

# political affairs

SEPTEMBER 1956 • 35 CENTS

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
CPUSA  
SIX SMITH ACT  
DEPENDANTS  
GILBERT FRAZIER  
CARL ROSS  
EMILIE HUYSMANS  
CELESTE STRACK  
WILLIAM Z. POSTER  
MARTHA STONE

- [ 1 ] Alfred Wagenknecht: In Memoriam
- [ 3 ] Reply to an "Open Letter"
- [ 7 ] The NAACP Convention
- [22] Old Traditions and New Perspectives in Minnesota
- [32] A New Atmosphere
- [39] Concerning "Method in Political Economy"
- [50] Marxism-Leninism in a Changing World (Pt. I)
- [59] On the War Danger

**CULTISM: ITS GENESIS AND EXODUS**  
By Stetson Kennedy  
[p. 33]

**IN MEMORIAM: ALFRED WAGENKNECHT**



**August 15, 1881 — August 26, 1956**

Vol. XXXV

A T

by Nat

O  
and a  
painf  
states

The  
Commu  
entire  
thousan  
ened  
our co-  
Alfre  
Alfre  
ew sho  
irthda  
asting  
well a  
meric  
As a  
was b  
arents

re-ent  
nder st  
publiche  
correspo  
nd Cas  
PRINTED

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## Alfred Wagenknecht: In Memoriam

by National Committee, CPUSA

*On August 26, 1956, at the age of 75, Alfred Wagenknecht, a founder and a renowned leader of the Communist Party, died. Marking that very painful event, the National Committee of the Party issued the following statement:*

The National Committee of the Communist Party, together with our entire Party and thousands upon thousands of others, is deeply saddened by the news of the death of our co-worker and beloved comrade, Alfred Wagenknecht.

Alfred Wagenknecht, who only a few short weeks ago marked his 75th birthday, has made important and lasting contributions to our Party as well as to the well-being of the American people.

As a mere infant, Wagenknecht was brought to this country by his parents, who left Germany because

of the repression against European socialists at that time. In Cleveland, where the Wagenknecht family settled, Alfred Wagenknecht grew up in an atmosphere of socialist thinking. The father, a shoemaker, contributed much to his son's thinking.

As a young man, Wagenknecht's leadership as a socialist was recognized when he was elected state secretary of the Ohio Socialist Party. Together with Charles Ruthenberg and Charles Baker, "Wag," as he was so affectionately known by so many, was sentenced to prison for

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

his opposition to World War I. Among the many who visited Wagenknecht in prison, was the outstanding leader, Eugene V. Debs. It was immediately after this visit to the Canton jail that Debs delivered his famous anti-war speech for which he was later imprisoned in Atlanta.

When the great debate raged in the Socialist Party on support to the Soviet Union, Wagenknecht and Ruthenberg, together with others, fought for the position of full support. In 1919, when the contending forces were not able to resolve their differences in the Socialist Party, Wagenknecht became the first secretary of the Communist Labor Party. Later he was one of the first leaders of the Communist Party, which he helped to bring into being.

In the '20's and '30's "Wag" led tremendous relief drives for support to the famine victims overseas and in support of the striking textile and coal workers in America. He spoke to hundreds of thousands of workers in his unceasing fight for international relief as well as for strike relief in this country.

Wagenknecht was one of the original founders of the *Daily Worker* and for a period served as the

business manager of the paper. In recent years he has served as Chairman of our Party in Illinois.

The sum total of Wagenknecht's life was always viewed by him in terms of the future. It was always viewed in terms of achieving Socialism, of rallying tremendous mass movements in support of progressive causes. Only two weeks ago in a letter sent to the *Daily Worker* from his sickbed in a Chicago hospital, he wrote:

*Here am I at 75, and wishing I was 50. The years ahead will be wonderful and beautiful, though ripe with struggle.*

The American people, particularly the working class and the Negro people, have lost a great champion. But his teachings and his memory will be remembered by them.

The National Committee expresses its condolences to his wife and co-worker, Carolina, and to his daughter, Helen, to his granddaughter, Michele, and all other members of his family who have lost a beloved member of the family as well as a dear comrade.

By Sir

tion  
lette  
York  
dent  
head  
vidu  
Orth  
Hun  
Witt  
tutio  
name

T  
a sou  
urge  
but t  
in th  
to go  
ideal  
cover

T  
yet a  
Party  
conv  
Willi  
Augu  
publi

We h  
cep in  
mong i  
news m  
alue hi  
flaves, t  
onal

# Reply to an "Open Letter"

By Six Smith Act Defendants

On July 31, 1956, the Rev. Charles W. Lowry, director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, released an open letter to "The Perplexed Among the Communists." According to the *New York Times*, of August 1, this Foundation "defines itself as an independent, non-sectarian, educational organization, privately supported, with headquarters in Washington." The Open Letter was signed by 55 individuals including clergymen of the Protestant, Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox and Jewish faiths, the presidents of Dickinson, Gettysburg, and Hunter Colleges and of Baylor, American and Temple Universities, by DeWitt Wallace (of *Reader's Digest*), Ralph McGill (of the *Atlanta Constitution*), Eugene Lyons, Isaac Don Levine, and others, including those named in the text of the reply printed below.

The Open Letter declared that those it was addressing had "experienced a soul searching of the most fundamental character." It said to them: "We urge you not to evade or silence these doubts and promptings of conscience but to face them manfully." And further: "There is no reason for shame in the fact of having made a mistake. To err is human. But it is shameful to go on in an evil course and to persist in the betrayal of man's highest ideals, simply because one lacks the courage to go to the bottom and uncover the source of fatal error."

This letter was made public on the same day as was the conviction, yet again, in a New York Federal Court, of six leaders of the Communist Party on the "conspiracy" section of the notorious Smith Act. The six so convicted—George Blake Charney, Fred M. Fine, James E. Jackson, Jr., William Norman, Sidney Stein, Alexander Trachtenberg—released, on August 4th, a reply to the Foundation's "Open Letter." This reply is published in full below:

We have read your letter with deep interest, particularly because among its signers are persons whose views men and women of good will value highly. Such persons as A. J. Hayes, the president of the International Association of Machinists,

and Dean James A. Pike of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, certainly cannot be classed among the fanatic professional anti-Communists whose witch-hunting has so poisoned our American air of recent years.

Your letter, addressed to the "Perplexed Among the Communists," was made public on a particularly perplexing day for the undersigned. For it was exactly the day on which a Federal jury found us guilty under the Smith Act—not for any deeds of force or violence, theft or murder, but simply for agreeing to teach and advocate our political views of Marxian socialism.

Thus our perplexity arises not solely from causes cited by you, but primarily from events within our own United States, namely the sinister development towards what Chief Justice Warren has called "the erosion of the Bill of Rights."

Needless to say, we Communists are engaged—as we have been for some time—in a searching and deep-going re-examination of our basic theory and practice. Events abroad, no less than those at home, have sharply accelerated this process of self-examination. We welcome constructive criticism from men of good will and examine carefully all criticism, even where it is clearly tendentious. A casual reading of Communist Party statements and speeches, as well as the *Daily Worker*, will indicate that the process of courageous self-critical examination is well under way on the Left.

We are happy that you recognize what some others have consistently denied—our "aspirations for a better world" and that these aspirations are "common human ideals held by

all men of good will." This at least gives us some framework for that mutual communication which is the essence of the marketplace of opinion.

With some of what you say we do not disagree. Surely all men of good will can agree that there is a distinct relationship between means and ends and that material prosperity alone cannot be the "ultimate test" of "the good life for man and for society." We certainly agree that there is evil in condoning evil. And to the extent that we did not condemn those acts subsequently exposed as violations of Socialist legality in the Soviet Union and did not criticize unjust acts in Socialist countries we, of course, bear a certain responsibility. We are, therefore, undertaking a deep-going examination as to the reasons for our lack of a critical attitude towards these evils. As supporters of scientific socialism we are prepared to draw whatever conclusions are, in our judgment, warranted by the total facts.

Where we probably disagree is in the notion, a) that socialism, the collective ownership of the means and machinery of production, is incompatible with political liberty; or b) that the Soviet Union is inherently incapable of restoring and extending democracy within its own borders.

Time, of course, will determine both. On our part we are confident that socialism and political liberty

are bo  
tary-  
lays t  
sible  
the flo  
and s  
feel e  
viet U  
shown  
criticis  
measu  
vitaliz  
racy.  
Comm  
help  
which  
the w  
work,  
Ameri  
istence  
to ma  
Marxis  
our ju  
But  
tion to  
as an  
advoca  
in the  
be terr  
among  
end th  
and dis  
people.  
We ha  
struggl  
can la  
the un  
course"  
icy of  
H-bom

are both compatible and complementary. We feel, in fact, that socialism lays the basis for the greatest possible extension of democracy and the flowering of the infinite creative and spiritual powers of Man. We feel equally confident that the Soviet Union and its people, who have shown an incredible capacity for self-criticism and self-correction, will measure fully up to the task of revitalizing Socialist law and democracy. On our part we as American Communists intend to continue to help create a political climate in which democracy can grow all over the world. We shall continue to work, together with millions of other Americans, to make peaceful co-existence a settled national policy and to make such fraternal criticism of Marxists in other countries as, in our judgment, the situation requires.

But we must take strong exception to your characterization of ours as an "evil course." Certainly, the advocacy of socialism and our belief in the Brotherhood of Man cannot be termed an "evil course." We were among the pioneers in the fight to end the racist crime of segregation and discrimination against the Negro people. Was that an "evil course"? We have been second to none in the struggle to help build a great American labor movement and organize the unorganized. Was that an "evil course"? We have fought for a policy of peace, negotiations, an end to H-bombs and universal disarmament.

Was that an "evil course"?

And when many civic and political leaders kept silent in the darkest days of McCarthyism, we fought on. In fact, we have been among the chief—although by no means the only—victims of McCarthyism. We have been the victims of governmental persecution, social obloquy and a myriad of harassments designed to keep us (and other dissenters) out of the American marketplace. Monopoly-controlled means of communication—press, radio, TV, etc. — have overwhelmingly suppressed our point of view, except for such occasion as it suits their purpose to make public the differences among us.

We have no quarrel with ideological opponents who seek to utilize our perplexities, real or alleged. That, apparently, is a standard tactic in political struggle. But for many of the fine liberal personalities among your signers who do not make a career of professional anti-communism, we have a few questions.

Where were they—with a few honorable exceptions—in the public debate around the Smith Act, termed by Justice Black "a virulent form of prior censorship"? Where were they when the Congress passed and President Eisenhower recently signed the law increasing penalties under the Smith Act from five to 20 years—for mere advocacy or agreeing to advocate certain proscribed views?

If we sound a trifle bitter, it is per-

haps understandable by the curious coincidence that your letter was made public on precisely the day a Federal jury found us guilty because of our alleged agreement to advocate our political views. Yes, the crimes against Socialist legality revealed by Khrushchev were as Eugene Dennis said in his celebrated article two months ago, "unforgiveable." But is that any reason for American civic leaders, again noting certain honorable exceptions—averting their eyes from the imprisonment of Americans for advocating their political views?

Where, for instance, is the passion for Presidential amnesty for Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and other political prisoners? Where is the passion for effective execution of the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation? Where is the passion to find and punish the killers of Negroes who dare to exercise their constitutional right to vote in Mississippi? Where is the passionate demand on the two major parties for a fighting civil rights platform and prompt, effective civil rights legislation?

May it not fairly be said that to

sanction the denial of political liberty to Communists and other dissenters is an "evil course"? May it not fairly be said that to sanction Jim Crowism, either by active support or by endless "gradualism," is also an "evil course"? Is not the placid acceptance of the cult of the professional political informer system an "evil course"? Is not support, either tacit or vocal, of the type of justice meted out to Negroes in Mississippi and Communists in Foley Square an "evil course"?

These questions may or may not contribute to perplexity on your part but they certainly require answer. On our part we would be happy to sit down and discuss with you your questions and ours at any convenient time. Such communication among men of good will can only help attain, in the words of your letter a "climate of freedom and hope." For we feel a profound confidence that you as well as we, non-Communists, anti-Communists and Communists alike, want a return to the norms of political freedom, a durable peace and intellectual sanity throughout the world.

By G  
THE 4  
Nation  
vancem  
was he  
July 1,  
organiz  
authori  
ant pro  
and de  
white  
equal c  
The  
in the  
they ha  
they h  
1954  
dose t  
in the  
lict in  
ation  
erious,  
he hist  
The c  
raction  
ision a  
white li  
temocra  
son" ha  
cing  
masses,  
The  
a vicie  
the Di



# The NAACP Convention

By Gilbert Frazier

THE 47TH Annual Convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which was held in San Francisco June 26-July 1, demonstrated anew that this organization is the most vital and authoritative center of Negro militant protest, organized mass struggle, and democratic unity of Negro and white Americans in the struggle for equal constitutional rights.

The NAACP delegates met in the knowledge that the issues they had come to tackle remain, as they have been since the May 17, 1954 Supreme Court decision, close to the center of the stage in the great drama of social conflict in the United States. This realization made for one of the most serious, hard-working conventions in the history of the Association.

The onslaught of the nation's arch reactionaries had caused some indecision and vacillation among some white liberal friends of constitutional democracy; the doctrine of "moderation" had gained currency and was being widely popularized among masses, North and South.

The past year had witnessed a vicious general offensive by the Dixiecrat die-hards; and this

offensive was nourished, often unwittingly, by liberals who pronounced themselves as favoring equality for Negroes, but were prepared to acquiesce in its further—if not indefinite—postponement in the interests of the "larger" goals of "Democratic Party unity," "racial harmony," and "domestic tranquility."

On the other hand, the Negro people's movement had refused to buckle or retreat in face of this offensive. In fact, NAACP had grown stronger. Board chairman Channing T. Tobias, in his greetings to the convention, noted that membership (300,000) and income had increased. Most significant, 480 of the Association's branches and more than 50 percent of its membership remained on the front line of battle in the South.

In addition, a new form of struggle had emerged to capture the imagination of the Negro masses, enlist their united strength, and regain the initiative for the forces of democracy. That was, of course, the historic seven-month-old Montgomery bus boycott, which had been the pace-setter and example for another boycott simultaneously being conducted in Tallahassee, Florida.

One further event of seminal significance for the Negro's freedom struggle had transpired in the year between the 46th and 47th conventions. AFL and CIO had merged into a mighty labor federation, 15 millions strong. The united trade-union movement had adopted and was beginning to implement a program which promised to place its vast resources and extensive machinery in the scales on behalf of equal economic opportunities for the million-and-a-half organized Negro workers and for the full complement of democratic rights long denied the whole Negro people.

So much, then, for the setting. How did all these factors, favorable and adverse, impinge upon the 47th convention of the NAACP?

#### INCREASED MILITANCY

*First, the convention adopted what appears to be a more militant posture in the fight for Negro rights than at any time in the recent past.*

This militant attitude was evident in many of the resolutions, as well as in sections of the speeches of all the prominent personalities who addressed the convention. Its most common expression was in the forthright rejection of "moderation" and gradualism.

Thurgood Marshall asserted: ". . . we must continue to recognize that gradualism as it is understood today is nothing more than a slowing

down process born of fear, fed by terror and exploited by prejudice.

Roy Wilkins put it this way, in a passage that might well be interpreted as an uncomplimentary contrast between the Administration's "go-slow" counsel to Negroes and its inaction in face of the illegal atrocities committed against them: "We are tired of standing still. We are tired of crawling and having some people tell us we are 'going too fast.' We are tired of having them tell us to wait while they let the other fellow do as he pleases with us."

Dr. Martin Luther King made his position clear with these words: ". . . if moderation means slowing up in the move toward freedom and capitulating to the whims and caprices of the guardians of a deadening status-quo, then moderation is a tragic vice which all men of good will must condemn."

A. Philip Randolph was no less explicit. He said: "And let us have no illusions about the doctrine of the middle of the road gradualism or moderation, for they offer no hope or assurance of liberation from segregation. Negroes want their rights and want them now."

The common note struck in each of these four convention speeches was echoed in the first substantive resolution of the convention, the Preamble, which equated the popular concept of moderation with stagnation and declared:

Action is what we seek. . . . Action to demolish the whole Jim Crow structure. Action to assure forever the equality of rights and human dignity proclaimed in all the great ethical political documents of humanity. Action to end forever inequality of rights among mankind of whatever race, of whatever faith.

Thus, a prime evidence of the militant character of the NAACP convention was the unanimous and resounding rejection of the doctrines of gradualism and moderation. The convention made it clear that one of the fondest hopes of the Dixiecrats—to bludgeon Negro leadership into a position of compromising or abandoning the fight for equal rights, and to elevate a small handful of opportunistic bush league Uncle Toms to positions of prominence among the Negro masses—has been decisively crushed.

How account for this militancy? First and foremost, one must look to the creative energies and initiative of the Negro masses for the answer. And nowhere has this initiative been more pronounced than in the South in general and in Montgomery, Alabama, in particular.

#### THE BOYCOTT MOVEMENT

*The Montgomery boycott became central issue of the convention.*

At the outset of the boycott the national leadership of NAACP withheld support on grounds which appeared to many specious at best

—that the original demands of the Montgomery Improvement Association did not include the total elimination of segregation on the bus lines. (This would seem to prove, if nothing else, that the Communists have no monopoly on "Left-sectarian" errors.)

This situation, fortunately, was short-lived. Obviously it is difficult to remain aloof from 50,000 Negroes engaged in the most dramatic demonstration against Jim Crow which the 20th century has witnessed and maintain one's posture as a Negro leader. Further, the logic of the struggle in Montgomery soon led to the inevitable demand for the total abolition of segregation in transportation.

Consequently NAACP legal personnel aided in the defense of the 89 persons arrested in the course of the boycott struggle; NAACP branches, along with thousands of other groups in the USA and abroad, sent funds to keep the Montgomery car pool rolling; and Rev. King and Rev. Ralph Abernathy, president and vice-president of the Montgomery Improvement Association, lent their support to a campaign for 10,000 members in the Montgomery branch of NAACP.

The question confronting the convention, therefore, was not what attitude to take toward the Montgomery or the Tallahassee bus boycotts. These were already in being, largely successful, and enjoying wide pub-

lic support. The question, as placed in the keynote speech of Thurgood Marshall, was to "make the most careful evaluation of this technique (non-violent resistance to segregation—G. F.), to determine to what extent it can be used in addition to our other means of protest."

The reasons why such a "careful examination" was required were clear to the delegates:

1) The boycott, a practically unanimous movement, provided a graphic demonstration of the all-class, all-denominational, all-party unity of the Negro people in action;

2) This unity had effectively undermined the contention of the White Citizens' Council forces that the demand for integration was fostered among Southern Negroes by "outside agitators" bent on destroying the "peaceful relations between the races" (sic!) in the interest of some alleged sinister "communistic" objectives.

3) The movement had attracted to itself, like a magnet, the enthusiastic and spontaneous moral and material support of the entire Negro people, a decided majority of white Americans, and millions of partisans of liberty the world over;

4) The insistence on non-violence and the phenomenal discipline of the boycotters had disarmed the minority of active white supremacists who could not succeed in manufacturing the provocation with which to arouse

masses of whites and to blackmail the municipal, county and state police forces to drown the movement in the blood of the Negro protestants.

5) The mass action of Negroes had won the active support of a small minority of whites in Montgomery, and had served to neutralize or stimulate the grudging and passive sympathy of a probable majority, despite deep-rooted prejudices.

All these factors seemed to provide an important part, though not all, of the answer to the prime question facing the Negro freedom movement: how to move the civil rights fight off the stalemate wrought by Dixiecrat intransigence; how to translate integration from law books to life; how to implement the favorable Supreme Court decisions?

### THE IDEAS OF DR. KING

The force with which this question confronted the convention was enhanced by the remarkable contribution made by the young and dynamic president of the Montgomery Improvement Association, Dr. Martin Luther King.

Dr. King came to San Francisco to tell the Montgomery story. In so doing he gave voice to the philosophy of struggle which has been taking shape among the leadership of the MIA in the course of the boycott. That philosophy bears the earmarks of the outlook which has

charac  
class  
in col  
its ma  
1) I  
"new  
derstar  
gomer  
unders  
Negro  
sense  
how i  
In ter  
non-m  
charac  
look:  
pend  
masse  
selves  
he wa  
2) I  
mass  
and "K  
King'  
greete  
story  
50,000  
justice  
willin  
tired  
walk  
justice  
by th  
necess  
3) I  
mover  
life,  
tasks  
for fr  
intern

characterized many of the middle-class revolutionary nationalist leaders in colonial lands. Here are some of its main elements:

1) It places major emphasis on the "new Negro": "You can never understand the bus protest in Montgomery," declared King, "without understanding that there is a new Negro in the South, with a new sense of dignity and destiny." And how is the "new Negro" described? In terms of the idealistic, *i.e.*, the non-materialist, tendency which is characteristic of Rev. King's outlook: ". . . Then something happened to the Negro. The Negro masses began to re-evaluate themselves. The Negro came to feel that he was somebody."

2) It is a philosophy of active mass struggle; the words "struggle" and "sacrifice" constantly recur in King's message. A great ovation greeted the statement that, "*The story of Montgomery is the story of 50,000 Negroes who are tired of injustice and oppression and who are willing to substitute tired feet for tired souls, and walk and walk and walk until the sagging walls of injustice have been finally crushed by the battering rams of historical necessity.*"

3) It envisions and calls for a movement of all classes in Negro life, sharing equally the burdens, tasks and rewards of the struggle for freedom. It urges the muting of internal class antagonisms and strug-

gles among the oppressed Negro people. Thus:

*So away with our class systems that so easily separate us. Remember the highest will not rise without the lowest. So let us get together and with great teamwork in the next few years, we will be able to carry the football of civil rights across the goal.*

4) It recognizes the need for white allies in a general sense, but does not emphasize the need for forging a special alliance between the Negro people and the white workers in order to achieve the particular as well as common aims of both in a joint struggle against an identical foe, monopolized Big Business and the plantation oligarchs.

5) It places prime reliance on the Negro people themselves in the battle for equality. Thus:

*. . . We must depend on the growing group of white liberals, North and South, who are still willing to take a stand for justice. But in the final analysis, the problem of obtaining full equality is a problem for which the Negro himself must assume the primary responsibility. Integration will not be some lavish dish which the white man will pass out on a silver platter, while the Negro furnishes merely the appetite.*

6) It places the American Negro liberation movement within the framework of contemporary colonial revolutionary upsurge and draws in-

spiration and precept from the example of India and Gandhi:

7) It draws heavily upon the bourgeois-pacifist interpretation of the redemptive power of idealistic "love as the regulating ideal." Rev. King declared:

*The real tension is not between white people and Negro people. The tension is at bottom between justice and injustice, between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. And if there is a victory it will be a victory not merely for 50,000 Negroes, but a victory for justice, freedom and democracy. This is at bottom the meaning of Christian love. It is understanding good will for all men. It seeks nothing in return. It is that love which loves the person who does the evil deed, while hating the deed which he does.*

#### ON NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

It was against the background of this philosophy, then, that Rev. King placed before the NAACP convention the challenge of adopting the method of non-violent resistance as a mass technique in the struggle for Negro rights.

Referring to court decisions striking down segregation, he declared:

*The problem of implementation will be carried out mainly by the Negro's refusal to cooperate with segregation. Wherever segregation exists we must be willing to rise up and protest courageously against it. I realize that this type of courage means suf-*

*fering and sacrifice. It might mean going to jail. If such is the case we must honorably fill up the jail houses of the South. It might even lead to physical death. But if such physical death is the price we must pay to free our children from a life of permanent psychological death, then nothing could be more honorable.*

The tumultuous applause of 5,000 people in San Francisco's Civic Auditorium left no doubt about the mass response to this dramatic challenge. The question, then, had been put: What to do about what Rev. King described as the "new and creative method which might be added to the several methods which we must use to make integration a reality"?

The question was canvassed in the resolutions committee and hotly discussed among the delegates. The decision finally reached would seem to reflect the *indecision* of the Board of Directors and the most influential staff members of the NAACP. The resolutions committee offered and the convention passed a resolve which recognized that:

Our program . . . must be broadened to the point of using all lawful means available to obtain our objectives (but it then concluded), Therefore be it resolved, that while we have examined to some extent the effectiveness of this program (passive non-violent resistance—G.F.), on a local level we are not yet ready to take a position on this as a national project; we therefore recommend that our Board of Directors and national staff give the most careful consideration to this new tech-

nique  
pandi  
rights  
On  
that  
Asso  
limit  
dine  
other  
into  
mass  
bring  
the I  
Som  
of I  
such  
with  
inter  
with  
strug  
stant  
bus  
force  
pend  
hold  
troub  
tions  
cial  
and  
hypo  
and  
issue  
Sti  
timic  
of o  
one  
help  
outp  
arou  
ine

nique for possible inclusion in our expanding action program for civil rights.

One is left with the impression that the dominant leadership of the Association, while recognizing the limits of purely legal action, is inclined to procrastinate and take another deep breath before plunging into the waters of the extraordinary mass struggle which is required to bring off a decisive victory against the Dixiecrat enemy.

Some nationally influential leaders of NAACP undoubtedly abjure such struggle altogether. Those with a Big Business outlook or vested interest may be expected to look with disfavor upon a technique of struggle which in Montgomery substantially reduced the profits of one bus company, and in Tallahassee forced another to temporarily suspend operations. Others, still beholden to the two old parties, are troubled by the fact that such actions heighten the demand for official intervention to end segregation and dramatically expose the arrant hypocrisy of both the Democrats and Republicans on the civil rights issue.

Still others are hamstrung by a timidity to break with old habits of organization and struggle. It is one thing to capitalize upon and help channelize the spontaneous outpouring of mass resentment around the Till case or the Autherine Lucy case. It is quite another

for those whose magic elixir in face of all manner of problems of oppression has long been, "We'll take them to court," to now *initiate* mass struggles the outcome of which will depend, not so much on whether a given court is enlightened or benighted in its ruling, but rather on the basic strength of the contending forces and their allies.

On the other hand, the forces favoring a more direct mass assault on segregation have been gaining strength in NAACP and in Negro life generally in the recent past. These are, mainly, such staunch Southern fighters as those who initiated and sustained the Montgomery and Tallahassee boycotts, among whom the clergy is playing an increasingly dominant role; the labor constituency of NAACP which is making a militant imprint on the Association's policy both nationally and especially in such strong trade-union areas as Michigan, Illinois, New York and California; and an important section of the top leadership, both elective and appointed, which is responsive to the mass demand for increased militancy.

The convention action in postponing decision on non-violent passive resistance registered the fact that, on this issue, the groupings which make up the more hesitant and politically conservative trend, had the upper hand in the convention.

It is unlikely, however, that the Association will be able to maintain

this posture of indecision for long. The deep-South stalemate on the desegregation issue fairly cries out for new dimensions and types of mass struggle against Jim Crow. The Association's Board of Directors and national staff can engage in a leisurely contemplation of these new techniques only at the risk that other leaders, not antagonistic to NAACP, but nevertheless independent of it, will boldly lead Negro masses into more direct conflict with segregation in transportation, schools, housing and all public facilities and functions while the NAACP top command gives "careful consideration to this new technique for possible inclusion in our expanding action program for civil rights."

The prospects of affirmative action on the resolution will depend, among other factors, on the steady increase in the Association of the influence of the more militant forces emerging in the Southern struggle, and of the trade-union spokesmen of the working class. Some consideration of the role of the former grouping has been given in the description of the convention role of Dr. Martin Luther King. Let us then turn to the part played by labor in the 47th annual convention.

#### LABOR AND THE NAACP

There can be little question but that the AFL-CIO merger and the progressive stand taken by the united

labor organization on civil rights is helping to transform the character of Negro-white unity within the NAACP. The Association throughout its history has had the support of a small segment of the liberal bourgeoisie in the person of such figures as Kine Kaplan, the Massachusetts manufacturer, and Alfred Baker Lewis, the red-baiting Connecticut insurance executive. It has also prized the support of such liberals as the Spingarns and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. While relations with these forces is being maintained and fought for, the NAACP in recent years has increasingly become the most vital center of the Negro-labor alliance in the country. This fact is serving to radically alter the mood, outlook and perspectives of the organization.

The viewpoint of labor was most strikingly presented at the convention in a remarkable address by A. Philip Randolph, vice-president of AFL-CIO and President of the Sleeping Car Porters. Randolph's speech was an eloquent call for "the moral alliance between Negroes and organized labor" which he described as "a major key, not only for the achievement of labor's and Negroes' as well as other minorities' rights but also for the consolidation and preservation of our democratic life."

He spelled out "the comparable problems and similar, if not identical types of enemies" which make such

a Neg  
"Both,  
lem or  
demag  
ride in  
on the  
have th  
selves  
exploit  
financi  
a sem  
garchy  
He  
Walter  
civil ri  
"But,  
factor  
for thi  
in the  
million  
of incre  
ness a  
unions  
varied  
crafts  
In th  
to the  
ness of  
Obvi  
strong  
in the  
white  
tion of  
state a  
ments  
of a  
cropp  
the br  
White  
lynch-l  
masses  
labor



a Negro-labor alliance imperative. "Both," he declared, "have the problem of getting the southern political demagogues off their backs, who ride into office from year to year on the slogan of racialism. Both have the problem of liberating themselves from the economic clutches of exploitation of city industrial and financial capitalists of the South and a semi-feudalistic plantation oligarchy."

He praised George Meany and Walter Reuther for their stand on civil rights, and then pointed out: "But, probably, the most powerful factor in providing the foundation for this new policy on civil rights in the new house of labor is the million and a half members of color of increasing trade-union consciousness and militancy, distributed in unions throughout the country in varied and various industries, classes, crafts and callings."

In the following terms he pointed to the most urgent unfinished business on labor's agenda:

Obviously, the development of a strong and aggressive labor movement in the South, embracing black and white workers, is the key to the transition of control of southern economy, state and local politics and governments from the weak and palsied hands of a rural, semi-feudalistic share-cropper and tenant farming economy, the breeding ground of Ku Kluxism, White Citizens' Councils, racism, lynch-law and illiterate emotional white masses to an urban industrialism and labor unionism where the paramount

social struggle will shift from racialism to economic, social and political reformism in the interests of higher wages and improved living standards and better government for all citizens, black and white.

Randolph, in short, gave a *class analysis* of the historic roots of Negro oppression, the present relationship of social forces in the battle for equality, and the need for solidifying Negro-labor unity as the core of a popular offensive against racist reaction.

Randolph's speech was well received by the delegates of the convention. They expressed their satisfaction in the fact that both Negro vice presidents of AFL-CIO, Randolph and Willard Townsend, president of the United Transport Service Employees, were also vice presidents of NAACP.

It must remain a concern of the Left and Party forces in the labor movement that we tended to *lag behind* the possibilities in the fight for Negro rights in the recent AFL-CIO merger. The fact is that in many areas our forces did not see the realistic opportunity and did not press for the election of *one* Negro to an AFL-CIO vice presidency, not to speak of two. There was a tendency to underestimate the readiness of the white membership of local unions to struggle for Negro rights, and therefore to see the placing of the demands of the Negro people in connection with the merger as

a divisive rather than a uniting factor. This represented a Right opportunist weakness which persists in our Negro work and must be eliminated at the same time that we continue and intensify the struggle against the major "Left" sectarian errors which have characterized Party practice generally in the past several years.

The resolution on Labor and Industry adopted by the NAACP convention reflects both the positive outlook of the Randolph speech and his realistic appraisals of the problems which lie ahead. It hails the AFL-CIO merger and looks to the next steps necessary to make the principles enunciated at the merger convention a "complete reality." It urges Negro workers to join unions and "to use their trade-union membership to strengthen trade unionism and eliminate discrimination and segregation wherever it still exists." It expresses support for a drive to organize the South; it calls for the opening of apprenticeship and other training facilities to Negro youth. It supports a series of demands, such as \$1.25 minimum wage, extension of social security benefits, etc., which constitute the bulk of the labor movement's economic program for the nation.

The adoption of the progressive demands of the Labor and Industry resolution may be explained in part by the composition of the delegates.

A total of 983 persons had official status at the convention. Of these, 507 were voting delegates and 475 were divided among alternates, observers and fraternal delegates. Among the voting delegates was a substantial, though undetermined number of trade unionists; some played prominent roles as leaders of delegations or of regional caucuses. Of the 475 non-voting delegates, probably half were fraternal delegates from trade-union locals, city and state councils and federations, and international unions. The unions of the packinghouse workers, auto workers, steel workers, clothing workers, as well as others, sent significant groups of fraternal delegates. Thus, though no breakdown was presented by the credentials committee to verify this estimate, it is likely that at least one out of four voting and non-voting delegates of the convention were trade-union members and leaders.

#### LABOR AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEES

The participation of these trade unionists in the convention underscores the growing importance of the labor and industry committees of the local branches. These committees provide the most direct liaison between the community branches of NAACP and the labor movement. In a number of areas they have spearheaded important mem-

## FOREIGN POLICY

Evidence of this two-fold development may be found in the resolutions of the 47th Convention. The resolution on international affairs associates the NAACP and the Negro people with the strivings of the oppressed peoples of Asia and Africa. It repeats the liberal demand for economic rather than military aid to underdeveloped countries. However, the resolution does not dissociate itself from the basic foreign policy aims of the Eisenhower Administration and the Western imperialist powers. In fact it endorses the anti-Communist "position of strength" of the Administration which provides the Western imperialists' justification for maintaining their grip on oppressed lands as sources of raw material, offensive military bases aimed at the Soviet Union and cheap labor power. Thus, the growing anti-colonial, anti-imperialist stand of the NAACP is contradicted by its adherence to the main anti-Communist line of the government's foreign policy.

The fact is, of course, that foreign-policy pronouncements of the convention usually remain dead letter items so far as branch life is concerned from year to year. The branches are customarily absorbed with the domestic question of civil rights in its many manifestations and do not act upon the clear connection between this question and for-

membership growth of the branches and strengthened the militant, mass character of their activities. In some instances leaders of the labor-industry committees, by their good work in building the association and winning for it the active support of the trade unions, have been entrusted with decisive positions of leadership in the branches as a whole. Here—by building these committees—is a practical way of carrying into life the leading role and special initiative of the Negro workers in the Negro liberation movement.

Within the framework of the Negro-labor alliance as reflected in the NAACP, a two-sided development would seem to be occurring. On the one hand, the NAACP leadership exhibits a continuing dependence upon the dominant labor leadership in the formulation of policy on foreign policy and on civil liberties questions. In some respects the convention reflected a tendency to trail behind important sections of the labor movement on civil liberties.

On the other hand, an issue that may be regarded as strictly civil liberties questions—matters of Negro equality "pure and simple"—NAACP, responding to the pressure of its mass Negro membership, is exhibiting an increasingly independent role which is different from and in advance of the position of the labor movement.

eign policy. This must be regarded as an evidence of weakness, not strength, in the Negro liberation movement.

For there can be no question but that the gains registered in the fight for Negro rights are in good measure due to embarrassment caused by the contradiction between U.S. democratic preachment abroad and reactionary racist practice at home. It is also true that a growing bloc of Asian and African nations has become disenthralled with the ridiculous notion that the Administration of the monopolists, who are responsible for the special oppression of the Negro people in the United States, can at the same time be the champion of peace, friendship among nations, and colonial liberation.

Certainly the effective fight which NAACP is conducting on the home front for civil rights would be considerably strengthened by a foreign policy position which more accurately reflected the objective facts of the present world situation. Such a policy would be a thoroughly American policy, in accord with the best interests of the American people, which must be differentiated from the interests of the trusts and international cartels for whom Mr. Dulles is the spokesman.

This is not to say that a pro-imperialist outlook has congealed among the leadership of NAACP. Rather it means that the natural

anti-imperialist attitude of the Negro masses and the majority of their leaders has not been carried to the logical conclusion of a more conscious identification with the policies of the Bandung bloc of nations and a rejection of the reactionary, anti-socialist mainspring of U.S. foreign policy machinations.

This step will be facilitated to the degree that the NAACP sees the necessity of developing an independent position on foreign policy for the Negro people—independent, that is, of the position of the trade-union bureaucracy, which is in itself derivative of the ideology of Big Business.

#### CIVIL LIBERTIES

An even more pronounced evidence of an unsalutary influence of the labor's top leaders on NAACP policy is to be found in the convention resolutions dealing with civil liberties questions. Here there were some positive developments, to be sure. The convention reiterated its support for academic freedom, its general opposition to thought control, and its demand for democratization of the government's "loyalty" investigation procedures which have so conspicuously victimized Negro workers and white friends of Negro equality. Beyond this, however, the convention resolution provided ammunition for the witch hunters.

Against the background of the

false  
and  
to ex  
legiti  
can M  
sian  
states  
Natio  
vance  
tinues  
Conf  
ter, v  
cipate  
with  
Comm  
or gr  
by C  
icy, a  
eligi  
NAA  
This  
is th  
adopt  
since  
duced  
1950  
mover  
floor  
promi  
were  
a sm  
branch  
a few  
doubt  
nation  
tion,  
as a  
of NA  
ing ca  
Counc

false accusation that "Communists and their sympathizers . . . attempt to exploit the just grievances and legitimate aspirations of the American Negro in the interests of Russian imperialism," the resolution states that "the official policy of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People continues to be that no Branch or State Conference, Youth or College Chapter, will endorse, support or participate in or cooperate in any way with Communist organizations, Communist-controlled organizations, or groups known to be dominated by Communist leadership and policy, and that Communists are ineligible for membership in the NAACP."

This anti-Communist statement is the strongest such resolution adopted at an NAACP convention since the original one was introduced by A. Philip Randolph at the 1950 Boston convention. The prime movers in its drafting and in the floor strategy for its adoption were prominent AFL-CIO figures. They were joined in this undertaking by a small but vociferous group of branch leaders, mostly lawyers, from a few of the larger branches. Undoubtedly, in the view of the top national leadership of the Association, the resolution was also seen as a means of "clearing the skirts" of NAACP in face of the mud-slinging campaign of the White Citizens Councils. These campaigns, which

equate all efforts to abolish segregation with "communism," are aimed at providing the public agitation against NAACP necessary to support such "legal" actions as have been taken in Louisiana and Alabama to outlaw the organization.

We are confident that the hard blows of experience will eventually convince the NAACP that such measures are futile, that civil liberties are indivisible, that their own attack upon the Communists weakens rather than strengthens the NAACP in its battle with the Dixiecrats. This is true because the catch-all injunction against "Communists and their sympathizers" opens the doors of the organization to those who would disrupt by smearing, places a political test for membership in a non-partisan people's organization, and can only serve to limit, water down, and hold back the militancy of the Negro liberation movement.

Meanwhile, there are considerations which militant fighters for Negro rights can ignore only at the risk of providing fuel for anti-Communist fires which ought to remain banked in the Association's work. First and foremost is that one must win his or her spurs and title to confidence in this organization, as in any other, by performance on the basis of the present program of NAACP. Overall it is a good program, a fighting program. It needs faithful advocates, hard working executors. The

quality of being the best builders and best fighters for the program of NAACP must be the first characteristic of the more progressive individuals among its membership.

Does this mean there is no room for differences in the Association? Certainly not. The convention shows that a lively and timely debate on strategy and tactics is now taking place in the Negro liberation movement and is reflected in NAACP. To this debate, progressive forces can undoubtedly make a distinct and necessary contribution. But again, this contribution must be made clearly on the basis of the immediate goals and long-term needs of the Negro movement; progressives must be the first to reject the imposition on NAACP policy of the dogma of any grouping or party, whether it is Democratic, Republican, Socialist, Communist, or any other.

Indeed, one of the most cogent arguments against the anti-Communist resolution is that it does not faithfully reflect the conditions in Negro life, or within NAACP, but rather is an imposition on the program of the organization, exacted as a price of continued major support of the AFL-CIO leadership.

#### POLITICAL ACTION

In the field of political action the NAACP convention reflected a growing independence of the two old parties and withering criticism

of both on the question of civil rights. Its "non partisan" position is not a passive one, but rather one of active intervention to influence both parties. Further, where the convention felt it necessary, it dissociated itself from the more timid position of labor on civil rights legislative questions. Two evidences of this fact were the resolutions on the Powell amendment and on enforcement of the 14th amendment.

On the Powell amendment, the convention resolved:

We call upon all friends of civil rights to support the school construction bill with the Powell Amendment. A vote against the amendment must be interpreted as a vote in favor of using northern money to underwrite segregation and defiance of the constitution in those states whose legislatures have voted to resist the decisions of May, 1954, and May, 1955.

This position went beyond the stand of the labor movement which sought to find a middle ground between the pro-labor Congressmen who opposed the Powell Amendment and the righteous demand of the Negro people. This middle ground took the form of substituting for the Powell amendment a demand that President Eisenhower give assurances that federal monies allocated to education would not be spent for segregated schools. Such an assurance was never forthcoming from the White House.

Roy Wilkins in his closing con-

vention  
the ma  
electi

Beca  
nial of  
on the  
should  
that se  
ment t  
represe  
states  
from t

Her  
bor h  
close  
ple ar  
the U  
equal

Wa  
and c  
discus  
panel  
ture  
place  
ing th  
local  
niqu  
tion.  
Auto  
plea  
the N  
on a  
comm  
organ  
Lead  
Righ  
now  
out  
Cong

vention speech addressed himself to the major party platform for the '56 elections and stated:

Because of the scandal of the denial of the vote in some states solely on the basis of race, the platforms should affirm the intention to enforce that section of the Fourteenth Amendment which provides for reducing the representation in the Congress of those states which arbitrarily bar Negroes from the ballot box.

Here, too, is a demand which labor has not yet raised but which is close to the hearts of the Negro people and an essential enforcement of the U.S. constitutional guarantee of equal citizenship.

Ways and means of realizing this and other legislative demands were discussed in a vigorous convention panel on legislative action. One feature of this panel was the emphasis placed on forming and strengthening the legislative committees of the local branches and perfecting techniques of independent political action. Roy Reuther of the United Automobile Workers made a fervent plea for concerting the activities of the NAACP legislative committees on a local scale with the similar committees of many of the other organizations which make up the Leadership Conference for Civil Rights. In the period ahead, between now and the elections, and throughout the life of the coming 85th Congress, the legislative committees

of NAACP branches will provide a key instrumentality in the fight for equal rights.

\* \* \*

Other developments of importance which occurred at the convention cannot be dealt with at length in this article, but deserve to be mentioned:

Floor debate on constitutional changes and matters of internal policy indicated that the efforts of the membership and branches for a larger voice in determining policy continue, although they did not succeed in bringing about any major changes at this convention.

The role of the youth councils and college chapters was not as noticeable a factor in the deliberations of this convention as it has been in others.

The convention marked the first year of the leadership of Roy Wilkins and revealed him as an able administrator and executive who has consolidated his position of leadership and strengthened the NAACP measurably both in terms of organizational structure and financial position.

The 47th annual convention of NAACP represented an important landmark in the historic struggles of the Negro people for freedom. Its deliberations and resolutions provide the basis for furthering the militant unity of the Negro people, their alliance with the working class and the speedy end of the hated Jim Crow system.

# Old Traditions and New Perspectives in Minnesota

By Carl Ross

SOME BASIC RETHINKING of the role and outlook of the Communists in relation to the Left and to the labor-farmer political movement of Minnesota is in order. Whatever are the general conclusions of the discussion now going on in the Communist Party nationally, the problem will still be with us of their *specific* application in this region. This article is addressed to that problem.

\* \* \*

We have, I believe, two main questions before us. One is to help develop a revitalization and unification of the Left around a discussion and advocacy of socialist perspectives. The other is active promotion by this Left of a broad united front relation between itself and the trade union, farm, liberal, Negro, etc., forces around a common immediate program of struggle against monopoly.

Both propositions are firmly rooted in regional tradition. In this area the two closely related tasks could be expressed in popular slogans with meaning far beyond the ranks of the Communists:

*For a Labor-Farmer Political Alli-*

*ance in the People's Fight Against Monopoly!*

*For a Socialist Co-operative Commonwealth!*

Perhaps no area of the country has such a rich tradition of radicalism and Socialist outlook as the Minnesota-Dakotas region. Nor has any other area such a long tradition of farmer-labor political alliance in which the Left has historically been a leading element.

This is more than a tradition. The imprint of this background has been firmly stamped upon the labor and farm movement of the present. First, everyone is well aware that there are today in the trade unions, farm organizations and co-operatives scores and hundreds of Left and socialist-thinking individuals. Many are "old timers," but a large number are of more recent generations. Most have at one time or another been part of the organized Left. Second, the *main movement* of worker, farmer and Negro political activity is the "hybrid" Democratic Farmer-Labor Party. The DFL is the product of the 1944 merger between the once dominant Farmer-



Labor movement and the traditionally minority Democratic Party of Minnesota. This is not today a people's anti-monopoly party, but it certainly is not the same as the Democratic Party is nationally.

A loose coalition of labor and farm elements working mainly through the DFL Party plays an exceptionally important and even decisive role in the political life of the state. It is to these forces and their growing strength and activity that the DFL movement owes its very recent success. The labor and farm forces are a substantial and important part, the decisive part, of the present membership and leadership of the DFL. We should not be led into thinking otherwise because they don't always assert that leadership.

The DFL Party has wrested control of the state administration from the Republican Party. It holds five of the nine congressional seats and one U.S. Senate seat.

Minneapolis has a trade-unionist Mayor and a labor majority of the City Council and School Board. St. Paul has a labor-backed Mayor and city administration. In Austin, So. St. Paul, the Mesabi Range cities and in many towns throughout the state, labor men hold positions of Mayors, councilmen, state representatives and senators, etc.

The working people of the Twin Cities can read with pride the diatribes of the monopoly press against the decisive part played by the Min-

neapolis Central Labor Union and the new joint AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education in municipal politics. Generally every aspirant for local political office or for DFL nomination to office must first pass the screening committee of the CLU and secure CLU endorsement. This the powers of monopoly dislike with the greatest intensity as shown in the current furor over the City Council appointment of a labor man named by the CLU to the School Board vacancy which gave labor a majority in that body.

It is unthinkable that the role and perspectives of the Communist Party can be defined without taking into account both these past traditions and the present realities.

Meridel Le Sueur, Marxist representative of the history and culture of our region, wrote movingly in her booklet *Crusaders* about the earlier regional history of agrarian revolt and Socialist activity as personified by her parents, Arthur and Marian Le Sueur:

Agrarian Socialists from the beginning of the century, with skill and agility they participated and led in the struggles of the people; arrived at the foremost post, but not too far ahead. They sensed, like compass needles, the direction of the struggles against monopoly; the need for agrarian reform, the breaking of power in the cities by organized labor, the alliance of every third party and reform movement of the worker and farmer. While

regional leaders, they were internationalists of a passionate kind, excited by every attempt of man to break the fetters of body and mind.

Socialism was their culture, action, poetry, life itself. . . .

In the slow, brave tortuous movement of the agrarian struggle, they were moving toward Marxism, aware that sharper instruments must be had for stronger struggles. . . .

They had a dream, we see the reality. . . . This is our inheritance.\*

Perhaps we have not examined "our inheritance" closely enough or set enough value upon it. This is not said with any nostalgia for those "old days"; history moves forward, not backward. But we should not think the traditions of Socialist outlook and mass people's struggle, of which it was a part, to be dead or meaningless.

### THE WORLD WAR I PERIOD

Around the time of World War I the Socialist Party was a force in both the cities and rural areas of this region with thousands of members and a wide following. In 1916 Minneapolis had a Socialist Mayor and the influence of Marxism was widespread in the trade-union movement.

These earlier Socialists were leaders and organizers of the farmers' Non-Partisan League that moved into Minnesota from North Dakota, and

they were founders of the Working People's Non-Partisan League in Minnesota. These two groups in the post-World War I period made a determined effort to capture the Republican Party to serve as a political vehicle, as they had done in North Dakota. *Only after failing in this endeavor did they launch the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party* which gained its first electoral victories in 1924.

It must be added that our own Party was organized by the Left wing elements of the Socialist Party in this state in 1919 as a result of the split precipitated by the Right wing support to U.S. imperialism in the war. From that day, our Party has been the rightful inheritor of splendid Socialist traditions, and by and large has carried forward with honor this inheritance.

Yet, as we are critically examining our past it is well to acknowledge that we Communists have not always worked successfully to unite and lead that broader section of Socialist thinking men and women outside of the Communist Party. This question now comes to the fore. We shall examine here some of the background.

### THE THIRTIES

Most of us are directly familiar with the Farmer-Labor administrations of Floyd B. Olson and Elmer Benson from 1932 to 1938, coinciding with the rise of the nation

\* Published by Blue Heron Press, N. Y., 1955.  
—Ed.

Working New Deal coalition around FDR. We recall that this was in Minnesota, as elsewhere, a period of great mass struggle of unemployed and farmers and of trade-union organization. These movements were often sparked by the Left and the Communists. This militant movement of workers and small farmers provided the backbone of Farmer-Laborism.

The Farmer-Labor Party was run by the federated Farmer-Labor Association composed of elected delegates from trade unions, co-operatives, farmer-labor club and other mass groups. Among them, labor led. In the vigorous debate over policy it was well recognized that the movement had a powerful Left wing of which the Communists were a part.

Reading Gil Green's recent book, *Enemy Forgotten*, one is struck by his apt analysis of past labor and people's battles as traditionally directed against monopoly. A particularly high level of that anti-monopoly struggle was reached in the Farmer-Labor days in Minnesota. This was represented in the great labor organizing and strike movement that broke the notorious employers' "Citizens Alliance" open-shop rule in Minneapolis as well as the steel trust terror on the Mesabi Range, and achieved organization of the miners. The anti-monopoly struggle had as its prime target the steel trust and moved with a vigorous anti-

monopoly tax program against the mining interests. The fight also centered upon protecting the small farmers from the voracious bankers' foreclosure drive, which was blocked by the "mortgage moratorium."

The relatively advanced anti-monopoly program and achievements of this F-L movement would have been impossible without the Left. The Left wing fought for such a policy. It rallied the people around their own mass organizations and battles, economic and political. Among these Left forces the Communist Party was easily the outstanding and strongest, but it was by no means the only Left trend or even the only group that advocated Socialism. The Farmer-Labor movement was the independent and radical wing of the New Deal coalition in Minnesota, which also included the Democrats. However, being a product of distinctive historic origin, Minnesota farmer-laborism was also strongly anti-capitalist. It supported the New Deal reforms, but it also advocated a new social order conceived as a "Co-operative Commonwealth," based upon common ownership of the nation's resources and "production for use."

The Co-operative Commonwealth idea and this strong radical current in the Farmer-Labor movement was produced from an amalgamation of many influences. Among these were traditional Midwest agrarian radicalism, Social-Democratic and co-

operative ideology of Scandinavian origin, Socialist and Marxist influences.

The principal Farmer-Labor spokesmen preached the "middle way" (between Socialism in the USSR and capitalism) as exemplified by Swedish Social-Democracy. But a lively debate was conducted over the question of what road would lead to a new social order. For instance, on one occasion Governor Olson debated the British Socialist, John Strachey, on the issue of Marxian socialism versus the "middle way."

#### THE PARTY AND THE FARMER-LABOR MOVEMENT

In retrospect it would seem clear that the Communists made a number of sectarian errors related to this movement. It took some time for us to come around to the view that we had to play a role of positive support as part of the Left wing of the Farmer-Labor movement. Once having entered the movement the Communists did not rely enough upon ideological influence and the give and take of political debate to forge a united front relation with the majority non-Communist labor and farm elements. Often the Communists could have been and were accused of trying to impose their opinions of tactics and policy upon the movement.

Along with this it seems to me that a wrong and narrow approach was taken to the Co-operative Com-

monwealth slogan. We tended to dismiss it as demagogy or to reject it as non-Socialist because this somewhat utopian concept did not correspond to our ideas of Socialism and was not generally based upon Marxism.

Yet, in fact the slogan reflected a striving toward Socialism by many who were not willing to accept the Soviet Union as their model much as they may have admired many of its achievements. Not to have fully recognized this and make it the starting point for a sympathetic approach and joint discussion of an American road to Socialism was a dogmatic application of Marxism and also sectarian. There was a very real opportunity in that situation for strengthening the collaboration of radical and pro-Socialist elements and strengthening the Socialist current.

Certainly the Browder episode in the life of our Party had much to do with our failure more vigorously to promote and develop this body of Socialist consciousness. Thus for many reasons and for some time the Socialist trend in the labor and farm movement of this area has been weakened or dissipated. Two factors have played a big role in this:

First, during the "cold war" decade the Left came under sharp attack from reaction. The blows of McCarthyism, while aimed at the whole labor-farmer-liberal movement, fell heaviest on the Left generally and upon the Communists in

partic  
and a  
from  
have  
the L  
Seco  
were  
DFL  
ger to  
error  
nesota  
Late  
ful b  
gram  
spring  
clear  
farme  
their  
war p  
candi  
inside  
cratic  
Th  
ings  
with  
sharp  
ership  
and  
of in  
main  
other  
went  
lapse  
rema  
A  
these  
THE  
Fo

particular. Intimidation, harassment and a drive to oust many of them from the labor-farmer movement have left scars and weaknesses upon the Left.

Second, the main forces of the Left were still a strong factor in the DFL movement from the 1944 merger to 1948. But they made a serious error in helping to launch the Minnesota Progressive Party in 1948. Late '47 and early '48 showed powerful backing to the progressive program and Wallace candidacy. By the spring of '48 it should have been clear that the majority of the labor-farmer-liberal forces wanted to make their fight for a progressive and anti-war program (and even the Wallace candidacy on a Democratic ticket) inside the DFL and national Democratic Party.

The Left did not heed the warnings and by election day found itself with dwindling support and under sharp attack by the main DFL leadership who sought further to isolate and oust the Left from all positions of influence. A substantial part of the Left found itself outside the main stream in relative isolation, other elements of the Left never went all the way with the PP and lapsed into political passivity while remaining with the DFL movement.

A train of consequences followed these above-mentioned developments.

#### THE DFL TODAY

For the first time in over four

decades the main farmer-labor political movement has been for several years without a strong and effective Left wing. DFL leadership slipped more and more into the hands of the Humphrey-Freeman clique and their University political science experts while the influence of the labor and small farmer forces declined. Monopoly pressure on the DFL, not being offset by strong counter pressure, has wrung concessions from the DFL state administration in tax policies and other matters on which it has retreated from a firm anti-monopoly stand.

The liberal-Social Democratic trend that this present top DFL leadership represents is basically middle class and was not characteristic of the old FLP movement. Resolute anti-monopoly struggle and people's political action cannot primarily depend on them. In this state, as everywhere, this requires a backbone and leading force. This cannot be anything else except a labor-farmer political alliance working with the Negro people and with the middle class liberals. *The task of the Left historically was and still remains the fight for such a strong labor-farmer political alliance.*

The Left has been regrouping slowly and moving back into the main labor-farmer movement, but is still strongly hampered by both this isolation and political passivity. A strong common characteristic within the Left is a tendency to "opposition-

ism" in the trade unions, farm organizations and political movement. This tendency to associate the whole labor and farm leadership along with Humphrey and Freeman as the objective against whom the fight should be waged is absolutely wrong and unrealistic. The enemy against whom to center fire is monopoly and the anti-labor and anti-farmer reactionaries whose chief political instrument in this state is the GOP. This attitude of "oppositionism" does not help to forge a firm united front between the Left and the bulk of the labor and farm people who have lots of confidence in Humphrey and Freeman but are nevertheless ready to fight on many of the important issues and to insist on a stronger voice in DFL policies. The rank and file trade union and Farmers Union people can understand and will support a fight for unity against monopoly; they are apathetic to whatever they feel is factional or a partisan move of the Left.

The recent DFL state convention adopted a sound position on many major issues of civil rights, farm and labor policy, education and social welfare issues, etc. It revealed the degree to which labor-farmer-Negro pressure influences DFL policy and compels its leaders to go along, sometime reluctantly moving forward. A strong demand for revision of the foreign policy plank toward a peace and disarmament line would also have won concessions. Unfortunately

the platform on this issue is a contradictory restatement of support to the Democratic "cold war" line along with points of emphasis on economic aid abroad, support to the UN, increased trade, etc., that move in the right direction but don't go even as far as Governor Freeman did in his appearance before the Humphrey Senate Sub-committee on Disarmament. There Freeman emphasized spending for social welfare as more important than spending for arms.

The very strong civil rights stand of that Convention was won by a strong block of labor and Negro delegates which the Left also helped to stimulate. Other positive platform planks directly reflect the position of the trade unions and Farmers Union.

However, let's note three things:

- 1) While labor is active politically and influential in DFL circles, it does not yet utilize more than a fraction of the great potential opened up by the AFL-CIO merger set to be consummated in Minnesota next October.

- 2) The Minnesota Farmers Union has not, as has the North Dakota F. U., established a full-fledged legislative and political set-up at the local level.

- 3) Labor and farmer political cooperation as yet doesn't have its own independent channels of joint work.

Solution of these problems would certainly shift the center of gravity

of pe  
farm  
unfo  
gram  
As  
simil  
have  
patic  
ship  
ing  
in t  
will  
ship  
in t  
and  
achi  
today  
in t  
cour  
prog  
mer  
T  
con  
mal  
a fa  
anti  
coal  
sha  
farm  
ma  
FO  
7  
anc  
in  
me  
clu  
lab  
str

of political leadership to the labor-farmer forces provided they also unfold their own independent program.

As we have endeavored to show, similar problems in other periods have been resolved with the participation and often under the leadership of the Left and Socialist-thinking elements. It is not likely that in the next period ahead the Left will occupy the position of leadership in this broad coalition. It could in the past when the trade union and farm organizations had not yet achieved the size and stability of today. The Left will and can lead in the future also, but only in the course of great advances in policy, program and ideology in the movement of today.

This does not, however, deny the contribution the Left must now make through a stubborn fight for a farmer-labor political alliance and anti-monopoly policies within the coalition. And, the Left can win a share of leadership among the labor-farmer forces corresponding to its mass influence and contributions.

#### FOR UNITY OF THE LEFT

The Left is obligated to rediscover and freshly develop its historic role in the people's anti-monopoly movement. A united Left cannot be excluded from the labor movement and labor-farmer political movement. A strong Left operating in coalition

with the other major labor and people's forces will also bring into the heart of the trade union and farm movement a new current of Socialist discussion and consciousness.

The question is how the Communist element of the Left will contribute to the unity of Left forces and to a strong Socialist grouping within the Left.

1) The Communists should actively project the slogan of a Socialist Co-operative Commonwealth as describing the common goal of pro-Socialist workers and farmers and as the alternative to American capitalism. This in itself will remove many barriers that have blocked the way between co-operation of Communists and others of the Left. The way can be opened for a much freer and wider discussion of what Socialism can mean to America and of current problems from a Socialist point of view. The eventual unity of Left forces cannot be based alone upon a common set of tactics around daily issues. It requires more ideological discussion and the eventual forging of a common platform upon which American socialists can stand and establish a new mass party of Socialism.

Anti-capitalist and Socialist thought was stimulated in the Farmer-Labor days by the economic crisis of capitalism more than any other factor, but also by advances of Socialism in the USSR and successes achieved by Scandinavian social-democracy.

The current increase of radical and Socialist ideology reflects new factors at work: the development of atomic energy and automation whose vast potentialities cannot be fully exploited under capitalism, the very prevalent lack of faith in permanent industrial or agricultural "prosperity" under capitalism and, of course, the vast new changes in a world where millions are turning to Socialism and fighting against colonialism.

The projection and debate of Socialist ideas against this background is not a sectarian proposition. It would be sectarian only if it is undertaken in self-isolation from the broad labor and people's movement.

In a sense the debate has already started, but generally without the pro-Socialist and Marxist view represented. This is how I interpret Walter Reuther's speech to the state DFL Convention where he discussed precisely the above mentioned issues. That speech, received with thunderous applause responding to his statement that "we stand on the brink of hell but can turn around to a bright new tomorrow," was a first-class challenge to the Socialist-minded people to talk to masses about this bright new tomorrow and how to get there.

2) The Communists should also emerge boldly from their present relative isolation to make contact with all healthy elements of the Left, seeking out especially the So-

cialist thinking individuals in the trade unions and farm organizations.

Experience shows that by and large they welcome our initiative and individually or in small groups will begin to exchange opinions. But, experience also already shows that this new relationship of mutual discussion and co-operation cannot be secured by demanding acceptance of the Party's opinions or submission to Party discipline. In fact, Party programs, policies, and tactics, should in themselves be formulated with the help of such exchanges of opinion and tested out for the response of such people.

The Left needs to hammer out a common line of approach to current political and labor problems by joint discussion. The question is both *what program and policies the Left advances and how it will fight for them in each specific instance.*

The Communists will have their mettle tested in contributing to this goal because new creative thinking, tactical flexibility, patience and ideological equipment will be required.

#### METHODS OF PARTY WORK

3) The methods of work, organizational practices and methods of propaganda of the Communist Party certainly need to come in for review and modification. All this should be considered with an eye to perspectives and to enable each Communist individual and Communist club to

work  
outsid  
That's  
The  
Party  
ideolo  
bers.  
the to  
for t  
Comm  
must  
policy  
collec  
comm  
level  
sition  
issues  
reflec  
life a  
ing t  
muni  
Or  
emer  
shoul  
our



work out a new relation to people outside the Communist movement. That's the central thing.

The emphasis ought to be on the Party and Party Club providing ideological grounding for its members. We need people who can use the tool of Marxist science to think for themselves. Besides that, the Communist club and leading body must be a place for free debate over policy. Especially should it be the collective responsibility of Clubs and committees at the state and local level to debate and work out a position on all major local and state issues. At present our Party is not reflecting in its inner discussion and life the issues and problems agitating the labor movement and community.

Once general policy is clear and emerges from Party discussion we should avoid the pitfalls of binding our members to a narrow discipline

which inevitably tends to create a faction—and emphasize the freedom and necessity for Communist individuals to develop their position and tactics to meet each specific situation they face according to the relationships they have built to the non-Communists who compose the movements in which they are active.

I can see better perspectives opening up for establishing the public role of the Communist Party and also for more freedom of Communists to hold and advocate their views within the trade unions and mass movements. I don't think that this will be done, however, except as other Left individuals and groups outside our Party do the same. In other words as the general movement of the Left, and Socialist-thinking Left, develops its public discussions and its public spokesmen, among these will be the Marxists of the Communist Party.

# A New Atmosphere

By Camille Huysmans

*In response to a request for comment on the "prospects for international working-class cooperation," sent by R. Palme Dutt, distinguished editor of the British Marxist magazine, Labour Monthly, Camille Huysmans forwarded the following reply. Mr. Huysmans, whose 85th birthday was the occasion recently of an international celebration, was secretary of the pre-1914 Socialist International, and is now Speaker of the Belgian House of Commons and a Minister of State.—Ed.*

\* \* \*

What interests me above all—since the recent events—is the question whether it will be possible, in the near future, to re-establish throughout the world the working class unity which existed and seemed durable before the first world war and which the misunderstandings of 1917 not only wrecked but transformed into mutual hostility.

This hope is permissible on condition that on both sides an effort is made at mutual understanding right away, so as to avoid new misunderstandings which might degenerate into latent enmity.

I am one of those who firmly believe that Soviet Russia is going through a crisis of a political character which may lead to a desirable rapprochement of an indefinite scope, if for our part we abandon the attitude—systematically adopted by some—of facile irony or systematic incredulity, often based on a distortion of reality.

I do not believe that any dictatorial regime in Eastern or Southern Europe will survive for long.

I believe that a democratic regime will inevitably be imposed wherever the working class becomes conscious of its strength and of its destiny. As for the rest, I am certain that a working class understanding in Europe will create a new atmosphere, which will bring forward new men and new governments.

I apologize for having only an act of faith to offer you, but if I have rightly understood the text of your telegram, this act of faith answers the question you have put to me.

# Cultism: Its Genesis and Exodus

By Stetson Kennedy

*In accordance with its general invitation for comment on the current discussions regarding the Communist movement and Socialism, Political Affairs is happy to present this article by the noted American journalist, Stetson Kennedy, author of the well-known book Southern Exposure, published by Doubleday.*

*In his covering letter, Mr. Kennedy writes: "The enclosed article was written prior to publication of the Togliatti, Dennis and CPSU commentaries on the findings of the XXth Congress relative to the cult of the individual. In view of the still existing gaps between the aforementioned commentaries, I thought you might be interested in publishing this commentary based on the prolonged first-hand observations of an independent American progressive."*

*Mr. Kennedy has spent the last three years abroad, visiting socialist lands from Berlin to Peking collecting material for another book. His article was sent to us from Budapest.—Ed.*

It is taking some time, naturally, for the world progressive movement to recover from the realization of the transgressions committed and fostered by Stalin during the latter phase of his career, as verified by the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. While the Congress has bravely said the first word, many more remain to be said before the last word is spoken, and socialists everywhere must be equally brave in speaking them. With each day that has passed since the death of Stalin and since the authentication of his misdeeds, it has become possible to see more and more clearly where the world progressive movement stands in consequence of those transgressions and

its repudiation of them, how it can best make rectification, and what Stalin's future status must be.

As a believer in socialism whose decades of active political work happen to have coincided with that period of Stalin's career in question, I have had occasion to study, with varying degrees of intimacy, the effects of cultism and its associated disorders upon the progressive movement in the USA, Latin America, West Europe, North Africa, and the lands of socialism as well. Though I cannot be charged with having been a communicant of the Stalin cult, neither can I be credited with having worked openly for its elimination. And so it is as a non-party progressive without any "axes to grind" or particular

connections past or present that I should like to venture a few friendly observations.

Before we can hope to deal decisively with even larger questions, we must come to some clear-cut conclusions to the basic question of: "How great was Stalin's guilt?"

#### "SOME BLANK SPACES"

The analyses thus far made by various Communist and workers' parties contribute much to an understanding of what took place and what therefore must be done, but there are still some blank spaces to be filled in. In this situation, it seems to me that the CPSU has a further responsibility to itself and to the world progressive movement to provide a definitive analysis of the "Stalin question," so that the world may know precisely what his contributions and transgressions were, and evaluate the man accordingly.

In any court of justice, the motivation of the accused is a prime consideration in arriving at the degree of culpability involved.

Stalin most assuredly could not plead ignorance as an excuse. He knew as well as any man the tenets of the creed he so grossly violated. And it is significant to note that, in violating some of the highest laws of socialism, he never took exception to those laws as such. On the contrary, they were rendered lip-service and kept inviolate on paper, and, incongruously together with the in-

cantations and observances of cultism, were diligently inculcated into the minds and hearts of the millions who followed socialism's lead. By not taking explicit exception to the creed in principle, but only in practice, Stalin was, paradoxically, a law-breaker who professed allegiance to the very laws he broke, even as he broke them.

The question then is, why did he break them?

#### WHY THE CRIMES?

If no defender-of-Stalin can plead ignorance as an excuse, neither can any prosecutor-of-Stalin find a shred of evidence that he did anything he did with intent to retard or damage—much less to destroy—socialism. We may be sure that what Stalin did he did not with a view to serving foreign reaction—though it is just as sure that some of his actions have unwittingly done more damage than a host of foreign agents could ever hope to accomplish. Stalinism (in the negative sense of the word, which has manifold positive connotations as well) was conscientiously intended to cure some of the ailments of socialism, but as a form of therapy it was unjustified and so drastic that it gave rise to even more serious disorders, actually endangering the life of the patient.

And yet the fact remains: if Stalin did what he did in a conscientious belief that it was somehow necessary to the security of the Soviet Union and the growth of socialism in the

world,  
factor.  
a mar  
But  
to wer  
good  
sion i  
later li  
illness  
serving  
clear t  
victim  
volv  
and a  
Veri  
by con  
a long  
in did  
good  
bones.  
resolve  
dict o  
young  
and ye  
hor hi  
We  
Ages,  
suffer  
is not  
mental  
surely  
burden  
For  
a gran  
also. C  
could  
of dive  
selves  
feudali  
sition,  
themse

world, that is assuredly a mitigating factor in any assessment of him as a man and leader.

But some of the measures resorted to were so horrendous that, granted good intentions, no other conclusion is possible but that Stalin in later life suffered from some mental illness. Even to the layman observing from a distance, it is all too clear that this man came to be the victim of a neurosis or psychosis involving both delusions of grandeur and a persecution complex.

Verification of this self-evident fact by competent psychiatrists would go a long way to prevent the evil Stalin did from living after him, and the good from being interred with his bones. At the same time, this would resolve the ambivalent emotional conflict of all those who loved the younger Stalin for his good works, and yet who are now obliged to abhor his later atrocities.

We are not living in the Middle Ages, and it is not a cardinal sin to suffer some mental illness. Stalin is not the first genius to crack-up mentally under severe strain, and surely no man ever shouldered more burdensome tasks than he.

For if Stalin's mistakes were on a grand scale, his achievements were also. Only a strong and steady hand could have led 160,000,000 people of diverse nationalities to dig themselves out of a quagmire of medieval feudalism, poverty, illiteracy, superstition, and inertia, to transform themselves within a single generation

into a united, dynamic, enlightened, cultured, industrialized multi-national socialist state, the first of its kind on earth. Under Stalin, and while surrounded by hostile powers, an ox-cart economy changed itself into a highly mechanized one; a nation moved by muscle-power converted itself into one with unlimited steam, petroleum, electric, solar, and atomic power at its command; a once-backward people became the acknowledged world leaders in many fields of industry, science, and culture. This is not to say that any or all of these monumental achievements could not or would not have been realized without Stalin; but together with the Party and people he did have a hand in them.

In passing final judgment on Stalin, we cannot ignore certain other mitigating factors, known in legal parlance as "contributory negligence," of being "accessory to the fact," and (yes) "harboring a criminal." It takes more than one to make a cult, and in all fairness, and in spite of the cultist perversion of the police power, each and every one of us who failed to speak out against it must shoulder some of the blame for permitting cultism to establish itself and prevail for so long.

#### SOCIALIST MORALITY

Not only socialist legality, but—still worse—socialist morality has been gravely compromised. If the latter is to be restored to its rightful pre-eminence, frank confession must

be followed by thorough-going rectification. The tap-root of cultism has been severed, but care must be taken lest the far-reaching tendrils of the poisonous vine put down fresh roots of their own.

Socialism can no more afford to embrace criminality after it is dead than it can while it is alive. But if, as all the evidence indicates, Stalin acted with the welfare of Socialism at heart, and was simply rendered incompetent, by virtue of psychotic compulsions, to choose between right and wrong according to socialist morality and legality, then our dilemma is largely resolved. We are left with the memory of a conscientious leader who committed criminal acts without criminal intent. Obviously, such a person is neither to be altogether venerated nor altogether castigated. While entitled to considerable esteem in the annals of socialist man, Stalin must rank considerably below such other pioneers of the new society as Marx, Engels, and Lenin, whose contributions were relatively spotless.

#### FOR SOCIALIST UNITY

When Stalin's place in history has been duly assessed, the Communist movement will be in a position to cope more effectively with the unfinished business of ridding itself of the musty remnants of cultism. This will in turn help to clear the way for accomplishing one of the most urgent and transcendent tasks confronting the working class today:

closing the ranks of all those who would lead mankind onto the paths of peace and socialism.

Even a supernal adjudicator would find it difficult to say now whether the Communist or non-Communist Left has been most responsible for the schisms which have retarded the growth of Socialism for decades. But fortunately a functional collaboration of the Left is not at all dependent upon any such invidious blame-fixing. The need is not for more of the charges and counter-charges which have already done so much damage, but for each party to put its own house in order. By thus eliminating the grounds for mutual recrimination, they can liberate and pool their energies for putting the whole of human society in order. The working class, while still lending an attentive ear to argument, is watching closely to see whose words are most fully carried out in deeds.

The Soviet Union and other countries under Communist leadership have taken the initiative in self-criticism, frank confession, and rectification. Prison doors which had closed around conscientious objectors against cultism have been thrown open. It is now incumbent upon the Communist parties in the capitalist world to open wide their doors to all those who stayed out, walked out, or were put out because of their opposition to cultism. For the reinvigoration of criticism, inner Party democracy, and collective lead-

ership  
Comm  
regain  
elemen  
and po  
engage  
Socialis  
Need  
fession  
great c  
munist  
there a  
in the  
to lean  
pose of  
effectiv  
Right.  
happily  
an exc  
evils n  
invente  
invente  
nifying  
if the  
but co  
little t  
need h  
big lie  
tion. I  
tion th  
the en  
cartrid  
bre an  
It m  
to get  
was it  
lectical  
fall un  
cultism  
Actu  
nomen

ership offers the highest hope to Communist parties everywhere of regaining the allegiance of valuable elements, making for the cohesion and polarity of every group honestly engaged in the task of promoting Socialism.

Needless to say, the need for confession and rectification is no less great on the part of the non-Communist Left. Also needless to say, there are very many forces abroad in the world today which pretend to lean to the Left, for the sole purpose of attacking Communism more effectively than they could from the Right. These elements seized most happily upon the evils of cultism as an excuse for their attacks; had such evils not existed, they would have invented them—as indeed they have invented countless others while magnifying and distorting these. And yet if the Communist movement will but continue to negate the internal little truths that tell against it, it need have no fear of all the external big lies that are aimed in its direction. It has been the live ammunition that was put into the hands of the enemy that hurt, not the blank cartridges, however large their calibre and loud their detonation.

It may well be asked, in seeking to get to the bottom of all this: How was it possible for the party of dialectical materialism, of all parties, to fall under the sway of individual cultism?

Actually, if we look at this phenomenon in the light of dialectical

materialism itself, it is not so paradoxical as it might seem. The human material comprising the progressive movement did not spring up overnight, but has its roots deeply embedded in the past. Man, in his long search for something on which to pin his highest aspirations, has progressed from an animistic worship of sticks and stones, to polytheistic reverence for pantheons of anthropomorphic gods created in his own image, to the monotheistic projection of one god as heavenly father of all men. Finding each of these in turn to be scant help and cold comfort, man did not despair, but went on to scale the highest pinnacle of the gods, to find there, in all his glorious potentiality, none other than—*himself!*

This penultimate discovery flowered into the creed of socialism, and on the solid rock of dialectical materialism proceeded to build its institution, the party, consecrated to the one shrine of socialist principle. Yet the party and its following consist of people, and in their arduous struggle to rise above mere man and become socialist man, it is not surprising that there should be some backsliding into ancient habits. And so long as there are masses who are willing to worship, it is quite likely that there will be some individuals who are willing to be worshipped.

#### DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

Democracy consists not so much

in a form of government as it does a kind of people. The revolution led by the party of the proletariat inherited in Russia a populace whose reflexes had long been conditioned to react to ukase and ikon. Democratic centralism offered to lead the way to the true self-government of Communism. But a people slowly persuaded to forsake the mirage of a heavenly father thought they saw a terrestrial substitute in the imposing figure of Stalin, and they, lovingly, hastened to envelope him with the garb of the supernatural. And he, for reasons best—or perhaps least—known to himself, chose to accept the role of demigod. No doubt it appeared expedient, in mobilizing the masses to cope with the perpetual challenges of these transitional years, to revert to the primitive archetype of cultism instead of struggling with the additional task of developing such an innovation as democratic centralism. The result, as we know, was a high degree of centralism, coupled with a low degree of democracy, ruling in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Fortunately, it was at least *for* the proletariat, and, if the institution of the proxy can be accepted in this case, it could even be described as being of and by the proletariat.

This commentary is intended neither as justification nor exorcism of anyone. It would be difficult indeed to find anyone qualified to throw the first stone. More important even than determining the cause of the disease of cultism is the neces-

sity of effecting its cure and insuring immunity against any relapse in the future.

This factor is not pointed to as either excluding or transcending the long-familiar factors of internal and external opposition to the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union, but as supplementing those factors. The necessity for controls to cope with internal and external opposition constituted the objective environment in which the subjective heritage of a specifically Russian national tradition and character, conditioned by centuries of tsardom and orthodoxy, gave rise to the various phenomena referred to as the cult of the individual.

The larger question may be asked: Why, if cultism is a product of Russian soil, Communist parties the world over so diligently cultivated it? The answer is not, as the advertisers of capitalism would have it, that cultism is inherent in Communism, for this is a contradiction by definition. The explanation is to be found, rather, in a justified respect for the pioneering role of the Soviet Union, coupled with an unjustified notion of how to achieve international proletarian solidarity. The fact is that cultism did not succeed in putting down tap roots anywhere, but only a network of surface feeders. Socialism has grown in the world not by virtue of cultism, but in spite of it: and as cultism is rooted out, Socialism will grow infinitely faster.

By C

ANN  
od i  
in th  
tia  
of C  
Befo  
ever,  
histo  
is kn  
hold  
An  
my  
cal  
prese  
Party  
as t  
CPS  
me v  
urge  
ately  
willi  
joind  
same  
sary,  
write  
urge  
Berm  
sister  
myse  
ante  
made  
reaso



# Concerning "Method in Political Economy"

By Celeste Strack

ARNOLD BERMAN's article, "On Method in Political Economy," published in the June issue, makes a substantial contribution to the examination of Communist errors in this field. Before discussing its content, however, I want to review briefly the history of this article, at least as it is known to me, because I think it holds some lessons.

Arnold Berman's basic criticism of my articles was submitted to *Political Affairs* last year, prior to the present discussion of Communist Party policy in this country, as well as to the 20th Congress of the CPSU. The editors forwarded it to me with a request for comment. I urged that it be printed immediately. However, the editors were unwilling to publish it without a rejoinder by myself appearing in the same issue. I felt this to be unnecessary, the more so since I could not write it at that moment, and again urged immediate publication of the Berman article. The editors were insistent that a simultaneous piece by myself appear, so in order to guarantee that the discussion would be made public, I agreed. For personal reasons, however, I was unable to

write it for two months, and so missed several deadlines. By the time my article reached *Political Affairs*, early this year, the editors felt the whole matter was no longer timely.\*

I have gone into this episode because it points a moral. It involved one instance of the critical discussion which has been developing in our ranks for some time now, but which was rarely, if ever, reflected in *Political Affairs*. Responsibility for this situation, of course, goes beyond the magazine itself, and is related to the general lack of open debate in our ranks; nor is this, therefore, a problem which the editors could alone have solved. However, from now on,

---

\* Owing to the special conditions at that time, the Berman article was already several months old when it reached *Political Affairs*. Since the article centered largely on a critique of the Norris articles, the editors, in accordance with the standard practice of all magazines, sent a copy to the author for a brief comment.

Because of the pressure of circumstances, as she points out, Mary Norris, the pen-name for Celeste Strack, missed two successive deadlines, and finally sent in an article equal in length to that by Berman. When the two articles were discussed with Berman, he pointed out that some of the statistical matter was then out of date, that events had moved forward, and that he preferred to bring his article up-to-date generally. The revised article was published as soon as received.

*Political Affairs* was by no means averse to publishing the Berman article without a rejoinder, as, in fact, it finally did.—Ed.

*Political Affairs* should set an example, with discussion and debate a regular feature of the magazine. Critical articles need not necessarily be answered in the same issue; we should allow readers a chance to mull things over and participate themselves at an early stage of a controversy, instead of buttoning it up prematurely. Perhaps one day *Political Affairs* will even open its pages to Marxists outside the ranks of the Communist Party, be they economists or otherwise. (I was glad to see Nenni's article reprinted, but let's not confine this practice to Marxists of other countries!)

\* \* \*

Now to return to the substance of Arnold Berman's article, which has been somewhat altered and expanded since the original draft. His central thesis is that the main weakness in the Party's economic analysis during the post-World War II decade has been a doctrinaire approach to the development of the economic cycle, as well as to other questions. I agree with this, and with his observation that: "Instead of an objective consideration of all the available facts, we tended to carry on an assiduous search for those data which would support our *a priori* expectations of imminent crisis, while ignoring or 'explaining away' all contrary data."

I also agree in the main with the reasons he gives for this weakness, the most important of which probably are our long standing dogma-

tism in this field, coupled with uncritical acceptance of Soviet economic thinking. It might be added that bourgeois economics affected our work in a double way. During the early post-war years we were doubtless influenced by the fairly general expectation of an early American depression which characterized the attitude of many economists both here and abroad. Only in the last three or four years has their emphasis shifted to the possible emergence of a crisis-free capitalism. Refutation of this proposition is a proper concern of Marxists, but it will not be effective if it is simply a restatement of general principles.

A subjective factor contributing to our difficulties has been the nature of our personnel in the field of political economy. There tends to be a dichotomy between "pure" theoreticians comparatively unconcerned with American realities, and research economists, immersed in the facts, but reflecting a certain weakness in drawing theoretical conclusions. This is not always the case: Hyman Lumer and James Allen, for example, have both attempted to combine serious study of the American scene with theoretical conclusions therefrom. But the tendency does exist, and represents the two extremes between which our Party generally has tended to oscillate: doctrinairism and pragmatism.

My main concern, however, is to discuss the weaknesses and errors in my own articles as I view them today. Here I find myself largely in

agree  
but w

TH

It

the b

articl

pen r

*Affai*

Marx

writt

with

meat

nomi

all a

dealt

their

appro

ing c

By r

appa

failu

ize v

orde

the

than

tion.

Th

diffe

spec

in th

deno

in a

tran

force

infl

of c

into

cal

the

Mar

agreement with Comrade Berman, but with some points of difference.

### THE NORRIS ARTICLES

It might be useful first to sketch the background and purpose of these articles, which appeared under the pen name of Mary Norris. (*Political Affairs*, February and March, 1954; March and June, 1955). They were written with the aim of breaking with the doctrinaire approach permeating our previous post-war economic analysis. Up to then, almost all articles in *Political Affairs* had dealt with the economic outlook, as their titles indicate, in terms of "the approaching crisis," "the developing crisis," and "the maturing crisis." By 1953, a more moderate tone was apparent, but explanation of the failure of economic crisis to materialize was still simply in terms of war orders, while no future leeway for the economy was indicated other than through more military production.

The Norris articles aimed at a different approach in several respects. Their basic intent was stated in the first article :

... We must guard against the tendency . . . to approach cyclical crisis in a mechanical way. This results in translating the recognition of basic forces leading to crisis into a rather inflexible prediction of the actual onset of crisis, which fails to take sufficiently into account those economic and political developments which might alter the exact sequence of events. What Marxist analysis can and should pro-

vide is an understanding of the decisive forces determining the direction of economic development, allowing also for those factors which may temporarily retard or deflect this course.

This was reiterated in the June, 1955 article, which dealt primarily with bourgeois claims that the economic cycle could be controlled:

. . . The issue involved cannot be disposed of by a simple recapitulation of Marxist theory . . . including the inevitability of economic crisis under capitalism. . . . We must answer the question: how has the economic cycle changed in recent years and what is its probable future development? Slowness in tackling this problem permitted another incorrect concept to develop . . . namely the tendency to believe that each economic downturn constituted the onset of a crisis of the 1929 type.

Second, the Norris articles attempted to assess some of the most important *new* economic developments affecting the economic cycle, particularly the role of the state in the economy. While this has been based primarily on military production and related measures over the past decade, it also includes a vast complex of other economic functions aimed at averting economic crisis. Parts of these were inherited from the New Deal, while some were developed since then. The economic role of the state is not confined to expenditures, military or otherwise, but includes many other fields, such as credit and fiscal policy, taxation, a variety of economic controls. Recognition of the impact of all these

government measures on the economic cycle was required. It had been ignored in the analysis of cyclical trends up to that time, yet it constitutes one of the important new features of the economic scene.

Third, the articles attempted to take into account the not inconsiderable economic reserves of American imperialism which allowed it substantial maneuvering room, short of war. Directly following the quotation Berman cites from my February, 1954 article to the effect that a new boom would be virtually impossible short of another war, appeared this comment: "It would be incorrect, however, to conclude that Big Business and its government have no reserves with which to maneuver short of a shooting war. The growing obstacles to war, both international and domestic, compel monopoly capital to consider alternative economic measures. . . ." There was an effort in each article to examine these alternatives, including government measures to sustain a high rate of capital investment, increase exports and foreign investment, as well as possible avenues of increased government spending. Basic to this maneuverability was and is the special post-war position of the United States, which was also discussed.

Finally, the articles attempted to indicate a people's alternative to the policies of Big Business, a program which could influence immediate economic developments in a way more favorable to the working class and

majority of the American people. This point was more fully debated in a discussion of Tabitha Petran's criticism of the original Norris articles. It may be recalled that Miss Petran, writing in the *National Guardian*, took exception to the position that government intervention had materially affected the economic cycle in recent years and especially to the view that a pro-labor, pro-peace economic program could also affect its course (without eliminating economic crisis) along lines geared to the interests of the people. I discussed her position in *Political Affairs*, November, 1955.

Thus the general objective was to study the economic scene as it actually is; to take into account all economic and political-economic elements affecting the cycle; and to indicate the nature of an immediate economic program flowing from such analysis. This was not, in important respects, simply a continuation of our past approach. Comrade Berman does not appear to recognize this, and seems to lump the whole of our economic analysis over the past decade into one pot. Yet to get at the real errors and weak spots of the Norris articles it is necessary to place them in their actual setting. (Not, however, in order to achieve "balance" in our criticism, because in the name of "balanced criticism" we often evade issues.)

#### CRITICISM OF THE NORRIS ARTICLES

Estimating the articles today I

would make the following main criticisms:

1. With the possible exception of the last article discussing Tabitha Petran's position, the effort to overcome doctrinarism was not sufficiently explicit nor developed. To tackle such an ingrained attitude effectively, it would have been necessary to dig into the reasons for its development and persistence and to uproot them from our thinking in the way that the Berman article begins to do. But to do this, something more would have been required, namely public recognition of the differences that existed on the approach to a number of economic questions, and open debate and resolution of these differences. I find that many readers of *Political Affairs* entirely missed the differences between myself and Alexander Bittelman, who had written most of the earlier articles on the economic outlook. This was not their fault. Had both his views and mine been presented fully, the points at issue would have been sharpened and debated with the participation of the whole movement. Moreover, weaknesses and mistakes in the Norris articles would have been more speedily corrected. We might have gotten Arnold Berman's contribution, together with others, several years ago, instead of having to wait for the present upheaval. We need open, frank debate on such matters in which the whole Party and the Left can participate—as occurred in the discussion with Tabitha Petran. These differ-

ences must not be confined to top bodies nor glossed over in public.

2. It is obvious that my handling of the 1953 to 1955 period still overrated the imminency of a major crisis and underestimated the scope of the boom which developed. During the 1954 decline, I underestimated the possible effects of the various reserves which existed, saying that they might "influence the tempo of approach of the crisis . . . result in temporary pauses in the downward trend . . . affect the specific features of the crisis, but they cannot ultimately prevent the onset of the crisis." (*Political Affairs*, February, 1954.) Any real recovery was thus ruled out. By 1955, life compelled modification of this. I then discussed the reasons for the upturn, but saw this as essentially limited, and regarded the development of a full scale boom as unlikely (*Political Affairs*, March, 1955). The best one can say is that the latter article, and the one in June, 1955, adopted a more cautious approach to the next economic downturn and did not regard it as necessarily representing the onset of a major crisis.

What was at the root of these misestimates? I do not think it was a qualitative rejection of the role of non-war factors in the economy. In principle, I tried to take these into account in 1954 and 1955, though more fully in the latter year. My error lay principally in underestimating the *quantitative* aspects of these elements. For instance, in 1954, I estimated that consumer cred-

it had about reached its limit at \$29 billion; but a year later it rose to \$35 billion. In 1954, I neglected the continued expansion of construction, which was a major element limiting the downturn and sparking the subsequent boom. And in March 1955, I accepted the predictions of bourgeois economists regarding a decline in capital investment, estimates which were subsequently contradicted by an upward trend. Such errors add up objectively to an underestimation of the size and scope of non-war factors. They also tended to lend credence to overstatement of the probability of fresh war dangers, which could be stimulated under adverse economic developments.

Nevertheless, I make the distinction between a qualitative omission and a quantitative error in judgment because I think it is relevant to the question of method. In the past, we tended to ignore certain vital contemporary economic and economic-political influences on the economic cycle. We viewed it as taking a certain inexorable course which could not be altered. In trying to overcome this, I did not correctly estimate the magnitude of non-military elements in the 1953-55 period. I feel this resulted not from an inherently doctrinaire approach, but from two more specific difficulties: first, my own relative inexperience in methods of handling current economic trends and data as they relate to the future; and second, limitations existing at that time on

collective work in reaching a judgment.

I would, however, insist upon the central importance (although not the exclusive role), of war and war production in determining the pattern of our economy since 1945. This includes the after effects of World War II, preparations for a new war, and of course, the Korean War, as well as the current high level of military spending. Berman says that he does not call into question "the basic role of war production in the American economy"; but in an extensive discussion of the non-military elements it is important this be constantly borne in mind. Otherwise we shall wind up with distortions in the other direction.

#### PRESENT NEEDS

It is clear that we need a more concrete and collective study of the main features of American economic life today and in the past. Of particular importance in relation to the economic cycle is a more detailed study of the relatively high level of capital investment during the post-war decade, which has been basic to the level of economic activity as a whole. We should also give more attention to the relation between the economy of this country and the rest of the capitalist world. Up to now, an important factor militating against economic crisis here has been the situation in other capitalist countries. After the war, there was the need for both capital and consumer goods in the war devas-

tated  
the  
State  
main  
last  
has  
capit  
for t  
II.  
first  
the  
may  
scale  
also  
ant  
T  
lies  
anal  
wor  
tion  
is e  
prin  
som  
DIF  
F  
area  
crit  
the  
mu  
star  
nat  
me  
bel  
esti  
sha  
on  
".  
har  
not  
gre  
arr

tated areas. Later, especially during the 1953-54 decline in the United States, the upturn in Europe helped maintain American exports. In the last year or so, a peacetime boom has been going on in all major capitalist countries simultaneously, for the first time since World War II. This suggests that also, for the first time in the post-war decade, the conditions for economic crisis may be ripening on an international scale. Attention to this question will also help check any incipient variant of American exceptionalism.

The road away from dogmatism lies through a thorough, concrete analysis of the economic forces at work in this country, and internationally, analysis in which Marxism is employed as a method, not a blueprint. The Norris articles took only some first, incomplete steps.

#### DIFFERENCES WITH BERMAN

From the foregoing, my broad area of agreement with Berman's criticism is apparent. However, there is one question on which I must differ with him, if I understand his implication. This is the nature and significance of government economic measures, which I believe he misinterprets and underestimates. His attitude is most sharply exemplified in his comments on the present boom. He observes: ". . . though there have been big handouts to the trusts, the boom cannot be called a result of new and greater 'injections' or 'shots in the arm.' On the contrary, it has grown

in the face of sharp decreases in total government spending, and in government expenditures for arms." He repeats this later in the article.

I cannot accept his tacit identification of "injections" with government spending, military or otherwise. State monopoly capitalism includes the development of massive spending, it is true, but this by itself is a far too narrow interpretation of the government's role in the economy. During the recent boom, at least *two* main aspects of government activity have been evident. One is the maintenance, despite reductions, of a level of spending much higher than that prior to the Korea War, both for military and civilian purposes.

Of these sums, roughly \$15 to \$18 billions went for military and related expenditures before the Korea War, compared to \$40 to \$43 billion annually for the same purposes after the war. The rise in non-war spending has been due especially to the increase in expenditures by state and local governments. Both military and non-military spending combined have provided a substantially higher floor for the 1955-56 boom than that underpinning the 1947-48 upturn.

But the government also provided major stimulus for the 1955 upward thrust through its fiscal and credit policies. A key element in this boom was the rise in construction, particularly housing. This in turn was generated primarily by the expansion of government underwritten credit in the form of F.H.A. and V.A. mort-

gages, which comprised over half of all currently written mortgages, and by early 1956, totalled 44% of all such mortgage debt outstanding.

While the big rise in consumer credit which also sparked the boom was not directly precipitated by government measures, the general credit policies adopted by the Federal Reserve System have tended to encourage such expansion. Moreover, the rise in capital investment which occurred (contrary to earlier predictions of business and government agencies) was stimulated in part by the tax policies of the present Administration, including the ending of the excess profits tax, the adoption of rapid tax writeoff provisions on a permanent although somewhat modified basis, and the loopholes available to big corporations.

In stressing this point, I am not arguing that *only* government measures have prevented a crisis or accounted for post-war booms. The economic and political-economic forces at work are more complex.

Economic factors as such played an important role. I would agree with Berman that the economy was not pregnant with a full blown cyclical crisis directly after World War II. The economic contradictions which precipitate crises could not reach a crisis level at that time, due to the war and its aftermath. Moreover, during the entire post-war period, economic factors not directly related to government policy, have had great importance. The rise in capital

investment from an annual rate of \$6.8 billion in 1946 to nearly \$35 billion in early 1956 has had many economic causes: the need for replacement after long deferment during the thirties and in some cases during World War II, the requirements of competition even among the giant corporations of today, the introduction of new technical processes like automation and of new industries like electronics and atomic energy, to mention only the most important.

But these economic developments were not wholly unrelated to the role of the government. Realization of the European market, for example, required the spending of almost fifty billion dollars in federal funds for "foreign aid." Almost one third of all U.S. exports have been so financed since World War II. In the case of domestic investment, the general taxation policies of the government (not to mention the special incentives provided by the Korean War) must be taken into account. At almost every point, there is an interweaving of economic and economic-political elements.

I am not emphasizing this only for the sake of establishing the facts, important as that is. Interpretation of what they mean is also involved. In this respect, two points stand out.

#### NEW FEATURES OF THE ECONOMY

First, the role of the government in the economy is one of the important *new* features of these post war

years, a  
followin  
On  
cite fig  
1929, g  
of all g  
tional p  
in 1929  
of our  
1955, t  
1929, t  
cign in  
in 195  
of all  
There  
velopm  
ured i  
the int  
with e  
bankin  
cign  
like.  
Seco  
growt  
is on  
greate  
capita  
eral p  
direct  
gover  
not j  
sive p  
of th  
the e  
cent  
woul  
altere  
Th  
whic  
scure  
powe  
cle



years, as compared to the decade following World War I.

On the quantitative side, one can cite figures like the following: in 1929, government purchased 8.5% of all goods and services (gross national product), and in 1955, 19.4%; in 1929, taxes accounted for 11.5% of our national income, while in 1955, this figure was over 25%; in 1929, the government share in foreign investment was negligible, while in 1955 it constituted nearly 40% of all U.S. capital invested abroad. There are some aspects of this development which cannot be measured in percentages. They include the interweaving of the government with every sphere of the economy—banking and credit, agriculture, foreign trade, construction, and the like.

Second, I would conclude that this growth of state monopoly capitalism is one of the indications of the greater underlying instability of capitalism today, not just in a general political way, but also in a very directly economic sense. Various government measures have provided not just the frosting on the successive post-war booms, but a good part of their substance. Without them, the economic picture of the most recent years, roughly from 1950 on, would have been quite materially altered.

This points to an underlying truth which today's externals tend to obscure. That is: the self-generative power of the capitalist economic cycle is weaker than in the past,

viewed in terms of "pure" economic forces capable of overcoming crises and precipitating booms. This was quite apparent during the thirties. I do not mean, however, that such forces have completely vanished; they still exist, but operate together with a *tendency* to stagnation and crisis.

To say this is not the same as adopting the stagnation thesis put forward by Alvin Hansen, the leading exponent of Keynes in this country. During the thirties, Hansen held that the opportunities for capital expansion had historically dwindled due to the ending of the frontier and the absence of new industries comparable to the auto, rubber, or electric industries. (Evidently some variation of this was adopted by Soviet economists, although the 20th Congress did not spell out the details.) Quite obviously new industries are possible, as dramatically illustrated in electronics and atomic energy. And capitalist production is capable of big advances. But, with the progressive narrowing of the capitalist world, and the deepening contradictions within imperialism, purely economic forces cannot pack the punch they once did. Hence the historical necessity for the intervention of the government to provide added stimulation. This stimulation is in a certain sense artificial; that is, it represents an element outside the "normal" functioning of the economic cycle. Of course, such government measures have themselves become a normal economic-

political feature of capitalism today. But this fact marks a further historic development of the system toward its own end. To recognize this is not to "explain away" the "good times" of the postwar decade, but is rather to understand one fundamental aspect of the reality underlying today's prosperity.

This new feature of our economic and political life will play an important part in our policies, and those of the labor and people's movement as a whole, during the coming months and years. We will have to deal with such questions as these: What government measures should be advocated today to give the American people a greater share in the present prosperity? Will present (and potential) government policies tend to limit the depth and/or duration of any major crisis? Or will they aggravate it? Will they perhaps have one effect at the outset and another later? What will be the long range political consequences of the growth of state monopoly capitalism? How is it related to the problem of achieving socialism in the United States? And many more.

The general question of the government's economic role is also of great concern to the labor movement today. While we would not agree with all its theoretical premises and conclusions, we can certainly find a broad area of agreement on practical measures.

Arnold Berman's article appears to underestimate, perhaps even to mis-estimate, the importance of such

questions. Perhaps the reason here too may be methodological. While it is necessary to examine all data without *a priori* judgments, it is also necessary to put pointed questions to these facts in order to determine the full truth, which often lies beneath the surface. Included in these questions should be: What is *new* in a given situation? What is its significance? Its relation to other tendencies? What does it point to for the future? This is another aspect of the struggle against doctrinairism. I emphasize it in the present context because I suspect that Arnold Berman recognizes the similarity between the twenties and the years since World War II—but not, perhaps, the differences. No doubt we could have drawn on the economic history of that period with benefit in estimating the probable course of events after 1945. But it would be a mistake to see only the resemblance between these two decades and not the very significant changes that have occurred.

I would question one other formulation Berman employs. In singling out main expressions of our doctrinairism, he speaks of the "tendency to overstress the sharpening of the contradictions of the U.S. economy and to underestimate sustaining and expansive features which could and did prevent these contradictions from reaching the critical stage."

We did overestimate the *acuteness* of contradictions and the *speed* with which they would come to a head in the form of a crisis. We did

under  
of the  
and  
them  
lation  
and es  
separa  
to the  
omy.  
seen  
these  
For  
invest  
most  
the la  
taneo  
tions  
enlarg  
faster  
larly,  
impo  
mark  
grow  
tion  
and  
ing o  
of in  
by m  
millie  
Th  
ures  
Some  
tradi  
rectly  
capit  
main  
acter  
prese  
tax  
tably  
secur  
ance

underestimate the size and duration of the 1949 and 1955 expansions, and of the elements which made them possible. But Berman's formulation seems to place the "sustaining and expansive" features as something separate from and even counterposed to the contradictions within the economy. To the contrary, they must be seen as part of and in relation to these contradictions.

For example, the growth of capital investment is probably the single most important expansive feature of the last ten years. Yet it is simultaneously deepening the contradictions within the economy, through enlarging productive forces at a much faster pace than the market. Similarly, consumer credit has been an important element sustaining the market. But at the same time, its growth has deepened the disproportion between productive capacity and consuming power, by encouraging capital investment in a number of industries on the one hand, and by mortgaging the future income of millions of workers on the other.

The effect of government measures is somewhat more complicated. Some quite obviously deepen the contradictions, such as those which directly enlarge profits and stimulate capital investment as the means of maintaining the boom. This is characteristic of measures adopted by the present Administration in relation to tax and credit policy. Others, notably those along the lines of social security and unemployment insurance, may mitigate somewhat the

sharpness of growing contradictions now and in the future. Still others may have more complex and even contradictory consequences. I am not attempting here to analyze all these "sustaining and expansive features"—governmental or otherwise but am merely making the point that they do not stand in opposition to the sharpening of economic contradictions. They are part of these contradictions and in many cases, serve to deepen them.

The revealing of basic contradictions in their specific, concrete forms is surely a central task of Marxist economics. But while recognizing how they are deepened in the course of the boom by the very forces which push it forward, we must not overestimate the speed with which this process will come to an "explosion" in the form of crisis. Sometimes not only *a priori* judgments, but also wishful thinking, led to such premature conclusions.

I have discussed these points of difference with Arnold Berman because I feel they are questions which will have a vital bearing on our analysis of future economic developments. This does not detract from my broad area of agreement with him, nor from the validity of much of his criticism.

I hope others will join this discussion. Only through the fullest participation in an examination of the past, as prelude to analysis of the present and future, will we achieve a new level of work in political economy.

## Marxism-Leninism in a Changing World, I

By William Z. Foster

MARX AND ENGELS, in their great works, formulated the basic principles of Scientific Socialism. They laid bare the workings of the capitalist system, explained how the workers are exploited under that system, analyzed the formation and struggles of social classes, demonstrated Socialism to be the inevitable historic objective of the working class, outlined the elements of working-class strategy and tactics for reaching this goal, made a fundamental picture of the structure and operation of the future society, and gave the workers a new philosophy of life, dialectical materialism.

In performing this monumental task of scientific philosophy, analysis, forecast, organization, and struggle, the two great Socialist pioneers made it very clear that they were not creating a social blueprint or utopia, the lines of which were to be followed rigidly at all times and under every circumstance. On the contrary, being true scientists, what they founded was a social science, that of the proletariat; one which would necessarily evolve with the complex and ever-changing circumstances of the growing capitalist

system and the expanding struggle of the working class and its allies. From their time onward also, every outstanding Marxist has stressed again and again the fundamental reality that "Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action." At the same time, Marxists have resolutely fought against those opportunist elements who, prostituting the above basic principle, would lightly cast aside the established truths of Marxism.

Central in the whole history of Marxism has been the two-sided struggle: against the Right revisionists, who would liquidate Marxism in a bourgeois direction, and against the "Left" dogmatists, who would degrade Marxism to a sterile sectarianism. By the same token, the history of Marxism in the world class struggle is that of an expanding, evolving movement — theoretically, strategically, and organizationally. The life of world-wide Marxism is full of examples of the movement making rapid and drastic advances to meet new situations. This flexibility and potentiality to adapt itself to special and changing circumstances, while maintaining a firm

grip up  
ciples, is  
has ma  
through  
The r  
adaptati  
conditio  
work, a  
world i  
reached  
the 188  
leaders  
met thi  
official  
an oppo  
them f  
pective  
rival in  
War I  
away fo  
content  
In th  
gan his  
perialis  
ism to  
added  
Marxist  
surrect  
lutionar  
Engels  
state, th  
ship of  
questio  
had bur  
ist func  
a whol  
in its i  
be cha  
caying  
great v

grip upon correct fundamental principles, is a basic reason why Marxism has made such tremendous progress throughout the world.

The most sweeping example of the adaptation of Marxism to changing conditions was Lenin's theoretical work, applying Marxist principles to world imperialism. Capitalism had reached its imperialist stage during the 1880-1900 period. The reformist leaders of the Second International met this situation by castrating their official Marxism and by adopting an opportunist line that was to lead them finally, along with their respective bourgeoisie, into the two rival imperialist camps in World War I. They thought they had done away forever with the revolutionary content of Marxism.

In the 1890's, however, Lenin began his epic work of analyzing imperialism and of strengthening Marxism to combat it. In doing this he added a whole new dimension to Marxism. Not only did Lenin resurrect and reaffirm the basic revolutionary principles of Marx and Engels regarding economics, the state, the class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and other vital questions, which the opportunists had buried; but on the basis of Marxist fundamentals, he also worked out a whole new analysis of capitalism in its imperialist stage. Imperialism he characterized as obsolete and decaying capitalism; the period of great wars and revolutions, the final

stage of the capitalist system. Lenin also developed a whole new strategy for the workers, embracing a revolutionary conception of the leading role of the Communist Party, the alliance between the workers and the peasantry, the cooperation between the workers in the imperialist countries and the peoples in the colonies, and a relentless struggle against Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism. Under Lenin's general conceptions, the workers and peasants of Russia, China, and various other countries, comprising over one-third of the population of the world, have carried through successful revolutions, while the colonial peoples generally are tearing to pieces the remaining sections of the colonial system. So great were the theoretical and practical contributions of Lenin that thenceforth Marxism became "Marxism-Leninism."

There have since also been other important evolutionary advances in the development of Marxism-Leninism. One of the most significant of these was the concept of building Socialism in one country, instead of necessarily establishing it simultaneously in a whole row of countries, as previously widely believed. Lenin pioneered in this conception; but it was not until the late 1920's, after the death of Lenin, that the Soviet Communist Party, led by Stalin (in his most constructive period), developed this great concept fully and carried it through to a striking success.

Another great stride forward of Marxism-Leninism theoretically and tactically was the formulation of the people's front policy, chiefly by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in 1935. This was the policy of forming a broad alliance of the democratic, peace-loving forces, on both a national and an international scale, in common struggle against fascism and war. This was the Communist "new orientation" of the period. The policy greatly widened the fighting front of the workers, linking them up with awakened farmers, middle class masses, and bringing into eventual war alliance the Soviet Union and the bourgeois-democratic countries for joint struggle against world fascism.

The People's Democracies, formed in Central Europe—in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria and Eastern Germany—at the end of World War II, also involved a sharp expansion of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. In this vital situation, embracing about 100,000,000 people in the heart of Europe, there were developed new types of government, based upon an alliance of war-time anti-fascist organizations, including bourgeois, nationalist, Catholic, and peasant parties, the formulation of new concepts of the dictatorship of the proletariat, without Soviets, and of new and relatively peaceful roads to Socialism.

The great Chinese People's revo-

lution, which, embracing over half a billion people, came to world-shaking victory in 1949, also marked radical advances in Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. Already in 1919, Lenin stated that the Chinese Communists faced a unique task, in that, "while relying upon the general theory and practice of Communism, you must adapt yourselves to particular conditions which do not exist in European countries." This is precisely what the Chinese Communist Party did under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung, with overwhelming success. And the doing of it required much pioneer Marxist theoretical work.

This involved the carrying through in China of a gigantic revolution on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology, in a country where the working class was extremely small in size; the virtual overleaping of the capitalist stage of social development, in proceeding almost directly from a near-feudalism to laying the basis for Socialism; the development of a revolutionary alliance, the basis of the new regime, which contains not only the workers, peasants, and middle classes, but also sections of the bourgeoisie; the development of drastically new methods of guerrilla warfare, etc., etc.

In China, as in Russia and Eastern Europe, the revolution could not have been successful had it not been for its basic Marxist-Leninist principles and also for the innovations

in its development conditions struggle with a violence is a question of Socialism

THE S  
WO

In the great occurred daily to imperia-ism, the of the be kept nationala-ments. forces of Socialism jungle lead hu present interest the high the dec part in changin it also, Marxis ing:

a) T ganizeo World ple li-leaped

in its theory and practice which were developed to meet the specific conditions of the respective national struggles. To keep Marxism-Leninism a vibrant, growing evolving science is, therefore, a life and death question for the progress of world Socialism in general.

#### THE SWIFTLY ADVANCING WORLD

In the immediately recent period great constructive changes have occurred in the world, and others are daily taking place. They demand imperatively that Marxism-Leninism, the scientific theory and practice of the proletariat and its allies, must be kept abreast of all these vital national and international developments. Only in this manner can the forces of peace, democracy, and Socialism make their way through the jungle of decaying capitalism, and lead humanity, both in a successful present-day defense of its immediate interests and also along the road to the higher order, Socialism. Among the decisive developments that play a part in the present new and swiftly changing world situation, and with it also, in the constant evolution of Marxism-Leninism, are the following:

a) The stupendous growth of organized Socialism since the end of World War II. The number of people living under Socialism has leaped from some 200,000,000 in 1945

to over 900,000,000 in 1956, and most vital, Socialism now, instead of being confined to one nation, as it had been for two decades before World War II, has expanded into a great world system of Socialist regimes. Besides all this, internally the respective Socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union, are making tremendous headway in building up their economies in every phase. They are now also profoundly improving their democracy. Their progress in this respect outdoes anything ever accomplished by capitalism in all its history. The question of realizing Lenin's great slogan of Socialism, of "overtaking and surpassing" capitalism, has now become a matter of daily speculation and worry in world bourgeois circles. Militarily, in industry, science, education, and many other spheres, Socialism has already demonstrated its great superiority over capitalism. All this is of epochal importance, politically, economically, and ideologically. It opens up wide new horizons of political-theoretical expansion.

b) A post-war development also of major significance, which also involves spurring Marxism into new theoretical heights, is the gigantic spread of the colonial liberation movement. Together with the freeing of semi-colonial China, several other countries have won their independence—India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Syria, the Sudan, Lebanon, etc. Asia and

the whole Middle East are stirring from end to end with colonial revolt, and so is Africa. Latin America, long dominated by American and British imperialism, is also beginning to awaken. All over the world, colonialism, a key foundation of the capitalist system, is definitely collapsing. The anti-war, anti-imperialist former colonies now constitute a great peace zone, the symbol of which was the recent Bandung conference. This huge new world force is increasingly hostile to warlike American imperialism and friendly to the peace-loving USSR. The stupendous progressive development constitutes a real challenge to the flexibility of the Marxist-Leninists of the world, in helping these countries to industrialize themselves, to maintain world peace, to guard their independence, to unite in a common anti-imperialist front with the workers in the capitalist lands, to find new routes to Socialism in this vast sphere of action, with its countless new problems, theoretical rigidity and dogmatism would be fatal, and political flexibility is a supreme necessity for Communists.

c) A further highly significant development of world political importance during the post-World War II years, deeply affecting Marxist thinking and policies, is the enormous growth of the workers' industrial and political organizations that has taken place throughout the world, both capitalist and Socialist. On the

eve of World War II, in 1939, the approximate number of trade unionists in the world was 60 million, of whom about 25 million lived in the Soviet Union; by 1956, however, the grand total had mounted to some 150 million, about 75 million of them in the many Socialist lands. The Communist parties, the cooperative movement, and the peace, women and youth organizations have also made spectacular growth. This enormous increase in the democratic strength of the workers and their allies, particularly in the capitalist world, requires much new thinking on such questions as labor unity, joint political action, the role of present-day Social Democracy, and many others. Imperatively, narrow viewpoints and outworn attitudes of the past must be overcome.

d) The opposite side to the above world picture of growing Socialism is presented by the declining capitalist system, which is in general crisis. This crisis, as we have seen, is marked by such elementary factors as the loss by capitalism of many countries to Socialism, the break-up of the colonial system, the growth of powerful anti-capitalist forces within the capitalist countries, the sharpening of inter-imperialist antagonisms, and the like. By the same token, the decline of world capitalism also presents many vital problems in theory and practice to Marxist-Leninists, which cannot be solved by doctrinaire rote. These re-

late to  
and s  
prese  
Keyne  
stimul  
cyclic  
the ge  
questi  
onism  
of imp  
extent  
capita  
All of  
new t  
e) A  
full o  
constr  
the so  
defeat  
imper  
world  
"sum  
This  
Street  
and a  
for w  
voked  
tion  
prece  
camp  
for v  
the co  
milita  
tries;  
atom  
sians  
worl  
troop  
rea,  
tense



late to such matters as the character and scope of cyclical crises in the present situation; the significance of Keynesian policies of industrial stimulation, designed to master the cyclical economic crisis, and with it the general crisis of capitalism; the question of capitalist mutual antagonisms in this period; the possibility of imperialist war taking place; the extent and substance of American capitalist hegemony, and many more. All of these questions demand bold new thinking by Marxist-Leninists.

e) A recent development, also full of dynamic possibilities for the constructive forces of the world, was the serious setback, if not decisive defeat, of the war drive of American imperialism by the peoples of the world, as dramatized at the Geneva "summit" conference of July, 1955. This war drive, initiated by Wall Street at the end of World War II and aiming at an atomic world war for world domination, eventually provoked an arms race and the creation of a military machine without precedent in peace times. But the campaign of American Big Business for world mastery was blocked by the counter-building up of a gigantic military force by the Socialist countries; the breaking of the American atom-bomb monopoly by the Russians; the defeats administered to world imperialist armies by the troops of People's China, North Korea, and Indo-China; and the intense mobilization by the World

Peace Council and other democratic forces of the overwhelming peace sentiment of the world. This vast, years-long peace struggle came to a victorious climax at Geneva, when Wall Street imperialism was compelled to relax its war menace, at least for the time being, if not finally.

Geneva, by reducing the war threat, was an historic victory for the world peace forces. It made the great policy of peaceful co-existence a vivid possibility among all the nations; it is beginning to ease the peoples of the world of the crushing burden of armaments and of the corroding fear of atomic war; it has generated a new and more hopeful spirit throughout the world; and, by minimizing labor's internal disputes over the war issue, it has bettered the chances for the unification of the world labor movement.

f) A further development, with far-reaching implications for Communists and others, in the fields of both theory and practice, is the "downgrading" of Stalin that is now taking place. In his earlier years, Stalin, as head of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, undoubtedly did much excellent work; but in later years he was guilty, working falsely in the name of the Revolution, of many gross excesses. Thus he developed his so-called "cult of the individual," expressed by extreme bureaucracy, one-man leadership, political brutality, the setting of artistic

standards and scientific truth by fiat, etc. All this did great harm to the Soviet Union and to the cause of Socialism throughout the world. The cult of the individual of Stalin was greatly facilitated by the fact that the Soviet people, encircled by hostile capitalist powers and struggling almost desperately to industrialize the country, to hold dangerous counter-revolutionary forces in check, to build a defensive army, and to beat back the Hitlerite invaders, lived for many years in almost semi-military conditions. In these adverse circumstances, dictatorship practices could grow and did. Now, however, upon the initiative of the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Stalin undemocratic cult is being liquidated root and branch. This process is producing many new problems of progress in the USSR and abroad, problems of democracy, collective leadership, relationships among Communist states and parties, which are fairly clamoring for solution.

#### THE RE-EMPHASIS UPON MARXISM-LENINISM

The present rapid change in the relationship of forces between those of world capitalism and world Socialism is especially prolific with new responsibilities in theory and practice for Marxist-Leninists. This change in international relationships constantly favors the forces of world

Socialism. Indeed, it is now timely to begin to consider whether or not the world's workers have passed the "summit," so to speak, along the road of their historic march to Socialism. This is no matter of mere idle speculation, but a question of real importance; for once the workers get on the "downhill pull," the circumstances of the class struggle will alter radically in their favor. It will also present them with a host of uniquely new problems. That the workers are now somewhere in the "summit" zone, on one side or the other, is pretty obvious.

One thing is certain, however: there is much struggle ahead. Although most probably the democratic forces will be able to insist upon a world policy of peaceful co-existence in the years to come, nevertheless it would be nonsense to suppose that the capitalists will surrender without making the maximum resistance of which they are capable. Their ruthlessness in this respect has been made all too clear to the workers during two centuries of class struggle—involving tens of thousands of strikes, hellish conditions in industry, the fighting through of many revolutions and two devastating world wars, the hard struggle to prevent a third great war, the bitter fight against fascist enslavement, etc. In view of all this, it would be folly to have any other than a fighting perspective for the

period  
mit.

A  
riod al  
ever,  
crease  
nation  
lies an  
ent to  
of the  
in the  
ing h  
the d  
ally.  
greate  
have  
years,  
preven  
ing a  
also,  
ing it  
the ca  
back  
the n  
of ca  
reason  
ful c  
has b  
why  
speak  
tiona  
vance  
tries.  
talist  
war  
tice u  
work  
howe  
the c  
read

A

period before us, summit or no summit.

A basic difference between the period ahead and that behind us, however, is that, with their vastly increased strength nationally and internationally, the workers and their allies are far better equipped at present to curb and defeat the violence of the capitalists than they have been in the past. And to do just this curbing has become a central policy of the democratic masses internationally. Already these masses, with the greatest peace movement in history, have shown during the past few years, that they are quite able to prevent the imperialists from launching another world war. They are also, in the various countries, making it more and more difficult for the capitalists to use violence to beat back the progressive movements of the masses. This increased curbing of capitalist violence is the decisive reason why the perspective for peaceful co-existence among all nations has become a realistic one, and also why Marxist-Leninists can now speak of the possibility for a constitutional and relatively peaceful advance to Socialism in various countries. The day is past when the capitalists can freely wage imperialist war against each other and also practice unrestrained violence against the workers. It would be a grave error, however, to conclude therefrom that the danger of fascism and war is already done away with.

A basic implication of the per-

spective of struggle now standing before the world's toiling masses, both in the colonial lands and in the imperialist nations—the United States, Great Britain, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, etc.—is the continued validity of Marxism-Leninism as the inspiring, guiding and organizing philosophy of the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggle. This is no less true of the United States, which is the hard core of capitalist resistance to the advancing world working class. It is an elementary reality that must not be lost sight of by us.

By the same token, the perspective also re-emphasizes the role of the Communist Party, based upon Marxism-Leninism, as the vanguard political party of the proletariat and of the peoples in general. All this implies, however, that, under the pressure of the rapidly changing world situation, Marxism-Leninism must grow and evolve in a theoretical, strategical, and tactical sense. It means, too, that the Communist parties must adopt innovations in their structures and disciplines, and in their relationships with each other and with people's organizations generally. Marxism-Leninism is adaptable to every need of the toiling masses in the imperialist countries, in the colonial lands, and internationally. Marxism-Leninism, resolute, clear-sighted, and flexible, has led the peoples to the establishment of Socialism in one-third of the world and it has put the whole sys-

tem of world capitalism a-totter; it alone also can provide the indispensable guidance for the completion of the victory of Socialism in the rest of the world.

In the crucial period now developing for the world forces of peace, democracy and Socialism, it is especially necessary, too, that Marxist-Leninists should realize clearly just which is the most serious danger, "Left" sectarianism or Right opportunism, that they have to combat within their own ranks. Communists always fight deviations on two fronts, the Right and the "Left"—the question being where to put the most emphasis.

During the time of the First International—1864-1876—the main danger was that of "Left" sectarianism. While there were harmful Right opportunists at hand—mostly British labor union bureaucrats—the worst danger was presented by the "Left" sectarian Anarchists (Bakuninists), who tried to force the young labor movement into decisive revolutionary struggles, for which it was not ready. This group finally wrecked the International. Throughout the period, however, when the Second International led the world labor movement—1889-1914—the main danger was Right opportunism, although the Leftist Syndicalist movement was also a big deviating factor. The Right-wing elements, whose aim was

to subordinate the workers' interests to those of the imperialists, eventually came to dominate the International and they finally led it to overwhelming disaster in the imperialist World War I.

In the period which is now developing, once more "Left" sectarianism is becoming the main danger in the Communist parties, because it acts as a brake upon the Communists and other Left forces in their imperative need to give a broader leadership to the awakening masses of workers, peasants, middle-class elements, and other democratic strata, who want to fight the capitalists. Right-wing tendencies are, of course, also strong, and as always, radiating liquidationism and opportunism, they must be fought; but the "Left" dogmatists and sectarians can be even more harmful in the years ahead. They block the cultivation of the possible new cooperative united front relationships with Social Democrats, farmers, the Negro people, Catholic workers, and others. To carry on the necessarily far broader line of struggle in the coming period will require not only real flexibility of program and action, but also a progressive spirit theoretically—all of which is foreign to the "Left" sectarians, whose narrow tendencies isolate the Communists from the masses.

*The concluding installment of this article will appear in our next issue.—Ed.*

# On the War Danger

By Martha Stone

DURING THE CURRENT discussion on the Dennis report, some comrades ask: Is it true that the Party overestimated the war danger? Was not the statement of John Foster Dulles that the country was at the brink of war, proof of the fact that our analysis was after all correct?

\* \* \*

The debate in the Party is not as to whether there was a war danger. The debate is not around the question of the character of American imperialism. I believe there is general agreement on these questions. There was a war danger, fomented by the big monopoly interests in our country. American imperialism, reactionary in character, was bent on world domination and war. First under Truman, then under Eisenhower, the foreign policy of our government developed a cold war program that lasted ten years. And for a period, the U.S. was in a hot war in Korea. Of course there was a war danger. There would not have been a world peace movement if the masses had not seen a real danger of atomic war.

The question under review is: what was the actual relationship of forces at various stages of the struggle? Were we correct in placing the war question from the point of view of its imminence?

To answer that question, we must not only re-examine Party resolutions, articles, etc., but must look in the field of practice, how we viewed given issues, how we acted among the masses, and what were the effect of our actions upon them.

## THE RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES

While the peace and democratic camps emerged victors in the post-war period, it was not a foregone conclusion that they would win permanently, or would be able to realize the policies of peaceful co-existence. This issue—war or peace—could only be decided in the daily struggles of the masses, against the reactionary monopoly circles threatening world atomic war.

To have relied solely upon the newly won positions of the democratic camp would have been a serious error, for the imperialist forces that threatened world peace had great strength and resources at their

disposal. Through the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the program to re-arm Western Germany, the atom bomb, the fifty-billion-dollar war budget, the formation of NATO and SEATO, they pressed their policies of world domination.

Our Party can rightly be proud of its role of opposition to this infamous bi-partisan foreign policy. Our conclusion that this policy could only lead our nation into disgrace in Europe and Asia, and our pressure for a return to FDR's policies of negotiation and peaceful co-existence, were important contributions to the American people and the world peace fight.

During the ten-year period of the cold war, there were times when the war danger was greater, and other times when it lessened. The criticism of the National Committee that we overestimated the war danger, is based on the fact that around specific phases of struggle in the fight for peace, our analysis of these concrete situations was not well grounded in the realities of world relations at the time.

To give one example: U.S. military involvement in Korea was a critical point in the international situation. Had the North Koreans and Chinese forces not succeeded in bringing about a military stalemate in that war, the danger of the war spreading would have been greater. But within a short period, U.S. policies in Korea encountered tremendous obstacles. The words uttered at the

U.N. in support of U.S. policies were never backed up by the material support the U.S. demanded of the "allies." World public opinion turned against this war. In our own country the demand for peace forced Eisenhower in the 1952 election campaign to promise a settlement of the war. It became clear that the war forces were blocked, the preventive war crowd suffered a defeat and the mass demand for an end to the war received ever-greater support from the American people.

The war's end in Korea and Indo-China marked an important turn in the international situation. It brought the policy of peaceful co-existence closer to realization. The gap between the drive of imperialism to world war and its ability to carry out such a war, became ever greater. We did not address ourselves to this growing gap. We concentrated mainly upon signaling the danger of war.

#### ON WAR'S "IMMINENCE"

The Party's program written after the tension around Korea and Indo-China had come to an end, placed the war question in the same manner as we did in 1950 when the war first broke out. In fact, in the past six years, there were tremendous new developments, such as the movements in the colonial countries leading to Bandung, the new role of the neutral nations, the new initiative of the Soviet Union in the field of foreign policy, and the growing

sentiment for peace in our own country. We took note of these developments. But we drew wrong conclusions from them. We concluded that as a result of these victories, the war forces would become desperate and more adventurous, and the war danger would be greater. This had the effect of spreading fatalism in our own ranks and sowed great doubts about the correctness of our position that peaceful co-existence was possible. This theory—that victories for peace increase the danger of war—ran contrary to the facts of life. For the "preventive war" grouping—the McCarthys, Knowlands, Eastlands, etc.—suffered a great defeat. The Eisenhower Administration had to shift its position toward negotiations. Dulles, too, had to make important tactical changes, climaxed by the Berlin conferences and by Geneva.

This placing of the war question at all times as though war were around the corner, played into the hands of those forces who were shouting that war was "imminent" and "inevitable." This was profitable propaganda for the men of the trusts. As long as the American people believed this, big business could justify the arms program and rake in big profits. If we Communists had not erred in overestimating the war danger ourselves, we would have been more effective in influencing the American people to reject these sabre-rattlers with their

bluff and bluster. We would have been more effective in dispelling their "gloom and doom" outlook. The way we placed the question of the imminence of war, tended to give credence to the war-scare headlines.

I distinguish here between those dangers that were real at the time of Korea and Formosa, from the impression war-mongers tried to create with their blustering talk of the imminence of war. I do not believe that we were at any time during this whole ten-year period on the brink of war. The capitalist class, while planning for war, was increasingly running into obstacles to the realization of its plans. Dulles' declaration of the "brink" should not become our analysis of the war situation. Dulles often reflected the line of the more war-like groups in both parties, but when the mass pressure on an international scale made itself felt, and the Eisenhower Administration shifted its position in the direction of negotiations between East and West, Dulles' practices were also altered by the struggles of these peace forces against war.

#### BIG BUSINESS AND WAR

Wars are not caused by "incidents" or "warmongers" or "adventurers." Such people, expounding the viewpoint of given classes in society, have a bearing on the policies of the ruling class. But imperialist wars grow out of the economic and political policies of big business in its

effort to regain lost markets and to stop the growth of the socialist countries. We sometimes place the question as though capitalists take to war lightly. This is not true. U.S. monopoly found alternatives in its drive for profits and domination short of war. It would certainly be wrong to draw the conclusion that the U.S. only suffered setbacks and defeats and scored no victories during these cold-war years. The cold war program brought to the coffers of big business exorbitant profits in arms production. Capitalism still had much room to maneuver from an economic point of view to realize these profits without war. From a political point of view, too, U.S. corporations met with some successes. The policy of "containment of Communism" contributed to bolstering the reactionary forces in the governments of France and Italy. It helped stem the Leftward tide among the war-weary millions in these countries. It played a like role in some countries in Latin America, as Guatemala.

Another example of this overestimation of the war danger was the way in which we described the division in monopoly circles. We said the monopolies were divided into a "war now" and "war when ready" groupings. This could lead to only one conclusion: that inevitably the imperialists would wage war. It did not correctly describe the differences in the ranks of big business. For

as the peace forces became more vocal here at home, and contradictions sharpened on an international scale around the issues of NATO, SEATO, Formosa, Indo-China, etc., the "war now" grouping began to reflect these international pressures. For example, the Hearst press interview, the idea of a shift of U.S. policy to peaceful co-existence, was advanced by one of the foremost war forces in the country. Then there was General MacArthur's speech in California, in which he advocated negotiations with the Soviet Union. There were differences between Knowland and McCarthy around Formosa.

We saw the monopoly groupings in our country as a united war group and did not utilize differences and contradictions in the ranks of the capitalist class to the advantage of the working class and the nation as a whole.

While we advocated a policy of peaceful-co-existence, in reality we felt a great deal of doubt and hesitation about it. This doubt was further fed by the position of our Party program in 1954, which said that a change in foreign policy was possible only with the defeat of the Eisenhower Administration. We spoke a good deal about peaceful co-existence, but our actions led people in and around our movement to believe that war was imminent, and rendered them ill-prepared to meet the new and rising develop-



ments that brought about Geneva. That is why the Geneva Conference came as a big surprise to most of our Party and leadership, and there was such reluctance in our ranks to recognize that we were embarked on a new world situation, the beginning of the era of peaceful co-existence.

#### TACTICAL ERRORS

Our inaccurate analysis of international developments led to some tactical mistakes in our peace activity. While it is true that tactics flow from theory, it would be oversimplification to say that once we correct theoretical errors, this will automatically correct our tactical line. It is conceivable that we might have erred in estimating the war danger and yet have avoided some of the tactical errors we made—such as the manner in which we pressed our point of view in the CIO. I believe if we had treasured the Marxist-Leninist principle of being linked with the masses of workers under any and all conditions, we could have avoided many of the errors in our trade-union work that cut us off from the labor movement.

The mastery of tactics is an art in itself, and embodies many principled questions. For the purposes of this article, I would like to show how our errors in overestimating the war danger influenced our mass work adversely.

Reacting to issues of foreign policy from the point of view of the imme-

diately danger of world war, we then exerted pressure on our trade-union comrades to stand up and be counted in their local unions. What could be worse than an atomic war, we reasoned; and in that atmosphere we pressed our members to criticize foreign policy irrespective of their ability to rally workers behind them. We became pre-occupied in our trade union work almost solely with this question of foreign policy to the exclusion of other issues that roused the labor movement (fringe benefits, taxes, social welfare, and legislation). In fact, for a long time our Party neglected its most basic task, concern for the economic problems of the working class. Seeing this question of the imminence of war as a central question, we threw everything we had into this struggle to the neglect of other issues. We felt this was necessary because the threat of war was so close. The fact is that, had we given equal attention to the issues workers were occupying themselves with, we would have done better in winning them for the struggle for peace, as these questions were also related to the cold war program.

For a number of years, from 1947 to 1952, we rejected any concept of developing united front movements around candidates backed by labor and liberals on domestic issues. Our yardstick for judging candidates became their attitude on the peace situation. Since all candidates went

along with the cold war program, this automatically ruled out coalition activities with them and the masses who followed these leaders. While the source of this error can be found in a sectarian approach to our electoral work, it is also true that our overestimation of the war danger pressed us to approach our tactical line in this manner.

This further influenced our judgment of the contributions the American people were making to the peace struggle. Viewing war as imminent, the mass activity of the American people to resist war seemed way off base to a great section of our Party. While it is true that the level of struggle here was not of the same scope and quality as that in Europe and Asia, nevertheless, the American people made important contributions to this world-wide peace fight. But we did not fully appreciate this because we were judging the movement from the point of view that we were on the brink of war. Under such conditions, delegations to Congressmen, postcards, letters to the press, etc., seemed to us to be at a very low level. We pushed more advanced slogans, created Left centers, and hoped to attract the peace-loving masses of American people in this manner. In reality, the American people reflected their peace sentiments through their own organizations, and in a manner that corresponded to their level of understanding.

In our Party, there were a number of comrades who recoiled completely from the task of exposing the predatory and war-like course of U.S. imperialism, and of helping the American people resist the reactionary foreign policies advanced by Truman and in 1952 by Eisenhower. This tendency to capitulate in face of the witch-hunt that got the support of the top leadership of the trade unions and mass organizations, had to be fought. But the lesson for our Party is this: we could not overcome such Right opportunism, correct such errors, by fighting a Rightist line with a "Left"-sectarian position. The errors we made fed such Rightist tendencies. It made it impossible to struggle successfully against Right opportunism, to strengthen and correct such comrades, and help them maintain their ties and connections with the mass movement.

Of considerable influence in committing these errors was the repetition in our country of the wrong concept held by the Cominform that described the international situation as divided into two camps—the camp of Socialism and the camp of Imperialism. This characterization lumped the large bloc of neutralist nations with the imperialist forces and hindered us from understanding their great potential in the fight for world peace. It also led us to overlook the positive role of the neutralist forces in our own land.

I believe that the errors we made

in respect to the war danger sprang from the fact that after the 1945 convention, when we correctly rejected the Browderite view that monopoly capitalism could play a progressive role, we went to another extreme of a "Left" sectarian character. We described monopoly groups as one homogeneous class, all united in their drive to war. We failed to see divisions and differences in the ranks of the imperialists. I believe that fundamentally our views clashed with the concept of peaceful co-existence. We centered our main fire on the Right danger, while we veered toward a "Left"-sectarian position. Even when questions in the Party, on the increased dangers of "Left" sectarianism, were raised in many districts and in the national leadership, the Party convention in 1950 took note of this growing danger, but nonetheless failed to come to grips with the main mistakes of this whole period.

The draft program came into sharp conflict with previous convention policies and estimates. The result was that many of these differences were conciliated and compromised, and were not basically resolved. The Party program finally adopted itself reflected continued Leftist estimates on the war question.

The April meeting of the National Committee took the first steps towards correcting our political line which it characterized as "Left" sectarian. This was something new for

our Party. For the whole period was marked by a struggle mainly against Right opportunism while the "Left" danger grew. Leftist errors were treated as tactical in character. They were regarded as errors of individuals or a given district. The Dennis report for the first time, despite serious weaknesses and limitations, places responsibility where it belongs. It traces the Leftist errors of this period to our policies as well as in the sphere of tactics. It declares in no uncertain terms that the main danger for our Party has been "Left" sectarianism. This has begun to put our Party on the road of self-criticism and self-correction.

To millions of American people this new era brings the promise of world peace. But peace is not inevitable. The drive for war, inherent in imperialism, is expressed by the continued policies of Big Business to maintain the high armament production, by Knowland and Nixon, the advocates of a hot war, by McCarthy, Jenner, Eastland forces who continue to press their reactionary war aims upon the Administration and the "allies." In the arena of continued struggle, to eliminate all features of the cold war, we Communists can make our modest contribution towards the camp of peace and democracy. Learning from our past mistakes will help us to become an integral part of the life, traditions and struggle of our country.

## **Key pamphlets for our time**

---

### **THE COMMUNISTS TAKE A NEW LOOK**

**By Eugene Dennis**

Report delivered on April 28, 1956 to the Communist Party's National Committee on problems and tasks confronting Communists and the people today. **25c**

### **THE MEANING OF THE XXth CONGRESS OF THE CPSU**

**By Max Weiss**

Report on the significance and lessons of the last Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. **25c**

### **THE NEGRO PEOPLE ON THE MARCH**

**By Benjamin J. Davis**

Report on the new stage of the struggle for equal rights and the role and position of the Communist Party on the Negro question. **25c**

### **THE CHALLENGE OF THE '56 ELECTIONS**

**By Claude Lightfoot**

Report on the forces, tasks and perspectives shaping up in the 1956 presidential electoral struggle. **15c**

---

**New Century Publishers**

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Party's  
Com-  
25c

ress of  
25c

rights  
on the  
25c

o in the  
15c