolution published in the following pages. It is introduced by Carl Ross of Minnesota, a member of the National Committee and its Secretary for Farm Affairs.—Ed.

INTRODUCTION

This Resolution on agricultural policy is very timely. The chronic crisis of farm economy continues and with it the crisis of farm policy also grows. Adoption of this Resolution should enable U.S. Marxists to enter effectively into the arena of debate and controversy over farm policy that is raging with such intensity.

Perhaps never before were so many books, surveys, studies and policy declarations being offered on farm policy. Some are thoughtful and probing, deserving of serious treatment. But none of the projected alternatives offers a quick solution or for that matter even adequately diagnoses the disease afflicting agriculture.

Here is indeed an open invitation for Marxists to plunge into the crisis of policy and void of solutions. But it would behoove the Communists to move with modesty inasmuch as they have not in recent years entered actively into this debate. Good scholarship and factual analysis are necessary. Nothing would be so fatal as doctrinaire answers rooted in fixed dogma in coping with the great complexity and unique character of agriculture in the United States.

The Resolution proposes a point of departure and urges that serious study and discussion be initiated. It indicates an approach that advances beyond the 1955 program on the farm crisis prepared by the National Farm Commission.*

That program had the virtue of identifying the Communists with a series of practical and immediate demands of the type generally advocated by the more progressive farm organizations to meet the Eisenhower-Benson offensive against the small farmers. It, therefore, helped to break down sectarianism and the isolation of Communists from the main stream of the farm movement.

This Resolution goes beyond an analysis of *administration policy*, such as all or most of the more progressive farm groups make, and begins to probe into *the root causes* of the problems of agriculture.

Unlike either the monopolists and their spokesmen or the "liberals," most of whom attribute the farm crisis to a temporary "imbalance" of the economy or the farm market, the Marxists see the present situation as an outgrowth

*This was published under the title *The Farm Crisis* by the New Century Publishers, N. Y., 1955; and is available at 10c a copy.—Ed.

of the very nature of the development of capitalism in agriculture and of highly aggressive efforts by monopoly to establish its complete domination over the agricultural economy from seeding to marketing.

The Marxists recognize a long-range trend in agriculture, inevitably to force the small and even moderately successful medium-sized family farm operator off the land. They propose to resist this trend and its effects, however, doing so in alliance with all non-monopoly sections of the agricultural population and labor.

Development of this more basic analysis ought to deliver a decisive blow to isolation and sectarianism within the Party. This will enable Communists more closely to identify themselves with the current battles of the farm movement while still emphasizing their own and unique identity as opponents of capitalist society in general and proponents of Socialism.

Marxist analysis can be a tool for shaping a broad mass struggle for a farm policy to extricate farmers from their present dilemma. It puts Communists out in front as defenders of the traditional "family farm"—a startling fact to those who have misrepresented the Communists as desiring to deprive farmers of their land.

At the same time, this approach projects Socialism to farmers as a response to American problems and conditions, an outgrowth of the problems of capitalism in agriculture, not as an alien "importation."

Actually the roots of socialist radicalism are deep in the American countryside and socialist trends have in the past flourished among farmers during periods of agrarian revolt. It will almost certainly be so in this prolonged

period of "farm revolt" that is now unfolding. And it will be incumbent upon the advocates of Socialism, and especially upon the Communist Party, to offer serious Marxist and working-class leadership both to the growing farm movement and the socialist sector within it.

THE RESOLUTION

A serious Party weakness for many years has been neglect of the farm question. Discussion and understanding of farm work must become the property of our entire movement and not just the farm members.

Basic research is needed on such questions as economic conditions and class divisions among farmers. We should examine more fully our experience and tactics in building farmer-labor unity, the role and present development of cooperatives, a farm program for our Party, and what changes socialism would bring to American farmers. We should study the growing class of semi-proletarians who work in industry while also operating part-time farms. This group is an important bridge between the working class and farmers.

We should not talk abstractly about an agricultural crisis, but examine its specific nature. We should examine the situation in each region of the country and problems arising in the production of various crops.

Generally, for a period of ten years beginning in the early 1940's, agriculture recovered from the deep crisis

of the 1930's, reaching its highest point in production and per capita farm income in 1947. Since 1951, however, we have witnessed a period of economic recession in agriculture.

The first major reason for this deteriorating situation was the development of relative overproduction of many farm commodities with consequent drastic price declines, which reflect both the influence of "overproduction" and monopoly price-rigging. Thus farm income fell drastically and many small farmers faced real difficulties.

It is estimated that by mid-1955 the average per capita income of the farm population from all sources (farm and non-farm) was about \$135.00 lower than in 1951. Whether this year will be better or worse depends on many factors, including the ability to mechanize and increase acreage, types of crop, and weather. Drought may prove disastrous in many areas.

Increased mechanization of farming and rising costs have accentuated and accelerated the trend to large-scale agriculture. Capital requirements have ballooned upward. As a consequence, the small farmer is being rapidly eliminated, and large-scale agriculture grows by leaps and bounds. This trend exists apart from the ups and downs in farm prices and the ups and downs of the economic picture generally. The larger and richer farmers and corporation farms are able to withstand the fluctuation in market prices and generally con-

tinue to prosper and increase their holdings while the small farmers and sections of the middle-income farmers, who lack sufficient capital to meet the technological developments, are being driven off the land.

This trend in agriculture is consciously promoted by government policies favoring the big farmers, corporation farms and trusts. Government policies speed up the elimination of the small and marginal farm operator. Only mass struggles have won concessions for the family-size farmers. The reactionary GOP and Dixiecrat coalition resorts to skillful maneuvering when necessary to slow the rise of the "farm revolt."

However, the "farm revolt" is growing, although it does not move upward evenly. It will develop and become effective as the farmer-labor alliance is strengthened around a common anti-monopoly program.

Our attitude to an agricultural program should be based on a many-sided approach including price supports, surplus disposal, Federal credits, crop insurance, conservation, supplementary income, modernization of farming communities, better roads, schools, recreation centers, etc.

The program should be concerned with protecting the incomes and living standards of the small and middle-income farmers. It should be directed toward making it possible for these farmers to stay on the land and make a living, in the face of the growing trend to big-scale agriculture which is eliminating these people as

farmers and driving them off the land.

Generally, progressive support should be given to the programs advanced by such groups as the Farmers' Union for these farmers, with the aim of giving full parity income to them. Emphasis should be on the use of production payments to implement price supports. These payments should be limited to small-income farmers; it is necessary to oppose the use of a farm program to enrich further the large and corporation farmers.

All government programs should be administered by elected farmer committees.

A great expansion and democratization of administration should be developed for Federal credits to these small and middle-income farmers.

We should raise sharply the issue of modernizing the farm communities in terms of schools, roads, hospitals, recreation centers and drought, flood and irrigation projects. Such programs would unite working people, farmers, small business people in rural communities, in a broad people's coalition. It could raise standards of living, provide greater economic security, supplement the incomes of these small and middle-income farmers. (Farmers Union leaders contend that the modernization of farm homes in America alone would involve the expenditure of some 80 billion dollars.)

The fight against the monopolies should be the central issue for the

farmer-labor coalition and the co-operatives.

It should begin with breaking the hold of the big banks on farm credit and making these credits available to the small and middle-income farmers.

It should intensify the struggle against the electric power trusts' efforts to monopolize public power sites, and to move in on the co-operative farm electrification projects. More steps should be taken to prevent the big power companies from buying power from government projects and reselling it to cooperatives. This fight for public control of power should be extended to atomic plants as well.

Congressional investigations of the food processing and marketing monopolies such as packing, milling, etc., should be initiated and measures adopted to curb the profiteering.

The same investigation should be made of the gigantic plunder of the farmers as well as the people generally by the oil trust. This should also apply to the farm implement, fertilizer and power trusts.

Markets for food should be expanded by fighting to raise minimum wages for millions of underpaid workers.

Expand the struggle for food export. Oppose the "cold war" foreign policy which accepts the idea of farm surpluses in a world of millions of starving people.

Strengthen and improve the farmer-labor economic, legislative and

poli
for
In
coal
mon
for
join
pro-
farm
The
trec
to th
to se
in or
and
with
with
Party
rural
circle
gress
wher
the q
cialist
Far
unity
appro
farme
Negro
a ma
unity
The
the pe
dation
unity.
gan
strikes
ing f
must
ing th
ruinat
the pr
worke

political alliance as the prerequisite for winning such a program.

In the process of forming a broad coalition around a minimum anti-monopoly farm program, it is time for us also to find new methods of joining with the Left, radical and pro-Socialist currents among the farmers and rural town people. There is a strong residue of these trends. We think it is not confined to the "old timers." We should begin to seek out hundreds of these people in order to develop friendly relations and a common policy with them without expecting them to agree with our program or to join our Party. The possibilities exist in many rural areas of developing discussion circles, debates and forums of progressives, pro-Socialists, Communists where all can have their say around the question of moving toward a Socialist Cooperative Commonwealth.

Farmer unity and farmer-labor unity must govern our policies and approach. Unity of small and middle farmers, including large numbers of Negro farmers and sharecroppers is a major problem. The key to this unity is the anti-monopoly position. The struggle against monopoly as the people's enemy is the basic foundation for building and expanding unity. Struggles such as the Michigan milk strike and other milk strikes impending, the egg-producing farmers' struggle for survival, must be supported by labor recognizing that the robbery and economic ruin of the small farmers on the production end takes place while workers receive little benefit from

lower immediate prices to producers, and that the elimination of the small producers will still further promote monopolization and therefore bring still higher prices to consumers.

We should promote unity of anti-monopoly struggle of the major farm groups—Farmers Union, Grange, Farm Bureau, including lesser ones such as the Missouri Farmers Association and the National Farm Organization. The struggle for joint action and unity among family-type farmers everywhere and their alliance with labor and the Negro people is the high road to success in fighting the current crisis and winning future battles.

Several million farm laborers are the most impoverished people in our country. Most of them are migrant. Many belong to Negro, Mexican, Indian and other national minorities. A major task for the working class and the unified labor movement is to organize these farm laborers and vastly improve their living standards. This would mean fundamental help to some groups of family farmers who are faced with the destructive competition of commodities produced by these super-exploited workers.

Our Party should establish a National Farm Commission and State or Regional Commissions where practical. Where possible, a majority of these commissions should be actual farmers. These commissions should undertake research and study as outlined above.

An Evaluation of the "Daily Worker"

By SUB-COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE, CPUSA

At a meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, held April 27-28, a report evaluating the Daily Worker and The Worker was made by a sub-committee appointed for that purpose. This Report, after extensive discussion, was accepted by the National Committee, by a vote of 46-6. Its content was then sent, in typed form, to various districts in the country for further discussion and for information. At the latest National Committee meeting, at the end of July, the publication of this Report was urged. It is printed below, in somewhat condensed form, as a matter that we know will interest our readers—Ed.

THE STUDY of the Committee is based on 40 issues of the *Daily Worker* (February 11th to April 5th) and 10 issues of *The Worker* (February 3rd to April 7th). The yardstick used in this examination is, first, how the paper carries out the total line of the Convention—and not merely this or that aspect that one or another comrade may wish to emphasize. Second, on the basis of the character of the paper, what it strives to achieve, the kind of paper it is. Third, the issues that were of paramount concern to the masses during the period under review.

On the character of the paper, there is not always full clarity. Some think the *Daily Worker* should be a sort of daily political magazine devoted to discussions, and not a newspaper. Some emphasize that it should be non-partisan, with no opinions. A great deal of emphasis is placed by some—and we believe correctly—on the idea that it should be a crusading paper, crusading on issues. Also there have been many complaints of inadequate dealing with the question of socialism.

We believe the *Daily Worker* is, and should be, a newspaper. It is a non-Party paper, but not a non-partisan paper. It is a Marxist paper, not a liberal paper, working class in character but working class in the broadest sense; in this sense it is also a people's paper; a newspaper which, while it cannot compete in all coverage with other large newspapers, can be second to none in coverage of the struggles of the people generally, and especially in the labor movement, the Negro people's movement, the struggle of the colonial people, developments in the international labor movement and the socialist lands. It should be a crusading paper, fighting on issues, reflecting struggle, giving the greatest attention to the struggles of the most exploited and oppressed sections of the American people, the Negro and Puerto Rican people in such areas as New York, for example, where they are such a substantial number.

The paper should also deal with questions in depth, strive to impart political education to its readers, giv-

ing fundamental answers to questions, helping to introduce the reader to theory in a natural way, and carrying on a constant education and advocacy of socialism on the basis of the concrete experience of the American working people.

With regard to the issues that were specifically examined, there were three foremost national issues during this period: the Mid-East crisis, the civil rights struggle, the racketeering investigation. In addition, of great importance were: the H-bomb tests, a question which in recent weeks has come to the fore as a major issue, the budget, taxes, inflation and automation. Here in New York, where the *Daily Worker* has its main base as distinguished from *The Worker*, whose circulation is about evenly divided between New York and the rest of the country, central issues were those connected with the session of the Legislature: rent control, changes in the Social Insurance Law, the Baker-Metcalf anti-discrimination bill, and the effort of the GOP Legislature to weaken SCAD. Within the city there were the developments on the Campus around the issue of free speech for Communists in connection with Academic Freedom Week; and finally how the Party Convention itself, which took place within this period, was treated.

Whatever weaknesses are to be found in the paper—and these we shall deal with as we go along—it is important to emphasize at the outset that the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* reacted to the main events quickly and on the whole correctly and effectively. This is not unimportant, for as is well known, there were times when the press was deficient in this respect. And especially is this important against the background of the last year when our movement was so

absorbed in internal discussions. Let us now pass over to some of these specific issues.

ON THE MIDEAST CRISIS

Here the *Daily* correctly centered on the struggle for peace and called for united action by the major powers—and in the first place by the USA and the USSR. There were many articles and editorials exposing the policy of U.S. imperialism in general and the oil interests specifically.

The *Daily* showed great sensitivity to the feelings of the Jewish people, though, at least in the beginning, not the same awareness of the need to keep in mind the feelings and sentiments of the Negro people.

The early discussions on this question, the letter of Comrade Jackson and the article of Comrade Strong, had a positive influence in overcoming a certain onesidedness of emphasis and lack of fundamental approach—the realization of the full significance of the struggles of the people in the colonial countries, the meaning of Bandung, and the relationship of this to the whole world struggle for peace, democracy, independence and social progress.

A number of weaknesses continued to prevail. Among these, we would center attention on the following:

Sometimes allowing tactical considerations—particularly as regards the Jewish people—to blur the main line. In this connection, it is also necessary to state that the Jewish masses here must be told the truth as regards the main forces and issues, the role of the Israeli Government, etc. The tactical line is for the purpose of facilitating the bringing of the correct line to the Jewish people, and not for capitulating to national feelings, etc.

ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST RACKETEERING

The papers reacted quickly and on the whole correctly, avoiding both main dangers: failure to identify ourselves with the workers' sentiments against racketeering for fear that we might appear to support the Senate Committee; and failure to expose the real aims of the investigators. The articles by George Morris; the editorials; reprints of views of national and local leaders, and of Bridges and the ILWU, were all helpful. The paper gave the correct line on how to fight racketeering and the racketeers, showing that the employers, the investigators, the racketeers were, despite their present falling out, one and the same camp, and that an aroused rank-and-file developing to the maximum trade union democracy, is essential to a consistent and effective fight against the racketeers in the interests of labor and the nation.

Perhaps it is necessary to give emphasis to the central objective of the investigation.

It is part of the whole well-planned and well-organized offensive by Big Business, expressed in Congress by the alliance of the Southern Dixiecrats and the GOP. It is primarily directed against the trade union movement and is designed to stop dead the organization of the unorganized, particularly in the South. It seeks to divert attention from the planned drive for a shorter workday without reduction in pay and from the congressional investigation into monopoly profits. It is also aimed at the civil rights bill, passage of which requires the alliance of labor, the Negro people, white collar and professional groups.

By discrediting the labor movement, the forces behind this rackets investigation hope to mount an offensive against the developing independent political action of labor and its allies. In this way they hope to block welfare legislation now and influence in a reactionary direction the outcome of the 1958 and 1960 elections.

This must be hammered home again and again. It must be made clear that the Teamsters Union was chosen because it was considered a weak link where reaction could move in without too much opposition; after which it was intended to go after what was really wanted.

A criticism can be made that it did not utilize this situation to get page after page of letters from rank and file workers on this matter in the form of workers' correspondence, interviews with workers, etc.

ON CIVIL RIGHTS

There is no question but that the paper did give a good deal of attention to the struggle in the South, to civil rights legislation before Congress, and to many local struggles, and in the last week or so, to the Pilgrimage. It was surprising to find in this connection that the *Sunday Worker*, which so outstandingly improved in many fields during this period, was in some aspects deficient in this respect. There was only one editorial on this question out of a total of 25, with 2 columns and 17 major stories in the entire 10-week period, as against 30 labor and 28 in the field of foreign affairs.

The paper reflected a number of local struggles on local issues, but insufficient attention to how the Negro people live—the discrimination in the dif-

ferent spheres, economic, social, cultural, housing problems. In this connection, perhaps it would not be amiss to state that not only on this question, but in general, it is difficult for the paper to sustain the aspect of being a crusading paper on issues where such struggles are not developed. Here it must be stated that very often the correct policy of working among the masses in the broad mass organizations, and not isolating Communists and the Left forces in Left organizations, is too often interpreted as meaning that there should be no initiative from the Left in helping to develop struggles. It should also be stated in this regard that much greater emphasis must be given by the paper to reflecting the changed population composition in the City of New York (where the *Daily Worker* has its main base), for example in connection with the struggles of the Negro and Puerto Rican people.

The *Daily Worker* was in the very center of the development of the struggle on the New York campuses around Academic Freedom Week and the right of the Communists to be heard. The Editor-in-Chief, Comrade Gates, spoke at many student meetings and brought forward the position of the Party. In some cases members of the Staff sold the *Daily Worker* at and around these meetings.

One of the things to be noted is the almost total failure of the labor movement to react to, and to participate in, this struggle and the failure of the paper to raise the question. This struggle involved the city colleges maintained by the taxpayers, which means the working masses in the first place, and certainly the labor movement should be aroused to play a role in this type of struggle.

The questions of the budget, taxation, inflation—these and related issues do not receive sufficient attention in our press. *The Worker* is somewhat better in this respect than the *Daily Worker*. It appears that this is connected with the organization of the paper and insufficient clarity as to responsibility for national politics, economic questions. The failure to deal adequately with these issues is very serious because it is precisely with these issues that the masses are most concerned. Perhaps this reflects a certain sectarianism, and a certain isolation from the struggles of the masses on these issues. It is through these issues that very often the masses can be mobilized to fight effectively in larger numbers on other issues of a more general character, including the fight for peace.

NEED FOR MORE DEPTH

One of the things the Committee observed was that *even where the paper on single issues in the various fields of work deals with them correctly and gives answers to the immediate questions, there is a failure to deal sufficiently with questions more fundamentally, more deeply.*

In this connection also, while the papers correctly give answers to questions of the day, looking back over a period of time, we find that there is insufficient emphasis on the perspective. From time to time there should be a summing up so that the reader will know the relationship, for example, of the current developments in the cold war, the attacks on the colonial people and all this in connection with the general struggle for co-existence. Similarly, relating the current developments in the economic situation

to the perspective as regards the outlook for the economic situation; or in regard to the outcome of an election here and there, the struggle on the legislative front, the whole aspect of the struggle for independent political action, for realignment, and for the strategic line adopted by the Convention for an anti-monopoly coalition.

As has been stated on numerous occasions, there is insufficient agitation for socialism based on the issues of the day and relating them to the principles of socialism. In this connection it is noteworthy that some good beginnings have been made in *The Worker*. It has carried a series of articles by Comrade Sparks, a number of articles on the Convention by Comrade Magil, debates on Socialism, etc.

ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

With regard to foreign policy, side by side with an excellent struggle for peaceful coexistence, for banning H-bomb tests, disarmament, etc., a number of weaknesses are to be found in the paper. In the March 19th editorial for example, we find a statement like the following:

The big powers will contribute to a more lasting peace only when they recognize the rights and sovereignty of all countries in the Middle East. And the big powers can help bring about a settlement if they keep their own East-West cold war out of the Middle East.

This is an instance of what often has been called equating the Socialist countries with imperialism. While this is not typical (and we are told was not written by the Foreign Editor), it is nevertheless an error which we believe cannot be attributed to mere accident. It reflects a weakness in dealing with the socialist countries on the one hand and American imperialism on the other. A number of columns also re-

fect a tendency to explain the Eisenhower-Dulles policies by their stupidity rather than as a reflection of the role and the aims of U.S. imperialism, and also constantly tell the readers that despite all recent developments peaceful coexistence is assured. While undoubtedly much of what is being said in these columns is correct and necessary, they are one-sided. They do not concentrate sufficiently, in dealing with the different interests, classes, groups, etc., on the role of the imperialists and upon how the people themselves can advance the struggle for peace.

On one aspect of foreign affairs, specifically the attitude to the Socialist countries, it would appear, both from the number of articles on this question, as well as from their content, that we are dealing here with more than neglect or error or weakness. We believe it reflects an incorrect line, a line which holds that dissociation from the socialist countries and from the Communist movement of the rest of the world is a precondition for building a stronger Marxist movement in the United States. Fast, Steuben and Starobin, to one degree or another, made this a central point in their attack against the Party, in their declarations as to why they left the Party. We can say that at least an echo of this is found in examining the press.

We find tendencies in the Party that different comrades emphasize different sections of the Resolution adopted by the 16th National Convention. It is necessary, therefore, to emphasize the struggle for the Resolution as a whole. In connection with the section on the Communist Party—independent party of American workers, where the formerly incorrect attitudes and relations to other parties and socialist countries are dealt with, it said:

The
People
sociali
exploit
tries
powe
and
ning
support
of the
themse
Big
to slaw
tility
Ameri
cerned
these
The
these
great
national
try's I
solidar
Party
of hon
At
recogni
wrong
its rela
ties. R
many
Not al
not con
The
nents
countri
lic crit
Marxist
weaken
class so
mies of
It i
have a
thing
Congr
thinki
must
cisely
this fi
the R
fight
revision
our in
As t
the ex

The Soviet Union, People's China and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe are socialist countries. The system of capitalist exploitation has been abolished in these countries and, together with it, the cause of poverty, fascism, war, national oppression and race discrimination. From the beginning the Communist Party has greeted and supported the efforts of the working people of these countries to build a new life for themselves on socialist foundations.

Big Business tries to vilify these countries, to slander and defame them, to incite hostility against them. In the interest of the American people the Communist Party is concerned with nailing these lies and exposing these slanders.

The attitude of the Communist Party to these countries reflects its devotion to the great principle of working class internationalism which has deep roots in our country's history. The tradition of international solidarity is a proud one. The Communist Party continues it and considers it a badge of honor.

At the same time the Communist Party recognizes that over the years it held certain wrong and oversimplified concepts of what its relations should be to other Marxist parties. The Party tended to accept uncritically many views of Marxists of other countries. Not all these views were correct; some did not correspond to American conditions.

The Party also viewed uncritically developments in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It mistakenly thought that any public criticism of the views or policies of the Marxist parties of these countries would weaken the bonds of international working class solidarity or bring comfort to the enemies of peace and socialism.

It is true that there are some who have a tendency to try to forget everything we have learned since the XXth Congress and to revert back to old thinking and old methods. This we must struggle against. But it is precisely because of the necessity to wage this fight effectively that we must, as the Resolution correctly states, also fight against the Right danger and revisionist tendencies, the distortion of our international viewpoint.

As the statistical analysis shows, with the exception of one article in *The*

Worker, dealing with an exchange of letters between the workers in Gorki, USSR and the workers in Greenwich in Great Britain, on Hungary and Egypt, there hasn't been a single major article on Hungary during the entire period under examination, although such material is available which our readers would like to have and has been printed in other periodicals, including the *New World Review* and the *People's World*. It is asserted that the Party has said nothing new on the question of the Open Letter of last November. But a reading of that letter will show that even within its limitations, much could have been done to give a deeper understanding of the events, the role of U.S. imperialism and the consolidation of the government rebuilding.

and the tackling of the problems of

In general, it should be said that in connection with this field of work—foreign affairs—it is necessary in one form or another to create guarantees that the line of the Party will be accurately reflected. It is necessary to draw in many collaborators, experts, many of whom are available, to guarantee that the paper will once more reflect the developments in the international movement, socialist countries, etc.

ON "SPEAK YOUR PIECE"

The statistical analysis of "Speak Your Piece" during this period shows 103 letters were printed in the *Daily Worker*. Fifty-three of these are what could be called of a general nature, not directly connected with the internal situation in the Party. Interestingly enough a relatively large number dealt with national politics, such questions as the budget, inflation, etc. It is also clear from the small number of letters

in the general category dealing with labor and the Negro people, that much improvement can be developed on this score. Of the other 50 letters printed, of what is called "a controversial nature," there is no evidence that these were used to favor one side or another in the disputes. But this is not what we wish to deal with at this moment. What we wish to say most of all is the fact that these letters disclose a great deal of thinking, experience, both theoretical and practical, on the part of the writers, a great deal of talent in our organization, and that it is necessary to continue "Speak Your Piece," making it a permanent feature, even making it more representative. For it is one of the channels through which not only can there be an exchange of experiences among the comrades, but the Party leadership on all levels can learn a great deal from the thinking going on in the organization and among people around our organization. Many questions of a strictly inner-Party nature, of course, in the future, will be found in the Party bulletin once it is published, as decided upon by the Convention. And even greater emphasis, therefore, will be given in "Speak Your Piece" to general questions of mass work, mass policy, reflecting the thinking of the workers, the Negro people, etc., without in the least doing anything to weaken the forum aspect of freedom of speech. At the same time, we feel that some question dealt with require comment. We do not mean answering each letter. No. That would tend to stifle freedom of speech. But taking up questions over a period of time, analyzing them, drawing conclusion, so that many things are not left hanging in the air; this, we believe would even strengthen the value of "Speak Your Piece."

COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION

The investigation covered only the period immediately following the convention and not the preconvention period.

On this, the following can be said: First, that aside from a certain tentatiousness during the Convention itself—especially in the main headlines—where one feels that there was sometimes more consideration given to what the *Times* and the *Post* would say than for consideration to accuracy and the need to unify our own ranks, the stories, articles, and the publication of actual material adopted were on the whole representative and factual.

But our main criticism is directed against the fact that there has, but for the two articles in *The Worker*, been no follow-up, no popularization and application of the many documents, policies and their relation to the problems and tasks confronting our Party, the workers, the Negro people, the nation. This criticism can be levelled not merely against the editors of the paper, but against all leading comrades and Party committees. This is the first time this was neglected to such an extent. It is not too late and such a series of articles should be undertaken by the Center, in the states, as well as by the paper itself. Our convention and its decisions need to be popularized, made clear to our own members and to the many thousands of friends and sympathizers. Through the press, as well as through leaflets and pamphlets, many tens of thousands have to be made aware of our policies. This is obviously one of our tasks in realizing the decisions.

RELATIONS WITH THE PARTY

The Daily Worker and *The Worker*

are not official organs of the Communist Party. But they bear a special relation to it. They are not Party papers, but neither are they non-partisan papers. They are Marxist workingclass papers, they are Communist newspapers in the broadest sense of the term. These papers, founded originally through the efforts of the Communist Party, are today independent enterprises with their own officers, etc. But as far as their very existence is concerned, they must have the fullest support of the Communist movement.

But this is not the only thing that needs to be said—though that is most important and must be the foundation on which all else stands—as far as the character and aims of the *Daily* and *The Worker* are concerned.

First of all, it is a most serious weakness that the papers have not created for themselves, independently, a base of support which includes Communists and other Left and Marxist forces, as well as among militant workers and Negro people generally; that they are not surrounded by a corps of people helping to plan and support the paper and many activities and affairs which could and should be organized around the paper in support of it. The example of the *Freiheit* is a very positive one from which much can be learned.

In this respect let us now consider the political line of the paper in relation to the Communist Party. Whatever goes into the paper is, of course, by decision of its own editorial board. There is no question but that the paper is generally reflective of the political approach of the party in general and on all theoretical questions as well as concrete aspects of immediate program. The paper has always aimed to fulfill this role and whatever

weaknesses existed in this respect were mainly in execution.

How is the main line of the Party reflected in the paper? Through the editorial board of the paper, through discussions with the comrades working on the paper. Whatever changes or improvements may be necessary to broaden the circle of correspondents, columnists, collaborators, to strengthen the staff of any of its departments can be achieved through discussions with, and recommendations to the comrades on the papers.

CONCLUSION

We have tried to give an objective report. It is perhaps over-critical. This is because we wish to center on weaknesses and overcome them.

Certainly the paper has many strong points; even as it is, it's an excellent paper—the best there is!

We must remember that the paper comes out regularly. Comrades must write and try to give answers quickly. At the same time those on the paper bear a great responsibility and have a great opportunity to serve. Only the best is good enough. Each must grow, develop, learn, improve his work theoretically, politically, technically.

We are going through a difficult period in the Party. We all must learn. We have many changes to make. The paper, too, should try to change people, their ideas. Only as a last resort should there be changes of personnel. We must do nothing to create new difficulties or increase factionalism. Changes take time. We must convince.

The paper needs united support. It will take a strong pull on the part of every one to save the press. All of us must pull in the same direction.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

IF ONE WERE ASKED to name the ten most distinguished figures among presently active professors of American history, he would have to include Howard K. Beale and Merle Curti, both of the University of Wisconsin; Samuel F. Bemis of Yale; John D. Hicks of the University of California (Berkeley); and Dexter Perkins of Cornell. Each of these scholars has been teaching and writing for over thirty years; their instruction, monographs and textbooks have reached hundreds of thousands of people, and in their impact upon teachers their influence has helped shape the ideas of many millions.

It so happens that two of these men recently have produced monumental biographical studies, and the remaining three have written shorter volumes which attempt analyses of central features of American development. The writings of such individuals require study and consideration; such effort cannot but help enlighten and stimulate the reader, even if, in many instances, agreement seems impossible.

I wish to comment, briefly, upon salient features of these volumes, while cautioning the reader that space limitations make it necessary for me merely to indicate some of the

contributions they contain, and to suggest where, as it seems to me, the analyses are faulty. One of my main aims is to call these studies to the reader's attention so that he may feel it worthwhile to examine them on his own, with the care and time they merit.

Professor Bemis' work (*John Quincy Adams and the Union*, Knopf, \$8.75) is the concluding volume of his two-volume biography of the sixth President. His first volume, published in 1950, had won the Pulitzer Prize, and a still earlier book—a study in diplomatic history, where Mr. Bemis is outstanding—was awarded the same Prize back in 1926. This latest work details the last twenty-four years (1824-1848) in the long and fabulously rich life of "Old Man Eloquent." Behind him is service in several Ministerial posts in Europe, in the Senate, and in Monroe's Cabinet; before him, and the subject matter of this volume, are his years as President and then, as a member of the House of Representatives. It is in the latter, relatively humble position in which his neighbors asked him to serve, that Quincy Adams rises to his noblest and most stirring role—as the Voice of the conscience of America in its pre-Civil War struggle to retain the

civil liberties of the white people, to oppose unjust and aggressive war, and to advance the liberation of the Negro people.

John Quincy Adams saw the organic relationship, in his era, between the system of Negro slavery and aggressive foreign policy; he saw, too, the tie between that rapacious internal system and its expansionistic external policy and the assault upon the freedom of speech, petition, and press. It is in the chapters elucidating and describing this series of interconnections—with its obvious applications to contemporary problems—that Mr. Bemis' book was most fascinating for this reader. In some cases, especially in the material on the Mexican War, Professor Bemis tends to deny or minimize some of the perceptions of his subject; in this, I think Quincy Adams was more correct than his biographer, but Professor Bemis provides the necessary material so that each reader may make up his own mind.

There are particular subjects upon which Professor Bemis' book is especially enlightening, bringing forward as it does material from hitherto unpublished or scarce sources tapped by the biographer's indefatigable research. This is true, for example, of the discussion of treasonous and near-treasonous activity by the Right-wing Federalists early in the 19th century; of the anti-Masonic movement a little later; and of the corruption and worse that characterized Daniel Webster's dealing with

the British concerning the Maine-Canada border.

While Professor Bemis obviously and understandably has developed the greatest respect and admiration for his subject, his objectivity is remarkable and he in no case spares Adams when weaknesses and blemishes appear. This applies not only to matters of personal conduct and character, but also to questions of some historic consequence. Thus, Adams' tremendous concern about property rights led him to defend such barbarisms as imprisonment for debt, and the British rape of China, known as the Opium War.

Yet, Adams lived in an era when such concern, given a rising bourgeoisie inhibited by the power of the slavocracy, more characteristically and basically expressed itself in terms of support of the Bill of Rights, hostility to chattel slavery, and opposition to a generally reactionary internal and external policy serving that slavocracy. I think Professor Bemis' work might have been improved had this fundamental social condition been more clearly comprehended and presented to the reader. Surely, it is enough, however, to have written the definitive life of one of the giants of American history. This Professor Bemis has done in his study of John Quincy Adams.

* * *

For some years it was known to members of the historical profession that Professor Howard K. Beale—

whose contributions to the history of freedom of thought and academic freedom had been outstanding—was studying the life of Theodore Roosevelt. Knowing the very severe standards that he sets for himself and his extremely painstaking methods of work, we were prepared to wait a considerable time before the fruits of his labors would be made available.

At last the harvest has come and the wait has not been in vain. The hope remains that this volume (*Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power*, John Hopkins University Press, \$6) stout as it is will be but the first of several more, and that the ensuing volumes will come more quickly than did the first.

Professor Beale's research, indicated in the one hundred pages of notes that conclude this book, is astonishing and as nearly exhaustive as human perseverance would seem to allow. His point of view is that of an ardent civil libertarian and opponent of colonialism and racism. This outlook makes it impossible for Professor Beale to evaluate Theodore Roosevelt's career positively, but the book is far from a debunking one. It is much too solid and thorough and profound for that, and these qualities make the study very much more devastating than is the sensationalistic "expose" type of book.

One finds in Beale's study an obvious attempt to understand TR, to give him the benefit of the doubt,

to comprehend his environmental limitations as well as advantages. Beale finds in his subject a certain kind of basic integrity, when dealing with those he felt were his peers, a dedicated loyalty to his own values, and a determined sort of courage. He finds, too, more astuteness than many have tended to grant him and proves him to have been less addicted to the exaggerated story or fabricated tale than other biographers have intimated.

All this makes the more impressive Beale's basic finding:

One comes away from the study with admiration for Roosevelt's ability, his energy, and his devotion to his country's interests as he saw them, but with a sense of tragedy that his abilities were turned toward imperialism and an urge for power, which were to have consequences so serious for the future.

And the last sentence in the text reads: "The trouble lay not in his abilities, but in his values and in the setting in which he worked, whether from choice or from necessity."

Those values, as Beale demonstrates, were chauvinistic, jingoist, imperialist. These, in turn, were tied to a consciousness of the rising threat of working-class organization and power. Theodore Roosevelt thought he could help establish a peace among equals—i.e., a peace among the imperialist powers (he called them "civilized") at the expense of the colonial peoples. This

Beale demonstrates and documents very well. I think Roosevelt also saw the relationship between a policy of expansionism at the expense of colored peoples and the possibility with the profits and power therefrom to placate, cajole, corrupt, hold off, mislead the class consciousness of the working classes in the metropolitan powers. I think this is why so often liberalism and foreign expansionism go hand in hand; but this Professor Beale does not say, although to me the material he presents, and other material, makes this view accurate.

Actually, as Professor Beale does show, Roosevelt's policy failed for it did not preserve peace among the "civilized" powers, but, if anything, exacerbated their relationships. His policy speeded up the formation of competing alliances of great powers and tended to commit the United States—secretly and certainly without the consent of the American people—to a prominent and bloody role in the struggle for world domination.

Moreover, the policy of ruthless suppression of the "backward" peoples could not but react not only on the economics and politics of the Big Powers, but also upon the moral fibre of their leaders and even of many of their peoples. Roosevelt himself wrote, in his *Winning of the West* (1896) that in the aggressions against the darker peoples, "no pity is shown to non-combatants, where the weak are harried . . . and the vanquished treated with merciless

ferocity. . . . There follow deeds of enormous, of incredible, of indescribable horror." But this was written not to condemn, but to justify; yet such practices cannot help but corrode the power pursuing them.

Then, too, it is part of the chauvinism of an imperialist, like Theodore Roosevelt, never to stop to consider the strength of the oppressed and their patience and their long memories. It is not only that these policies of rapine, slaughter and robbery make beasts of the perpetrators; such policies make undying enemies of their victims, who will not always, in the long reaches of history, remain victims. They will become and they have become avengers.

Beale's work documents more fully than any other the tie between the United States Government in the early 20th century and developing Big Business in its exploitation of Asia (his present book has little on Latin America). It shows how the betrayal and conquest of China and Korea by Great Britain, Japan and the United States were consummated with malice aforethought and with the prizes of profit and power ever uppermost in the minds of the rulers. It offers new and significant material on the relations between the United States and Germany also. In a word, this volume is a gold mine for anyone interested in diplomatic history from 1895 through World War I, and for anyone seeking to comprehend the historic roots of the imperialist policy of the United States.

There are, I think, certain deficiencies in the book. Professor Beale accepts too readily and uncritically the findings of Julius W. Pratt as to the alleged opposition of Big Business to the Spanish-American War. While Pratt's evidence is impressive, there is evidence of a contrary nature which is missing from his work and which would lead to some modification, at least, of his thesis. Professor Beale twice remarks that the present Chinese government is the prisoner of the Soviet Union. He offers no documentation, apparently assuming the truth of this idea is self-evident. I would say that it is not only not self-evident, it is not true. Surely, Professor Beale should re-examine this idea; he should at least attempt to prove it, rather than simply assert it.

In the recent period, Professor Beale finds the United States "left holding the bag [for Great Britain] and paying the price of liquidating, everywhere outside the Western Hemisphere, the imperialism Roosevelt had helped create." He goes on to say that the United States is "fighting a costly rear-guard retreat in defense not only of British, but of Dutch and French empires in opposition to the aspirations for freedom that America would once have befriended." While this catches the reactionary kernel of U.S. foreign policy, it ascribes to it too passive and defensive a posture. That policy is seeking, I think, to supplant other imperialisms, not for the purpose of liquidation but for the purpose

of usurpation. This mistake in emphasis is related to a more basic failing in Beale's volume: it does not present imperialism as a stage in the development of capitalism, but rather as a policy adopted by certain segments of the bourgeoisie. This throws some of the analysis askew and makes much of it less profound than it might be.

Once again, however, in dealing with this book by Beale, as the earlier one by Bemis, the great fact stands out that here is a major work of sound research, written by a fully mature historian striving to deal honestly and fully with his subject matter, and with his readers.

* * *

John D. Hicks, best known as the historian of the Populist movement, has produced a rather brief volume promisingly entitled *The American Tradition* (Houghton Mifflin, \$2.50). But it must be said that this reader found it far from satisfying. Mr. Hicks has not produced an analysis of the American tradition; he has written, rather, a short paean of praise for the arrival of a "people's capitalism." There are useful data in the book, particularly on trends in population development and movement in our country; but on the whole the work is a highly uncritical and frequently downright erroneous caricature of the delights of American capitalism in the best *Fortune* manner.

By far the best chapter in the work is the last, "An American Professor in Europe," in which Mr.

Hicks describes, in a delightfully humorous and warm manner, his observations while in England—which, of course, is something less than "Europe." His stay there leads him—perhaps by contrast—to write some cogent sentences on the anti-intellectualism in the United States and the threat here to academic freedom.

Rather striking, because of Professor Hicks' general outlook, was his reporting the widespread hostility to American foreign policy that he found in England, and most of this was not of the Tory, but rather of a democratic kind. The American bulwarking of Franco Spain, for example, was something thrown up to him frequently; he seems to have been especially shocked to find that his friends in England "hold the American Government principally responsible for the Korean War." Professor Hicks does not record his replies to these challenges, which is unfortunate for they would have made interesting reading. Perhaps objections of these kinds coming from such thoroughly respectable sources will lead Professor Hicks to re-examine his views on conditions and practices right here at home.

Not among the least of the values of this volume is its appendix which consists of a bibliography of Professor Hicks' writings; it is regrettable that this latest work does not add particular distinction to a notable list.

* * *

Dexter Perkins has written an equally slender book (*The American Way*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, \$2.75) but it is more meaty than that of Hicks. In a series of five essays Professor Perkins, President of the American Historical Association in 1956, analyzes conservatism, liberalism, radicalism, and socialism as he finds these to have been manifested in our history and then offers his view of "The American Way."

To do justice to all the ideas stimulated by Professor Perkins' very provocative volume, would require a volume of one's own. Here I wish to offer little more than some notes on certain of the concepts put forward by Perkins.

In this volume is a brief but quite penetrating discussion of a common failing of intellectuals and it is well that it comes from one of the foremost among them. Professor Perkins remarks rather gently that intellectuals "may easily suffer from the kind of intellectual arrogance that is very far removed from the needs of humanity." Teaching in particular carries with it the occupational hazard of arrogance; and a remoteness from the pressing needs of humanity may quickly appear where intellectuals become obsessed with the "word" or with debate for its own sake. All of this is not unrelated to sectarianism, which frustrates useful social action as it often stems from a lack of such action.

Professor Perkins also, and at somewhat greater length, cautions

against the easy identification of religion with conservatism, not to speak of reaction. He is right, I think, when he states:

The maxims of Christianity may make for the calm acceptance of the *status quo*. They may make for the precise opposite, for a deep and religious-minded discontent with the order that exists.

American history confirms his opinion, too, that "the religious life of America has always had in it a strong infusion of that kind of practical altruism on which liberalism feeds." I would add that radicalism often benefits from this, also. Professor Perkins does not enter into the question of religiosity itself and its essential idealism, philosophically speaking, and the impact this has on social theory. Nevertheless, his remarks are an important corrective for a rather mechanical equating of religion with conservatism that has marked much of Left thought.

Perkins' book is saturated with a passionate hatred for McCarthyism. He condemns the late Senator (in words written before his death) as "unscrupulous, violent, with no respect for truth, and still less for the integrity of the individual personality," and finds loathsome "the blatant appeal to fear and suspicion"; he is unequivocal in his denunciation of all attacks upon freedom of thought and speech.

Even more notable are the tributes which Professor Perkins pays to radicalism and to the ideas of socialism and communism. I do not

mean to suggest that he avows an intellectual kinship here; the contrary is true. But this adds impact to his remark that "whatever the limitations of socialism or communism, their doctrines have stirred men's consciences and made for greater sensitivity to human suffering and to gross social inequalities." The author poses the question: "Is not the presence of the radical one of those unfortunate things that all reasonable people should deprecate?" His answer certainly is noteworthy:

One can hardly believe so. It is the function of the radical to awaken us from complacency, to goad us into action, not for the attainment of his own goals but for the improvement of the social order.

I wish, however, that Professor Perkins had not omitted reactionary ideology and practice from his consideration of "The American Way." The omission is deliberate and reflects the judgment that reaction has not been significant here. This is manifestly false, even if one thinks only of the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Legion, Huey Long's movement, or the power of Charles Coughlin a generation ago—not to forget McCarthy himself. It is false in terms of the history of ideas here; how shall one place people like Fisher Ames, Calhoun, Irving Babbitt, William Graham Sumner, McKinley, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Mellon, Rockefeller, Frick, Ben Tillman, John Rankin, Tom Watson, etc.?

The omission misreads much of

American history and tends to make incomplete a comprehension of radicalism or liberalism. It fits into the rosy-hued and false picture of America's past and present that is exemplified, as I have remarked, in the volume by Professor Hicks. No doubt it is true that the contrary error has been made—perhaps most often by some on the Left—and that all who were not radical were labelled indiscriminately as reactionary; but it is equally wrong to swing to an opposite extreme and deny the very presence and great influence throughout American history, in practice and in ideas—of a truly reactionary core.

I find, too, that Professor Perkins presents liberalism and liberals in an anachronistic fashion. What I mean is that he often treats as liberalism what, at the time, was considered by contemporaries to have been radicalism. Space does not permit a full exposition of this point, so that an example will have to do. Professor Perkins refers to Thomas Jefferson as embodying liberalism—there was, he writes, "no truer liberal" than the Virginian. But this was not the estimate of Jefferson's contemporaries and it was not the opinion of Jefferson himself. Of course, Jefferson fortunately lived a long time, and while he might perhaps be described as a liberal in 1820, he certainly was a revolutionist of the most pronounced kind in 1776, and this applied not only to his views vis-a-vis Great Britain, but also to his social and economic views.

One result of this, as I see it, is that Professor Perkins tends to confine the radical's role purely to that of a "goad." This is easy if so many of the pioneering demands of radicals are labelled as the content of liberalism today—one hundred or fifty years after people were clubbed or jailed or spat upon for demanding these things—like women's suffrage, or the organization of basic industry, or unemployment insurance.

Where Professor Perkins identifies liberalism with imperialism, I fear the historical record will not bear him out. Certainly some liberals have opposed imperialism and colonialism, but liberalism has not been outstanding in this regard. Quite the contrary, and I suggest that a basic reason for this is liberalism's commitment to capitalism, which carries with it an acquiescence at least in monopoly capitalism (with exceptions) and thus an acceptance, if not advocacy of imperialism. Certainly from Theodore Roosevelt to Woodrow Wilson to Adlai Stevenson, liberalism has not been identified with resistance to American imperialist expansion.

Professor Perkins is a good example of a liberal's commitment to capitalism, and the blinding impact this can have when it comes to comprehending the realities of worldwide political development. Thus, at one point, he finds that only the ideas of Communism and of Socialism appear as alternatives to capitalism, and he writes:

The case against Communism does not need to be argued. But what is striking is today that Socialism is becoming more and more discredited as an answer to the ills of humanity.

I do not wish to be unkind, or to use harsh language, but I fear that this evaluation of the world today stems not only from a commitment to capitalism, but also from an American chauvinism. It may well be, of course, that Professor Perkins has in mind, among other things, the fact that the prestige of Communism and of Socialism has suffered severely because of the revelations concerning mistakes, injustices and crimes within the Soviet Union in the past and in other socialist lands; it may be, too, that he has in mind the blows against socialism that have come with the demonstration of considerable popular grievances and discontent in various socialist lands—notably Poland and Hungary. Of these things I have expressed my views at length in other places and need not here repeat them.

Nevertheless, the great difficulties in building socialism have served to help bring maturity to its adherents; and the process of their elimination is going forward, is inexorable, and can only result in the strengthening of the socialist system and the enhancing of its ideology.

But I spoke of chauvinism as playing a part in Professor Perkins' rather extraordinary statement be-

cause not only is it a fact that the ideology of socialism has enormous power in all of Western and Northern Europe; it is also a fact that the socialist system exists now among 900 million people. This means that the whole heart of Europe, and China, North Korea and North Vietnam are now socialist. It means that the Prime Ministers of India, Indonesia and Burma are socialists. And it means that the Communist Party has achieved momentous successes in recent elections in India and in Indonesia. Further, the ideology of socialism is exceedingly potent on the Western Hemisphere, especially among the colonially oppressed; and here, too, in the recent elections in British Guiana the forward movement of humanity towards socialism was again confirmed. And this, as in India and Indonesia, via elections held while the bourgeoisie was in power.

To write, then, as though the argument against Communism were won anywhere in the world, or as though socialism is in ebb, is to write blinded by an American chauvinism and provincialism altogether unworthy of Professor Perkins.

* * *

Merle Curti is the leading historian of American thought. He has again put us in his debt for another stimulating volume (*American Paradox: The Conflict of Thought and Action*, Rutgers University Press, \$2.75). Professor Curti inquires into the sources of anti-intellectualism that he finds so marked in our coun-

try.
our
tic
find
of
ness
mili
mon
conf
A
from
Wh
N.
very
scho
estal
turn
men
tigate
istic
the
ity."
C
conv
tural
Unit
how
writ
nue
was
wor
more
Prof
nition
Int
those
terest
edge
sues
H

try. He finds it in some features of our history emphasizing the "practical" over the theoretical; but he finds it especially in the domination of higher education by Big Business, the enhanced influence of the military, the tendency to subordinate moral values, and the stress upon conformity and "adjustment."

Against this he poses a quotation from no less an individual than Whitelaw Reid, early owner of the *N. Y. Herald-Tribune*, that "the very foremost function of the scholar in politics is to oppose the established." Curti calls for a return to this value and an abandonment of what Wendell Phillips castigated as "the scholar's characteristic aloofness from or opposition to the great battles waged for humanity."

Curti offers as an example of the conventional denigration of the cultural and intellectual worker in the United States, President Eisenhower's smart remark (no doubt written for him by a Madison Avenue "egghead") that an intellectual was "a person who takes more words than are necessary to say more than he knows." Against this Professor Curti poses his own definition:

Intellectuals may be regarded as those men and women whose main interest is the advancement of knowledge or the clarification of cultural issues and public problems.

He appeals for an emphasis upon

critical thinking, and insists that in the instrumentalist and pragmatic mode of instruction one gets some competence in technique but precious little comprehension of what real thinking is, or how to evaluate evidence and form logically founded conclusions. To achieve this, he knows the need for freedom of research and of thought and makes a passionate plea for the termination of all overt and hidden pressures undercutting that freedom.

He, too, as Perkins, cautions against arrogance amongst intellectual workers and suggests that contact with the living problems and needs of the people is a good vaccine against the disease.

Most significantly, Professor Curti puts his finger upon the sense of alienation that afflicts so many Americans today. He finds a widespread despair and cynicism and a sense that participation in politics is useless. He writes:

If multiple leadership is really an end of democracy, we must work to promote it in all the ways we can think of—work especially to promote willing participation of everyone in the making of public decisions. Our society could satisfy much more deeply than it now does deep-rooted desires for recognition and appreciation, desires present in every human being.

So splendid is Professor Curti's book, on the whole, that I find it particularly painful to have to object to a paragraph in it, not germane to his central theme and re-

mote from the whole truth. I have in mind these sentences where Communist intellectuals are discussed:

The free mind cannot be trusted, they assume; it must bow to dogma and authority. Communist intellectuals have also, by the most amazing quasi-intellectual gymnastics, justified rapid shifts in the party line. In so doing they advertised their contempt for reason.

If Professor Curti wishes to inveigh against particular individuals let him do so, with, as is his wont, careful documentation. If he insists on lumping many thousands of people together, let him offer at least one quotation before consigning them to limbo as having "contempt for reason." If he finds particular shifts in particular Party lines hard to justify or understand, let him particularize, as he would do were he writing seriously about any other subject, and his criticism can then be taken seriously and weighed. Communist intellectuals have made their share of errors—and possibly their share of contributions. But Communists as Communists are devoted to reason and are the enemies of dogma. Communists are also individuals and some fall below the standards of their philosophy and their commitment. But their philosophy and their commitment is to reason; they have no other god before them, and I think Professor Curti should avoid, in the future, generalized insults and libels.

As one Communist intellectual, but for this paragraph, I welcome

Professor Curti's volume as an illuminating contribution to the continuing battle on behalf of reason and science against obscurantism and dogma.

* * *

Apropos of Professor Curti's concern about a developing cynicism there were two relevant articles that I found quite striking. One contained a fair share of cynicism characteristic of its writer, though it attacked one aspect of the question; the other was a very moving plea for a return to a passionate belief in the nobility of learning and the sacredness of teaching.

The first article is entitled "The Decline of the Serious Writer," appeared in *The Antioch Review* (Summer, 1957) and came from the pen of the best-selling novelist and professional anti-Communist, James T. Farrell. Mr. Farrell declares that there is no market for serious literature in the United States today and that, hence, a writer cannot "afford" to create such literature. To a large degree he blames this upon the depraved tastes of the masses, which is a convenient antagonist to have these days in this country. But the bitterness with which Mr. Farrell writes is significant—for he did once try to write "seriously"—and is apparent in the exaggerated irony he chooses with which to make his point:

The capital investment in communication and popular culture runs into hundreds of millions or more. I should guess that in the United States at least

a billion dollars is invested in the cliché market of stereotypes, banality, and stupidity. In addition, there are the merchants of the moronic sex magazines. If all this declines too much, we could even have a depression. Truth, sensibility, creativity could possibly produce an economic tailspin of rather wide proportions: too much intelligence could even produce a depression in the United States.

The second article is altogether clean and completely heart-felt. It is entitled, "Plea for the Restoration of Teachers"; the author is Phyllis D. Weidig, a teacher in a New York high school, and she contributes this article to *High Points* (April, 1957), an official publication of the Board of Education of New York City. One can do no better than to quote extensively and so lay bare just a little of the torment facing some of the best workers with hand and brain in the midst of the tinsel and gadgets, the speed-up and the check-up, the unpaid bills and the precariously held job and the awful absence in so much of our country today of what Professor Curti calls the "deep-rooted desires for recognition and appreciation." The high school teacher, addressing her colleagues, writes:

We are mechanics of living—nothing more. We have analyzed down to the last bolt—and we do not even know what road we are on!

If we cringe before superiors, undermine our colleagues, or abdicate prin-

ciples we believe in, we need not trouble to teach the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, or "the blessings of democracy." We have already denied them with every flabby tissue of our beings.

... We seek to influence young people, to guide them and, heaven help us, to set their feet on the path to a more abundant life. We who are not even sure what is our own purpose in living? We who have lost ourselves in the common chaos? We cannot do it!

The chaos and inadequacies in education today are only a reflection of a world in which true values have been lost sight of, and we and those we teach are inevitably among its victims.

Virgil M. Rogers, Dean of the School of Education at Syracuse University, writing in a recent issue of the American Library Association *Bulletin* (April, 1957) reported that "a National Education Association study of 5,200 school systems recently disclosed that teachers in many communities avoid discussing anything controversial with their students for fear of reprisals."

This is something of what is behind Miss Weidig's cry of despair. The time is ripe for a united campaign against such festering sores of intimidation, frustration and corruption that contribute more than their share to the making of such scandalous headlines as now deface our newspapers, telling of veritable wars waged against heart-sick and impoverished youth by police armies with clubs and pistols.

Joll's "History of the Second International"

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

BOURGEOIS AUTHORS, in offering their conceptions of the history of Socialism, work under the big disadvantage of defending the obsolete capitalist system, either directly or by implication. Consequently, they strive to transform a great historical positive into an historical negative, and vice versa. That is, they try to prove, falsely, that world Socialism is a failure, and that world capitalism is advancing and successful. In consequence of this dilemma, they underplay at many points the strength of Socialism and overplay that of capitalism. James Joll's book, *The Second International: 1889-1914** suffers from this elementary weakness.

Joll's volume contains much excellent information material upon the workers' early fight for Socialism, a great deal of good secondary analysis, and many valuable biographical sketches of the leading figures of the pre-World War I Second International. The shortcomings of the book, however, are of a basic character. Here it is not a case of challenging this or that dubious fact or formulation; but rather, of colliding with the book's main premises. Every student of international labor history should read Joll's book for

its wealth of material; nevertheless, the volume cannot stand as a fundamental history of the Second International for the period it covers, 1889-1914. And even less can it achieve its implied aim of serving as essentially an authority on world Socialism in general, with its false thesis, however sketchily stated, that there has been not much left of world Socialism since the Social-Democratic war debacle of 1914.

DISREGARDING THE CAPITALIST BACKGROUND

One of the basic weaknesses of Mr. Joll's history is his almost complete failure to analyze the capitalist system as the general social framework within which the organization of the Second International grew and functioned. He thus tends to reduce the whole movement largely to a sort of ideological development. His book lacks even the amount of "economic determinism" that is usually to be found in the writings of bourgeois historians since the time of Charles A. Beard. Joll does not see clearly the dynamics of the labor struggle which was the foundation of the Second, as well as of the other two Internationals; namely, the deep-going discontent of the heavily exploited workers, who are impelled to organize and fight by the remorse-

* Published by Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 213 pages, \$3.50.

less workings of the capitalist system. He tends, therefore, unduly to write off Socialism in all its aspects. On the other hand, he assumes that capitalism is altogether a sound system, one that is not responsible basically for the vast Socialist ferment that has gone on within its bosom for the past century and more. Of course, he practically ignores the development of the world crisis of the capitalist system, of which the first World War and the Russian Revolution were such profound precipitants and expressions.

As part of his neglect of general analysis in developing the social background of the Second International, Mr. Joll devotes almost no attention to the evolution of the capitalist system from its competitive to its monopoly (imperialist) stage, which took place fundamentally during the years he deals with, and which had most potent effects in determining the life course of the Second International, and particularly in bringing about its debacle in 1914. In the leading capitalist countries of the world, it was especially during the pre-World War I lifetime of the Second International that the great trusts and monopolies took shape, developed finance capitalism, spawned foreign policies of aggression and colonial conquest, and came to dominant political control in all these countries.

Revisionism—with which Joll deals at considerable length, but never explains—was the trend upon the part of the opportunist leaders of the International to so recast and

adapt labor's policies as to subordinate the interests of the working class to those of the big capitalists. Revisionism, directly produced by imperialism, had by the eve of World War I, come to saturate the entire daily practice and outlook of the decisive bureaucrats at the head of the Second International. It is impossible to explain the character and effects of revisionism unless one shows clearly its direct relationship to imperialism. This basic task, which was a supreme achievement of Lenin, Joll utterly neglects.

Joll's failure to develop the decisive role of monopoly capital and imperialism in determining the course of the Second International makes it quite impossible for him also to draw an authentic picture of the role of the Right-wing leadership of the International and of most of its parties. He depicts the betrayal of the International into World War I, brought about upon the initiative of the German Right Social-Democrats, primarily as the action of confused but sincere leaders, caught unawares by the war situation. He declares that they acted genuinely on behalf of the rank and file, stating (page 176): "But above all, as in Austria, there was the feeling that any other action would be a betrayal of the interests and intentions of the rank and file." Such conclusions by Joll are highly unrealistic.

The German Right leaders, mostly opportunist intellectuals and seasoned trade-union bureaucrats, were not surprised by the advent of the war situation. They had discussed

this question for many years. Had they been of the intention to do so, they could readily have organized an anti-war stand, although admittedly, as in Russia, the immediate cost for them would have been great. Undoubtedly, however, they had long before made up their minds not to oppose the war if and when it should come. Two decades of intense imperialist "prosperity" and almost as much of widespread Bernstein propaganda of revisionism, had done their work thoroughly, sapping the earlier Socialist convictions of these leaders. By the time the war broke out they had already abandoned revolutionary Socialism for all practical purposes, and they supported the war basically as believers in "evolutionary capitalism."

The Right Social-Democratic leadership in all the countries, during the next couple of decades, demonstrated their loyalty to bourgeois reformism by their implacable hatred of the Soviet Union, their shooting down of the German Revolution, their surrender of the Italian and German labor movements to fascism, and their support of the war drive of militant American imperialism against the U.S.S.R. and its allies during the cold war. The Right Social-Democrats who led the workers of the world into World War I were by no means the political innocents that Joll pictures them. From the very outset Lenin correctly characterized their conduct in supporting the war as a gross betrayal of the working class and of Socialism.

SOCIALISM DID NOT DIE IN 1914

The most serious single error in Mr. Joll's book is his conclusion that world Socialism virtually perished with the war debacle of 1914. He does not state this view explicitly, but the implication is there clear enough. Thus, the opening sentence in his concluding chapter reads: "The Socialist world was never to be the same again after 1914"—meaning that it would never again be generally so strong. As his sum-up of things as they now are, he then proceeds to draw a very dismal picture of a once powerful Social-Democracy at present having strongholds in only Great Britain, Belgium, and Scandinavia, and he gives no account whatever of Communist Parties in Communist-led countries as factors in world Socialism.

This constitutes a profound misestimation of the status of world Socialism, which is today vastly more powerful than it was at the beginning of World War I. Socialism did not die with the great betrayal by the Right Social-Democrats, but went into a higher stage. The vast complex of Socialist developments of this period—the revisionist war betrayal, the disaster of the World War I, the Russian Revolution, and the birth of the world Communist movement—taken together, amounted to a great turning point an advance for world Socialism. The historical progress of the world's workers is often marked by tragic defeats, as well as by important suc-

cesses—the birth and death of elaborate economic and political theories, the maturing and decay of great national and international organizations of labor, the loss of huge strikes and even of revolutions, the failure to halt devastating wars and the advance of reaction—but the international working class makes its way ahead nevertheless, learning from its defeats as well as from its victories. In a historical sense, therefore, the Social-Democratic war betrayal of 1914, for all its immediate tragic consequences, was only an incident in the epic forward march of the world's workers toward Socialism.

Joll's passing by of the world Communist movement as though it does not exist in a Socialist sense is his most extreme belittlement of Socialism in the face of a presumably entrenched and dominant world capitalism. But one-third of the world becoming Socialist is not to be so easily exorcised out of existence. The clear fact is that world Socialism today, embracing a whole system of states with some 900 million people, and rapidly growing, is overtaking and surpassing the decrepit and obsolete capitalist system on every front. The central political reality of this period is the swift march of the peoples of the world into Socialism. Khrushchev was speaking in terms of realism when he forecast that the grandchildren of the present generation in the United States would live under Socialism.

The strength of world Socialism, also reflected in the weakness of

world capitalism, is further exhibited by the tremendous break-up of the colonial system that has been going on since about the end of World War II. This is a major disaster to the capitalist system, and by the same token it brings about a tremendous relative and actual increase of strength for world Socialism. Nor can the enormous growth of the trade-union movement (several times over since 1914) and of other basic mass organizations of the workers and of the democratic masses generally in the capitalist countries be disregarded when taking count of the strength of modern-day Socialism.

Joll even understates the post-World War I role and strength of the international Social Democracy. While in 1914 this movement did actually break up on a world scale, it came together again shortly after the first great war had concluded, and since then it and its affiliated national parties have been a very important factor in world politics generally. Since 1918, in fact, almost every country in Europe has had, at one time or another, Right Social-Democrats at the head of its government. More than this, the revisionist leaders exert a powerful influence in the general trade union, cooperative, workers' political, and other mass movements of many countries on all the continents. True, the revisionists in power have left but few traces of Socialism behind them. Their general program has been rather a sustaining one for a "reformed" capitalism than a deter-

mined fight for Socialism. Also, their one-time affiliation with Marxist thinking has just about vanished in a composite of Keynesian "progressive capitalism." Nevertheless, the Social-Democracy, in all its phases, running far beyond the narrow British - Belgian - Scandinavian base ascribed to it by Joll, still commands the support of millions of Socialist-minded workers and constitutes a strong political force. It is these masses who must be constructively reckoned with in dealing with the question of Social-Democracy.

STATIC CONCEPT OF SOCIALISM'S PROGRESS

In his book, Mr. Joll not only does not indicate the tremendous progress of world Socialism in general, despite the great betrayal by the revisionists of 1914, but he also does not appreciate the basic advances that have been made at solving, either partly or completely, many of the elementary individual problems that plagued the world Socialist and labor movement in its earlier stages. Thus, he tends to picture rather hopelessly the appallingly difficult questions that wracked the recurring congresses and national organizations of the Second International, including the bitter ideological disputes between Anarchists and Marxists and between revisionists and revolutionaries within the Marxist camp; the quarrels between the advocates of political action and those who proposed direct action, particularly the general strike; the complex and gigantic question of colonialism; the

general problem of nationalism vs. internationalism in labor's ranks; the basic practical problems of how to win universal suffrage in many countries of Europe, how to carry through the historic demand for the eight-hour day, how to achieve trade union unity, and how to overcome the apparently impregnable opposition of the great trusts and monopolies to the trade unionization of their plants. And overriding all other practical questions in the life of the Second International—how to prevent the ever-looming world war.

Underlying all the problems and struggles of the congresses of the Second International, which Mr. Joll portrays so graphically and with such detail, but too statically, there was going on an irresistible progress in an accumulation of understanding, experience, and organization. This was true even if the Second International, like the First, was destroyed and the Third International dissolved in the historical process. The central fact is that in the intervening years since the Social-Democratic war debacle in 1914, the world's workers and their colonial allies, in the course of, or under the pressures of, the imperialist wars and great revolutions of the period, have found the answers to most of the knotty questions which tore the Second International, like the First, with internal disputes and overwhelmed it with immediately insoluble practical problems.

Together with blazing the way to Socialism in many countries, the workers' and allied forces have, dur-

ing th
practic
land,
hither
indust
day fa
tems o
the ha
chise
They
erstwh
and a
hundr
of imp
import
years,
first g
ist war
democr
strong
War I
able to
can im
into ar
bid fo
they ar
of war
Intern
ens die
The
achieve
ism, h
Marxis
half ce
more t
guide
and its
nism i
ades-lor
Anarch
pure an
other l
anism

ing the past forty years or so, in practically all the major capitalist lands, organized the bulk of the hitherto almost impregnable basic industries, established the eight-hour day far and wide, won elaborate systems of social security, and cracked the hard nut of the voting franchise for both women and men. They have also found the key to the erstwhile baffling colonial question and are winning new freedoms for hundreds of millions of the slaves of imperialism. And of vast historic importance, during the past few years, they have administered the first great defeats to the imperialist war-makers. Where the forces of democracy and Socialism were not strong enough to prevent World War I and II, they are now proving able to block the attempt of American imperialism to plunge the world into an atomic war in its desperate bid for world domination. Thus, they are mastering the great question of war, which wrecked the Second International and which still threatens disaster to the world.

The greatest of all the individual achievements of the forces of Socialism, however, has been to bring Marxism, enriched during the past half century with Leninism, ever more to the front as the theoretical guide of the world's working class and its political allies. Marxism-Leninism is the end-product of the decades-long ideological conflicts among Anarchists, Syndicalists, Revisionists, pure and simple trade unionists, and other labor currents. Marxism-Leninism has proved over and over

again in the daily class struggle, and in the fire of successful revolution, that it points the way, both to the most successful struggle for the workers' interests under capitalism and to the abolition of capitalism and the building of Socialism. It has already become the most dominant world labor theory and program of action, and its prestige and influence are irresistibly on the increase. At the present time—freeing itself from Stalinist bureaucratic and doctrinaire excesses, largely the products of many years of super-disciplined revolutionary struggle, and also curing itself from a recent infection of Right-revisionism, produced primarily by the post-war effects of the capitalist "boom," particularly that of American imperialism—Marxism-Leninism, flexible and adaptable, is now taking one of the greatest leaps forward in its progressive history. But this, too, like so many others of Labor's major advances, is not being accomplished without much difficulty and travail.

Of course, the forces of Socialism have not solved all the individual problems which historically have plagued the labor movement—else the capitalist system would be no more. Chief among these specific unsolved problems is that of the need for an ever-greater unity in the ranks of labor and its allies. Already in the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels, with their great slogan, "Workers of the World, Unite!" signaled the central character of the problem of unity and the workers have wrestled with it for many decades. But here, too, vast prog-

ress has been made since the war debacle of 1914, although Joll does not indicate it. All the above-listed advances of the workers and their allies, tending to clarify and entrench the labor movement, are at the same time basic factors in furthering labor unity, nationally and internationally. The question is much more complex than merely establishing better working relations between Communists and Social-Democrats, important though this is.

The most powerful manifestation of the growing world unity of the forces of democracy and Socialism is the system of Socialist states that has been built up since the end of World War II. Akin to these gigantic forces also is the powerful aggregation of colonial and semi-colonial peoples lately combined in the Bandung movement. Of epoch-making importance, too, in the general unity respect, was the enormous consolidation of pro-peace forces that were organized to resist the war drive of American imperialism during the cold war years. The great World Federation of Trade Unions, formed at the end of the war (but now split), likewise indicates the eventually irresistible forces of unity that are at work in the vital field of trade unionism. The people's front and people's democracy policies have also proved to be open ways to broad unity developments in various countries. And the new Communist perspective of a parliamentary achievement of Socialism is opening up fresh possibilities of mass

unity, particularly with the Social-Democracy. Already, world unity of the forces of democracy and Socialism, of which the Left is the main organizer and leader, has reached the point where it is able to block the war plans of the imperialists, to prevent the growth of fascism upon an international scale, and to guarantee the existence of new Socialist states in the face of the hostile capitalist sector of the world. And still more far-reaching expressions of expanding unity developments will not be long in manifesting themselves.

The 1914 war debacle of Right Social-Democracy, so painstakingly portrayed by Mr. Joll, was, true enough, a vast tragedy in the history of world Socialism. But by no means did it halt this historic movement. On the contrary, the disaster eventually contributed indirectly to the movement's soaring, through the Russian Revolution and other basic developments, to higher levels of achievement than ever before. One very important thing that the war debacle also did was to deal a mortal blow to the dominant world leadership that the revisionists had long enjoyed in the Second International. From 1914-17 on, the trend in the world labor movement, regarding its leadership, has been from Right to Left; nor is this general tendency likely to change. The revolutionary program of Lenin has triumphed over the surrender program of Bernstein; hence the world is now rapidly travelling to its inevitable historical goal of Socialism.

By

m
us
w
re
ou
yoAMER
that c
isolatiWe
tion v
vangu
Conve
cept in
sectionIt is
guard
manyThis
other r
contain
tion anthat co
Amo
features
interest
ing-clas
The co
ent and
by idea
working
moverm

On the Party's Vanguard Role

By JIM WEST

The author of this article, a Chicago worker, in submitting it, very modestly suggested that it contained some ideas which he hoped might be useful for stimulating discussion around a central question for all those who identify themselves with the Left in American politics. We think our readers will agree that this article does just that, and that it presents its own view persuasively and, at the same time, constructively. Let us have your opinions, please.—Ed.

AMERICAN COMMUNISTS are agreed that our chief task is to overcome isolation.

We are also agreed that the isolation we must surmount is that of a vanguard organization; for the 16th Convention affirmed this basic concept in a special, though generalized, section of the main resolution.

It is in the arena of *how a vanguard* overcomes its isolation that many of our disagreements occur.

This is no accident; for among other reasons, the vanguard concept contains within it both a contradiction and the means for working out that contradiction.

Among its many distinguishing features, the vanguard represents the interests of the future in the working-class movement of the present. The contradiction between the present and the future is overcome not by ideas of desperation, but by the working-class struggles and people's movements—provided the vanguard

plays its role of bringing class and social consciousness into the working-class movements.

There are those who equate vanguard role with direct leadership over the working class at all times. This is an idea of impatience. To be sure, the vanguard eventually earns its way to leadership of the class; but this does not mean that a vanguard must necessarily be in direct leadership of the class every moment of each stage of development.

To the degree that the working class and its allies are won over to the road of struggle for socialism, to that degree can the vanguard enjoy mass support and wield mass influence. More to the point, to the degree that a vanguard fulfills its role concretely in each given stage of development, to that degree can it break its isolation and become a mass influence.

Obviously, such an approach has

nothing in common with the bankrupt idea that the vanguard concept is outmoded or sectarian in the present period. This approach also refutes the impatient idea that the ability of the vanguard to directly lead the masses here and now is all that counts—the idea which confronts the party with the impossible choice: since we aren't leading the masses today, we aren't a vanguard, so why try to be one with all the stigma it carries? It further rejects the desperation idea that changes in name and form per se—without regard to the problems before the people, the tasks before our class, the specific nature of the Party's role—will bring about the direct leadership of the vanguard over the class at once.

THE DIRECT LEADERSHIP DISTORTION

This exaggerated emphasis on direct leadership, condemned by the 16th Convention as "arrogant" and one that was heedless of our real position of strength and influence, has been largely responsible for some of the worst sectarian and opportunist errors of the past (and even into the present).

In trade-union work, it led to efforts at "capturing control" of locals and unions. It tended to negate the united front approach in which a Communist minority *shares* leadership with a non-Communist majority. It contributed to cutting us off from our allies, to going it alone,

to a deepening of isolation.

In certain mass organizations it occasionally gave rise to a kind of deviousness; that is, because of reactionary attacks, the chief thing was one's ability to hide his Communist position on questions (not to speak of identity). In such instances, the measure of success was ability to get elected to leadership in the organization on the basis of the mass organization's program (all well and good) *but* with no regard whatsoever to questions of vanguard aims and perspectives.

In this latter case, it must be added in all fairness to the many fine comrades involved, that the responsibility is least of all theirs. The fact is, the failure of the Party to work out a concrete approach to vanguard role made it impossible for these comrades to see how they could play such a role. It is thus no accident—and here is the point—that, having achieved positions of "direct leadership" (ostensibly fulfilling the vanguard concept thereby), many of these comrades have dropped away from the Party or are on the way out because they see no need for the Party today!

While most of our errors in the past have been of the Left-sectarian variety, the foregoing may serve to show the common basis for many Left and Right errors in the "direct leadership" distortion of the vanguard concept. This underscores the folly of combatting Left-sectarian distortions with revisionist dis-

tor
bei
nch
I
our
ject
sim
van
selv
Len
We
beca
char
with
bas
clear
point
all
strug
State
TOV
SI
At
socia
work
ershi
socia
the c
ing
coun
into
tion.
To
concr
mine
toward
stand
opme
The

tortions of the same principle; of being a "Left" or a "Right" exponent of the vanguard concept.

I believe that the fight against our isolation will be advanced by rejecting both variations of this oversimplified and distorted view of our vanguard role; by addressing ourselves to the fight for a Marxist-Leninist view of the vanguard role. We are compelled to do this now because the 16th Convention charged the National Committee with responsibility for drafting a basic program which will "define clearly and unequivocally the viewpoint of American Communists on all fundamental problems of the struggle for socialism in the United States."

TOWARD CONCRETE EXPRESSION OF VANGUARD ROLE

At the heart of the question of socialism is the problem of the *working class coming into the leadership of the nation*. The road to socialism in any given country is the concrete way whereby the working class, with its allies, in *that* country may come, step by step, into eventual leadership of the nation.

To determine the vanguard task concretely, it is necessary to determine at what point of the advance towards socialism the working class stands at each given stage of development.

The organization of American

workers into trade unions, especially in the basic, mass production industries, brought about a large measure of fulfillment to a particular stage in the advance of our class toward leadership of the nation.

Even as it must still complete this big forward step (through labor unity, through organizing many still unorganized, especially in the South)—the general outlines of the next stage of advance have been shaping up.

Experience teaches more and more workers that defense and promotion of their economic welfare requires more than economic struggle alone. In addition, political and legislative struggles are becoming ever more essential, even decisive.

All signs point to the next stage in the step-by-step advance to leadership of the nation as being the *emergence of the American working class as an independent political force in the life of our country*.

It is the unique nature of this next forward step that should determine the specific, concrete character of the vanguard role and tasks today—the fundamental point of approach by the vanguard to all questions of the day.

The Communist Party in the 30's successfully fulfilled its vanguard role (and consequently became a mass influence) not so much because a depression existed, but rather because it was able to work out its vanguard role suited to the specific

tasks facing the working class at that time. (In this connection, the Extraordinary Conference of 1933, and its famed Open Letter to the Membership, merit special study at this time). Obviously, objective conditions then tended to favor Left activity but without a correct, concrete approach to vanguard role, and the correct mass line and policies flowing therefrom, those conditions would have been just so many more lost opportunities.

As it turned out, the C.P. played an indispensable, decisive role in helping the class solve an historic task. This brought about an end to its isolation. It brought an identity with the working class movement rarely equalled by any other socialist movement in our country.

TOWARD THE NEXT HISTORIC FORWARD STEP

The emergence of the working class as an independent political force in American life is a difficult task. Viewed as a stage in the political and social growth of the class of workers, it is obvious the class won't *enter* as an independent political force in one fell swoop; it will *emerge* from this stage as a result of a whole process of development.

A conscious approach by the vanguard to this historic task requires working out a series of vast, complex questions, such as: how to prepare the working class to take this step; tackling all the ideological,

organizational, tactical questions involved; how to stimulate and produce the new literature, culture, agitation required by this step; how to develop the skill, the art, of "linking up" day-to-day struggles for democracy, peace, economic security with the aim of independent political emergence; how to meet the different levels of understanding among workers; how to unite those ready for independent political action now (and who are actively building COPE today) with those who are still more or less blindly following in the wake of the Democratic Party and with those who are still politically passive.

The outlining of just some of these questions should suffice to show what an enormous, historic undertaking it is; and why a vanguard is indispensable.

POLITICAL EMERGENCE AND COALITION TASKS

The placing of this basic vanguard task has nothing in common with the effort of some die-hard sectarians to negate the struggle for an anti-monopoly coalition and the coalition struggle to complete the bourgeois democratic tasks in the South—as foremost, crucial mass needs of the day.

The placing of this basic, historic aim of the present stage, far from negating these mass tasks, provides the vanguard's special approach to them, bringing a vital contribution

to the coalitions which no other organization is doing, and for which our Party is uniquely qualified.

More, attempting to cope with the problem of the main driving forces of these coalitions and movements, it seeks to solve the problem of how to achieve labor's role in them. In so doing, it seeks to work out how the vanguard may make its own maximum contribution in an appropriate manner, thus breaking its isolation.

Viewed in this light, the movements against monopoly and for completion of bourgeois democratic tasks in the South are seen as being not solely people's, all-class (except for the small gang of monopolists) movements—but *also* as movements embracing a number of classes and groups with differing viewpoints, interests, etc., and in which the working class has special interests as well, and a special role to play.

It is, of course, essential to keep in mind and to emphasize the broad, the multi-class nature of these coalitions. But this emphasis alone will not necessarily solve the problem of bringing these coalitions into existence and developing them in a progressive direction.

If we are to pass beyond the stage of slogan-chanting on the need, for example, of an anti-monopoly coalition, it is necessary to recognize the different economic and social groups that must make up that movement, the relationship of their different interests and problems, the role each

has to play, etc. In other words, the vanguard must develop a *class approach* (based on the chief tasks before the working class today) to the various coalition movements.

To this day we have not fully worked out the relationship between anti-monopoly coalition and the coalition for completing bourgeois democratic tasks in the South and the fight for Negro rights generally. A decisive element enabling us to work out this relationship is to be found in the approach afforded by seeking to work out the chief historic class task today; that is, in the light of the emergence of the working class as an independent political force.

Nor is this question placed as a substitute for the fight for peace, for democracy, for civil rights, etc. While allowing for all varieties of struggles on these and other problems, it sets forth that which is basic to the *content* of Communist work in this period, even if it cannot be expressed in the mass movements in the most direct way at all times or in all conditions. It defines that which we strive for at this time, inasmuch as this is what the class is reaching out and aspiring towards.

In the fight for peace, it may be that few things in the beginning will contribute directly or immediately to the working class emerging as an independent political force. And of course, it is not essential that they lead directly to this result in

order for us to participate in various peace activities. What is important is that we remain conscious of this basic task; that we seek, without cease, the ways and means whereby we may advance the fulfillment of this historic goal in the course of the fight for peace.

This applies to all arenas of struggle and mass activity: economic struggles, youth, women, nationality groups, professional, cultural, etc. It is that which unifies all our work, giving it common purpose and direction. It is that which enables a Communist club and an individual Communist to find their bearings in this period, the North Star, helping them work out the relationship between mass work today and the next step towards the socialist future.

IN SUMMARY

The historic 16th Convention, settling a number of questions which threatened the Marxist-Leninist basis and unity of our Party, making a number of contributions towards clarifying new questions arising out of the changed situation, began to clear the decks for a new upsurge in the mass work of our Party.

Today, as we turn to the issues confronting the people, we face the task of hammering out the basic program of the Party from which will be projected the mass line for the immediate years ahead.

Keystone to program and mass line in any given historic period is the chief task which faces the working class at the time in its step-by-step advance to the leadership of the nation.

The emergence of the working class as an independent political force, with its own program and policies, becoming organizationally independent of monopoly's parties, and capable of building and leading people's coalitions, shapes up as the chief task in this period.

This determines the concrete nature of the vanguard role and tasks at this stage. The great collective effort to solve the problems of content involved in this historic task is the process whereby we break our isolation.

By recognizing and developing this as the *basis* of our approach to all questions, we arm our Party with the means for overcoming aimless drift. We thereby begin to give vanguard purpose and direction to our day-to-day work, which, if resolutely pursued, brings the initiative in national affairs into the hands of the working class; bringing, consequently, an initiative to the vanguard which can only come from playing a role vital to its class.

A mass line based on accomplishing this class objective in the period ahead arms our Party with a strategic, longer-run approach, enabling it to rise above a petty, hand-to-mouth, blind existence; and helping it overcome purely administrative,

pure help for and talism

It the l coura tion tems, ability stren, cies t of th ment

the t every to su lears wheti

It yards ness o vance bring class force: sense impor portar

As line, i found deviat Left.

wei
Inte

purely tactical approaches. It would help arm the Party with a policy for activity in all kinds of political and economic climates under capitalism in the years ahead.

It would facilitate the ability of the Party to *guide*, to *teach*, to *encourage* workers to self-participation in working out their own problems, to gain confidence in their ability to lead the people. It would strengthen the Party against tendencies to intervene in the daily affairs of the labor and people's movements over every little question—the tendency to try to work out everything *for* the working class, to substitute for it, to take direct leadership over it without regard to whether or not it wants it.

It would provide a vanguard yardstick for measuring the effectiveness of day-to-day work: does it advance or retard the aim of helping bring about the emergence of our class as an independent political force? It would restore a proper sense of values as to what is most important, what is of secondary importance, etc.

As the basic approach to mass line, it would provide the soundest foundation from which to determine deviations to the Right and to the Left. For, in the absence of a cor-

rect mass line, the fight against "Right" and "Left" deviations is a fight against windmills which only serves to befog our isolation!

Further, the basic mass line provides the healthiest basis for criticism and self-criticism. In its absence, criticism and self-criticism can too readily degenerate into meaningless, cruel moralizing, soul-searching subjectivity, and exercises in amateur psychiatry.

Finally, the basic mass line, imbedded in helping the working class achieve its next big forward step to socialism, would provide the spark for revitalizing Marxist-Leninist education and theory in the Party; for cadre training on a planned, systematic basis; for advancing and developing the *indispensable* role of the Party and of the Communist Press, without understanding which, we cannot build the Party and the Press.

Conversely, given the conviction of the Party's indispensable, vanguard role—a conviction which can arise only from seeing its concrete application to the needs of the day—we can overcome gigantic obstacles and move mountains, as we have in the past, as we will again in the near future.

In our October issue, Hyman Lumer will analyze the contents and weigh the significance of the new book by Victor Perlo, just issued by International Publishers, New York.—Ed.

"The Politics of Industry"

By HYMAN LUMER

WALTON HAMILTON is Professor Emeritus at the Yale University School of Law, a practicing attorney in Washington, and one whose writings have marked him out as possessing a quite unconventional mind, suggestive of the probing challenges that characterized the late Thorstein Veblen.

In his latest book,* Professor Hamilton again contributes a stimulating critique of certain aspects of

the American social order. Its main thesis is that the market with its rigid mandates of supply and demand is no longer supreme, and that business judgments increasingly are shaped also by

a host of procedures and arrangements—political in character. . . . As a result there has arisen, quite apart from the ordinary apparatus of state, a government of industry which in its own distinctive way has its constitution and its statutes, its administrative and judicial processes, and its own manner of dealing with those who do not abide by the law of the industry.

What Hamilton refers to here is the policies arising from the growth of giant corporations and the development of monopoly control of industry. This, he says, has signalled

the end of "free enterprise." Moreover, it has led to a blurring of the distinction between "public" and "private" aspects of industry—to an ending of the separation of state and economy which was the hallmark of the earlier era of *laissez-faire*.

He goes on to examine certain features of this intermingling of government and business, and in particular to describe some of the legal and political means through which big business employs the state apparatus to its own advantage. He explores some of the ways in which it turns "controls into sanctions," and converts government agencies intended for regulation in the public interest into devices for monopoly control and price-fixing.

Thus, regulations designed to assure the purity of milk are used by the milk trusts, through their influence in the administrative bodies concerned, to cut down the number of producers and so to create an artificial scarcity. Similarly, the Interstate Commerce Commission serves the interests of the big railroads, while the Civil Aeronautics Board protects existing airlines from new competition.

There is an interesting section on the use of patents as a means of securing and maintaining a monopoly in a given field of produc-

* Walton Hamilton, *The Politics of Industry*, (Knopf, N. Y., 169 pp., \$3.50)

tion, and on the use of patent licenses to fix prices and distribute markets. The securing of patents has been developed into an extremely intricate business, which no longer serves the original purpose of encouraging and protecting technological innovation, but rather has become essentially a legalistic device for controlling or destroying competitors.

Large corporations are able to pile improvement on improvement, patent on patent so that when any patent finally enters the public domain it very often represents only an obsolete technique. Furthermore, through drawn-out, costly patent infringement suits, they can bleed smaller antagonists dry and leave them at best with Pyrrhic victories.

In this connection, Hamilton devotes much attention to the corporation as an entity pre-eminently suited for establishing and maintaining domination over a field of production. A particularly intriguing example is the case of the glass container industry in which, despite the existence of a host of small manufacturers, a tightly-knit monopolistic control was established through the creation by some of the larger firms of the Hartford Empire Company. In this corporation, which itself produced nothing, control of the key patents was centered, and on its licensing of their use other firms became increasingly dependent for their very existence.

The corporation also serves well as a vehicle for hurdling national barriers. Though the export of

goods may meet with formidable trade restrictions, a corporation in one country can, either openly or covertly, establish or take over corporations in other countries. It can secure in these countries the same patents which it has at home, and so export technology in place of goods. Above all, clandestine international cartel arrangements can be effectively concealed in intricate corporate networks which defy disentanglement. Hamilton gives some examples of such arrangements which ultimately came to light only through sheer accident.

Finally, he deals with the techniques of flouting the anti-trust laws, and with the legal and economic difficulties in enforcing such legislation. He shows also how the big corporations are able, in one way or another, to control the personnel of government administrative agencies.

* * *

It is in the exposition of these practices of big business that Hamilton is at his best, and it is here that the chief merit of the book lies. But when he undertakes to analyze their historical background, he tends to becloud rather than to illuminate the subject. These sections of the book, which are fairly extensive, are written in a complex, obscure fashion, and at times their pertinence to the immediate questions at hand seems unfathomable.

What is more important, however, is that in presenting the historical and economic settings of the operations of big business, he totally neglects its class character on

the domestic scene and its imperialist role on the world scene. His approach leads, for example, to such expressions of confusion as this: "It was the accident of history that it was the men who had the funds to invest, rather than the laborers or landowners, who came to take the initiative in launching joint-stock companies."

He does not distinguish clearly between the big monopolies and small business. Thus, he impartially lumps together the use of state licensing boards by barbers and undertakers to limit entry into their fields with the use of the ICC by the railroads to restrict competition of other forms of transportation with them.

Throughout the book, the state is portrayed as an impartial arbiter, misused by the big corporations to be sure, but capable of safeguarding equally the claims of labor and the public. This leads to some rather curious conclusions.

For example, Hamilton pictures the formation of international cartels as a reaction to restrictions on foreign trade imposed by the state, which block expansion through the development of foreign markets. What he fails to see is that the foreign trade policy of the modern capitalist state is also designed primarily to promote the interests of the monopolies. Indeed, the multiplication of trade barriers, with the demise of free trade, is especially characteristic of the period of advanced development of monopoly capital.

Hamilton also tends to place the imperialist powers and the dependent countries exploited by them on a par. He equates the efforts of the latter to bolster the prices of their export commodities with those of the imperialist nations to force the prices of raw materials and agricultural products down to an absolute minimum.

At the heart of all this is the bourgeois-liberal approach to monopoly, which sees the danger in it as arising from "giantism"—that is, from the sheer bigness of enterprises. On this basis the cure, obviously, is to restrict bigness, and Hamilton presents the typical liberal proposals for this purpose.

The problem, as he sees it, is how to regulate modern industry so as to protect individual enterprise and initiative. "As large an area of the industrial system as possible should be left to competition." Mergers should be allowed only where required by technological developments. The use of patents to foster monopoly should be checked. The distribution of military orders should be broadened. And the regulative functions of administrative agencies should be strengthened.

There is no need of discussing here the merits or limitations of these proposed measures. Hamilton himself does little more than mention them. Suffice it to say that it is not in these but in the details which it presents of the methods of operation of big business that the main value of the book lies.

men
"lim
this
Gen
resp
Edit

of P
tion
the
gero

old
They
peter
easie
not
hunc
"clea
scho
and
mad

M
trine
of th
beco
Rom
prese
civili
be ar

Letters from the Readers

In the August issue, the Editor, in his "Ideas in Our Time," commented at length upon the proposals of Henry J. Kissinger and others for "limiting" future nuclear-weapon wars, and cited among those resisting this line of argument the work of Hugh B. Hester, a retired Brigadier-General of the U.S. Army who, during World War II, had held very responsible positions in both Europe and Asia. General Hester wrote the Editor a letter and has permitted its publication:

Philadelphia, Pa.

Many thanks for your kindness in sending me the August issue of *Political Affairs*. You make a splendid case for sanity in international relations. Kissinger's "limited warfare" and the advocates of the "clean bomb" are not only completely wrong but the most dangerous enemies of peace.

As you point out, the world would like to go back to the good old days when wars were limited and full of romantic nonsense. They never, of course, were really that except in fiction. Any competent student of international relations must know that it is infinitely easier to prevent war altogether than to limit it; otherwise we would not have had unlimited wars for unlimited objectives for the past hundred and more years. The advocates of "limited warfare" and "clean" bombs know this full well but they belong to the Kennan school of containment, and how can they set up a world gendarmerie and sell it unless they can fool the people into believing it can be made into a safe police force?

Make no mistake about it: the Truman-Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine resembles closely the 20th century edition of the Holy Alliance of the 19th. Much of the world believes now that the U.S. is rapidly becoming the heir of the reactionary Hapsburg, Hohenzolern and Romanov houses of the 19th century. And unless our leaders change present foreign policies in this respect, they will certainly destroy civilization itself. If there is "no alternative to peace," then can there be any substitute for cooperation?

Sincerely,

HUGH B. HESTER

New York, N. Y.

One of the improvements we've noted in *P.A.* is that it gets out pretty much on time. More important, we think the content is improving. One of the things we would like to see is more theoretical material from here and from abroad. In the latter case, we are specially anxious to get material from the socialist countries.

Cordially,
E. G.

* * * * *

Waltham, Mass.

I find the department, "Ideas in Our Time" first-rate, and overdue for *Political Affairs*. In fact, I'd like to see it get even more space than it has so far, and extend its analysis. It's so important to keep up with the main currents of thought in our country; that department helps in this regard and I appreciate it.

S. K.

* * * * *

We are very anxious to continue and expand this "Letters from Readers" section. Please share with us your ideas, experiences, suggestions, and criticisms. Try to keep your letters this side of 700 words, and we'll print them. The main thing is: Let's hear from you!—Ed.

FIGURES FOR "FREE WORLD" INHABITANTS

In Saudi Arabia, the oil belongs to the Arabian American Oil Company. That company (Aramco) is owned by Texaco (30%); Standard of California (30%); Standard of New Jersey (30%); and Standard of New York (10%). In 1955 Aramco had net earnings of \$272,268,667; it paid U.S. income taxes to a total of \$56,200. In 1956, Aramco had net earnings of \$280,811,650; it paid U.S. income taxes to a total of \$282,377.

KEY BOOKS FOR OUR TIME

THE EMPIRE OF HIGH FINANCE

By **VICTOR PERLO**

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$5.50

A comprehensive study of the structure and operation of monopoly in the U.S. Analyzes the various groupings of monopoly giants and their financial empires, as well as the merger of monopoly structure with government.

A LONG DAY IN A SHORT LIFE

By **ALBERT MALTZ**

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$3.75

This new novel on the theme of the fight against race bias as it unfolds in a single day in a Washington, D. C., prison, is now being translated and published in 22 foreign countries.

THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM IN AFRICA

By **ALPHAËUS W. HUNTON**

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$4.00

A vast continent in ferment lucidly explained by a foremost specialist in African affairs, including the varied social structures and freedom movements from Capetown to the Mediterranean, the new state of Ghana, the fight against apartheid in South Africa, Suez, Kenya, Liberia, etc.

THE ORDEAL OF MANSART

By **W. E. B. DU BOIS**

(MAINSTREAM) Price \$3.50

"A fascinating and an extraordinary book. . . . The very condensation of over fifty years history in some three hundred pages, the bewildering richness of factual knowledge, concrete first-hand physical observation, and profound sociological interpretation with which each page is crammed demand the reader's closest, most intelligent attention and reward a second and even a third re-reading."—ANNETTE RUBINSTEIN

AT MOST BOOKSTORES

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY

By **HERBERT APTHEKER**

"*The Truth About Hungary* is an extremely valuable contribution. The work of a highly competent Marxist historian and scholar, it provides a well-documented, detailed account of the upheaval and its background. This is the first book of its kind to be published anywhere, and it is particularly fitting that it should come from the pen of an American writer."—HYMAN LUNER (*Political Affairs*)

"Aptheker's book is well documented and speaks for itself. It is an outstanding Marxist contribution and deserves to be translated into many languages and circulated the world over. . . . We will try to fulfill its mission by getting the book into as many people's hands as we can reach."—ROSE and LOUIS WEINSTOCK (*Daily Worker*)

"The book is of great help in the unceasing struggle for truth. Many socialist-minded people, who were distressed and confused by the picture of events as given by U.S. official and unofficial sources, will find the material for a re-evaluation of the Hungarian events in this book."—JOHN PITTMAN (*People's World*)

"The book on Hungary is an excellent piece of work with carefully collected documents. It is especially needed now as the battle is being renewed by Big Business."—W. E. B. DU BOIS

"What a blow for truth is *The Truth About Hungary*! I am filled with respect for the author's courage as historian in taking his position against the contemporary current of falsehood in regard to Hungary, and with admiration for the painstaking research and objective analysis that lead with the inexorable steps of Greek Fate to the conclusions he presents. Aptheker has neither embellished nor covered up; he has written honestly, critically, constructively."—V. J. JEROME

256 pages. Paper \$2.00; cloth \$3.00

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

tion.
pro-
ack-
here,
an

out-
many
l its
can

many
pic-
find
this

fully
eing

with
tion
ary,
lysis
he
has