


political affairs

SEPTEMBER 1961 • 35 CENTS

- 
- [14] **The Smith-Act Membership Cases**
- [29] **Japan Today and the VIIIth World Peace Conference**
- [47] **On National Democracy (Pt. II)**
- [58] **A Working-Class Novel**

BASIC ISSUES IN TODAY'S WORLD
by Gus Hall

[1-13]

THE MEANING OF BERLIN
by Andrew Rothstein

[18-23]



Warmest fraternal greetings on the 70th birthday of
WILLIAM L. PATTERSON
Chairman, New York State Communist Party

By G

AT EACH
and sur
turbule
most r
social
I belie
you to
betwee
one w
two gr
all tha
and it
ages k
that h
outsid

Til
by-pro
domin
happe
to figh
forces

* T
Commis
form.—

Re-ent
under
Publish
corresp
and C
PRINT

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

Basic Issues in Today's World*

By Gus Hall

AT EACH of these national gatherings, we must as soberly as possible, assess and sum up the tremendous scope of activity that takes place in this most turbulent of all epochs. We are reaching the very heights of civilization's most momentous, most revolutionary, most fundamental period of basic social change in history. So fundamental is this period of transition that I believe people who will write history in the distant future—and I want you to notice that I didn't use the word "historians," because the difference between manual and mental labor will be done away with, and it will be one who does many things who also will write history—will divide it into two great periods: First, all that which has gone by till now, and second, all that will follow from here on in. For this is mankind's final assault and its historic breakthrough both from the social barriers that have for ages kept it divided against itself, as well as from the gravitational barrier that has for ages kept man earthbound and largely ignorant of very little outside of his own narrow immediate surroundings.

Till now progress was the helpless, and in a sense, almost the illegitimate by-product of the rare moments when the self interest of the small but dominant class groups or individuals and the interests of society as a whole happened to coincide. Till now progress was made slowly because it had to fight its way through and against the stubborn resistance of the dominant forces in society—the privileged minority. During the greatest part of history,

* This is a portion of the tape-recorded Report made by the General Secretary to the National Committee, CPUSA, August 12, 1961. The entire Report will be published shortly in pamphlet form.—*The Editor.*

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.

 209

the dominant forces have been a drag, an obstacle, a millstone around the neck of progress. Now the balance of world forces, as we know, is shifting. From here on in, the dominant force in society will be a progressive element. And because of this, progress from here on in will be the conscious product of the everlasting and complete unity and harmony between the self interest of the individual and that of society. From here on in, progress will move along with new dimensions of speed and tempo, because instead of having to fight against the resistance of the dominant force in society, it will now have the assistance of this dominant force.

It is more than coincidental that this week, almost simultaneously, we have witnessed two dramatic developments in relation to these historic breakthroughs. And, as we Marxists know, it is not an accident of life that both of these developments, both of these rockets and missiles zoomed to the horizon from the Soviet Union, the center of the Socialist world. The 25-hour, half million mile space journey was a giant step in man's effort to conquer the cosmos. The draft program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sets up the broad outlines of man's breakthrough to barriers set up by a class society. As our *Worker* so aptly said, "this program is the working papers for the building of a Communist society." This historic program was possible and necessary because human society has now reached the zenith of this period of transition and has placed the questions of the new Communist society for solution. Such is a broad outline of the historic phase through which we are passing.

Motion, turbulence, change, activity are the hallmarks, in fact, the vehicle during periods of fundamental transition. It is a characteristic of this period that life will present a continuous flow of new problems for solution, a continuous flow of sudden and dramatic change. We must accept as normal for this epoch sharp struggles, fast changes, including in the ideology and outlook of millions.

As we know, this moment has a very special meaning for us, the people of the United States, because it is our nation that has become the pivot around which gravitate all the forces resisting progress. It is our nation that has become the den for the whole reactionary imperialist force. At moments like this, one must hold fast to the tested moorings as set forth by our science of Marxism-Leninism, but also keep up with the developments and reflect on them with a freshness that matches these new dramatic changes.

Within such a sweeping framework, I think now we should look more closely at some of the developments that we have on hand. I think we must start by saying that since our last gathering there has been an appreci-

able inc
of clou
heighte
countr
ultra R
these n
there w
capitalis
of the d
istration
—that
One m
the div

But
tion an
Well, I
forces
and pe
the for
I'm su
have es
to obs
that th
it is a
contrar
On th
and to
Th
space
that th
lines i
to dis
an ach
of ma
that i
the So
kind-
colon

able increase in world tensions—there has been an additional gathering of clouds of war around the world—that the armaments race has been heightened and that the propaganda for war has increased, and that in our country especially, there has been a continued growth in the activities of the ultra Right and fascist forces. It would be a mistake for us to ignore these negative developments in the world and in our country. I think there would be some benefit in projecting ourselves into the shoes of U.S. capitalism and specifically into those of the Kennedy Administration. One of the difficulties in projecting oneself into the shoes of the Kennedy Administration or of U.S. capitalism is that they are not one homogeneous group—that there are divisions, there are differences in the total picture. One must try to reflect the central aim, the central direction, but also the divisions within the class and the Administration itself.

MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

But be that as it may, how does the world look through this Administration and American capitalism's eyes in the last three, four, five months? Well, I'm sure they could not fail to see that the historic balance of world forces continues to tip against them. The forces of progress, of socialism and peace, continue to grow while on the other hand in the same period, the forces representing reaction, imperialism, capitalism continue to decline. I'm sure this was a conclusion and an observation that could not possibly have escaped their attention. In this connection, I'm sure that they were able to observe that the socialist world continued to become a stronger force—that the rate of economic growth was not a temporary phenomenon but that it is a continuous development in the whole socialist world. Second, that contrary to their dreams, the socialist world did not become divided. On the contrary, it has taken additional steps to become more united and to coordinate activities even in a wider and deeper way.

Third, I'm sure that they cannot help but see the astronauts and the space ships that fly from the Soviet Union. I want to say that I am sure that the Pentagon and the ruling-class economists see more than the headlines in the papers indicate at the present time. And I'm sure I don't have to discuss with you the importance of even the technical aspects of such an achievement—what that means to industry, to science, to the whole future of mankind. Of course, I'm sure that they could not help but surmise that in spite of all of their efforts, they have not been able to isolate the Soviet Union and the socialist world from the rest of progressive mankind—from the peace forces, from the newly liberated peoples in the colonial peoples and the peoples generally. That in spite of the tremendous

amount of agitation and propaganda they have not been able to isolate the Soviet Union. The fact is that the prestige of the Soviet Union in the minds of the millions around the world no doubt now is at its highest peak, and continues to grow as this balance of forces shifts.

Finally, I am sure that they have not been able to dismiss the fact that in spite of all of the statements that the United States is going to capture the political initiative, the fact remains that this initiative is in the hands of the Soviet Union and the socialist world, and that all initiative comes from that direction. How could it be otherwise than that the initiatives for peace and for progress must come from the spokesmen for socialism?

I'm sure, too, that the Administration has seen the continued decline in the prestige of the United States. I am sure that they have been able to see that since it is so visible. The trips that Stevenson, Bowles and the rest of them have taken I'm sure have shown them that the prestige of the United States is on the decline and continues to decline. And I'm sure by now they must have concluded that they have never recovered fully the prestige lost as a result of the Cuban fiasco. It was a decisive turning point for it hit at the touchiest element around the world, especially Latin America and the colonial world. This type of open, imperialist action in this day and age brings irreparable damage so far as the minds of the peoples are concerned. I'm sure they couldn't but help to see that the national liberation revolution continues. It continues to spread and deepen. In this sense they have not found an answer to that question that interestingly enough Mrs. Roosevelt placed some time ago; she wondered, ". . . why we cannot get the peoples of the underdeveloped countries to fight on our side." I'm sure they have a couple of bureaus that have been trying to study this and I'm sure they are coming to some conclusion that to get the peoples of the underdeveloped countries to fight on your side, you must be fighting for progress and not for imperialism.

In this connection, I'm sure they drew some conclusions from what happened in connection with Tunisia. And, in a way, it is kind of a vivid and dramatic example of developments in this period of transition. A month ago, when President Bourguiba was in the U.S., he was hailed as the most farsighted statesman in the world, he was hailed as a friend of the West and as the future leader at least of the Arab world. He was toasted and hailed in editorials, in speeches, Presidential and otherwise. Now, after President Bourguiba took a stand against imperialism, and especially in this case the imperialism of France, these same forces call him a narrow nationalist, unworthy of the trust placed in him. And I think what U.S. imperialist forces forgot is that Borguiba remembered the old saying, origin-

ating in
smelled
into his
of the f
Further,
to comp
happeni
stage is
independ
In this
governm
force. T
progress
like the
thinking
"defeats
forces o
I am
Latin A
ence, in
did not
made hi
of diplo
importa
of Braz
Latin A
States i
decisive
sure tha
to stabi
and arc
was no
econom
been de
this rev
Cub
especial
and gro
of Lati
Cuba, c

ating in the Arab part of the world, that "flattery, like perfume, should be smelled and sniffed at, but not swallowed." As for all the flattery that went into his trip here, he "sniffed at it," but he didn't swallow it; and because of the forces in Tunisia, he had to take a stand against imperialism. Further, I'm sure the Administration and U.S. capitalism have not been able to completely ignore the developments in the Congo. Because what is happening there is a new stage of the liberation movement, and that new stage is a coming together of many forces into a new national unity for the independence of the Congo, obviously without the Belgium forces in control. In this unity there is included the Lumumba forces, through the Gizenga government, which brings into it immediately a very strong and a powerful force. *The New York Times* and others hailed this as a defeat for the progressive, anti-imperialist and communist forces. But I am sure that like the hailing of Bourguiba, this is premature, and that it is more wishful thinking than anything else. The fact is that as a rule, out of such "defeats," tomorrow's big victories materialize for the anti-imperialist forces of the world.

I am sure that they have also noticed that the nations and peoples of Latin America continue to move towards a definite position of independence, in diplomacy, in economics, in politics and so on. I'm sure they did not fail to see the significance of the fact that upon the very day Kennedy made his war-like speech, the President of Brazil announced the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and announced it as an important step in the struggle for peace and for the economic independence of Brazil. Other signs also were visible to them as the fact that four of the Latin American countries did not go along with the position of the United States in connection with Tunisia and France, and actually became the decisive factor in calling for a special session of the United Nations. I am sure that to their consternation they have also noticed that Cuba continues to stabilize itself and become a greater and greater force in the Americas and around the world. I'm sure that they have not failed to see that it was not only the defeat of the invasion that was important, but that the economic blockade has been defeated, and that the provocations have been defeated. No matter which way they have turned in trying to upset this revolution, they have completely failed.

Cuba continues to rise in the estimation of peoples around the world, especially in the colonial world. The example of Cuba becomes a greater and greater factor in the relationships of the United States to the countries of Latin America. The fact is that they have not been able to isolate Cuba, especially from the Latin American neighbors, or the Socialist world,

and this was really one of the major attempts in the last few months—to drive a wedge, to isolate Cuba from the countries of Latin America, and this way begin to squeeze it.

And I would say that they cannot help but notice that the resistance to U.S. imperialism continues from every front and continues to grow, including in the smaller areas and nations like Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Okinawa, Guam, and wherever U.S. imperialism has a foothold.

I am sure they have not been able to hide from themselves that there has been no basic solution to the competition from its friends, that this competition, once the economies of these so-called allies was established—Japan, West Germany and so on—continues to grow and in some fields gets tighter and tighter. I'm sure they are not going to be fooled by the idea that the joining of Great Britain in the inner six is a solution to any problem. Actually what that is going to do is to take the contradictions that were on the outside and put them inside. The fact remains that those contradictions will sharpen instead of getting easier as we go along.

These are some of the problems that I am sure did not escape the thinking and the surveying that constantly goes on in the minds of the spokesmen of capitalism, and specifically, the Kennedy Administration.

THE HOME FRONT

Now, how did the problems at home look in this last period? I think they must conclude that there is no basic solution to the fundamental economic problems that the United States faces. The best proof of this is that while the economy is moving up, while there is an upward movement from the bottom of the recession, there is really no appreciable dent in the number of unemployed. This continues as a slowly creeping, permanent thing in American life at the present time. For the last month or so, the production increases that did take place, occurred largely because of the new automatic equipment that was put in while the workers were out because of the recession. There was a whole new stage of automation that took place while the bottom of the recession was on. Really what is characteristic of this upswing is that production has gone up while the workers who were expected to go back are not going back. There is a greater and greater number involved in this development in American life.

While production is on the upswing, there are already new signs of weakness, that indicate the upswing will not go too far, and that it will be very slow. These new signs of weakness are in the slow increase in capital spending for new equipment, new machinery, and in the fast accumulation of unsold products, both in industry and warehouses, and in the fact

that exp
least the
conclusi
in peric
This al
econom
in spite
on the
spending
in these
an add
to this
period
to prod
1953 to
there w
up. I th
15 year
a fund
stage o
States.

Oth
Admin
in the
of the
militar
The
Right
thinkin
is no. 6
reache
I'm
divisio
Bowles
taking
that t
That's
look a
of for
consid

that exports are not going up. I would say, they couldn't help—or at least their economists couldn't help to see, even if they don't draw the right conclusion—that the most serious drag on the American economy even in periods of upswing is the growing size of unused industrial capacity. This also has become one of those permanent things in the American economy now; the percentage of the industrial capacity that is not used, in spite of the fact that production is going up, becomes a permanent drag on the economy, because, for instance, it affects such things as capital spending. Actually, the expansion of capital spending that has taken place in these last months has been on new automated equipment, which becomes an additional problem as the economy goes on. Thus, from last January to this June, steel production went up 31%, but during that very same period employment in steel went up 11%. In 1937 it took 25.7 man hours to produce one ton of steel; in 1959, it only took 11.6 man hours. From 1953 to 1960, a period of only seven years, in the steel industry itself, there were 300,000 less workers. And this is while production was going up. I think it's clear that what took place in coal mining during the last 15 years is now taking place in one industry after another. This is a fundamental, long-range economic problem that appears in this present stage of the general crisis of capitalism as it shows itself in the United States.

Other major developments must have been obvious to the new Administration, including the growth and pressures of ultra-Right forces in the United States. I refer to ultra-Right forces within and outside of the Administration; these appear especially in the form of some top military brass and certain spokesmen for monopoly.

There has been a tremendous growth of pressures from the ultra-Right and in it are some definite fascist fringes. Nobody can escape thinking about it—either resisting it or going along with it. There is no escape from this choice, for that is the point that these forces have reached.

I'm sure they could not have failed to notice that there is a growing division in their own ranks. In this sense what happened around the Bowles question is only a little indication of some of the divisions that are taking place in this Administration. And here, let me make clear again, that the divisions are not between progressives and reactionary forces. That's not the division. The division is between those that take a saner look and have a more balanced understanding of the new relationship of forces, and those that are rabid warmongers and who refuse to even consider this new relationship. In other words, the division is as to what

is the best method of serving American imperialism. That's really the division. But that's not an unimportant question for us.

I am sure that this Administration in its thinking in the last few months must have noticed that there is a disillusionment among certain sections of the American people with it. Of course, this is a frightening fact to a young man like President Kennedy, who surely does not want to be defeated in 1964. When disillusionment starts, that is an important question for an ambitious politician like Kennedy and the people around him.

Such were some of the problems that must have appeared for this Administration and the capitalist class of America. It is not a very encouraging sight for them. They project plans and ideas to meet this type of a situation, and to meet it in the interests of American capitalism. I think it is as a result of meeting this type of problem that there appeared what we can call the Hyannisport plot. When this conspiracy was born, it was McNamara and Rusk and Taylor that met with him. This Hyannisport conspiracy was basically a resumption of the blueprint of John Foster Dulles. I'm sure in thinking over an answer to the problem, they looked in the files and they couldn't have helped thinking of F.D.R. and his approach to the problems of the period, but they pulled out the John Foster Dulles blueprint. That is really what we have seen in the last few weeks and it is a dangerous movement.

THE DULLES BLUEPRINT

What is this movement? John Foster Dulles wrote of it in his book in 1932; he put it into life while he was foreign minister, and now it was again pulled out. It has become one of the answers of American imperialism in this present period to the problems that it faces. The blueprint is that, first, you must create a clear and present danger to the United States, and that is an absolute necessity. With the tremendous prestige and the policies of the Soviet Union, this isn't so easy to do. Therefore, you must falsify the Soviet position in one way or another. So, second, one must falsify the position of the Soviet Union and give it a warlike appearance, which is being done. Third, one must leak all kinds of war scares in order to start building up hysteria in the country as fast as possible.

Fourth, one needs hard hitting, warlike Presidential speeches, asking for national unity and full mobilization. That is the first stage of the plan—to have all this projected to the people.

The second stage is to rush into Congress for appropriations, and they

did thi
and a
the res
and cy
history-
with it
this cy
For
of self-
shabbin
up tha
big mi
he said
and wh
unilate
world,
self-det

As
revolut
smacks
Actual
indictm
much
An
and rat
tion," E
lead an
issued
figures
as aut
and in
Mr.
a top o
for gre
relation
almost
to capi
afflictio

did this time—three and a half billion dollars for war orders, almost four and a half billion for foreign aid, mostly military aid—and the calling of the reserves. An over-all covering for this is the heavy coating of demagoguery and cynicism, which has reached the most tremendous height I think in our history—brazen and open. In this connection, we must not let them get away with it, and there must be a continuous exposing of the demagoguery and this cynicism.

For instance take this question of right of self-determination, the right of self-determination of the people of Germany. Especially after Cuba the shabbiness of this idea is clear. Every time that is used we must bring up that speech that Kennedy made after the Cuban fiasco; one of those big mistakes of history that are made every once in a while. That is where he said, "We will decide when, where and how our interests are in danger and what action we'll take any place in Latin America. We will decide that unilaterally." Well, that has a special meaning for the people of the world, especially the colonial world: when the Administration speaks of self-determination, that speech must be brought up.

THE NEW DEMAGOGY

As another feature of the demagoguery there is insistence that ours is a revolutionary country, and that this is an age of revolution; everything smacks of revolution—in Kennedy's speeches and in Rusk's speeches. Actually I expect that one of these days Robert Kennedy will bring an indictment under the Smith Act against his own brother for talking so much about revolution.

An excellent illustration of this new kind of sophisticated approach and rather high-level demagoguery appears in the essay, "The Age of Revolution," by Henry M. Wriston (not to be confused with Henry Winston!), the lead article in the July, 1961 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. This publication, issued by the Council on Foreign Relations, has on its editorial board figures such as Allen W. Dulles, George F. Kennan and John J. McCloy; it is as authoritative an expression of ruling-class views as one can find, and in many ways even more revealing than a State Department Bulletin.

Mr. Wriston, President Emeritus of Brown University, and for years a top official in the State Department, seeks to convey the idea of the need for greater subtlety and imagination in the approach to international relations, especially in those areas suffering, as he writes, from "poverty almost beyond belief." Such poverty, he assures his readers, has no relation to capitalism or colonialism or imperialism, but is rather simply an age-old affliction. But this helps induce revolutionary ferment, and Mr. Wriston

urges that U.S. officials try to sympathize with this, and recall our own country's revolutionary background. He writes: "The first necessity is to rid ourselves of nervousness when 'revolution' is mentioned. Politicians often shy like skittish horses at the mere word. That is nonsensical."

Mr. Wriston even suggests a somewhat broad-minded outlook on so sacred a matter as the Monroe Doctrine. Here what he writes is particularly interesting:

One of the most striking instances of different national perspectives upon history—as a cause of profound misunderstanding—is the Monroe Doctrine. It has customarily been treated in our histories as a wholly defensive concept. From the standpoint of the United States, it was an anti-imperialist pronouncement designed to let the nations of this hemisphere develop without external interference. The angle of vision of Latin countries is different. . . . Inconceivable as it may seem to us that Monroeism could be identified with imperialism, for some Latin nations that identification seems natural.

These quotations perhaps are sufficient to indicate the tactical approach of this more flexible kind of demagogic and hypocrisy.

What is the Dulles Plan calculated to accomplish? First of all to increase the military forces, and thereby the strength of U.S. imperialism. Secondly, it is calculated to resolve the economic problems with a kind of package deal. It is supposed to take care of the economic growth problem and we all remember Kennedy's campaign promises. The rate of economic growth which he promised has not been taking place. This plan is supposed to accomplish such growth through war orders and a war economy. Further it is supposed to pass the sacrifices along to a subdued, hysterical people, in the form of high prices, high taxes, and other sacrifices. Finally, it is also a plan to sidetrack the disarmament talks, which they are not ready to go into at all, except in a demagogic fashion. This atmosphere offers the opportunity to cut them off.

The Dulles Plan envisages also the possibility of winning re-election on the basis of war-time "patriotism," and support from profit-bloated monopolies. It is hoped, too, to add some employment both in filling increased war orders and in terms of increasing the armed forces.

Clearly, America must condemn this policy. It is fully as dangerous now as it was when in the hands of Dulles himself.

There must be a real mobilization, explanation, and movement against this policy. Because what would be the actual results? The actual results would be a further increase in world tension, in the danger of war. And it does bring about an atmosphere where the worst warmongers and fascist elements thrive.

In t
tempor
of old
exacerb
dollar
will co
fundam
either i
interest
marked
The
cotics, b
brass ar
fore it
has bee
yield to
problem
truth. I
pressur
certainl
And
in the
war, an
intensif
States.
I th
by Pre
of a li
that if
decision
Hence,
war be
that su

The
course,
to com
campai
I v
though

In the long range it aggravates rather than resolves any question. A temporary increase in armaments orders only intensifies the replacement of old machinery with automated equipment, and, under capitalism, this exacerbates difficulties. Further, the program would result in a ten billion dollar increase in the national debt, each year. The total interest rate will continue to grow; this will lead the country closer and closer to a fundamental financial crisis, when there will not be sufficient confidence either in borrowing from or lending to a government whose debt and interest rate are so high that one-half or more of its budget will be earmarked just to pay interest on old debts.

The Dulles Plan may have immediate boosting effects, like a dose of narcotics, but the long-range effects cannot help being disastrous. The military brass and the top monopolies will be richer and more powerful, and therefore it is the kind of policy they favor; it is the policy that the ultra-Right has been clamoring for, and the Kennedy Administration has tended to yield to that clamor and make concessions to it. But it will not solve the problems of our country. And our nation must be made to understand that truth. Many Congressmen may run scared and yield to these kinds of pressures, when hysteria is concocted, but the peace forces of the world—certainly of the socialist world—will not run scared.

And the Dulles Plan most certainly will not change the balance of forces in the world by one iota; on the contrary, it will tend to stiffen the anti-war, anti-colonial forces of the world against our country. The Dulles Plan intensifies the war danger and weakens the relative position of the United States.

I think, too, that we should take very seriously a point made recently by Premier Khrushchev. He said that he thought there was little possibility of a limited or "controlled" war between major powers today. He said that if major powers went to war today it would probably go to an ultimate decision and involve the use of all modern weapons, awful as they are. Hence, Premier Khrushchev was insisting on the necessity of preventing war between major powers and not operating on the basis of illusory hopes that such wars might somehow be held to "reasonable limits."

WEST GERMANY AND THE WAR DANGER

The most acute and most dangerous point in the world today, of course, is Berlin. This problem is going to be with us for sometime to come. I would urge our Party to make this its number one area in the campaign for peace, for the next few months, because that's what it is.

I would say that we must convince our countrymen of four basic thoughts. First, that this crisis emerges from the policies of U.S. imperialism

in the first place and its relations with West German imperialism and militarism. I know that's not an easy thing to do. It's a difficult thing to do, but we must do it. Secondly, we must convince our countrymen that U.S. policy in Berlin is against the best interest of our nation and people. Third, we must convince our countrymen that this policy creates a serious danger to world peace. And fourth, we must convince our countrymen that this crisis can be and must be settled by negotiations. The crisis flows from the same policies as the first and second world wars—that is from a buildup of German militarism; that buildup is by the imperialist powers. Alone, Germany could have not done it before, and couldn't do it now. U.S. policy—actually, a kind of insane policy, a repetition of the old insanity of the past of building up West German imperialism—takes the form now of wanting to build up a U.S.-West German alliance. The view is that the United States will be the dominant partner in this alliance and West Germany will be a junior partner. The West German government as of now goes fully along with this idea. This alliance will control NATO, which it does now; through NATO, it will control Europe. Through Europe, it will expand wherever possible, including in the socialist world. The policy is, therefore, again to use German militarism as a shock force against the peoples of Europe, especially the working class of Europe, and against the socialist world, especially the Soviet Union. This is the policy that has been continuing for sometime, actually since the Second World War.

It is a stupid policy. What's already happening with this junior partner? What's already happening is that West Germany continues to make new demands. It makes new demands for markets, as for instance, the bickering that's now going on in South America, and there were some concessions there for West Germany. It's true that the United States is making these concessions at the expense of Great Britain and some other countries, but she is making concessions. And this is true in Africa, and other parts of the world also. They are making demands in terms of new arms, and up to now, new arms without any expense to West German imperialism, and they have been getting away with it. They are making demands in terms of so-called training grounds in France and England and the United States has gone along with that. In other words, what they are already doing, is demanding concessions in the name of building up for the attack against the socialist world and the rest of Europe. It's exactly the same pattern as before.

Secondly, what West German imperialism will do—what it has done already—is that it will move against the weakest foe. It will continue to move wherever there is a weakness in order to grab. I think we

must co
the weal
This is h
about t

The
German
making
nuclear

This
socialist
hundred
peace of
subversio
Khrushche
of the k
might o
peace to
be postp
and thi
question

The
And I
the Un
propos
what th
Berlin,
no prop
no prop
It's a v
to do
German

I w
I woul
tralize
West I
that A
"tough
ground
feeling

must convince the American people that there may come a time when the weaker spot will be the United States rather than the Socialist world. This is how stupid this policy is, and I think in this sense we have to speak about the interest of our nation and people as a whole.

The fact is that this buildup has now reached the point where West Germany talks about annexing the German Democratic Republic, and about making West Berlin a part of West Germany; it now openly talks about nuclear weapons.

This buildup has now reached a point where it would be a crime for the socialist world to continue to permit the buildup of this force over one hundred miles within its own territory. It would be a crime against the peace of the world to permit this to be a center of sabotage, provocation and subversion. And it is this that brings on the crisis of Berlin, not that Khrushchev decided that he's going to "annex" West Berlin, or do anything of the kind. What has brought on a crisis is this buildup of the military might of West Germany to a point where it will be a crime against world peace to let it go on any further. A solution must be found, and it will not be postponed. And because of this there is going to be a sharp situation, and this is going to emerge for the coming period as a very serious question.

The position of the Soviet Union is very clear in this connection. And I must say that some of the writers are beginning to notice that the United States is not answering Khrushchev on this question of proposals for negotiation. And we have to bring to the American people, what the proposal of the U.S.S.R. is. It's to have a free, independent West Berlin, neutral and non-military. Now, what's wrong with that? There are no proposals of annexing it, no proposals of changing its economic system, no proposals of cutting it off from the rest of the world—no such proposals. It's a very simple proposal—to put an end to this kind of a situation, and to do it by signing a peace treaty. Even the idea of recognizing East Germany is not a condition, although it's raised.

I would say that for the American people, the most popular idea—and I would say millions accept it now—is the idea to negotiate, and to neutralize and demilitarize West Berlin, to establish a neutralized, demilitarized West Berlin through negotiations. I think that's the most popular idea that Americans will accept, and will see, if it is projected properly. The "tough" policy in German has not gotten real support and there is a groundswell against it in the United States. There is a groundswell of feeling for negotiations on this problem.

The Smith-Act Membership Cases

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

On June 5th, 1961, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the application of the McCarran Act to the Communist Party.* It also upheld the membership clause of the notorious thought-control Smith Act, in confirming the six-year prison sentence of Junius Scales of North Carolina. The contradiction between these two decisions is obvious, even to a layman. One orders Communists to register, the other makes their membership in the Communist Party illegal. On the same date the Supreme Court dismissed the charge against John Noto of Buffalo, under the membership clause. An identical time span, type of stoolpigeon witnesses, allegations of knowledge and activity were presented in both cases. In face of this, the Court's five to four decision against Scales is further contradictory. But the decision brings back into action the discredited Smith Act. A few years ago the Supreme Court dismissed the California Smith Act conspiracy case and eleven other similar cases against Communists were dismissed. A federal judge said at that time the decision had "made a shambles of the Smith Act." But Humpty Dumpty has been put together again by the present court decision.

ORIGIN OF SMITH ACT

The Smith Act, forerunner of all present repressive legislation, was passed in 1940 as a sneak rider to the Alien Registration Act, which later spawned the Walter-McCarran Act. Originally rejected by both the Senate and House Judiciary Committee, it was slipped into the bill without a hearing, debate or press notices. Prof. Chafee of Harvard Law School said in 1941: "*Not until months later did I for one realize that this statute contained the most drastic restrictions on free speech ever imposed in peace time.*"

It was used twice during World War II—once against 18 anti-war advocates in Minneapolis, several of whom were members of the Teamsters Union. They were convicted and imprisoned. The *Daily Worker* of Aug. 6, 1941 said in reference to this case: "The people of this country must oppose every attempt of anti-democratic forces to establish precedents for the use of the Smith Act against the rights of bona fide workers' political organizations or trade

* This decision was analyzed, in an editorial article, in the July issue of this magazine, and in an article by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn in the August issue—Editor.

unions." It was a case of political persecution.

The other trial, conducted in Washington, D.C., involved 28 avowed Nazi sympathizers—Pelley, Mrs. Dilling and others, who jeered and shouted, turning the courtroom into a circus. After a mistrial, due to the death of the harassed judge, Tom Clark, then Attorney General (now Supreme Court Justice) ordered the Government's trial lawyer not to prosecute the case further. Thus a group whose wartime overt acts of a treasonable character, were well known, who had aided the enemy during the anti-fascist war, were allowed to go scot free.

CONSPIRACY CASES UNDER SMITH ACT

In 1948 when the Cold War had just begun, the Communist Party became the special target of the Smith Act. Sixteen groups, involving 131 men and women, were indicted. Trials were held and from the New York and Maryland defendants, 28 men and women served prison sentences. Later all pending cases were dismissed under the Supreme Court decision, except in Colorado where a new trial was ordered, and the one against Wm. Z. Foster, who has been too ill ever to be tried. However, this earlier decision did not affect a group of membership indictments, which are now likely to become reactivated, under the

recent June 5th decision.

In 1948 all of the Communist leaders who were defendants in the original Smith Act trial were also indicted under a second charge of membership. Seven of these are still under bail and travel restrictions on the untried membership indictments. They are *Foster, Hall, Davis, Winter, Green, Thompson* and *Stachel. Gates*, who resigned from the Communist Party in 1958, is still under this indictment. In addition there are two other untried indictments against *Max Weiss* and *Mike Russo*—the latter dismissed in New England under a conspiracy charge. *Albert Blumberg* was convicted in Philadelphia but not sentenced. *John Hellman* received a five-year sentence in Montana but is at liberty, on bail. *Claude Lightfoot* received a five-year sentence, was granted a new trial and is on bail. Including Junius Scales, there are fourteen cases, which are directly affected by the June Supreme Court decision. The Scales case is a precedent and can be the basis of wholesale indictments for alleged Communist membership as well as trials of all those presently indicted.

SCALES CASE

Junius Scales has been refused a rehearing by the Supreme Court and denied a reduction of sentence by the trial judge. His six-year sentence is actually longer than that of any

leader of the Communist Party under the Smith Act. He was a Southern organizer of the Party for a few years. Four years ago he resigned from the Party because of differences of opinion. The testimony against him was of the typical lurid stoolpigeon character, including tales of a Communist (not Scales but allegedly one in his presence) who described how a sharp pencil could be used to cause death. The fact that his duties covered two Southern states was exaggerated into an organizational effort to start an insurrection there. If he had been willing to name names, especially of Southern Negroes, to be a stoolpigeon and endanger the livelihood and lives of Southern workers, there might have been a different outcome. But he did not do so. He worked in private industry in New York City to support his family. The Dixiecrats could not forgive him.

When his attorney, Gen. Telford Taylor, sought a reduction of sentence, the local federal attorney opposed it on the extraordinary grounds: "*He has been seen in the company of Communists since June 5th.*" Undoubtedly this referred to a social affair, arranged in the home of a personal friend, to raise funds for his defense, when some known Communists were present to offer support and to help secure his release. It was of a non-partisan character. Out of this has come a new

"crime"— *associating with Communists*. To what low level is our country to be dragged by the witch-hunting Department of Justice! Scales is now ordered to prison on October 2nd.

DOUBLE JEOPARDY

In the case of the Communist leaders who had been already tried under the thought-control section of the Smith Act, the fact of double jeopardy is present, since the wording in both sections of the Act is identical. The witnesses and alleged "evidence" would undoubtedly be the same. The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution specifically forbids this. It states: "*Nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life and limb.*" Some of the men testified on behalf of themselves and their comrades in the infamous Foley Square trial—as I did. To have refused to avow our membership in the Communist Party under those circumstances would have disqualified our testimony as "experts" and subjected us to contempt charges, as well. Some of us did suffer contempt sentences for refusing to name other people. Between our own trial testimony, the common knowledge of our political views, and the McCarran Act and membership clause, Communists are actually *entrapped*, which is also an illegal procedure

under
Asid
and p
emerg
ened v
membe
choice
ciples
the rig
ism T
for inc
the wo
rights,
the se
peoples
agrees
Party
tional
When
have a
"When
political
groups
it will

Dem
the thr
It has
fight f
antede
Consti
when
war to

under American law.

Aside from all arguments on law and procedure, the simple fact emerges that Americans are threatened with imprisonment for being members of a political party of their choice and for advocating its principles of peace, equal rights of all, the rights of labor, and for Socialism. The Communist Party stands for independent political action by the workers and farmers; for civil rights, for housing and health, for the self-determination of colonial peoples. Whether or not a person agrees with what the Communist Party stands for, it has a constitutional right to present its views. When that right is destroyed we have a police state. Justice Black said: "When the practice of outlawing political parties and various public groups begins, no one knows where it will end."

FACING THE WORLD

Democratic rights are a bone in the throat of the reactionaries today. It has become a revolutionary act to fight for the democratic rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. But 1961 is not 1940, when this law was passed. A world war to wipe out fascism intervened.

Old tyrannical dynasties fell and were replaced by People's Democracies. The great Chinese People's Republic arose in Asia. New strong winds of freedom are blowing in Africa, where colonialism and racism have received mortal blows. Latin America is no longer willing to be a vassal of American big business. Any attempt of the U.S. to pose as a progressive world leader will be futile before the masses around the world, in face of political and racial oppression at home. Our prestige has already been lowered tremendously because of the continued denial of full rights to Negro Americans.

It is good to hear that an Assembly for Democratic Rights will be held in New York City in late September so that freedom-loving Americans may speak out against all forms of repressive legislation. To abolish the Smith Act, McCarran and Walter-McCarran Acts, the Taft-Hartley Landrum-Griffin Laws—is necessary to save our country from becoming a police state. We cannot endure this gruesome fascist array and preserve the Bill of Rights. The membership cases under the Smith Act are a first line of battle for democracy.

The Meaning of Berlin

By Andrew Rothstein

Andrew Rothstein is one of the leading Marxist scholars of Great Britain. He is the Director of the Karl Marx House in London, and the author of several vital works, including the Penguin edition of the History of the U.S.S.R. and The Munich Conspiracy (London, 1958). His analysis of the Berlin question, writing as he does from Europe, will be of particular interest to our readers—
The Editor.

The press for several weeks past has been full of war headlines. Inevitably the mind begins to turn to some other August. Men and women in their sixties think of August, 1914. Those in their forties will remember August, 1939. Are we back again to the eve of a new tremendous slaughter, after a still shorter interval than between the first and second world wars? The Western Notes to the U.S.S.R. on July 17 threatened war almost in so many words.

1914 AND 1939

Such doubts and fears are legitimate. Yet it would be wrong to look at the headlines out of their setting: and if we recall the setting of August, 1914, and August, 1939, this will be particularly clear. The first world war came upon the British people suddenly, as a thunder-clap from a hot summer sky, when most of them were in holiday mood. The Socialist movement, indeed, had

for years warned the people of the peril—but in those years its words had very little echo in the press, or anywhere else. For the vast majority of the nation, foreign affairs were something remote, and the diplomatic preparations for war, still more the military, were conducted in profound secrecy. The unsuspecting nations were herded into the slaughter like sheep. In 1939 things were different—yet not so different. Hitler Germany's successive aggressions and war plans were brazen and notorious. The British Government's encouragement of them was obvious. But a conspiracy existed to pretend that it was inspired by desire for 'appeasement' or by 'weakness'—and in this conspiracy the Right-wing Labor leaders joined, because they shared the hope of the Tories that the war storm could be turned against the Soviet Union. The mass of the people had from time to time since 1918 intervened massively in foreign affairs on the side of peace—to stop war on Soviet Russia in

1920, to force the first Labor Government to establish diplomatic relations with Russia in 1924, to support collective security against Fascist aggression by the eleven and a half million Peace Ballot in 1935, to demand arms for the Spanish Republic fighting German and Italian invasion in 1936-38. But the people were prevented from influencing foreign policy *continuously* by the constant refusal of the Right-wing Labor leaders to join in a common anti-fascist peace front.

A CHANGED WORLD

Today, thanks to the immense advance of Socialism in the world—from one hundred and ninety millions in one Socialist country in 1939 to over one thousand millions (one-third of humanity) in twelve Socialist countries—with another eight hundred and seventy-five millions in the former colonies strongly resisting attempts to commit them to imperialist aggressive policies—both the balance of forces and the chances of secrecy in preparing wars have very much changed. The peoples can have more say in deciding their destiny. War therefore, is now no longer fatally inevitable. "The time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed. World war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national

liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and all peace-loving forces." As these lines are written comes a timely reminder of the change thus proclaimed in the statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties gathered in Moscow last November. By great majorities the biennial conference of the Transport and General Workers' Union—not so long ago dominated by some of the most jingoistic Right-wing leaders in British history—has decided to continue the campaign for Britain's renunciation of nuclear bombs and nuclear bases (in particular the Polaris submarine base) and to oppose the training of any foreign troops in this country. Such decisions taken in the teeth of a violent press, B.B.C., Parliamentary and Right-wing Labor campaign, mean even more than they did, say, a year ago. At the same time they are also a reminder that peace has to be worked for, day by day. For this, too, was the message of the 81 Parties.

HOW GERMANY WAS DIVIDED

The latest maneuver of the war-mongers is around West Berlin. It must never be forgotten that Berlin is divided because Germany is divided; and Germany is divided because that was the decision of the western capitalist powers. *The Times* leading article on June 28 told an untruth when it said that "Russia is responsible." Well-documented

works, which the mass of the Western public has not been allowed to see, have long demonstrated that the United States and British Governments in 1945 began tearing up the Potsdam agreement with the Soviet Union, signed that year, before the ink had dried. They refused to break up the great industrial monopolies, or remove economic power from the hands of those who had supported the Nazis, or indeed to replace notorious Nazis and Nazi supporters by tried anti-fascists "in important and influential positions in the management of German industries." That was happening only in the "eastern zone." This was attested as early as February 1946 by a delegation of the then united World Federation of Trade Unions—including Sir Walter (now Lord) Citrine. *The Times* itself reported that by January 1, 1947, out of 733 war plants there, 676 had been dismantled, whereas in the western zones only 3 out of 1,554 had been so treated. Up to November, 1947, reparations deliveries of industrial equipment from the western zones to 20 ravaged countries amounted to only \$33 millions. This policy was not a chance thing. Prime Minister Attlee, on June 5, 1946, justified it by the need for "flexibility," and charged the Russians with "importing into the Potsdam agreement a rigid literal interpretation." Ultimately this flexibility led, in 1948, to the setting up of a separate three-power western

zone, on the plea that there was no economic unity with the eastern zone (as though there could be any, in the circumstances described), the creation of a separate western currency, and its introduction on June 23, 1948—in defiance of explicit pledges—into the areas of Berlin controlled by western troops. In that way Berlin was split—and in that way the foundations were laid for Dr. Adenauer's West German Republic, in which the great pre-1914 and pre-1945 monopolies thrive, and Nazi Generals, Nazi police officials and judges, Nazi bureaucrats and propagandists (disguised as Ministers and history professors) flourish.

NO SOVIET THREAT

But is the Soviet Union threatening to change all this with its military forces? Is it true that "it is the freedom of two million West Berliners which is threatened"—as Mr. Macmillan stated on July 1? Is the Soviet Union proposing "acts of force" which—he then said—the western powers "will not accept"? Is it true that the U.S.S.R. has "designs" which are menacing the peace and security of the people of West Berlin with "aggressive acts"—as President Kennedy said on June 28? No, every one of these statements is, putting it as politely as one can, balderdash—and let us add, since the consequences of such statements really do threaten world peace,

criminal
Soviet U
treaty to
man Re
which f
failing t
with cit
of the St
be no of
has anno
own pea
Democr
U.S.A. :
cedent i
a peace
they ha
ulting
through
mainly
fired a
perialis
the Sov
on the
—"save
kindly
French
ed and
and G
It prop
in such
being
miles
should
Germa
ternal
rights
tions,
guara
antors
power

criminal balderdash. What has the Soviet Union proposed? A peace treaty to be signed with both German Republics by all those states which fought Hitler Germany: or failing that, separate peace treaties with either Republic, at the choice of the States concerned. Should there be no other way, the Soviet Union has announced that it will sign its own peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic (for which the U.S.A. and Britain provided a precedent in September, 1951, forcing a peace treaty with Japan—which they had drawn up without consulting the Soviet Union or China—through a conference composed mainly of states which had never fired a shot against Japanese imperialism). And what then? Does the Soviet Union propose to pounce on the two million West Berliners—“saved” from Socialism by those kindly democrats, the American, French and British generals, marooned and helpless amid countless Soviet and G.D.R. divisions? Not at all. It proposes the only practical course in such a situation: that West Berlin, being a capitalist island a hundred miles inside a Socialist Republic, should become a separate neutral German State, independent in internal affairs, with all its external rights of political and economic relations, transport and communications guaranteed internationally. The guarantors would be a combination of powers or the United Nations—and,

if desired, the city could be protected by token contingents of troops of the Great Powers or neutral States. Espionage, sabotage and militarist propaganda would be prohibited.

A NEW PEACE PLAN

“But would not this little State be liable to be crippled, hemmed in and ultimately overrun by German Communist forces?” Here the Peace Plan of the G.D.R. Parliament adopted on July 6, 1961—kept from the knowledge of the British people by its free and democratic press—is of very great importance. Apart from a series of practical proposals aiming, through growing co-operation with the two Republics, to culminate in free democratic elections, with secret ballot, throughout Germany, and the formation of an all-German Government, the Plan provides the answer to the very question just put. It proposes a good-will agreement, to be worked out right away between the two German Republics, under which they could:

- 1) renounce atomic armaments
- 2) fix a ceiling for their armies and armaments
- 3) undertake not to interfere in each other's affairs and guarantee each other's frontiers
- 4) propose an atom free zone in Central Europe
- 5) promote a treaty of non-aggression between the NATO and Warsaw Pact States

- 6) prohibit militarist and revenge propaganda on their territories
- 7) following the signature of a peace treaty with both Republics, gradually withdraw from military alliances—including the withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases—declare their neutrality and begin complete disarmament 'as the German contribution to universal disarmament.'

What a threat to freedom! What a design for aggression! If Messrs. Macmillan and Kennedy and the millionaire newspapers which support them had ventured to publish the text of the Peace Plan, one might charitably have supposed that they had never heard of the *real* Germany of the past—the Germany of Prussian militarism under the Kaisers (1870-1918), and of Nazi preparations for world conquest (1933-1945)—and therefore did not realize what a totally different Germany such a Plan would bring.

WORRIED PEOPLE

But they have hushed up the Plan, just as they publish as little as possible of the Soviet proposals: and they go on spreading their balderdash about "the threat to West Berlin." The only possible conclusion is, therefore, that they want trouble and tension in Europe to continue. And this conclusion is being reached, even though they won't admit it, by very many wor-

ried people who are anti-Communists. It spoke in Lord Montgomery's proposals for recognition of the German Democratic Republic, withdrawal of all foreign troops from Germany and back to their own countries between 1961 and 1965, under international inspection, and elimination of all nuclear weapons from Europe (*Sunday Times*, June 18). It spoke in the endorsement of Montgomery's proposals by the *Economist* (June 24)—which added the suggestion that the western frontier of Poland should be recognized at least by the western powers, and that the two German Republics, "already linked by bonds of commerce, might bring themselves to discuss other matters as well." It reappeared in the editorial suggestion of the *Observer* (July 7) that "one of America's necessary contributions to world peace" was to "negotiate the recognition of East Germany in return for a Berlin settlement"; and still more in the proposals of Marshal of the R.A.F. Sir John Slessor which appeared in the *Sunday Times* on the same date. He admits himself that the Russians "have frequently suggested" gradual withdrawal of foreign troops from both part of Germany. He now revives the suggestion, with the additional idea of "a zone of arms control under mutual inspection throughout Germany" (which the Russians have also suggested, providing it was control of *reduced* arms), of "overlapping

screens
surpris
also su
on of
with
allianc
Kreml
emy g
Soviet
Slessor
should
East
come
that P
tier be
anent.

L

How
ments
none
louder
Govern
In thi
clear:
it. Af
protes
Berlin
betwe
Premi
the N
29) p
from
event
a war
concer
tier, fo
Britis

screens of inspection posts against surprise attack" (which the Russians also suggested years ago) and later on of the two German Republics withdrawing from their respective alliances. *The very next day, at a Kremlin reception to military academy graduates, Khrushchev renewed Soviet support of the same proposals.* Slessor also proposed that the G.D.R. should be recognized, that West and East Germany should gradually come to a working agreement, and that Poland's present western frontier be declared reasonable and permanent.

LOUDER THREATS AND LOUDER

However, the western governments, up to mid-July, would have none of this. Their threats grew louder and louder—until the Soviet Government began to reply in kind. In this connection let it be perfectly clear: the imperialist powers began it. After a short period of bogus protest about the "crisis" over West Berlin—and on the eve of a meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev in Vienna—the *New York Herald Tribune* (May 29) published a "deliberate leakage" from NATO about plans in the event of "Soviet pressure on Berlin": a war alert of all NATO forces and concentrations on the G.D.R. frontier, formation of a special American-British-French armored striking force

at Helmholtz, and a break-through there into G.D.R. territory, on the road to Berlin. After this had been allowed to sink in, it was "leaked" in Washington that "the Administration is now considering the partial mobilization of NATO forces as an expression of the West's determination to defend Berlin" (*The Times* Washington correspondent, June 21). On June 25, the *Sunday Times* Washington correspondent reported that the American plans, "still being drafted," included calling up enough reserves to replace American units "that may have to be sent to Europe in case of emergency": and practice flights by "mobile strategic divisions" to Europe and back. On June 30 *The Times* and *Daily Telegraph* Washington correspondents reported a session of the National Security Council with President Kennedy, which had discussed what should be done in various parts of the world if "the Russian threat to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany" were carried out:

more American divisions to be sent abroad
more nuclear weapons for allied forces in Europe
callup of 4 National Guard divisions
evacuation of 250,000 dependents from West Germany and France
an appeal to the public to prepare an emergency supply of two weeks' food, etc.

All this before any Soviet military

steps had been suggested.

SWINDLING THE PEOPLE

But oh, what an uproar when Khrushchev announced on July 8 that, in reply to military measures being taken by the U.S.A. and its allies, "the Soviet government has been compelled to instruct the Ministry of Defence to suspend temporarily, pending special orders, the reduction of armed forces planned for 1961." So long as the western governments were rattling the sabre, nothing was untoward—and the lie about the "threat" involved in the Soviet proposals for Germany sped on its way. A particularly gross example of how the British public, in particular, has been bamboozled is the following. On June 23 the Appropriations Committee of the United States House of Representatives approved Kennedy's draft military budget of £15,300 millions—an increase of over £1,250 millions (nearly as much as the whole British war budget) on that previously put forward by Eisenhower—and sent it forward for discussion. *The Times*, *Daily Telegraph*, *Daily Mail*, *Daily Herald* did not even notice it next day: only the *Daily Worker* and *The Guardian* reported it: neither the *Sunday Times* nor the *Observer* (June 25), usually free with their comments, even mentioned it. But Khrushchev, in the speech mentioned earlier, referred both to this in-

crease and to those announced this year in the British, French, West German and other NATO Budgets, and said that the Soviet Government had accordingly decided to increase defence expenditure in its own current Budget (adopted last December) by about £1,250 millions. Immediately there was a scream. The headline-writers were given their head ("U.S. blames Russia for Starting Arms Race"): U.S. Defense Secretary McNamara said: "The fact that the Soviet Union proposes to increase its military expenditure cannot be overlooked," and President Kennedy ordered "a review of United States military capability" (*The Times*, July 11). Next day Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric declared that Khrushchev's announcement "displayed a menacing attitude," and by July 13 the *Guardian* Washington correspondent was reporting a decision to increase military appropriations still further—by "almost certainly" more than \$2,000 millions (say £720 millions). Thus the lie about a threat to West Berlin was excuse for one round of new military expenditure, and the natural precautions forced on the Soviet Union thereby became the pretext for another. It is necessary to add that not one of the larger British newspapers, sporting sixteen or twenty pages or more, found room to print Khrushchev's speech of July 8—which would have exposed both lies and threats.

HELPING TO WRECK PEACE EFFORTS

But what is it all for? Why go to all this trouble to keep West Berlin a running sore on Europe? If the Western governments know that they could have security for their precious island of capitalism in the heart of a Socialist State, and that Europe could breathe more freely by the settlement of the German question on the realistic basis described earlier, without any West Berliner being a penny the worse, why don't they have it? Why is it, in the disgusted words of a most orthodox Washington correspondent, that in the U.S.A. "the military are adopting belligerent postures, and a war psychosis is beginning to infect some of those who influence public opinion"—whom he defines later as the Joint Chiefs of Staff "airing their opinions in Congressional Committee rooms," with a network of service and veteran associations who "provide a ready-made propaganda machine," conducting an agitation "for toughness, mobilization and any other course except intelligent diplomacy" (*The Times*, July 14)? The answer is, of course, only too obviously that these people, and their counterparts in Great Britain, don't want Europe to settle down, they don't want peaceful co-existence of socialist and capitalist States, above all they don't want to tell Adenauer to cease his perpetual rejection of any con-

structive proposals. His wrecking activities redoubled just when the Americans stepped up war talk: thus he rejected a peace treaty with both German States (*Daily Telegraph*, July 10). The next day he denounced the idea of a demilitarized zone in Europe as "twisted thoughts" (*Daily Telegraph*, July 11). On July 11 he called the suggestion of a special military status for Germany "crooked ideas," and boasted that Western Germany "had partners who could stand up to Russia, and perhaps were even superior to her" (*The Times*, July 12). On July 13 he flatly rejected negotiations with the German Democratic Republic, and declared that neutrality "would mean the end of Germany." He was also sympathetic to the idea of Spain joining NATO (*The Times*, July 14). Can anyone doubt that, if Adenauer had not the whole-hearted support of his partners the Pentagon and the State Department, he would not be adopting these tactics—which (even a long-suffering bootlicker of the Americans like the *Guardian* was constrained to tell him on July 13) are "increasing tension in Central Europe."

STEPS TO SUICIDE

These facts make even bigger criminal nonsense of the decision of the Government to admit a German tank battalion for training to this country—a decision repudiated in advance by the miners and many

other unions in South Wales, denounced since by the transport workers and to be strongly opposed by both the Trades Union Congress and the Labor Party Conference, if the delegates of unions which have discussed the question stick to their mandate. Facts prove the present emergence of aggressive militarism, backed by the full strength of reborn monopoly capitalism, in West Germany. Adenauer himself, with other leading Bonn politicians, spoke in Hanover at a rally of 150,000 German ex-settlers from Silesia (restored to Poland after the war), which was held on June 9-11. The rally demanded the return of this territory to Germany—which they knew could be secured only by war. As in the case of previous such demonstrations demanding Polish, Czech or other territory, the participants were brought to Hanover from all parts of Germany by a series of special trains. Thus, like the Nuremberg rallies of Hitler's days, these demonstrations serve not only as occasions for stirring up war fever, but as mobilization tests for the German railway system of which the military authorities take full advantage. How they must be laughing up their sleeves at the British government's acceptance of their claim to be "allies" as sufficient justification for admission to tank training grounds, air training stations and naval bases—not to speak of selling

them guided missiles, acoustic and magnetic mines, vertical-take-off fighter planes and much else! For only very simple people can really imagine, after the experience of Chamberlain's dealings with Hitler, that when the spokesmen of an imperialist Germany proclaim: "We want the old frontiers of the German Reich," they mean only the eastern frontiers.

WAR MANEUVRES

For the time being, they build up their strength with western help under the cry of "defense against Communism." More details are now available from the West German press of the maneuvers mentioned last month, carried out under the benevolent supervision of British and American generals. "Wallenstein II" (summer 1959) combined exercises in

- 1) landing an infantry division from the Baltic
- 2) breaking through on land with a tank division
- 3) crushing the enemy rear by long-range rocket bombardment from Schleswig-Holstein.

"Wallenstein III" (August 1960) repeated this scheme on a much bigger scale, using 100 naval and auxiliary vessels, supposed to be destroying all Soviet and Polish naval bases with night landings (using frogmen

as sco
bling
Repub
for a
"Ho
which
troops
tional
air ar
those
exerci
(toget
landin
port
while
Germ
other
which
12,00
oppo
many
cond
doub
territ
Czec
there
at fi
force
launc
lery.
both
was
year
Wes
to c
"Da
(Bu
uary
of a
Wes

as scouts) on a coast closely resembling that of the German Democratic Republic. This was the preliminary for a large-scale NATO scheme, "Hold Fast" (September 1960) in which over 20,000 West German troops and some 45,000 of other nationalities took part. In this, the main air and naval features reproduced those of the two "Wallenstein" exercises on a still greater scale (together with massive parachute landings in the enemy rear, air transport of attacking troops, etc.). Meanwhile, in January 1960, the West German army had carried out another exercise, "Winterschild I," in which two army corps (70,000 men, 12,000 lorries, 700 tanks) successively opposed each other in southern Germany, in approximately identical conditions on both sides (thus doubling the effectives trained) over territory resembling the hilly G.D.R.-Czechoslovak frontier. This time there was no "atomic" preparation at first, but on the third day large forces prepared in the rear were launched, supported by atomic artillery. The same maneuver—giving both sides training for a blitzkrieg—was repeated in "Winterschild II" a year later (January 1961); and the West German press did not trouble to conceal that this was based on "Day X" of an East-West war (*Bundeswehr-Korrespondenz*, January 31, 1961), preceded by "a state of active tension between East and West" (*Suddeutsche Zeitung*, Febru-

ary 6, 1961). The British press does not ordinarily supply its readers news of this training for lightning war on the G.D.R. and its Socialist allies. But the *Sunday Times* report from Bonn, on July 2, that "the biggest ever West German naval maneuvers" are to be held this month in the North Sea and the Baltic, "near the coast of East Germany," will not come as a surprise. Submarines, 100 surface vessels, and naval aircraft, "including British built Sea Hawks and Gannets," will take part.

WHY MUST LABOR KNUCKLE UNDER?

That the Tory business men who govern this country at present, for whom the national interests come second to profits, should, for their class ends, play into the hands of the American millionaires and the West German successors of Hitler is understandable. They act after their kind. But why should the British working class accept their directives—any more than it does on freezing wages? Almost all the Commonwealth countries have told Macmillan, some more frankly and some less so, that Britain's entry into the Common Market spells ruin for them—and that they do not trust his assurances that all will be well. Why must Labor be more trustful than the capitalist ruling class of Australia and New Zealand, or the govern-

ments of the recently liberated colonies? We must underline here that the attempt to force Britain to do so is part of the drive to subordinate her to American and West German finance-capital. And just as there is a clear and obvious alternative to training German troops and retaining American rocket and submarine bases—namely a policy of friendship with the U.S.S.R., of settling the German question reasonably and of general disarmament—so there is a clear alternative to economic suicide through entering the Common Market—a policy of expanding trade with the U.S.S.R., China and the Socialist countries, of immediately halving military expenditure to provide the resources of modernizing British industry and supplying basic capital goods to the recent colonies for their development as producers,

and therefore as consumers and customers. Some Tory and Right-wing Labor politicians have lately talked as though the internationalism which Socialists stand for means supporting NATO and Adenauer. They forget that the working-class movement for over a century has stood for *working-class* internationalism, Socialist internationalism—the solidarity and cooperation of worker and worker, not worker and banker. “Would a policy of friendship with the Socialist countries, and of rejecting everything that cuts across it, be popular with the people?”—those with an eye on the next elections may ask. Let them listen to the thousands, the tens of thousands, and finally the hundreds of thousands who cheered Yuri Gagarin, in the streets of London and Manchester, for four days.

JAPAN

The
6 and
announ
beginni
the Sov

The
against
import
most d
industr
divided
the Ur
ago—a
like it,
a U.S.-
U.S. G
Soviet
states—
after h

Ast
concre
of Nes
Oil Co
dollars
corpor
from
machi
high
Ti
mono
fabul

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

JAPAN TODAY AND THE VIITH WORLD PEACE CONFERENCE

The two A-bombs that annihilated Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 6 and 9, 1945—killing 300,000 people in a matter of seconds—were less announcements of the end of World War II than they were heralds of the beginnings of the Cold War. The Japanese suffered the staggering blows; the Soviets were supposed to take heed.

The surprising sweep and rapidity in 1945 of the Soviet Army's successes against the crack Japanese troops in north-east China, made all the more important—from the viewpoint of U.S. ruling circles—the swiftest and most devastating possible termination of the war against Japan. That Asian industrial center was to be the exclusive prize of American prowess—no divided occupation there; as soon as possible a separate peace treaty between the United States and Japan was to be signed—something done nine years ago—and this was a unilateral act. If any of the war-time Allies didn't like it, let them complain, but they would have to endure it. To this day, a U.S.-dominated Japan has signed no peace treaty with the U.S.S.R.; but the U.S. Government manages to stimulate fearful *moral* indignation when the Soviet Union insists she plans to sign a peace treaty with the two German states—or with one of them, if the other refuses—more than sixteen years after her armies captured Berlin!

Astride Japan stands U.S. imperialism. Its cities are spotted with the concrete citadels labelled Bank of America and First National City Bank of New York; at street intersections dance the wild horses of the Standard Oil Company; in its industries were invested two hundred and fifty million dollars in 1955 and one billion dollars in 1960. From Japan came to U.S. corporations, in the form of profits and interest, almost \$340 millions from 1950 to 1960; 76% of Japan's coal, 70% of her oil, 67% of her machinery—as of 1959—were imported from the United States at relatively high prices.

Tied, in a subordinate status, to the American colossus, stand Japanese monopolies, owned by three hundred families. Their wealth has grown fabulously in the past decade: corporation capital in Japan expanded

(1950-1959) from 2,476,800 million yen to 20,560,500 million yen.* With this overall expansion has gone intensified concentration: as of 1959, just 214 corporations, constituting half of one-tenth percent (0.05%) of all corporations, possessed over 48% of all corporate capital!

The economic picture is encouraging for American monopoly, but the political and military features of Japan are less than satisfactory. Two of the U.S. outposts in the Far East—South Korea and the Chiang gang—are owned body and soul, burdened to the eyes with fantastically huge armies, and sufficiently reactionary to please Senator Goldwater. But both together have a population of some thirty millions, neither is very rich in resources, each lacks industry, and the makeshift character of their governmental structures is plain. Without Japan—a nation of nearly one hundred million people, possessing greater industrial capacity than the rest of Asia put together—the offensive power of the United States in that part of the world is seriously crippled.

Eliminate militarized West Germany from the provocative bloc that is called NATO, and the main fulcrum of U.S. imperialism in Europe—and the heart of the war threat in that Continent—would disintegrate; such a main fulcrum in Asia requires a militarized Japan. For the past ten years a basic element of U.S. foreign policy has been to accomplish with Japan what has been accomplished with West Germany; “progress” has been made, but in Japan the U.S. timetable remains years behind that in West Germany.

Upsetting the timetable have been the overwhelming majority of the Japanese people. These are the people martyred at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; they remember the “glories” of the Tojo era when the “Asian Greater Co-Prosperity Sphere” brought loot to the rich and tears to the poor; they bear as a special sense of shame, knowledge of the unutterable suffering their military imperialism imposed upon China for fifteen years; and with all the “economic miracles” and “prosperity” of the Cold-War years, most Japanese live in awful poverty despite grinding labor.

“APATHY” AND REALITY

Professor Saul K. Padover—having served one year as a Fulbright Professor at the University of Tokyo and currently lecturing in Japan—contributed an article, “Japan Puts Democracy to the Test,” to the *N.Y. Times Magazine* (August 20, 1961). Its accuracy approximates that of the

* 360 yen equal one dollar.

Schlesinger-Draper *White Paper* issued soon after the collapse of the CIA-
"freedom fighters" invasion of Cuba.

What difficulties U.S. policy is meeting in Japan are explained by Professor Padover as due to the political backwardness of the Japanese and to verbal inaptness. The first argument appears in Padover's assertions: "The fact is that the Japanese have simply not yet learned how to use the machinery of democracy without doing violence to its spirit;" and, "Among the common people . . . apathy is widespread." The second argument appears in Padover's discovery that there is a common error of "identifying democracy and capitalism," an error, we are told, that is maliciously stressed by Communists—who are, regrettably, neither quoted nor named. The omission is readily understandable, of course, since there is no Communist—neither in Japan nor anywhere else—who identifies capitalism with democracy, a fact so notorious that only an American professor can be oblivious of it.

That Padover urges "a dis-identification between the political system of freedom and the economic system of private enterprise" is explicable in view of the fact—as even he discovered—that "Marxism is prevalent among Japanese students and intellectuals." The "system of private enterprise" is therefore in severe disrepute; to identify it with the current U.S. political system—which is called "the political system of freedom" by Padover—puts American liberal propagandists, like himself, at a severe disadvantage.

To illustrate the alleged "apathy" in Japan, Padover writes: "Anyone who has taught in Japan knows how difficult it is to get students to ask questions, to challenge, or to formulate provocative ideas." I suggest Padover confine himself to his own experiences and not assume that these are identical with "anyone's." I was not a Fulbright Professor in Japan, and indeed had some difficulty getting into the country at all—and then had my visa restricted to fifteen days. But, after duties connected with being a delegate to the Seventh World Conference Against A and H Bombs, and For Total Disarmament, I did have the pleasure of lecturing at four universities. Never have I met more numerous and more probing questions; for example:

Why does the peace movement lag in the United States? What is the relationship between armaments production and prosperity? Why is there no labor party in the United States? Can the Negro people achieve full equality without socialism? Do the American people understand the nature of Hydrogen and Thermo-nuclear bombs? What were the causes of the American Civil War? What role did the Negro people play in the American Revolution? Are there youth movements in the United States?

What has Cuba meant to the American intelligentsia? What is your estimate of the Kennedy Administration? Has the Communist Party been outlawed? What do you think of the writing of Ralph Ellison? Of C. Wright Mills?

Further to bulwark his estimate that apathy characterizes the Japanese people, Professor Padover writes: "The Left lack the power (the Communists have only two members in the Diet) to do anything more effective than to promote rioting." Only the spelling is correct in that sentence.

MARXISM IN JAPAN

In the last elections, the Japanese Communist Party received 150,000 *more* votes than earlier, and now have six members in the Diet compared with three previously. The Left in Japan—by no means, of course, limited to the Communist Party—is immensely powerful. The tremendous mass demonstrations it organized kept President Eisenhower from the country, made it necessary for a helicopter to release Hagerty, forced withdrawal of U-2 planes from Japan, seriously delayed ratification of the U.S.-Japan "Security" Treaty for over a year, caused the resignation of the Kishi Government, and prevented the passage of a quasi-fascist Political Activities Control Bill.

Almost the entire intelligentsia, almost the entire student body and almost the entire teaching profession of Japan are Marxist. In Japan there is no longer any serious debate about Socialism vs. Capitalism; debate revolves around how to get Socialism.

Basic to the thrilling advances of the Left in Japan in the last few years has been the enormous increase of prestige and strength by its Communist Party. That Party—whose ranks had been decimated in the pre-World War II days of underground resistance—suffered severe setbacks and crisis during the 1950's, and, in fact, was split for much of that decade. In 1958, however, at the Party's Seventh Congress, the split was ended, unity was restored, the Moscow Declaration won enthusiastic endorsement, a line seeking the establishment of a united, national democratic front—for peace, independence, democracy, improved living conditions—was adopted and the objective of turning the Party into a mass one was set.

This Party played an honorable role in the colossal mass struggles of the last few years—for example, it was the militant and prolonged demonstrations of over *four million people in the city of Tokyo* that forced the resignation of Kishi. Particularly with its leadership of all efforts at developing unity and its insistence upon a policy of achieving the full national sovereignty of Japan, the Party has leaped forward in influence. As a result,

at its r
of Japa
Congre
month
had do
Elec
acter o
years a
memb
twelve
than 2
Am
this ca
of wor
also; f
many
Leagu
it had
force
Th
influe
the n
the Ja
and c
class
As in
and
recen
poor
rejoin
T
millio
about
and
nearl
what
quic
belo
ers
thou
expo

at its recent Eighth Congress (held this past July), the Communist Party of Japan was able to announce that its membership had doubled between Congresses and now included over 100,000 people; the circulation of its monthly theoretical organ, its daily newspaper, and its Sunday paper also had doubled, reaching, respectively, 45,000, 115,000, and 255,000 copies.

Electorally, despite severe repressions and the notoriously corrupt character of political campaigns in Japan, the Party's advances in the past two years also have been very considerable. In the Diet, as we have noted, Party members advanced from three to six; Party members today hold office in twelve prefectural assemblies rather than ten, in 320 city councils rather than 230, and in 478 town councils rather than 412.

Among the new members a high percentage were industrial workers; this category now comprises 42% of the Party's membership. A large number of women and an encouraging number of peasants were among the recruits also; furthermore, the average age of Party membership was lowered since many of the newcomers were quite young people. The Democratic Youth League, warmly sympathetic to the Party, has had a sensational growth; it had only 1,500 members in 1958, but today it has over 50,000. It is a main force in the tremendous youth and student movements of Japan.

The Socialist Party of Japan is a powerful force and has particular influence in the trade-union movement. The nearest approximation to it in the non-Asian world would be the Socialist Party of Italy; that is to say, the Japanese Socialist Party is well to the Left of the Second International and consistently has rejected affiliation with the Communist-baiting, anti-class struggle, anti-Marxist orientation characteristic of Social-Democracy. As in Italy, the Right wing in the Japanese Socialist Party has split away and formed, quite recently, the Democratic Socialist Party, but in the recent elections this Party did very poorly. The results, indeed, were so poor that the new Party is already in crisis and elements in it are considering rejoining the Socialist Party.

There are about twenty million workers in Japan; of these about four million are members of the General Council of Trade Unions (SOHYO), about one million are in the Trade Union Congress (ZENRO), about one and a quarter million are members of unaffiliated national unions, and nearly two millions belong to so-called enterprise unions, approximating what we would call company unions. The trade unions are growing quickly; SOHYO gains 100,000 a year. Still, more than half the workers belong to no union; these are made up very largely of the millions of workers laboring in the small, family-operated home-factories, located in ten thousand back-alleys in every city in Japan. Here are produced most of the export commodities of Japan—toys, plastics, small electrical equipment, etc.,

—in a kind of industrial slavery; the work is mostly sub-contracting, with the laborers living and eating with the boss, and getting perhaps twenty-five dollars or thirty per month for a fifty-hour (or more) week. This system, plus the permanent reserve of unemployed—they total about three millions—assures the abysmally low wage level of Japan. Manufacturing workers in Japan are paid less than those in the Philippines or in Algeria; they receive about the same amount as analogous workers in Mexico or Salvador. The productivity of the Japanese worker is higher than that of the French and equal to that of the British, but his earnings come to one-third that in Britain and one-half that in France. On the other hand, the cost of living is not particularly low: margarin, eggs, sugar are actually cheaper in France than in Japan; electricity and cooking gas are lower in cost in England than in Japan.

The Socialist Party is dominant in SOHYO; the Democratic Socialist Party was largely responsible for forming the disrupting and class-collaborationist ZENRO. Both, however, are committed to Socialism as a goal, and certain of the unions in SOHYO are affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions. The 17th Convention of SOHYO was held early this August; it displayed some tendency to move to the Right, especially insofar as it pressed for an anti-fascist united front, excluding Communists. This, however, was not carried through, and the general line of SOHYO remains about one thousand degrees to the Left of the AFL-CIO. It affirms its commitment to Socialism, its reliance upon class struggle rather than class collaboration, its friendliness to the Soviet Union, its desire for the recognition of China and its seating in the UN, its demand for a policy of neutrality on the part of Japan. The clearest mark of its domination by the Socialist Party—in addition to the effort to create an anti-fascist front exclusive of Communists—is its single-minded concentration only upon Japanese monopoly to the exclusion of the decisive role played in Japanese economics and politics today by U.S. imperialism, a point especially stressed by the Communist Party.

In briefest outline, this is something of the economic, political and class realities of present-day Japan; it bears absolutely no resemblance at all to the picture presented by Professor Padover in the *New York Times*. That such articles are written by such authors and published in such vehicles help explain why the American people are the least informed and the most misinformed people in the world today.

To summarize: the ten greatest facts about Japan are: 1) the martyrdom of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which makes opposition to nuclear war an absolutely national commitment of the fiercest kind; 2) the experience of great torment from war, quite apart from the unique experience of atomic

bomb
sense
China
as the
the fa
4) the
cities,
world
treme
in Jap
7) the
Comm
centra
abort
9) th
in par
ing a
and t
move
the A
of W

A
of un
Hiro
sixte
with
torm
one
thou
agon
of th
men,
—no
thou
And
from

fr

bombing—for instance, 90% of Tokyo was destroyed by fire-bombing; 3) the sense of national shame because of the atrocities committed upon the Chinese people, and a national desire for friendship and good-will so far as the Chinese people are concerned; this desire is intensified because of the fact that China has been traditionally the main economic tie of Japan; 4) the persistence of widespread poverty both in the countryside and in the cities, with Japan's industry being among the most developed in the world, but her wage level being among the lowest in the world; 5) the tremendous prestige of Socialism and the ideological triumph of Marxism in Japan; 6) the high class consciousness of the working masses in Japan; 7) the great power of the Left in Japan and the remarkable growth of the Communist Party in the past three years; 8) the very high degree of concentration of finance and industry in Japan, with determined, though so far aborted, efforts to recreate a strong military fascist force in the country; 9) the very powerful anti-U.S. imperialism feeling in the country, directed in particular against the presence of 261 military bases in the country—usurping almost 12,000 acres of the crowded land—and the occupation of Okinawa and the Bonin Islands; 10) the existence of the strongest organized peace movement in any non-socialist country which, in particular, has thwarted the American government's policy of making of Japan what she has made of West Germany.

THE MEANING OF HIROSHIMA

A few words about the atomic bombings. Most Americans have no way of understanding this at all. Visit the Museum of the Atomic Bombing in Hiroshima, the hospital still devoted entirely to victims of the bombing of sixteen years ago, the wooden shacks that line the rivers of Hiroshima with their scores of inhabitants in various stages of disfigurement and torment. Look again upon the seven rivers of the city and remember that one August morning in 1945 their waters stopped flowing since tens of thousands of burning people had flung themselves therein, screaming with agony. This was a crematoria—a crematoria brought to the people, instead of the people to the crematoria; and here were burnt alive some 240,000 men, women, and children. After the holocaust thousands entered the city—not knowing exactly what had occurred—seeking for loved ones and these thousands likewise became infected with the poison of radio-activity. And this—unlike Hitler's crematoria—still goes on; here is a dispatch from Reuters:

Tokyo, January 31, 1961: An estimated 230,000 persons still suffer from radioactive diseases, ranging from burns and bleeding gums to

leukemia and cancer, contracted as a result of the two atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki more than fifteen years ago, according to a report by the U.S. Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission.

From 1951 through 1958, in the city of Hiroshima, 7,693 people died from the effects of the atomic bombing of 1945.

Talk to survivors. Here is a father who miraculously escaped serious injury, but his two children suffer horribly, for the bones of each are so fragile that they break when the least pressure is brought upon them. "My children weep and weep and I can only cry with them." How shall an American bear to weep with him?

Visit the Museum. Here are concrete facings three, four, five miles from the bomb's explosion melted together; here are bottles, five, six miles from the explosion melted together; here are acres and acres of buildings smashed to smithereens.

And all this accomplished by just one Bomb, and one bomb that was only a baby, like the cross-bow of the Middle Ages compared to a 155-gun of World War II. The latest models—the "improved" weapons—have fifty, five hundred, one thousand times the power of that primitive thing of 1945; and Free World Statesmen, New Frontiersmen, Churchmen—not to speak of Senators and Generals and other moral idiots—talk of employing these weapons first, of using them in quantity and in the name of **FREE-DOM!** Disarmament Conferences should be held in Hiroshima; and survivors should sit in the front-rows and listen to the Statesmen.

Americans know nothing of all this. In the beginning our occupation troops requisitioned all photographs and documents and banned all talk about what really happened. Now there is even a movement—inspired by Washington—to tear down the monument in Hiroshima erected to the Atomic Dead. What is required is national acceptance of the guilt of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; national action to support the thousands of victims; national initiative to develop the best possible research institutes dealing with radioactivity. Delegations of Americans—especially, I think, women—should go to Hiroshima and Nagasaki and see for themselves and talk to the victims. Let the YWCA, the Churches, the Ladies Auxiliaries, the Veterans Organizations, the Unions send delegations, if only for sweet charity's sake, and help bind up wounds, help relieve awful suffering, help expiate the fearful national sin committed by the United States. What is needed, above all, is a movement in our country that will put an end forever to the nightmare of nuclear warfare, and will make real the pledge inside the tomb of the Hiroshima Dead: "Rest Peacefully; This Crime Shall Never Be Repeated."

PRESENT REALITIES IN JAPAN

The headlines and featured news stories in Japan during the first three weeks of August will convey more precisely and vividly present realities in that nation. The first day of the month, the Associated Press from Washington released this one-line item: "*The State Department said today that Japan had turned down an informal request that American atomic-powered submarines be allowed to visit Japanese ports to give their crews shore leave.*" This was a subject of lively discussion and much head-shaking in Japan for days thereafter; the head-shaking came from incredulity at the callousness, insensitivity and down-right ignorance that such a request indicated.

The recurrent phenomenon of the suicide of an atomic-bomb victim attracted attention; in this case a 37-year old man, who had been ill for 16 years, hanged himself in a cemetery near Hiroshima. In his pocket was a note suggesting that "my body be used in research on atomic diseases."

A 13-year old lad was arrested in Tokyo after having travelled illegally all the way from Okinawa in order to see a ball game; the point was that Japanese living in Okinawa require a special pass from the U.S. authorities if they wish to visit other parts of Japan, and the youngster had no such document. The comments in the press about the occupation of the island where almost one million Japanese live—very much crowded together, since the U.S. military occupy 46% of the island—that this story evoked, may be imagined.

Hundreds of farmers living near the sacred Fuji Mountain held protest rallies and demonstrations demanding that the land now reserved as a firing range for U.S. artillery forces be returned to their use. In August parades reached a highpoint; the farmers had begun their activities in May, since which time, "they have been resorting to sit-down protests by setting up 'observation posts' within the firing range." Folks "sitting-down" in Mississippi and Alabama and North Carolina may be particularly interested in this news.

The commanding officer of one of the U.S. Naval Bases in Japan—this one, with a complement of 6,000 men, is the Atsugi Naval Base, south of Tokyo—made headlines when he imposed a midnight curfew on his personnel and controls upon the sale of bottled whiskey. Captain Masterson said he "was fed up with the excessive public drunkenness, increasing venereal disease and barroom brawls involving sailors, marines and Japanese hoodlums." The Captain said he was moved to act when he learned that "we were selling more three-star brandy in a week than the whole base could possibly drink in a year"—the excess was going to the black-market; moreover, "the nearby towns were breeding places for crime and

prostitution." All this was simply reported straight and without comment, editorial or otherwise, in the Japanese press.

Early in the month a veritable insurrection started among the tens of thousands of slum-dwellers in the city of Osaka; thousands fought the police with sticks and clubs and stones for three days and nights. To see an Asian slum is to get a preview of Hell; mass outbreaks in them in Japan are not at all uncommon. A leading newspaper of the gentle ruling class decided that the police were not sufficiently stern and did not possess enough really modern equipment; in its words: "the conclusion is that local police should organize a more effective network and at the same time be equipped with modern gear."

Also reminding one of Professor Padover's discovery of popular apathy in Japan was the beginning of a strike by 320,000 textile workers, and these were members of the moderate, Right-wing ZENRO labor federation. They were demanding an increase of 3,500 yen per month (not quite ten dollars), over their current pay, which averaged about \$27 a month. After nine days, during which not a spindle turned in the struck plants throughout the country, the demand was granted and the strike concluded.

The growing tendency towards some kind of *rapprochement* with the Chinese People's Republic—which, despite Washington, is an almost irresistible trend for Japan,* even with a reactionary government—was reflected in several news items. Thus, a party of four leading journalists from China arrived in Tokyo early in August for a month's visit as the guests of several leading Japanese organizations of editors and reporters. At the same moment, there was announced in Tokyo the formation of The Association of Ex-Soldiers for Japan-China Friendship; several hundred former Japanese officers and enlisted men—meeting in the building of the Upper House of the National Diet and under the chairmanship of a former Lieutenant-General—pledged themselves "to promote friendship with all neighboring nations, Communist China in particular." It repudiated war and denounced all war preparations, and publicly affirmed a sense of repentance because "former militaristic Japan had inflicted serious injury upon China and its people."

Of tremendous importance for Japan, and the world, was the rejection by a High Court of the 12-year old labor frame-up known as the Matsukawa Case. In August, 1948, a train of the National Railways was derailed near the town of Matsukawa with the loss of three lives. Twenty militant trade-unionists—of the railway workers and electrical workers unions—were

* See the article, "Japan Reaches Toward Red China," by Arthur P. Crockett, in the Catholic journal, *America*, April 15, 1961.

arrested and charged with deliberate sabotage; thirteen of the twenty were Communists. At the time, the Party and the two unions previously mentioned were leading in a very militant struggles against wholesale dismissals being conducted by the Yoshida government and the U.S. Occupation authorities.

The commercial press made a sensation of this Case, and the subsequent convictions of the defendants, in December, 1951—with five sentenced to death and the others to life or long-term imprisonment—was the basis for rather successful assaults upon the Party and the Left in general and upon the trade-union movement as a whole. An intense defense effort—with worldwide support—developed. In December, 1953, at the first appeal, three defendants were acquitted, but the convictions of the remaining 17 were upheld, and four were again sentenced to die. Appeals continued and reached the Supreme Court in 1959; in August of that year that Court ordered a retrial to be held before the local Higher Court. In August, 1961, that Higher Court brought in the verdict of NOT GUILTY for each and all of the defendants, thus confirming the charge by the Left that the employers and the Japanese Government and the U.S. authorities had been responsible for concocting the frameup in the first place.

The case developed the greatest kind of mass militancy and unity. A total of 750 attorneys were actively associated, at some point in the twelve years, with the defense; the presiding judge of the Higher Court received 550,000 letters in the two years since 1959, demanding justice for the workers. Leading figures of Japanese culture, such as the distinguished writers, Naoya Shiga, Saneatsu Mushakoji, and Kasuo Hirotsu, devoted great time and much labor to the case. As the case was being actively considered beginning this July, two columns of marchers from north and south began to approach the city of Sendai—where the Court sat. Twelve thousand people covered over a thousand kilometers in this march, and every town through which they passed had mass meetings and demonstrations. The verdict of NOT GUILTY was cheered for minutes at a time by tens of thousands gathered in the court-yard and town-square. That night of August 8, thousands upon thousands of students and workers, with torches and banners and flags—and with songs, including the International—took over downtown Tokyo, marching and dancing and stopping traffic; it was a sight never to be forgotten, a time for tears and laughter, for rejoicing and for rededication. This Case was to Japan what the Sacco-Vanzetti and Mooney-Billings Cases were to us, put together; and here was real Victory. The Government has since moved before the Supreme Court for another re-hearing, and danger still exists; but the back of

reaction has been broken in this Case, almost certainly.

And then, out of the Soviet Union, four tremendous events stirred Japan from top to bottom. First, the thrilling Draft Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was announced and even the commercial press in Japan took a very sober view of that document. Typically, the *Asahi Shimbun*, one of the most influential daily papers, editorialized on August 2:

That living standards are rising slowly but surely, that the Soviet people are looking to the future with hope, that Mr. Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence has been confirmed and that the people are guided by a sense of duty—these facts must not be overlooked.

Next, came the stunning news of Major Titov and Vostok II. We were in Hiroshima that day, and in the evening at the commemoration ceremonies, before thousands of people, delegates to the VIIth World Conference Against A and H Bombs and For Total Disarmament were being introduced and were speaking briefly. As one of the Soviet delegates—a woman physician—stepped forward to bring greetings, cries went up from the ten thousand throats—"Vostok! Vostok!"—and there behind us and above us rode in the heavens the light of the space ship. The Hiroshima Memorial, the Soviet woman-physician, the pledge of no more Hiroshimas, and the thousands of people of Hiroshima gathered together, and Vostok II in the heavens, heralding the Future and coming from the Land of the Future—it was almost too much, it was as though the Master Dramatist of all had fallen for the melodramatic. But that is the way it was, dear readers—even if the *New York Times* did not find this "fit to print."

Then came the visit of Deputy Premier Mikoyan of the U.S.S.R.—the first official of the Soviet Union ever to visit Japan—to open the first Soviet Trade Fair in Tokyo and to discuss increasing trade between his country and Japan. Hopefully, the commercial press, just prior to the visit, published sentences like this one from the *Japan Times*: "Information gathered by police authorities indicated that various Rightist organizations are planning to mobilize about 10,000 persons at Kaneda airport August 14 to demonstrate against Mikoyan's visit." Others published scarcely veiled suggestions as to what might happen to Mikoyan at this or that point along his route from the airport.

But thirty-four mass organizations—including the Socialist and the Communist Parties, together—formed a welcoming group. On the day of Mikoyan's arrival, airplanes dropped leaflets over the city, listing all the welcoming groups and hailing the Deputy Premier's visit, and I myself

saw these
assembled
professional
columnist
mass org
enthusias
to the S
gymnasit
presence
cribed th
readers t

Sever
efforts,
Ambassa
of front
Japan.

One
counter
to SOH
Washing
from th
of the g
in these
of the I
"was on
be conv
in this
the cou
a seriou
month,
of rearr
But
Council
it is th
news of

Tha
local or

saw these picked up and read as soon as they alighted. All that could be assembled against his visit were 500 steel-helmeted and jack-booted professional gangsters of terrorist Right-wing groups; as a leading reactionary columnist, Kazushige Hirasawa, explained, "the ultranationalists lack the mass organization to mobilize." On the other hand several thousand people enthusiastically greeted Mikoyan at the airport and hailed him as he rode to the Soviet Embassy. Over twelve thousand Japanese jammed a huge gymnasium to pay their respects to Mikoyan on the final night of his presence in Japan; the American press, with its conventional lunacy, described these thousands as "Reds," and did not feel it necessary to tell their readers that the Chairman of the evening was a former Prime Minister.

EFFORTS AT DISRUPTION

Several items in the press during August evidenced the developing efforts, no doubt traceable to the U.S. Embassy with its New Frontier Ambassador, to take the tack of diversion and splitting rather than that of frontal assault, in an effort to advance the cause of remilitarization of Japan.

One told of the formation of two Right-wing Teachers' organizations to counter the overwhelmingly dominant Japan Teachers' Union, affiliated to SOHYO and too far to the Left to satisfy either Ikeda's government or Washington. The creation about 18 months ago of the Right-wing splitoff from the Socialist Party—the Democratic Socialists—is a main reflection of the general splitting tactic. The nature of these "Socialists" is indicated in these two pieces of August news: when Eki Sone, the secretary general of the Party, learned of the Matsukawa acquittals he remarked that this "was only a matter of course" since naturally in Japan people would not be convicted "on suspicion only." But what moved him to further remarks in this case was that "lay criticism of this trial had been so rampant that the court had almost the semblance of a 'people's court.' This constitutes a serious treat to the democratic institutions of the nation." And later that month, this Party announced a draft platform; included was the advocacy of rearmament for Japan as "necessary to safeguard its security."

But the main disruptive efforts were directed against the Japanese Peace Council, leader of the enormous mass peace movement in the nation. And it is the activities of that Council which comprise the last item in the news of Japan during August.

THE JAPAN PEACE COUNCIL

That Council—now seven years old—has affiliated to it *two thousand* local organizations in every city and town of Japan. The Socialist and Com-

munist Parties, SOHYO, the leading women's, youth, student organizations are all part of the Council. It conducts nation-wide and year-round peace activities, centering around opposition to A and H bombs, to armament programs, to all sources and centers of war danger, to all aggressive military alliances and blocs, to military and naval bases in Japan. The highlight of its activities begins each June when marchers start out from all the extremities of Japan and head for a general convergence upon Tokyo early in August to be on hand for the holding of what has now become a yearly World Peace Conference.

In the year 1961, about TWENTY-TWO MILLION Japanese people participated at one time or another—from mid-June to mid-August—in these nation-wide marches. Thousands of people march several days and weeks, and some real heroes actually marched for the entire period from June through July through the first two weeks of August. I, myself, had the great honor and experience of joining one of the fifteen columns of thousands of marchers converging on Tokyo in August, and stayed with them until we reached a park. Then we all together joined other columns in a vast stadium holding many thousands. Here, banners and flags streaming, we poured in like a veritable river of determination and passion, singing and glowing and knowing ourselves irresistible.

In this Japan Peace Council are several former Premiers, Foreign Ministers, present Members of the Diet, and dozens of the most distinguished teachers and intellectuals of Japan. The Chairman is Dean of the Law School of the University of Tokyo (and a recent Lenin Peace Prize winner).

This Peace Council is the greatest organization for peace in the non-Socialist world and the peace movement in Japan is the most potent single political force in Japan resisting the reactionary, military, aggressive role that the United States is seeking and has been seeking to impose upon this Asian land.

Naturally, then, great pressures are developing to split and weaken this movement. The pressures come from Right Socialists, from the Democratic Socialist Party, from ZENRO, and from the governments of Japan and the United States. These pressures manifested themselves in the organization of a so-called Second Japan Peace Council, with its first meeting date set for August 15, exactly the day after the meeting of the Japan Peace Council had been scheduled to close. Present at this meeting of the Second Peace Council was the Prime Minister of Japan who is as much a man of peace and disarmament as is Adenauer of West Germany; others who were there were opportunists of various stripes notable, on the whole,

for the
The
Confere
ment
tion-
Ameri
in add
delega
of pol

Th
and th
freest
bers o
Resolu
to the
atomic
all ve

Gr
China
Indon
Unio
out to
Dr.
Hock

T
were
deleg
Repu
Prob
anc
of th
and
Cub

years
by th
Peace
partic
minim
he ne
himse
the P

for their lack of any history of participation in the struggle for peace.

The pressures showed themselves also within the VIIth World Peace Conference itself. Some of the Right-wing Socialists there—with encouragement from the Yugoslav delegation and one member of the Indian delegation—and with much publicity garnered for and by Dr. Earle Reynolds, an American living in Japan,* tried to develop the maximum discord. This, in addition to normal difficulties that would appear among several thousand delegates, including over 100 from 27 foreign countries, having all sorts of political and religious and ideological differences.

The great fact is, however, that all disruptive efforts were beaten back and that all differences were overcome—through many, many hours of the freest kind of debate—and unanimity was reached (this included all members of all delegations, including the Yugoslav and the Indian, finally) on a Resolution and Declaration and Program which were deeply committed to the struggle for universal disarmament, for the immediate banning of atomic and nuclear weapons, and for the elimination of colonialism and all vestiges of imperialism.

Greetings came to the Conference from the heads of Government of China, Mongolia, Ghana, Guinea, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Iraq, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and the Soviet Union. Messages of congratulations came from distinguished people throughout the world, including from our own country, Mrs. F. D. Roosevelt, Dr. Linus Pauling, Professor P. A. Sorokin, Professor William Ernest Hocking.

The Conference itself and the many mass meetings associated with it were drenched in high drama. One of the great moments was when the delegates from the German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic publicly embraced and called for an end to German militarism. Probably the highlight of the days together was the moment of the appearance of the three delegates from Cuba; they arrived in the midst of one of the mass meetings of thousands and as they strode down the aisle and then as the delegates from the United States embraced these heroic Cubans, absolute pandemonium broke out.

* Dr. Reynolds, famous as the skipper of the *Phoenix* which sailed into Pacific waters some years ago in protest against U.S. H-bomb testing, refused to agree to a Resolution, adopted by the U.S. delegation, affirming that delegation's general support of the purposes of the Japan Peace Council, though, of course, reserving the right to debate and argue and disagree with particulars. Though Dr. Reynolds himself verbally agreed that this might well appear to be a minimum requirement for a bona fide delegate to the gathering of a volunteer organization, he nevertheless refused to join the other delegates in signing it, thus in effect and in fact reading himself off the list of the U.S. delegation. Thereafter, Dr. Reynolds did all he could to damage the Peace Council.

Still, more than everything, was the Japanese mass; the seas of men and women and youth. Full of charm and courage and love; a great collective force; a will to live and to live peacefully and creatively; a crying out from millions of hearts; a grasping to shake hands, to express all these overwhelming feelings. I'm afraid all this is beyond my powers; I see I have only listed feelings and strung together words, but for this some great poet like Neruda, some master of words like Tolstoy is needed.

THE U.S. DELEGATION

Allow just a word on our own U.S. delegation—four delegates and nine observers. I think it did itself proud and made an honorable contribution to the success of the Conference. Its differences were greater than its numbers but on one thing all were united—the need for peace in the world and the hellish nature of the New Weapons and the necessity of banishing them from the earth. With us—as I'm sure with all the other delegations—not every member would have agreed altogether with every word uttered and every resolution or declaration or proposal adopted—at least to each of its details. Yet unanimity was reached on the basis of the central demands of our time; this was true of the U.S. delegation and it was true of the VIIth World Conference as a whole.

In our delegation, two trade unions were represented officially—for the first time, I think, to a World Peace Conference: Mr. Russ Nixon of the United Electrical Workers and Mr. Robert Moore of the International Longshore and Warehouse Workers Union. Dr. Corliss Lamont, distinguished philosopher, civil libertarian and public figure, was a most active member of the delegation. The elected Chairman of our group was Mr. Nixon; his patience, good-humor, diligence, conscientiousness, and deep knowledge were absolutely indispensable. Certainly, the one more responsible than anyone else for whatever positive contributions may have come from the U.S. Delegation at this VIIth Conference was its Chairman.

Most important in bringing about a U.S. delegation was the Provisional Committee set up in the United States to assist the work of the Japan Peace Council. Here the Reverend Stephen Fritchman of Los Angeles, Mr. John H. Kelly, Jr. of Hawaii, Mrs. Jeannette Turner and Mr. Norval Welch of New York City, have done yeoman labors, with a minimum of any kind of acknowledgment. The whole story of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, of the Japan Peace Council, of these World Peace Conferences must be brought to the entire American people. For this a Permanent U.S. Committee clearly is needed, and it should strive for the widest possible breadth and for really powerful delegations in the future—delegations representing

completely as possible the various peace groups, the labor movement, women's organizations, the Negro people, youth, various national minority groupings, and coming from every possible section of our country.

There is reason to expect that disruptive attacks upon the Japan Peace Council will continue—not only inside the country but elsewhere and not least, perhaps, in the United States; this makes all the more urgent the quickest possible efforts to strengthen its work here.

As an integral part of my report on Japan today and on the VIIth World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, and For Promotion of Total Disarmament, we publish below the complete text of the DECLARATION unanimously adopted by the over ten thousand delegates to that Conference, in Tokyo, on August 14, 1961:

* * *

The successful launching of manned spaceships symbolizes a new age open to mankind, an age in which peace can be won. This clearly demonstrates that it is an absurdity to wage war and kill each other with nuclear weapons on this small globe.

Total disarmament, including a ban on atomic and hydrogen bombs, must be regarded not as an unattainable ideal, but as something which can be achieved by the struggle of the people.

This new stage in the world situation is characterized also by the rapid disintegration of the colonial system and imperialist domination. The movements of the oppressed peoples for independence and freedom, and the severing of the shackles of colonial and imperialist rule, are sweeping over Asia, Africa and Latin America, like a fire that cannot be stopped.

Such developments in the march of human history inevitably isolate and render insecure those forces that benefit from the continuance of the Cold War and the maintenance of the colonial system, leading them to engage in hysterical and desperate efforts to rehabilitate their crumbling policy of strength.

The nuclear strategical system maintained by the United States, is being intensified in West Germany in Europe, Japan in the Far East, as well as in other parts of the world. Military forces are being armed with nuclear weapons and military bases turned into missile launching sites. Related to this, ominous threats are being made in the United States to resume nuclear-weapons tests, and the testing by France continues.

No one can guarantee that local wars, which may be caused by military provocations based on the false policy of strength, will not spark a total nuclear war. The existence of aggressive military alliances and foreign military bases increases this danger. The cloud of the danger of nuclear war hangs oppressively over mankind.

Against this background of the world situation, the Seventh World Confer-

ence was convened in Tokyo, the capital of Japan, under the banner "A ban on atomic and hydrogen bombs and for promotion of total disarmament." Ten thousand delegates from all parts of Japan and 110 overseas delegates from 27 countries and 8 international organizations participated in the Conference, firmly determined never to permit military provocations in any parts of the world, and to prevent resumption of nuclear weapons tests.

The Conference reaffirmed that the basic policies of the movement laid down by the six preceding conferences were correct. Earnest discussions on further developing the movement were held on the basis of past achievement.

The Conference has proved to be the place where friends of peace, who represent an overriding desire for peace found in every part of the world, came to meet to weld their unity. Delegates from Cuba, whose people recently defeated the aggression of U.S. imperialists, and delegates sent by U.S. peace forces joyously embraced each other on the stage of the Conference hall to thunderous applause and cooperated closely as defenders of peace.

It is because all the delegates are bound together by a single common duty—the sublime duty of emancipating mankind from the threat of nuclear war—that such firm unity has been formed among delegates with different ideologies and beliefs, and from countries with different social systems.

Conscious of this duty, all of the delegates of Japan and other parts of the world expressed their determination to devote all their energies to smash all attempts of the forces preparing nuclear warfare, and orient politics toward the goal suitable to the new era—that of ensuring the victory of peace. They unanimously decided to organize common action to achieve this end.

This is the time when the movement against atomic and hydrogen bombs, which is devoted to the humanitarian cause of defending the life and happiness of mankind, precisely because of this very humanitarian motivation, must join issue with the forces threatening nuclear war. Only by such resolute action can the movement loyally fulfill the pledge inscribed on the atomic bomb memorial in Hiroshima: "Sleep peacefully. This crime shall never be repeated."

The movement against atomic and hydrogen bombs is now entrenched deeply and widely among the people. It is from the people that the movement draws its vast strength.

Calling for action and staying always close to the people, we arrive at truth. For this purpose, the All-Japan peace march, covering a total length of 20,000 kilometers was held this year, and laid the foundation for the success of the Conference by winning the participation of more than 20 million people.

Truth can penetrate walls, however thick they may be, and is bound to come out victorious. Confident in the great strength of the defenders of peace who are so many in Japan and throughout the world, we will continue to go ahead untiringly toward a bright future where mankind will be set free from the menace of nuclear warfare.

This declaration is made in the name of the Seventh World Conference.

On National Democracy [Pt. II]*

by B. Ponomarov

THE PEOPLES OF the former colonial countries have won their independence both through armed struggle and in a non-military way. But in all cases independence has been gained as a result of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic, national-liberation struggle. It has been waged by the main classes and social groups of these countries: the workers, peasants, professionals, artisans and the national bourgeoisie.

This struggle has been spearheaded against imperialism as the butcher and oppressor of the peoples. Its main task is to get rid of the grip of imperialism, of foreign domination. That is why it is an anti-imperialist revolution.

Imperialism has an ally in the colonial countries first of all in the feudal top group, which seeks to preserve the remnants of medievalism which fetter the development of the productive forces. It preaches and defends tribal disunity. To sweep out feudalism and the remnants of medievalism is one of the important tasks of the revolution.

That is why it is an anti-feudal revolution.

The principal aim of the revolution is to win national freedom and independence, to cast off the yoke of colonialism. That is why it is a

national-liberation revolution.

The main way to consolidate the national freedom won in struggle and to ensure social progress is to give the people broad democratic rights, to establish a democratic system. That is why it is a democratic revolution.

All these tasks can be successfully accomplished through the building and development of a state of national democracy. What makes national democracy important is that, arising in the course of the development and deepening of the national-liberation revolution, it consolidates and extends its victory.

It is very important that national independence and democracy are combined in a state of national democracy. Representatives of the progressive forces of the nation are at the helm in such a state. They take into their hands the banner of national independence and ensure the country's advance along the road of social progress. As for the liberated countries where the peoples are still deprived of democratic freedoms, struggle for the establishment of national democracy enables the progressive forces to sweep out the remnants of the colonial administration,

* The first part of this article appeared in the August issue.

to wrest power from national traitors who are in the service of imperialism and to take the destinies of their countries into their own hands.

Countries stand at different levels of economic, political and cultural development. In their overwhelming majority they represent agrarian countries with poorly developed productive forces, exceedingly backward technically and economically. In many of them the population is still divided into tribes and the process of formation of nations has not been completed as yet. A national democracy creates the conditions for the successful overcoming of backwardness, for the consolidation of nations and the strengthening of the democratic forces.

DIFFERENTIATION OF CLASS FORCES

It goes without saying that the deepening of the anti-imperialist revolution makes inevitable a definite differentiation of the class forces. All the patriotic forces of the nation unite in the period of the struggle for liberation from colonial oppression. The national bourgeoisie, a considerable part of the landlords, the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia participate in this struggle. Subsequently, however, a differentiation of forces takes place: the workers want a shorter working day and higher wages, the peasants

want to get land and a chance to enjoy the fruits of their labor. The workers, peasants and intelligentsia strive for democratic rights and freedoms. The capitalists, on the other hand, seek to extract the utmost profits and the landlords want to keep their estates. In other words the aspirations of the progressive forces, their striving to attain social progress, to strengthen national independence run up against the resistance of reactionary circles supported by foreign imperialists.

Naturally such processes in the countries emancipated from imperialist rule arise not at the will or desire of some or other parties or personalities, but because of the juxtaposition of the basic interests of the different classes. The policy of the national bourgeoisie is contradictory. It takes part in the struggle against colonialism, trying to weaken the grip of the foreign monopolies over the national economy and at the same time maintains contact with the imperialist powers and enables them to make more capital investments. While seeking to curb and weaken feudalism, the national bourgeoisie at the same time makes concessions to the landlords, maintaining an alliance with them against the democratic forces. Expansion of national industry and nationalization of foreign capital is advantageous for the national bourgeoisie. It favors the country's industrialization and is

willing to accept an expansion of the state sector. But the upper national bourgeoisie wants to apply this policy on the basis of capitalist methods. It supports the monopolists in their drive on the working people. Calling on the people to cooperate in carrying out the task of economic development, it at the same time reinforces the bureaucratic machine, refuses to extend democracy and to take measures for improving the lot of the people.

The national-liberation revolutions can be consummated only through resolute struggle against imperialism and the internal reactionary forces. Only the struggle of the masses decides the question of establishing a national democracy. The main thing is to find (taking into account the specific features of the economic, political and cultural life of the peoples) the most expedient forms of uniting all the healthy forces of the nation in the struggle for uprooting imperialism and the remnants of feudalism and advancing along the road of social progress.

The experience of states recently liberated from imperialist bondage shows that nationalization of foreign banks, and the property of the monopolies, and setting-up of state enterprises, banks, etc., brings about a more progressive form of ownership than private ownership, namely, state ownership of the means of production. State ownership is a great force. Its development and consoli-

dation in a national democracy make it possible to press back big private capital, enable the progressive forces to take ever more important positions in production and to increase their political influence.

What makes the Communists strong is that they find new ways and forms of struggle which most properly lead to the defense of the people's basic interests. The idea of a national democracy, put forward by the Communist and Workers' parties, is not a product of arm-chair contemplation: this idea is born of life itself.

The proposition on a national democracy is a Marxist-Leninist theoretical proposition. It is not a question of classifying all the liberated states in some definite categories and stating: these belong to one category, these to another, or to a third. Such an approach would be stereotyped and harmful. It is important to stress something else: a national democracy opens the way to the reinforcement of political and economic independence, to social progress. In real life there are already liberated countries which have made a number of big steps on the road of social progress: they restrict the development of capitalism, dislodge the imperialist monopolies from the economy, create and strengthen the state sector of the economy, carry out land reforms in the interest of the peasantry; they have granted democratic freedoms to all sections of the

nation and have created the prerequisites for establishing a national democracy. The peoples themselves will decide what country will follow the road of national democracy.

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF NATIONAL DEMOCRACY

What are the features of a national democracy? A national democracy is a state which consistently upholds its political and economic independence, fights against imperialism and its military blocs, against military bases on its territory.

Without ensuring political and economic independence there can be no question of a genuinely sovereign country. Political independence enables the peoples fully to drive the imperialists out of their countries, to choose such a road of development as would enable them in historically brief periods to attain national regeneration, to build up a national economy and to advance the material and cultural standards of the population.

The imperialists, as pointed out earlier, are doing everything to restrict the national sovereignty of the liberated countries, to keep them in economic dependence and to draw them into military blocs. In the countries inveigled in military blocs—Pakistan, Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines—the U.S. imperialists are the actual masters. In many other

countries—Tunisia, Libya, Kenya, Morocco, Liberia—the imperialist countries have set up their military bases. They are exerting strong ideological influence on them by circulating misleading literature, special radio and TV broadcasts.

The results of all this is conclusively demonstrated by the example of Pakistan, whose rulers have harnessed the country to imperialist military blocs. Pakistan is spending about 70 per cent of her budget for military purposes. The imperialist monopolies are resisting any attempt to build up her heavy industries. Moreover, the existing poorly developed heavy industry is being curtailed. The agrarian reform is of a limited nature and actually preserves the land estates intact. There is a sharp food shortage in the country, a rationing system has been introduced and the majority of the population is starving.

The liberated countries, underdeveloped economically, are faced by a number of common tasks which characterize the aims and content of today's national-liberation revolutions: consolidation and reinforcement of political independence in the struggle against imperialism; elimination of the grip of foreign capital on the economy, liquidation of unequal economic relations with the developed capitalist countries; rapid development of the productive forces through elimination of the survivals of medievalism, advance

of the national industry and agriculture and abolition of the one-sided structure of the economy; sharp improvement of the living conditions and rapid cultural advancement of the population.

These tasks are interconnected, they comprise the elements of one common problem, namely, the liberation of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America from imperialist exploitation, their national regeneration. It is impossible to achieve genuine independence without abolishing the positions of the foreign monopolies in the economy, without creating a material basis for further independent development—a strong, independent national economy, particularly heavy industry. In its turn, economic development can be attained if all obstacles are removed from its path, namely dependence on imperialist powers, the grip of foreign monopolies and survivals of the past.

The establishment of a state sector of industry is an effective means of ensuring economic independence: in the liberated countries this sector plays a progressive part, it helps to concentrate efforts on the development of decisive economic branches, greatly to accelerate the rates of economic growth and undermine the positions of the imperialist monopolies. Development of a state sector in a national democracy, its conversion into the key sector of the country's economy, can prepare the mate-

rial basis for the gradual transition to a non-capitalist road of development.

A national democracy is a state fighting against both the old and the new forms of colonialism and against the penetration of imperialist capital. In conditions when the imperialists are devising new forms and methods of colonial exploitation, the peoples must be extremely vigilant as regards the intrigues of the colonialists. The policy of colonialism in new forms is just as unacceptable to the peoples as in the old forms. They want to live in freedom and to dispose of their wealth themselves.

DANGER OF DESPOTISM

A national democracy is a state which rejects dictatorial and despotic methods of government. The experience of history shows that after the attainment of national independence the upper local bourgeoisie and big landlords try to establish a reactionary, anti-democratic system in the country. The danger of despotic regimes is real in many countries. In a number of them they have already been established. The authorities of Pakistan are brutally persecuting the participants in the democratic movement. Political parties and democratic organizations have been banned, strict censorship has been introduced, there is a law

punishing the "convocation or attendance of meetings and demonstrations on a political basis" by seven years of strict imprisonment and "strikes and agitation" by ten years.

The administrative authorities in the United Arab Republic are more and more often resorting to reactionary terroristic methods against revered anti-imperialist fighters, against foremost representatives of the working class and the masses. Court trials follow one after another. Hundreds of selfless fighters for national independence and democracy are in exile or in prisons. A number of facts show that reprisals are also employed by the authorities in Iraq, whose government was placed at the helm as a result of the active support by the working people and their democratic organizations.

Restoring to the establishment of dictatorial regimes, the reactionary upper bourgeoisie weakens the unity of the nation in the struggle against imperialism, strikes a blow at the national interests. Such a policy narrows down the social basis in the struggle against foreign imperialists and in the long run may lead to the loss of national independence. Resolute struggle against attempts to establish dictatorial and despotic regimes is the way to strengthen the solidarity of the nation and its positions in the fight against colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

A national democracy is a state in which the people are ensured broad democratic rights and freedoms, the opportunity to work for the enactment of an agrarian reform and other democratic and social changes. A decisive moment in the development of a national democratic revolution, the consolidation of its successes and its advance to a higher stage is the granting of democratic rights and freedoms to the people—freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, the right to the establishment of political parties and social organizations, to take part in shaping government policy. The broader the democratic freedoms, the greater the influence of the masses on the country's destiny, the better the state expresses the interests of the nation, the stronger it is, and the more selflessly the working masses defend their gains.

Having cast off the yoke of colonialism, the masses naturally want to improve their position, to enact a number of reforms in their favor. Agrarian reforms are especially important and urgent for the liberated countries: the peasantry makes up more than half of their population, in the African countries from 80 to 90 per cent. Without thorough-going agrarian reforms, without abolishing the remnants and survivals of feudalism, it is impossible to solve the food problem, to ensure the development of the productive forces. Solution of the peasant question

state in which directly affects the interests of the majority of the population is problem No. 1 in all the liberated countries.

Carrying-out of the propositions in a national democracy, expounded in the Statement of the Meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers Parties, would enable the liberated countries to make decisive steps in strengthening national independence, developing their national economy, raising the living standard of the people and granting them broad democratic rights and freedoms. This is the primary condition for all-round progress of the liberated countries, for the enhancement of their role in the struggle for peace, against the aggressive policy of imperialism, for the complete abolition of colonialism.

The establishment of a national democracy, its development and the carrying out of progressive reforms can take place only if the working masses engage in struggle, if they unite in their parties and organizations. Reactionary circles are viciously attacking the freedom of establishing progressive political parties and public organizations, claiming that this undermines the unity of the nation. But different classes exist in the liberated countries, consequently, there are grounds for the existence of political parties expressing their interests.

The Communists have always been in the front ranks of the fight-

ers for national independence. Thousands of them have died the death of heroes in the struggle against colonialism. But even today in most liberated countries the Communist Parties are underground. Is this right? No, by no means is it right. The Communists express the interests of the working class, of the peasant masses, the supreme interests of the nation. Prohibition of their parties practically signifies prohibition of struggle by the workers and peasants, by the entire people for their rights. But no draconic measures can stop the struggle of the masses for their vital rights. Those who take the anti-democratic path and prohibit the activities of progressive parties and organizations strike a blow at the vital interests of the nation, willingly or unwillingly facilitate the loss of all the gains and might create conditions for the return of the rule of foreign imperialists.

THE EXAMPLE OF TURKEY

A graphic case in point was Turkey when her policy was determined by Bayar and Mendares who ignored all the positive aspects of Kemalism. The first stage of the liberation movement in Turkey was characterized by resolute anti-imperialist struggle and a number of reforms aimed at eliminating the remnants of feudalism. Kemal established

friendly relations with Soviet Russia, which strengthened Turkey's positions on the international arena.

But subsequently the Right-wing Kemalists spearheaded their policy against the vital interests of the workers and peasants, against the national minorities. In an effort to deprive the working classes and other oppressed sections of the population of the possibility to fight for their rights in an organized way, it opposed the democratization of the social system and stated cruelly to persecute all the progressive forces. National needs were relegated to the background to suit the selfish class interests of the upper Turkish bourgeoisie which drew closer both to the internal and foreign reaction. The country was inveigled into various imperialist military blocs, it increasingly oriented itself on the imperialist powers and became dependent on them. Large American military bases have been set up in Turkey, and they are already causing great harm to her interests; should these bases be used by those who established them this could place the country in an extremely dangerous position.

Turkey remains one of the most backward countries in the world. Only in one sphere is there a noticeable "advance"—in prices of prime necessities. For the rate of their growth Turkey holds second place in the world. The official monthly minimum cost of living for a family

of four in 1959-1960 was estimated at 2,000-2,500 liras, while wages of textile workers were 150-300 liras, of miners 300-600 liras. Sixty per cent of the population were illiterate in 1960.

The anti-national reactionary regime of Bayar and Menderes has been overthrown and they themselves have landed in the prisoners dock. But this example is instructive. It shows how anti-democratic measures applied by the ruling top clique of the bourgeoisie retarded the country's development, how servility of her former rulers before the imperialists made Turkey fully dependent on the imperialist powers.

Inasmuch as the imperialists are now banking on a breakup of national forces in the liberated countries, the consolidation of these forces in the struggle against the reactionaries, against the placemen and servitors of imperialism acquires particularly great importance.

The working class is the most consistent fighter for fully accomplishing the tasks of the national anti-imperialist democratic revolution. Its ally is the peasantry. This alliance is the most important force in winning and upholding national independence, in carrying out deep-going democratic reforms and ensuring social progress. The degree of participation of the national bourgeoisie in the liberation struggle

largely d
stability
the allia
and the
influen
stimulat
activity
compro
ated sta
old and
tant fac
the plan
the nati
Natio
country
pendenc
of its P
the influ
from th
talist ec
its poli
independ
and spi
The
lishing
has been
munists
Commun
champi
selfless
Natio
upon
strengt
econom
erated
perialis
the roa

largely depends on the strength and stability of this alliance. The firmer the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, the stronger it can influence the national bourgeoisie, stimulate progressive moments in its activity and restrict tendencies to compromise. Solidarity of the liberated states in struggle against the old and new colonialists is an important factor in the struggle against the plans of the imperialists to stifle the national-liberation revolution.

National democracy enables each country which won political independence, irrespective of the level of its productive forces, to weaken the influences of, and then break out from the system of the world capitalist economy and to ensure not only its political but also its economic independence and all-round material and spiritual progress.

The fact that the idea of establishing states of national democracy has been put forward by the Communists once again shows that the Communists are the most fervent champions of the national interest, selfless patriots of their countries.

TOWARDS HIGHER SOCIAL FORMS

National democracies are called upon to ensure the consistent strengthening of the political and economic independence of the liberated countries, the abolition of imperialism's rule and advance along the road of social progress.

There is no doubt that national democracy makes it possible to open up prospects of transition to a higher form of social order, as the objective and subjective prerequisites mature, depending on the struggle of the peoples in these countries. Revolutionary changes in one or another form are needed to attain the socialist system. But it is not precluded that the road to a non-capitalist way of development in some countries will pass through national democracy. It best of all ensures deep-going social and economic changes, the transition to a qualitatively new stage in the development of a given country, the possibility of a non-capitalist road. The establishment of national democracies, the successful solution by them of the problem of abolishing imperialist monopoly rule, their advance towards social progress and democracy and struggle for peace would strike fresh powerful blows at the colonial powers and the imperialist system as a whole. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that all peoples will come to socialism. But they themselves will choose the ways of transition.

The peoples have learned well from their own experience the essence of the capitalist system with its jungle laws of exploitation and oppression. It is this that explains why in the liberated countries only the most confirmed reactionaries speak of the capitalist way. Progressive people of Africa, Asia, and Latin

America reject this way. Socialism is the most popular conception on these continents.

Prominent leaders of many liberal countries speak of socialism. Of course, socialism in the view of bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaders of the liberated countries is not identical with, and frequently is directly opposite to, the Marxist-Leninist conception of socialism. But it is already characteristic that today a leader who wants to win the sympathies of the people cannot but voice recognition of socialism as the way which ensures the development of a country towards national independence, towards the progress of the nation. This is a sign of the time.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOCIALISM

The Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, by their epochal achievements in the development of industry and the entire economy, in the advance of the people's material and cultural standards, are making a revolution in the minds of the peoples. Speaking about the achievements of Soviet science, epitomised in the first flight in the world into outer space by a Soviet citizen, the Ghanaian *Evening News* wrote that the fact that this exploit became possible some 40 years after a formerly backward country had taken the road of development in conditions of genuine freedom strikingly

attested to the might and efficiency of the socialist system. That offered a good example for the African and all the other new countries.

The Uruguayan *Popular* drew the following conclusion: "For 43 years the ideologists of capitalism made fun of the power of workers and peasants. And each time they predicted a short-lived existence to it alleging that workers and peasants are unable to govern a state. This lie has been blasted to smithereens in front of the masses. Workers and peasants can govern a state, and how!"

The experience of history has demonstrated that in the present epoch, the capitalist stage of development is by no means obligatory for underdeveloped countries. It has fully confirmed the Leninist proposition that with the assistance of the working classes in the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to socialism and, through definite stages of development, to communism, skipping the capitalist stage. Many peoples of the Caucasus and Central Asia have come to socialism from feudalism and tribal relations. The Mongolian People's Republic has traversed the non-capitalist road of development. This road is being followed by the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

A little more than 40 years ago the Soviet Central-Asian Republics stood at the same level of economic development as Turkey, Iran, Pak-

stan and a number of other Asian countries. Forty-odd years are a brief span in history, but the lifetime of one generation, yet what amazing changes have occurred in advanced industrial socialist republics with a highly developed economy, culture and public health services. The output of large-scale industry in these republics has grown more than 50 times over.

Prior to the revolution there were no universities or colleges in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenia, while now a wide network of higher educational establishments functions there. There are, on the average, 88 students per 10,000 of population in these republics, while in France there are 40 students, in Italy 34 and Western Germany 31 per 10,000 of population. In other words, in countries following the capitalist road which at one time were two-three centuries ahead of the Central-Asian republics, there are now 50-66 per cent less students proportionately.

All these facts are generally known. Today it is no longer necessary to guess which road, the capitalist or socialist, is progressive, which one corresponds to the interests of the peoples. This is seen from a

comparison of what the one and the other offers the people. Socialist development ensures the genuinely independent progress of the peoples, the solution of all social problems in the interest of the working folk, of the entire population. Socialist society is characterized by the absence of exploitation of man by man, socialist ownership of the means of production, planning of the national economy, the absence of unemployment, of racial and national discrimination, the granting of the broadest democratic rights to the people, and the systematic advance of their living standard.

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are taking the high road of independent, creative endeavor and no doubt will enrich the theory and practice of social transformation. Their road is not an easy one. Many fierce battles against imperialism lie ahead. But there is no force that could stem the forward movement of history. The national-liberation revolutions are spreading and growing deeper, the disgraceful system of colonialism is being consumed in their flames. Following the road of national democracy, the road of social progress, the former colonies and semi-colonies will become prosperous states.

A WORKING-CLASS NOVEL

By Sidney Finkelstein

Phillip Bonosky's novel, *The Magic Fern* (International Publishers, N. Y., 640 pp. \$5.95) opens with a car traveling to "Tuboise," a steel-mill city of some 100,000 families, somewhere in Pennsylvania. The time is the early 1950's. Driving the car is Leo Jomaitis, a Lithuanian-American who, about twelve or thirteen years before, had worked alongside of his immigrant father, Jurgis Jomaitis, in the Turpin steel works, the main industry of Tuboise. Now Leo is returning to work in the mills again, impelled by a Turpin advertisement for extra hands. With him are his wife, Ruth, and little boy, Tommy. Thus begins a literary journey which will take the reader through one of the crucial economic and social upheavals of recent American history. Like every truthful, creative and profound work of art, it will leave the reader a changed person, enlightened and strengthened by an illuminating understanding of his land and people such as no tract or treatise could give him.

One of the main events about which the novel turns is the great strike at the Turpin works, which occurs soon after Leo gets a job in the mills. It is a much different kind of strike from those of the late 1930's. The old strikes had been forced by the workers, and were for the right to organize in unions, the forty-hour week, and decent wages. The workers

had been beaten by thugs, shot at by police, but had won union recognition, the closed shop, and some decent working conditions. Now, however, in the 1950's, the strike is tacitly being invited and even instigated by the steel-mill bosses. With a vision of super-profits before them, they are quite willing to pay increased wages and add some fringe benefits. But they want a great leap in productivity per man-hour, which means a reorganization of the factory, with automation and further speed-up. So they must break the power of the union to guard the health of the workers, to have something to say about the internal operations of the mill and about reclassification of jobs. They must get it to agree to conditions whereby several thousand workers will be thrown permanently on the unemployment scrap-heap.

Before the strike deadline, the Turpin Company has been hiring hundreds of new, unskilled hands. Armed by the Taft-Hartley Law and its state counterparts, the company plans, if necessary, to use these new workers as an anti-union force in the event of a Labor Board election. They also plan in the course of the strike to divide worker from worker. They will use the carrot and the stick; the wage increase to the workers who will remain in the mills, at the price of forgetting their fellow workers and their own future, together with the

threat of violence against the recalcitrant. They know which militant, class conscious union local leaders they have to isolate; which middle-of-the-road leaders, still clinging to the principles of the 1930's, they can render impotent; which "new-type," "practical" collaboration leaders they can work with.

The strike begins when the union workers in the mill, angered to the breaking point by the refusal of the company to sign a new contract, together with the introduction of speed-up, drop their tools and walk out. Torrents of propaganda inundate the press. The strike, it screams, is unauthorized. Turpin, it says, is offering the workers everything they ask for, except what the "reds" demand. The "reds" it claims, don't want better wages. They want to run the factories and take over the industry. The strike-breakers, the new hands being hired, must be protected in their "right to work." A former FBI official becomes the head of the Turpin labor management. When the mayor of the city, remembering his own steelworker background, is reluctant to use the police, state wires are pulled and the National Guard is called to the scene. At the climax, when the Turpin plant hits difficulties because of the dogged union consciousness of the workers, the management deals its trump card, the Smith Act. A Communist member, who had been turned into an informer by FBI threats and bribery, denounces a number of workers as "reds," including some who happen to be on the union local strike committee. They are promptly arrested and held for trial. This "coincidence" pre-

sumably has nothing at all to do with the strike. But it is decisive in ending the strike on Turpin's terms.

The main narrative line concerns Leo Jomaitis, Hot-headed, impulsive, always hating to be pushed around, he had been involved as a youngster along with his father in union organization struggles of the late 1930's. A small group of Communists had been the nucleus of the campaign which finally brought the United Steelworkers Union, CIO, into the Turpin plants. In 1940 a group of higher-up trade union officials had tried to take over the militant Turpin local, and in the ensuing internecine fight, Leo had been badly beaten up. Enraged, he quit the city, letting down the Party and the militant union members who had planned a fight for his rights in the union and on the job. His life since then had been one of moving from job to job, persecuted and followed by a blacklist. Now, twelve or thirteen years later, to return to his father, his home city and the steel mills has become a kind of self vindication. It is not easy for him to unbend, to bridge the estrangement between him and his former associates in the union and in the Party. There is always his pride, the chip on his shoulder, the impatience with others, the readiness to fire up at any slight, the drive to do things his own way and alone if necessary. When the Turpin Company begins its maddening speed-up and the workers almost spontaneously walk off the job, beginning the strike—this is one of the many magnificent scenes in the book—Leo stays behind in the mill. He has decided impulsively on his own individual campaign—to approach the

newly hired men not as prospective strikebreakers, the role the company had planned for them, but as harried and worried workmen, a number of whom had some labor consciousness and could be won over to join the strike, or leave the city. How he accomplishes this in the face of the company's armed guards is another magnificent scene. The closing pages of the book tell of how Leo finally makes his peace with the Party.

This is one thread of many in the book. Unforgettable is the portrayal of the Jomaitis family. Leo's father, Jurgis or "Joe" Jomaitis, had come from Lithuania to a land of the democratic dream, and had discovered that it was necessary to fight for and help create this democracy. For more than forty years he had worked in the steel mill, entering into every union drive and also bringing up a family. He has no claim to retirement pay, for a lay-off period has broken his continuity of work for Turpin. He labors in intense pain from leg ulcers—an occupational disease—which he must hide from the foremen, since if they discovered his disability he would be fired. He passes on to his children and grandchildren the one foremost lesson he has learned; "Fight back." He is like an oak tree, and his death, near the end of the book, is like the fall of an oak tree.

Jurgis' daughter Adele, Leo's sister, is married and has brought up two sons, now adolescents. Separated from her husband, she has become embittered against her father, against the life of a steel worker, against the trade unions, and against anything to do with politics and labor. She works

as a nurse, has embraced religion for solace, and owns the Jomaitis home, having taken over the mortgage payments when the father was laid off. Fiercely she fights to "protect" her sons from the ideas of her father and brother, which she thinks will only lead them into trouble. She wants to make them different from steel workers or other people in the Tuboise slums. But she arrives only at tragedy. Of the two sons, one, Steve, quits school to work in the Turpin mill, and lands in the middle of the strike. The other, Andy, disappointed in his hopes of winning a college athletic scholarship, runs off to join the National Guard. He is attracted by the military recruiting posters with a promise of both glamor and security, adventure and the end to worrisome problems. The adventure comes. He is in the detachment sent to guard the strikebreakers at the Turpin plant where his grandfather and brother are on strike.

One of the finest characters in the book is the Negro steel worker, Calvin Boone. He had struggled up from the South, found a job with Turpin, learned to read and write, and became one of the organizers, Communists and charter members in the steel workers' local. He is also a militant working class figure in the Tuboise Negro community, and his story involves, along with the strike, another line of plot. This is the effort to save two Negro youth who are arrested on the charge of having shot a notorious racketeer. They are innocent but there is evidence to work up a case against them. The police are satisfied to have a "closed case," a means of keeping the Negro

people "from w
ansavory
the killing
another
she create
like the
He has
white
and ma
own car
"Don't
to have
on goo
includin
sonnel?
of Calv
sitized.
no pick
stir this
than ex
it into
example
special
-or pla
will sur
in this
in this
The l
put pos
passing
ent kin
but rat
stand t
the ps
these a
takes
and his
On a
of two
Bonosk
forced
1950's.
origina

people "in their place," and an escape from what could prove to be an unsavory situation if they investigated the killing further. Around these events another group of memorable portraits is created from the Negro community, like the lawyer Edwin A. Richardson. He has abased himself before sleazy white politicians, swallowed insults, and made compromises, but not for his own career alone. As he says to Boone, "Don't you understand what it means to have a colored lawyer in the court, on good terms with all and sundry, including all judges and court personnel? For our people?" He demands of Calvin that the case be not publicized. "No petitions, no delegations, no picket-lines! We want nothing to stir this up and make an issue bigger than exists—and if you try to turn it into a case of injustice, or as an example of oppression, or frame-up, or special pleading for a dark boy's skin—or place the court on trial, those boys will surely hang—and they can hang in this state, colored boys can hang in this state, and don't forget it!"

The book is filled with deep thought-put portraits. It is not a matter of passing judgments on a series of different kinds of people or ways of action, but rather that of making us understand the thinking, the state of mind, the psychology and conflicts behind these actions. And so the judgment takes care of itself. It is a social and historical judgment.

On a similar level are the portraits of two union leaders through whom Bonosky discloses the inner conflicts forced upon the industrial unions in the 1950's. Ray Melden was one of the original militant organizers of the steel

union in the turbulent 1930's. As a symbol of the union's success, he is now a regional director at a handsome salary. He has no Communist attachments or sympathies, but he doggedly holds on to his working class principles of protecting the rights of all together. He remembers the connection that had been so clear in the '30's, between the open-shop industrialists and the support of fascism, both within and outside the country. What he now cannot adjust himself to, and what breaks his spirit, is that the world has changed. Instead of the Wagner Act supporting him, he has the Taft-Hartley Law against him. Instead of a "New Deal" behind him, in theory opposed to international fascism and to the local brand sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, he has to cope with a government in which the Dulles brothers are heroes, one which is rehabilitating the fascist-minded German cartels, and in which the head of the Turpin steel plant is chosen for a State Department "economic mission" to Latin America. And so, although Melden has the affection and confidence of the steel workers, he finds himself with only broken weapons. He must in the end yield to the shrewd manipulator among union officials, Edwards. To Edwards, running a union is like running a business. His job is to understand the bosses' problems as they see them, impress them on the workers, convince the workers that what they are offering is the best bargain they can get, declaim against "killing the goose that lays the golden eggs," fight the cold war with more avid red-baiting than the bosses use, and isolate the "trouble

makers." The only enemies he sees are among the workers themselves, those who insist upon such "un-American" notions as class interests and class struggle.

Splendidly drawn is the informer Emil Yoste. He is a thoroughly credible, if unlovely, human being, with a smiling, breezy, black-slapping exterior and an insecure, unhappy and frustrated inner life. He has made a wreck of his family life, with drink and adultery, and is an easy fish for the FBI net. Even before he has to unmask himself as a court informer, he has done systematic disruptive work, posting as a super-militant, instigating provocations, antagonizing workers with his distorted and pseudo class-consciousness. His last appearance in the book is in a drunken scene, when he is searching for his wife Florence, who has left him along with their two daughters.

Leo, with a faint smile, said: "You're just a stoolpigeon, Emil."

Emil jumped out of his chair and fell on the table, and pounded it with his fist. "Goddam it!" he cried, pounding. "Don't nothing get across to you? I've been to church, the priest shakes my hand, the chief of police knows me in the street—what do you mean calling me an ugly name? If all them says I'm doing all right, including the government itself of the United States," he said, "who the hell are you—" he cried, sweeping his hand over them all—"to call me anything different." . . .

He kept shaking his head. "No use, *paisano*," he said. "He lifted one hand and his chest. 'I'm hooked, it's too late, *paisano*.'" He took both hands away and his head dropped slightly. He spread them and said, "Too late. . . . Don't ring them funeral bells—I'm a free man. The only one in America right now—free!" He brayed at them and thudded his fists on his chest. "The same Emil—the only one in America! Free!

Hooked—but they're hooked worse! I give them what they want, but I can do anything I want: nobody can touch me. You think that stinking Mill can touch me? No!" He banged his chest again. "I just pass the time there. No foreman, no boss—nobody can drop me a dirty look, or the wrong kind of word; for I got a straight line to the top! I can go anywhere in the country today; anywhere in the United States of America, and just show them this card—" He pulled it out of his inside coat pocket and waved it. "This one! It's special from the FBI—and it makes me the free man of this universe!" He waved it in a circle over his head. "Nobody can touch me!" . . .

His heavy eyes wandered for a moment with dull triumph. Then, without any warning, he suddenly jumped up from his chair and screamed in unexpected falsetto: "Flo! Flo!"

These and the other characters whom Bonosky turns inside out with the most penetrating knowledge and literary skill, throw a revealing light upon a drama which took place not merely in the novel's steel-mill city, but in one form or another, in every major industrial center of the country. The theme guiding the great social picture Bonosky paints is the contrast between and change from the America of the 1930's to the America of the 1950's. Industry, after repeated blood transfusions from the Marshall Plan, the armament drive and the Korean War, finds itself in an again-renewed competition. Competition is fierce, markets must be fought for, and the way out it sees is speed-up and automation, mechanizing the worker and mechanizing a work process. The heavy burdens fall on the working class, which must at the same time be divided and bludgeoned. The unions must be forced into collaboration. To save and increase steel profits (or oil, or auto, or rubber

to defend America. Any other course is unpatriotic. Strikebreakers and anti-union workers must be given the democratic "right to work." The permanent and increasing army of unemployed must be denied the right to work. To refuse to quietly starve is also unpatriotic. It is the internal side of the external cold war. The forces of "law and order," from the legislatures and courts to the police, the National Guard and the FBI, must be arrayed on the side of "management," for management is America. And there are repercussions far and wide, as Bonosky's novel shows. In the Negro community, for example, it is the Negro workers who suffer the most heavily from the cutting down of the work force, for they have least seniority, and government must see that they know their place." The city (like "Tuboise" or any other) must be "beautified," since the real estate interests are also in crisis, and must be helped. And so there are "windfall" housing developments providing for the better-off, while in "Tuboise," (as in every other city), Negro families, immigrant families, workers' families, remain in the "smoggy bottom" slums. The Turpin Steel Company (like any other big industry) must get gifts and tax benefits for expansion.

Bonosky's novel deals with this great contrast between the 1950's and the 1930's, artistically and historically. Creating a galaxy of convincing characters, representing every side of the picture, he at the same time rises to a point of view which enables the reader to see, in terms of the human lives involved, all of the social currents in their main line of movement. There

is the picture of work in the steel mills themselves, drawn as only one who had himself worked there could do it. There is the depiction of the insidious entrance of speed-up, with a brilliant portrayal of the first day in the mill of two young "efficiency experts," college graduates and specialists in "labor relations" and "industrial engineering." There are great scenes in the union hall, in which Bonosky has caught to perfection the personality and manner of speech of the various officials and workers. Anyone who has belonged to a union can testify to their truth, in every detail of tone and atmosphere. With equal sensitivity, Bonosky presents scenes in a Negro church; scenes in the top levels of management, involving the Turpin officials and a United States Senator; scenes of city political maneuvering.

An especially notable achievement is the feeling Bonosky gives of the new generation of the 1950's, not only in management, and in the trade-union officialdom, but among the workers and their children, and in the city as a whole. How close in time are the late '30's to the early '50's! And yet the upheaval in the nation's life has made the earlier period seem as remote as pre-history. Bonosky reveals all these currents as they clash with one another, and yet coalesce into a channel which we know is the direction taken by American life as a whole in recent times. We know that what we take from the book is truth, especially the presence, life and mind of the working people, whom Bonosky understands better than any other writer I know of in America today. Through his presentation we draw from the book a

conviction, not put into any explicit statement but rising out of the cumulative scenes, that the working people of America have far from said their last word. The great strides they made in the 'thirties have been halted, the avenues for progress that they opened up have been choked. But what that period taught will never be forgotten.

The theme is a big one and the result is a big book, in which the significance, the dramatic power, the continuously absorbing interest and the beauty of the writing in every way match the length. *The Magic Fern* is in the great tradition of the realistic and social novel, which is the central tradition of the novel itself, as an art form. It is not a perfect novel. One can make a short list of threads left loose, of secondary conflicts left unresolved. One feels at times that real life has interfered with the plans Bonosky set himself at the beginning. But he is the kind of writer who will always obey the demands of real life, and in the light of the immense task he set himself, his achievement is a memorable one. A true artist, he has created not merely characters and interesting situations but a real and living society, in which people from New York to San Francisco will recognize themselves.

Bonosky has moved boldly into an area of life which American literature has touched on but gingerly. He has written a true working-class novel; not only one about the working class, not only one passionately on the side of the working class, but one which the working class, through its own life, has helped create. That is especially what

makes this a novel essential to read, and to bring to as many people as possible.

The American people as a whole should know this book, for it is one they need. That such a novel has been written and published is a sign of the fundamental health of our cultural life. And the frightened, "silent" treatment given to it by the commercial press, up to the time this review is being written, is a sign as well of the poisonous, corrosive forces that are eating away our cultural life. Worse in some respects than the censorship of feudal monarchs and the inquisition, which at least called itself a censorship, is the hypocrisy of the commercial press, which tries to kill a piece of America itself and a notable work of art, with scorn and silence, while boasting of its "cultural freedom." This is a crime against the American people, like keeping a remedy from the sick. And the crime will not go unchallenged. The book will make its way, for every reader will want to bring it to someone else. And people in other lands will read this novel eagerly, be moved and enlightened by it, and will feel a new kinship to the American people because of it. They will hold it to our shame that the arbiters of our cultural life are so blind, scared or corrupted that they prefer to act as if this book didn't exist. Future historians of literature will not forgive them. Nor will they forgive us if we do not strive to give this novel the wide circulation it deserves. When lights of human freedom are turned on, they should be helped to shine.

NEW PERMANENT BOOKS

THE MAGIC FERN

By Phillip Bonosky

A new novel mirroring the impact of automation on workers under capitalism. By the author of *Burning Valley*. Available now.

Cloth \$5.95

A PUERTO RICAN IN NEW YORK, and Other Sketches

By Jesus Colon

Fifty-five sparkling vignettes which tell "how Puerto Ricans in this city *really* feel, think, work and live." A delightful and wonderfully human book.

Paperback \$2.00

AMERICAN LABOR — WHICH WAY?

By George Morris

A critical analysis of the policies and practices, role and aims of the trade union movement, and new possibilities for big advances in the period ahead.

Paperback \$1.75

WORLDS OF COLOR

By W. E. B. Du Bois

Final volume of the great trilogy entitled *The Black Flame*, bringing the story of the Mansart family, their struggles, defeats and triumphs, to the present day.

Cloth \$4.50

THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

By Blas Roca

The significant and profound report of the General Secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba to its eighth national congress.

Paperback \$1.25

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

DARE WE BE FREE?

The Meaning of the Attempt to Outlaw the Communist Party

By HERBERT APTHEKER

A fighting, polemical book which subjects to critical analysis the June 5 five-to-four Supreme Court decisions upholding the Smith Act membership clause and the McCarran Act registration clause. In weighing the opinions of Frankfurter, Harlan, Warren, Black and Douglas, the author probes the nature of the laws themselves, the significance of the decisions in the context of world developments, perspectives facing the Communist Party, and the impact of the decisions on general democratic rights, the Negro freedom struggle, the labor movement and the fight for peace. This important book contains specific recommendations for converting the seeming victory for reaction into its opposite.

128 Pages: Paperback \$1.00; Cloth \$2.50

JUST PUBLISHED

THE STRATEGY OF REVENGE, by Ernst Henri	.25
FREEDOM BEGIN AT HOME, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	.15
"A FATEFUL MOMENT IN OUR HISTORY"; Dissenting opinion of Associate Justice Hugo Black in the McCarran Act Decision	.15
"I DO NOT THINK THE COURT'S ACTION CAN BE JUSTIFIED": Dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Earl Warren in the McCarran Act Decision	.15
RIDING TO FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker and James E. Jackson	.10
THE LESSONS OF CUBA, by James S. Allen	.15

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.



5
5
5
0
5

V
4
C
S
S
I
C