

# political affairs

JULY 1957 • 35 CENTS



- HERBERT APTHEKER** [ 1 ]      **Ideas In Our Time**
  
- BENJAMIN J. DAVIS** [14]      **The Pilgrimage  
to Washington**
  
- HYMAN LUMER** [21]      **"The Truth About Hungary"**
  
- HARRY K. WELLS** [31]      **"Philosophy in Revolution"**

**ON CONTRADICTIONS AMONG  
THE PEOPLE**  
*By Mao Tse-tung*      [ 36-65 ]  
**(THE COMPLETE TEXT)**

**IN MEMORIAM**



**JAMES W. FORD**

December 22, 1893 — June 21, 1957

*A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism*

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

## Ideas in Our Time

By HERBERT APTHEKER

RECENT SUPREME COURT decisions in the areas of civil rights and civil liberties reflect mounting domestic and international popular pressures, mirror the deep hold in our country of traditions and conceptions of individual freedoms, and themselves enormously stimulate, of course, the continuing effort to eradicate the last vestiges of McCarthyism.

Yet, it is to be noted that the decisions are never self-implementing, in a social sense, and that while much was accomplished after the 1954 anti-segregation verdict, the accomplishments resulted from struggle—even after the decision—and the bastions of jim crow are still powerful and ubiquitous. It is to be noted, too, that the decisions on civil liberties, particularly that in the California Smith Act case, rendered June 17, while tremendously gratifying to all fighters against the witch-hunt, still generally are con-

finned to lamenting some of the outrageous excesses committed in the course of the hunt; the decisions do not deny the existence of witches, nor denounce the barbarity of hunting myths in order to murder liberty.

It is further to be observed that the Court's decisions in the area of labor's rights have continued to be restrictive, including the decision on that same June 17 upholding State laws which banned picketing for purposes of organization. As Justice Douglas said, speaking for the three dissenters (Warren, Black and himself), "the Court has come a full circle" in surrendering free-speech protection for unions; he labeled the majority opinion as a "formal surrender" of such rights, and added that State courts now were "free to decide whether to permit or suppress any particular picket line for any reason other than a blanket policy against all picketing."

---

*Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 35 cents.*

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

 209

To the degree that popular pressure and labor's political strength and activity multiply, to that degree will the Court's decisions directly affecting the working class and the trade-union movement change, and move away from its present persistent pro-boss bias.

While there remains a tendency toward "moderation" in the Supreme Court so far as implementing its generally anti-segregation views is concerned, and a pronounced ambiguity—to put it mildly—when it comes to the rights of Communists and radicals in any organizational sense, the present Court is notably strong in defending civil liberties as these pertain to persons in their individual capacities. Hence its findings in the Jencks case adverse to secret and untouchable reports by Government informers. Hence, too, its language was unequivocal and eloquent in the cases reversing the convictions for contempt of Mr. Watkins and Dr. Sweezy (both men, pleading the First Amendment, had refused to become informers, and had denied the right of Congressional Committees to inquire into their political associations) and denying the propriety of the firing of State Department employee, John S. Service (accused of "disloyalty"). Thus, in the Sweezy case, Mr. Chief Justice Warren did not hesitate, speaking for the Court, to ground the reversal on the broadest principles, for:

There unquestionably was an inva-

sion of petitioner's liberties in the areas of academic freedom and political expression—areas in which the government should be extremely reticent to tread.

\* \* \*

The Watkins and Sweezy decisions, reflecting upon the arbitrary exercise of powers by Congressional investigating committees, and the Service decision, upon the hounding and penalizing of government employees for "sedition," bring to mind at once the most celebrated case combining both these features. In this case, the victim suffered the loss of five years of his freedom, the wiping out of his savings, the anguish of his family and friends, the loss of his good name; and the people of the United States also were penalized because, as a direct result of that man's conviction, the idea of social reform and the right of political dissent became synonymous with treason.

I am referring, of course, to the Case of Alger Hiss. And now Mr. Hiss has produced a book—*In the Court of Public Opinion* (Knopf, N. Y., \$5)—where he, himself, minutely examines the process whereby he was imprisoned.

This volume has the potential energy, in the sphere of politics, that the atomic bomb has in the sphere of war; but in its sphere, the after-effects of the book will be lasting, cumulative, and salutary. Hiss' conviction in January, 1950, for perjury, in connection with charges involving espionage for the Soviet Union,

"gave  
who t  
at the  
of inc  
tende  
ish, 4  
... t  
politi  
victio  
then T  
in T  
one o  
Carth  
velt  
ist-inf  
Deal  
of su  
Th  
most  
publi  
ceives  
treat  
Time  
in T  
mark  
McC  
ism i  
Of  
Chan  
the  
in M  
reads  
so de  
by F  
Hiss  
was  
Edga  
stater  
tial,  
Time  
mer  
inves

"gave the FBI," as Alistair Cooke, who then believed in his guilt, wrote at the time, "an unparalleled power of inquiry into private lives . . . it tended to make conformity sheepish, and to limit by intimidation . . . to put a high premium on the politically neutral snob." Hiss' conviction, as Milton Howard, who then believed in his innocence, wrote in *The Worker* four years ago, "is one of the main props for the McCarthy propaganda that the Roosevelt Administration was 'Communist-infiltrated' and that the New Deal attitudes . . . were the result of such 'infiltration.'"

That Hiss' book is issued by the most highly respected commercial publisher in the country, that it receives two full pages of respectful treatment from the *New York Times* and three different reviews in *The Saturday Review*, are hallmarks of the fact that not only is McCarthy dead, but that McCarthyism is staggering.

Of course, the Old Guard rallies: Chambers, finally located among the three farms that he now owns in Maryland, sneers that he only reads books to get at the truth and so does not intend to read this one by Hiss; Senator Mundt says Mr. Hiss is just a convict yelling he was framed, like all convicts do; J. Edgar Hoover issues an irrelevant statement filled with inconsequential, but important-sounding details; *Time* defends the honor of its former senior editor in whom Luce invested thousands of dollars; Wil-

liam E. Bohn, an editor of *The New Leader*, finds Hiss' book—the actual nature and details of which he carefully keeps from his readers—"such a fantastic concoction" that he is sure it "would be most difficult" to find any readers who could believe it; Professor Sidney Hook, in the *Sunday Times Book Review* reports that the book is dull and unconvincing and that the verdict of guilty brought in by the jury remains unshaken.

Anyone who knows the writings of Sidney Hook knows at once that this means the Hiss book actually is exciting and convincing, and demonstrates that the jury's verdict in the midst of the witchhunting hysteria of 1950 was a travesty upon justice.

As for the persuasive quality of the book: Marquis Childs, in his syndicated column of May 7, stated that Knopf had given the manuscript to a person who was present at the original trials, had read every word of the transcripts and "had been convinced of Hiss' guilt," and that what Hiss had written "had shaken his conviction," wherefore he urged Mr. Knopf to publish the volume. Alistair Cooke, reviewing the book in *The Manchester Guardian*, May 16, changes from one who had been quite sure of Hiss' guilt to one who finds it necessary to "consider the possibility of a miscarriage of justice" and believes that the best that could be said now for the Government would be "the Scottish verdict of 'not proven.'"

R. H. S. Crossman, a leading English author of Social-Democratic persuasions, who had been convinced of Hiss' guilt, reports in his review of the work in *The (London) New Statesman and Nation*, June 1, that "sensational new evidence" makes it appear quite possible that Hiss "was the victim of a frame-up"; hence he concludes: "there is certainly a sufficient margin of doubt to justify his demand for a new trial."

Morris Ernst, the well-known American attorney, bitterly anti-Communist in his outlook, who was originally certain of Hiss' guilt, received the first jolt to his confidence with the appearance, in 1953, of the Earl Jowitt's *The Strange Case of Alger Hiss*. That book, however, led him to decide only that Hiss' guilt on one of two perjury counts was not proven, but that his guilt on the other was indubitable. Hiss' own book leads Morris Ernst to say, "I am now more inclined to believe that Hiss was not guilty on either count." And he says this though, as he adds: "It is not easy as a member of the Bar to hold a position contrary to the finding of a jury and Appellate Judges." Other distinguished individuals—Catherine Drinker Bowen, Mark DeWolfe Howe, Jonathan Daniels — testify similarly. Thus, Mr. Daniels declares: "Hiss speaks his innocence. I can only attest the moving power of his protestation."

Mr. Wayne K. Boulton, product analyst for the Royal Typewriter

Company (and forgery by typewriter is a feature of this case) writes, in *The Saturday Review*, May 18, that while his own feeling originally was one of disinterest, after reading the volume, he "would like to see another unbiased examination of the facts of this case."

While the book is detailed, it is far from dull, despite Sidney Hook's assertion. Books about trials have an innate fascination anyway, and this one, revealing the nature of a frame-up, has the added attraction of a "whodunit." But above all, the book is exciting because it deals with a central issue of our time; the author's restraint and care and modesty and patient assembly of data add to the volume's impact.

It is not possible within the confines of this department to convey with any particularity the nature of the overwhelming evidence of frame-up that Hiss presents. Suffice it to say that I believe no honest mind can read this book with its documented demonstration of literally dozens of lies and distortions and contradictions in the Government's case without being persuaded, at the very least, as Alistair Cooke was persuaded, that the guilt was "not proven."

In my own case, I had studied this prosecution with care (and wrote of it in 1953, reprinted in my *History and Reality*) and was persuaded that it was a political frame-up of the crassest kind. The Hiss book adds important new evidence and its logical arrangement of that

vide  
speci  
forma  
infam  
Amer  
led th  
Presi  
and  
part  
I fi  
ume.  
tions  
part  
is, F  
Com  
proof  
that  
still  
natur  
it as  
sibly  
by i  
Were  
know  
up w  
in th  
know  
and  
down  
just  
pose.  
If I  
able  
ture  
gives  
too n  
that  
engin  
frami  
Sacco  
frame  
tionar

evidence is most persuasive. It is especially revealing in the inside information it gives concerning the infamous proceedings of the Un-American Activities Committee—led then by Congressman, now Vice-President, Nixon—its obvious bias and malice, in hounding Hiss as part of its anti-New Deal efforts.

I find two limitations in the volume. Both are part of the limitations of Hiss and, ironically, are part of the innocence of Hiss. That is, Hiss is "accused" of being a Communist, and one of the best proofs of his "innocence" is the fact that he never does (and apparently still does not) comprehend the real nature of his frame-up. He thinks of it as the work of a spiteful and possibly insane Chambers, goaded on by irresponsible hack politicians. Were Hiss a Communist, he would know that the culprit in his frame-up was the Cold-War ruling class in the United States; he would know that the Government leaders and the FBI masterminded his downfall, and that Chambers was just a despicable tool for this purpose.

If he grasped this, he would be able to overcome the weakest feature of his own case: namely, he gives to Chambers too much energy, too much ingenuity, for it is clear that no one man, alone, could have engineered the whole process of framing Hiss. No one man framed Sacco and Vanzetti, no one man framed Dreyfus. In each case reactionary government apparatuses

were guilty, in furtherance of reactionary political ends. Exactly the same thing is true of the frame-up of Alger Hiss. With this key the whole monstrous story falls into line. Without it, one can see that Hiss could not have been guilty as accused, but one still falls short of being able to grasp what actually happened and how it was brought about.

Second, Hiss accepts the fundamental postulate of the reality of "Communist conspiracy" and "Communist espionage"; but that whole idea is false. The Communist Party never was and is not a conspiracy of any kind and never engaged in any kind of criminal behavior. That Party certainly never engaged in espionage and members of that organization were Communists, not spies. Actually Hiss' demonstration of the ridiculous ease with which documents of all government departments could have been lost or misplaced or strayed, or lifted (for all sorts of purposes, including that of frame-up); his demonstration of the utterly inconsequential nature of the "awful" documents that Chambers produced; and his proof of the completely farcical nature of the whole charge—all this constitutes a refutation of his own guilt in the first place, and also a refutation of the idea of "Communist espionage." Had Hiss seen this, and said it, he again would have strengthened his own case.

A final thought on this remark-

able volume: Hiss has served his time, and no one can restore his lost years. There remains the task of restoring his good name, and simultaneously exposing the political frame-up system that stains American justice, in the first place, the unconstitutional carryings-on of the FBI. There remains, too, with great urgency, the case of Morton Sobell, who faces yet another twenty-five years—a lifetime—of jail, and who is guiltless of any crime. The conviction of Alger Hiss made possible the execution of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg; the vindication of Alger Hiss should make possible the liberation of Morton Sobell.

## II

Another "Cold-War criminal" made an auspicious debut in a new medium just about the time Mr. Hiss' book appeared. This was Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois, who during Negro History Week in 1951 was arraigned as a "foreign agent" by the government of the United States, handcuffed, and finger printed and very nearly sent off to jail. Dr. Du Bois—humanity will celebrate his 90th birthday this coming February—was interviewed for half an hour May 28, on the television program "Nightbeat," visible via the Dumont network to several hundred thousand viewers in and around New York City.

The man interviewing Dr. Du Bois was Al Morgan, a highly successful script-writer, and author of

the best-selling novel and widely seen film, "The Great Man." That was the story, it will be recalled, of a consummate "heel"; a thoroughly corrupt, foul, lecherous, self-centered, deceitful "success." Mr. Morgan, in interviewing Dr. Du Bois, had before him the antithesis of "The Great Man"; it was obvious that while he was respectful on the whole, he also was exceedingly nervous with a great man.

His questions were the more or less obvious baiting ones that reflect the level of much American political thinking. Dr. Du Bois, though in his television debut, was his normally serene, thoughtful, courteous, stalwart self, and answered the younger man's queries about the Soviet Union and about Hungary in a calm, factual manner, leaving room for differences of opinion, but no room at all for any doubts as to the honesty and depth of the replies.

While there was brief mention of Dr. Du Bois' latest book, *The Ordeal of Mansart* (Mainstream Publishers, \$3.50), there was no discussion whatsoever of the central feature of Dr. Du Bois' life, i.e., the struggle for the liberation of the Negro people and for the destruction of colonialism. This struggle is summed up, however, in the trilogy Dr. Du Bois has completed, *The Black Flame*, of which the Mansart volume is the first. This work, which tells what it has meant to be an American Negro from the years of Reconstruction to the mid-1950's, could have been written by only one



man, and he has written it.

Of the book, I want only to say this at the moment: it has a quality of profundity, of having been thought over and over and over. The book is the life work of a master-life. It must be read with extreme care and thought. Much of the work is so exciting that this is difficult; read it more than once, therefore. *The Black Flame* brings you the learning and experience, conclusions and feelings, passion and humor of one of the foremost figures in the history of the twentieth century.

\* \* \*

Among the most distinguished of American scholars is E. Franklin Frazier, Head of the Department of Sociology at Howard University in Washington, former President of the American Sociological Society and now President of the International Society for the Scientific Study of Race Relations. A work from Professor Frazier's pen requires careful study by anyone who wishes to keep abreast of the most advanced segments of American thinking. Of one thing the prospective reader may always be sure: Professor Frazier says exactly what he believes; is beholden to no man; lets the chips fall where they may; and follows the most rigorous standards of scholarship.

These attributes appear again in Professor Frazier's latest work, *Black Bourgeoisie* (The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., \$4). In this volume are useful data on the actual economic

situation of Negro businesses, frequently illuminating analyses of the attitudes and drives of the growing Negro "middle class," and a devastating evaluation of the dominant values of the American rich, and the degree to which these have been adopted by what Frazier calls the black bourgeoisie.

The impact of Marxism is clear in the work of Professor Frazier as it must be in the work of any social scientist of this century; since the stature of the scholar is great, the evidences of indebtedness are plain. What is more unusual, for a work from an American professor, is that even the Communist Party of the United States—honored with more unrestrained abuse by the rich and their servitors than any other organization in American history—is referred to decently and respectfully if briefly, and while in the course of expressing some differences with its estimates.

My overall reaction to this very challenging work is, however, one of dissent and disagreement. Most of Professor Frazier's "black bourgeoisie" is not, in any scientific sense, a bourgeoisie. As he, himself, says, "the black bourgeoisie is comprised essentially of white-collar workers"; those Professor Frazier places in this category have incomes ranging from \$2000 upwards, the majority do not have incomes of \$4000. In any case only half of one percent of Negroes in the United States have incomes of \$5000 per year or more.

Professor Frazier's evaluation and characterization of this considerable and varied group are, I think, much too generalized and much too harsh. He sees them as generally ashamed of their own people and deeply ashamed of themselves (Professor Frazier evaluates highly the very dubious and sensationalistic *Mark of Oppression*, by Kardiner and Ovesey); as deeply anti-Semitic, profoundly cynical and opportunistic; amoral and fatuous.

He thinks Negro teachers, in the majority, "have no knowledge of books nor any real love of literature"; that Negro teachers and students alike are after money and interested in conspicuous consumption and not in learning or culture or art; he feels the Negro intellectual "has not been able to engage in independent thinking," that he "has never developed a social philosophy."

Professor Frazier finds that:

There have been only two really vital cultural traditions in the social history of the Negro in the United States: one being the genteel tradition of the small group of mulattoes who assimilated the morals and manners of the slaveholding aristocracy; and the other, the culture of the black folk who gave the world the Spirituals.

While Professor Frazier sees the origins of the free Negro's Church in the North prior to emancipation to have been in protest against a jim-crow Christianity, he does not see this as of any significance for he

does not find the Negro church to be substantially different from the White in its social attitudes. Further he finds the Bible to have been used as a rationalization and justification for slavery and oppression and that the essence of religious instruction offered the mass of Negroes was that the Negro "had been cursed by God." He finds that while the religion of the slaves was supervised by the masters "they were allowed some freedom" and that "'the invisible institution' of the Negro church grew up where the slaves were permitted to conduct their religious services with a Negro preacher," but he indicates that this meant no alteration in the substance of the religion taught.

Of the group as a whole, while it is dissatisfied with its second-class status, Professor Frazier places this, too, throughout his work, in an essentially negative fashion, as: "Its demand for equality for the Negro in American life is concerned primarily with opportunities which will benefit the bourgeoisie economically and enhance the social status of the Negro."

I would say, first of all, that Professor Frazier fails to place the Negro people, including the relatively rich among them, within the context of the American social order, with its imperialist nature and the degenerate values of its dominant class. Secondly, Professor Frazier ignores the fact of imperialism, in terms of its impact upon life in America. For example, the influence

of monopoly capitalism in stifling Negro business is ignored: or, the fact that it is monopoly capitalism which conquers the South beginning about 1890 and what this means in terms of Southern politics and Negro reaction to this conquest is also ignored. In this sense, the actual historical position of Booker T. Washington, *in terms of the Negro people*, is overestimated, and that of the young Du Bois is underestimated.

In terms of generalizations and their dangers, space will permit me to bring forward only a few examples of what I mean. Take the group of Negro ministers, central to the "black bourgeoisie" that Professor Frazier has in mind. These are exceedingly varied; many work six days a week as field-hands, carpenters, masons, etc., and preach one day; many serve exceedingly poor and harassed and militant congregations and reflect corresponding attitudes; all must preach a religion of discontent, even if a few advise meekness in the face of adversity, because all are servants of a people in adversity and riven by discontent.

Again, the religion of the Negro is simply not that of the dominant white churches. The Negro Churches, neither in origin nor in function, have been bulwarks of the status quo; the contrary is true. The African Methodist Episcopal Church, and the AME Zion Church, beginning in protest against segregation, continued that tradition of

protest from the late 18th century through the Civil War, and since. The "invisible institution" of the slave's church was not approved by the master, and was generally in fact "invisible" to him. The slaves held "hush-harbor" meetings in the dead of night, with sentries posted to warn of the coming of the patrol. At these seditious gatherings, they elected their own ministers; the sermons preached there came from the same Bible as the master used, but the passages selected were quite different. The text was not: "Servant obey your master," nor was it the curse upon Ham and the charge that his descendants were to be hewers of wood and haulers of water all their days. On the contrary, the text was: "He hath made of one blood all the nations on the earth"; the text showed that God so hated slaveowners that he drowned their army, and He so loved the slaves that He parted the seas to help them run away. The text of the slaves was: "The first shall be last and the last shall be first." Their elected preachers told how the meek would inherit the earth—not heaven; they told how the rich would get into heaven when a camel passed through the eye of a needle.

These are the sources of the church of the Negro slaves, and after the Civil War this branch of sedition joined with the free Negroes' branch of protest to form the present swelling current of insistence on an end to discrimination

which so dominates Negro religion today.

If one limits Negro culture to the two branches Professor Frazier indicated, what would one do with the contributions of Douglass, Still, Loguen, Bibb, Garnet, Ward, Remond, Delany, Tubman, Truth, Chesnutt, Hughes, Woodson, Du Bois, Locke, King, Robeson—and Frazier? With names such as these—and their total could be duplicated and more with altogether different names—is it not very excessive to deny independent thinking to Negro intellectuals and to assert that they have developed no social philosophy?

Did not the Negro people worship Frederick Douglass? Were not the magnificent editorials of Dr. Du Bois for a generation in the *Crisis* read aloud to an assembled and hushed Negro family in ten thousand homes? Are the Negro student youth and their teachers today in Montgomery and Tallahassee, interested only in money? Surely, Professor Frazier has infinitely greater experience than I do in terms of Negro colleges, but, while being brought up sharply by the impressive testimony of Professor Frazier, I must nevertheless protest that my own limited experiences in perhaps a dozen Negro institutions of learning throughout the country—especially as these are compared with experiences in predominantly white institutions—leads me to declare that there is more excitement, more intellectual challenge and daring,

more seriousness, more devotion to the power of truth and the need for learning on the Negro campuses than anywhere else in our country.

True it is that the black bourgeoisie as defined by Professor Frazier seeks an improvement “economically” and seeks to enhance its “social status”; but taking his own definition, starting at \$2000 a year, I would say that the first motivation was thoroughly justified for the vast majority and showed no grossness in taste. Where the desire is for equality in social status, I know that this is precious to Professor Frazier. That self-interest impels the vast majority of the “black bourgeoisie” in the direction of opposing jim crow and for economic and social advancement, is fundamental to their role today in the Negro liberation movement, whose level—unprecedentedly high as it is—unfortunately does not fall within the ken of Professor Frazier’s volume. At the same time, that class position and capitalist pressures may make a portion of this “black bourgeoisie” prone to defection or vacillation is true; but no radical effort has ever been without this drawback. At any rate, for the present, so militant is the movement, so notable the advances, so effective the leadership, that participation in struggle, not the nursing of suspicions, is what is required. In any case, the test of action is the best exposé of demagoguery.

\* \* \*

Carl T. Rowan is a good example,

in terms of status and profession, of one of Professor Frazier's "black bourgeoisie," but his values and aims are certainly not such as to give comfort to the American ruling class. A staff writer for the *Minneapolis Tribune*, Mr. Rowan's keen eye, clear prose and journalistic resourcefulness appeared in his *South of Freedom* (1953) and *The Pitiful and the Proud* (1956). Now, again, in *Go South to Sorrow* (Random House, N. Y., \$3.50), Carl Rowan has produced an important eye-witness account of the stirrings below the Mason-Dixon line.

The heart of those stirrings speaks in the voice of the Methodist minister in the small grocery store in Summerton, South Carolina:

We ain't asking for nothing that belongs to these white folks. I just mean to get for that little black boy of mine everything that every other South Carolina boy gets, and I don't care if he's as white as the drippings of snow.

It is the voice of the elderly woman in Montgomery, persisting in the bus boycott, who replied when asked: "Sister, aren't you getting tired?"

*My soul has been tired for a long time. Now my feet are tired and my soul is resting.*

The forms of struggle are new; some of the quality of the leadership is new; the level of the struggle is new. But the essential in-

redient—the will to be free—is not new. I wish Mr. Rowan saw this more clearly than he does, for he, too, talks of the New Negro, as contrasted with the "poor, powerless and humble" one of old. In the three hundred years of writing on the Negro in our country, every generation is struck by Negro militancy and proceeds to discover a "new" Negro. This is true from the days of 1663 when Negro slaves joined indentured white servants in rebellion, to 1800 when thousands joined Gabriel Prosser to shake Richmond to its foundations, to 1822 when Vesey just fell short of taking Charleston, to 1831 when Nat Turner gave the Tidewater planters a nightmare, etc., etc., etc. Let's stop speaking of the "new" Negro as though his father and grandfather were sheep who somehow managed to sire a lion.

Rowan's book is important, too, for the direct evidence it brings from deep in the South—Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina—of the development among significant sections of the white people of support for the effort to end segregation. He tells us he spoke to "hundreds of white southerners" who wanted an end to inequality; he informs us that the mail from whites to the Montgomery newspapers ran 5 to 1 in favor of desegregating the bus system; that over one-third the faculty at the University of Alabama wanted Miss Lucy reinstated as a student; that "hundreds" of white students at that University had signed a peti-

tion seeking her readmission. He brings to his readers such smothered news as the fact that the Dean of Education at the University of South Carolina was fired recently for opposing segregation, and that the President Emeritus of Georgia State College for Women was stripped of his title for the same "offense."

Yet, Mr. Rowan is far from confident because he sees the Dixiecrats defiant and violent and well organized and does not see effective opposition to them coming from the Federal government. He is properly incensed too at the propaganda for "moderation" which, as he shows, is serving the purpose of rationalizing inaction.

Analytically, Mr. Rowan's work is weak, for while he asks why those "who speak with rancor in behalf of baseness and violence" are permitted to defy the Supreme Court of the United States," he comes up with no answers.

Still, Carl Rowan went into the Deep South for his newspaper to report what the people there were saying and doing and thinking. *Go South to Sorrow* does that job well; at the moment I do not know of a better source for that kind of information.

### III

Dear reader, do you remember the alarums in the American press last year about the hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing into

South Viet Nam from the Communist monsters in the North? Here comes the *Far Eastern Survey*, volume XXV, no. 11, published by the intensely anti-Communist Institute of Pacific Relations, with some interesting revelations about that particular sensation. Professor Roy Jumper, of Wake Forest College in North Carolina, spent two years (1954-56) on a Ford Foundation Fellowship in South Viet Nam, and contributes a study of "The Communist Challenge" there to the aforesaid publication. Here we learn that: "Vietnamese soldiers and their dependents who moved on the orders of the French high command actually accounted for about 200,000 of the refugees." And many of the others were peasants in two provinces where the Catholic bishops "were virtual rulers"; these dignitaries had promised the peasants free land in the South, and had added "that 'God' had moved South." As a clincher, the peasants "were warned that the United States would drop the atomic bomb in North Viet Nam as it did in Japan during World War II."

Professor Jumper provides interesting information, too, about the splendid rule of Premier Ngo Dinh Diem in South Viet Nam, whose recent visit here, it will be remembered, was climaxed by long talks with President Eisenhower, and an address before a Joint Session of Congress. The peasants are in peonage, the workers are starving, corruption is universal, the slums are

incredibly bad and are spreading, protesters are all "Communists" and dealt with accordingly, and very recently dozens of "prominent Saigon intellectuals—doctors, lawyers, government officials, engineers, professors and theatrical people" were arrested; they had joined a "Committee for the Defense of the Peace."

\* \* \*

It is possible that this is related to a phenomenon that Professor John K. Fairbank of Harvard laments but finds difficult to explain in the lead article in the current issue of *The American Historical Review* (Vol. LXII, No. 3); namely, "... so many Asians have a Marxist view of Western history." Of course, in China there "has been the acceptance of Marxism-Leninism," but in Japan, too, "Marxism has become respectable among historians and certainly quite popular among the student body."

Possibly this is partially explained by the quality of some of the free world's studies of backward Asia. Thus, Professor John H. Kautsky writes on *Moscow and the Communist Party of India* (John Wiley, N. Y., \$6) and his effort is to understand "the process by which a Communist Party line is formulated and finally adopted." But in examining this process he ignores India, and looks only at Moscow; no wonder his book is of no help whatsoever in explaining to the reader why twelve and a half million Indians (not Russians) voted for the Communist Party of India (not Russia)

in the recent General Elections, held in India (not Russia).

\* \* \*

This leads me to a concluding note relative to Marxism and scholarship. When I read it I felt refreshed, and after taking the reader this far (I hope) I want to leave on a refreshing note. Professor C. Wright Mills, author of that penetrating study, *The Power Elite*, was annoyed by some misrepresentations, mixed, appropriately enough, with some hints at the sinister Marxist tendencies of Mr. Mills occurring in an article by one Robert Lekachman, in the March, 1957 *Commentary*. In the June issue of that magazine appears a letter from Mr. Mills straightening Mr. Lekachman out, and then adding this superb paragraph:

It is less important that your writer [he tells the Editor] imputes to me opinions I do not hold than that he obscures serious problems by such fashionable superficiality. Let me say explicitly: I happen never to have been what is called "a Marxist," but I believe Karl Marx one of the most astute students of society modern civilization has produced; his work is now essential equipment of any adequately trained social scientist as well as of any properly educated person. Those who say they hear Marxian echoes in my work are saying that I have trained myself well. That they do not intend this testifies to their own lack of proper education.

\* \* \*

# The Pilgrimage to Washington

By BENJAMIN J. DAVIS

*The struggle of the Negro people in our country for full equality is the most dramatic epic of this period. One of the events in that struggle which captured the attention of the world was the recent Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington. Among those participating in the Pilgrimage was Benjamin J. Davis, formerly a member of the New York City Council, who is a member of the National Committee, CPUSA, and Secretary for Negro Affairs of the Party. In the following pages he offers an estimate of that event.—Ed.*

THE PRAYER PILGRIMAGE of May 17 was a magnificent and historic protest demonstration, representing a new high level of the Negro people's movement. It registered their united will, together with significant sections of their white labor and progressive allies, for full integration into first-class citizenship, particularly in the deep South. The demonstration will have its impact on coming events, nationally and internationally, and will greatly strengthen the confidence of the Negro people in moving together as a people. But the struggle has just begun.

Under the slogan "to arouse the conscience of the nation," the Pilgrimage put forward five main objectives: to demonstrate Negro unity; to provide a means for Northerners to aid Southern "freedom fighters"; to protest the persecution of the NAACP; to protest violence against Freedom Fighters; and to urge passage of pending civil

rights legislation. Whatever the diversity of opinion on various matters, the Negro people, thanks to the influence of the 2 million Negro trade unionists, and their advanced white supporters, were in unison on these demands.

Of the 30,000 present at the Lincoln Memorial, it is estimated that more than 8,000 came from the deep southern states, and were largely organized by the Negro press and Negro churches in cooperation with the Southern Leaders Conference headed by the Rev. Martin Luther King. This was truly an outstanding achievement. The remainder came from more than 30 states in all sections of the country, representing churches, trade unions, women's and youth organizations, fraternal groups and the like.

Among the participants were adherents of all political parties, featured by a cross-section of the Negro people in particular. The atmosphere was charged with militancy



from both speakers and audience—Southern Negro ministers declared, with electric response from the audience, "We are ready to lay down our lives for freedom." At the same time, these expressions of militancy and determination took place within the framework of non-violent resistance and non-cooperation which constitute the new form of Negro people's struggle now taking place in deep Southern urban centers.

\* \* \*

Not since the Civil War has there ever been such a powerful, massive demonstration of the Negro people for first class citizenship; nor has there been in modern America a similar mobilization from any other section of the population, not excluding labor in its own direct interest. As for the Negroes attending from the South, scores of them put their homes, their children, their jobs and their lives on the line to be present. The Negro workers played a tremendous role in this regard.

The monopoly press and governmental circles have thus far expressed contempt for this united demand of more than one-tenth of the American people, a demand supported by the overwhelming majority of democratic-minded Americans. Virtually a conspiracy of silence greeted the demonstration in the capitalist newspapers—few of them editorializing on it—and most from the very beginning damned it with faint news. They cannot con-

ceal their fear of this movement and have no desire to encourage its determination to democratize and revolutionize the South. At the same time, they dared not incite terror to smash it because of rising socialist world currents—led by the Soviet Union and China—the colonial liberation movements symbolized by Bandung, not to mention the progressive developments in our own country.

The behavior of Eisenhower and his whole General Motors cabinet is thus far disgraceful and contemptible. The President refuses to speak out against the lynch terror, bombings and racist defiance of the law of the land; he makes no attempt to place the executive branch of the government behind the Supreme Court decisions; and he flatly refuses to fight even for his own watered-down civil rights bills. When it comes to Adenauer and the latter's revival of West German militarism, he is neither tongue-tied nor too busy to see him; he is touchingly willing to uphold the pernicious Eisenhower doctrine in Jordan, but cannot uphold the Supreme Court and the law of the land in Mississippi. He has not deigned to comment on the peaceful, lawful demands of the Pilgrimage, and Attorney General Brownell permits the Klan, the White Citizens Council, and racist state officials to bomb, frame, and persecute Negroes—and whites—with impunity.

Such an example by the President

of the United States denotes a corrupt standard of public morality which cannot but have its corroding effects upon the fibre of American society and life. It is no wonder that the ideas and examples of socialism are having an increasing appeal to Negro and white Americans, no less than to workers and other peoples in the so-called "free world." When, in 1956, the Soviet leaders self-critically made public the Stalin revelations, our pious secretary of State Dulles pointed a self-righteous finger at the socialist countries. But what has he to say of the still continuing 300 years of capitalist crimes against Negro Americans and against the colonial peoples?

The fight for the full citizenship of the Negroes in the deep South, and for the democratization of that blighted area, intersects the whole pattern of American life and, for the most part, is determinative of the social progress and future of the nation.

The fight for the objectives of the Pilgrimage remains. Not a single demand put to the government has been realized. The first fruits of the pressure represented by the Pilgrimage was the passage of the limited civil rights package through the House, and Vice President Nixon's belated willingness to meet briefly with the Rev. King.

Nevertheless, essentially, the struggle continues, as this is written, at the point where the President has left off. Much has been said by Mr. Eisenhower about so-called "mod-

ern Republicanism." But it should not be forgotten that 39 years ago—on July 26, 1918—a Democratic Party President, Woodrow Wilson, spoke publicly against Lynch law. In this regard, the "modern" Eisenhower must catch up with the antiquated Wilson. Negroes are not worried because the sharp struggle for their citizenship "embarrasses" the Republican Administration or the Democratic Party. The name of the U. S. is already degraded by the notorious and brutal jim-crow system, and will continue so until this system is smashed.

\* \* \*

A number of lessons can be drawn from this Pilgrimage which will have a profound effect upon the Negro people's movement as it continues the struggle to end racist violence, and to realize its objectives of human dignity and full citizenship. The richness of the event is bound to stimulate the widest discussion, enhancing the possibility of even more united and effective mass actions and struggles.

First of all, the Pilgrimage arose out of the will to struggle and initiative of the masses of the Negro people in the South to end segregation and achieve their full constitutional rights. Secondly, the leadership of the movement now comes out of the South itself, with the Pilgrimage being an adoption of a new form of struggle developed in the South, highlighted by the technique of mass boycotts. There was certainly more than prayer at the event,

though prayer was the main form of its summons. Undoubtedly this form lent itself more readily to continuance of the struggles by the Negroes under the difficult conditions of the deep South, conditions under which active mass support from white labor, farmers and masses in the South is almost negligible. Besides, the political content of this movement in the south is so meaningful, militant and revolutionary, that the Eastland racists try to suppress it notwithstanding its religious character.

Thirdly, the movement evinced on both sides of the platform a high degree of solidarity with the colonial liberation movements of Asia and Africa. The presence of a number of U.S. Negro leaders in Africa at the birth of Ghana, whose Prime Minister, Nkrumah, denounces both imperialism and capitalism and advocates a "socialistic society" for the new Negro nation, was of considerable importance. The heavy hand of American imperialism in Puerto Rico, in Haiti, in the Caribbean and in Latin and South America is of the same cloth and will eventually be seen as such.

Fourthly, the readiness of the Negro people for independent political action was apparent in the enthusiastic response to the proposal of Rep. A. Clayton Powell for a "third force" in political life. Both the Democratic and Republican parties were scathed for their failures on civil rights, and the Republican-Dixiecrat alliance in Congress in-

dicted. With the advent of the Roosevelt New Deal, the Negro voters demonstrated that they were no longer in the vest pocket of the G. O. P.; now they're demonstrating that they're not in the vest pocket of the Democratic Party.

Fifthly, the Negro people in the North and the labor movement in particular have a profoundly important role to play in supporting the Negro liberation movement in the South, in the use of the ballot and in organizing the unorganized in the South. The Dixiecrat flunkies of the Northern monopolies are the source of racist poison throughout the nation and, at the same time, are mainly responsible for the anti-union, right-to-work laws which frustrate trade union organization and weaken the whole labor movement. Sen. McClellan is the common enemy of both the Negro and labor.

Sixth, the Rev. Martin Luther King placed as the most urgent and basic demand of the Negro people in the South—the demand which underlies those put forward by the Pilgrimage and then some—the right to vote. The realization of such a demand would spell the end of the Eastlands and Talmadges, and the election of officials pledged to uphold constitutional freedom, and the extension of democracy in the South for both Negroes and whites. In an exceedingly thoughtful address, the Rev. King brought forth a number of interesting new ideological approaches which bear

serious examination.

Among the highlights of the event was the warmth demonstrated by the Negro people toward the NAACP; the participation of a Jewish Rabbi which was far more significant than his lone prayer; the outstanding participation of Negro women, backbone of the bus protest activities in the South. The role of A. Philip Randolph as one of the three leaders of the Pilgrimage was an earnest of the fact that more than 2 million Negro workers are in the trade unions; and that they are still destined to play their full role in this movement, both as Negroes and as co-unionists with their white brothers.

\* \* \*

Although the shortcomings of the event are secondary to its tremendous positive significance, it obviously faces many serious problems. It is regrettable that the role of white workers was not dramatically symbolized by the participation of leading white trade union speakers. The failure of Meany or Reuther, for example, to be present was noticeable.

However, the most dangerous weakness—in the sense that it goes to the core of the Negro-labor alliance—was the scant presence of white workers and popular forces, due largely to failure of trade-union leaders to really back the effort. Many unions undoubtedly sent delegates representing many thousands of white workers in locals; but this was a mass demonstration involving

maximum individual participation as well as indirect representation. One would understand that the repeated calls of the Pilgrimage leaders, certainly on the Eastern seaboard, for inter-racial participation was a direct invitation to the white allies of the Negro people to be present. For full strength and effectiveness, the struggle for Negro rights must be inter-racial. This question requires further examination, since the strength of the Negro-labor alliance, which has shown disturbing strains recently, is based essentially on the initiative of the white workers in the struggle for Negro rights, on the political as well as on the economic fronts. Worth consideration in this connection is the advanced political character of the Negro peoples movement, in terms of its dissatisfaction with both major parties, while, by and large, organized labor is still tied to the Democratic and Republican Parties, principally the former. Secondly, the white workers and masses do not understand clearly that it is in their own self-interest to combat the main ideological weapon of American imperialism—national and white chauvinism—that they would gain, even as would the Negro from the revolutionary transformation of the South. The base of the anti-labor, anti-Negro combination in Congress is the Republican-Dixiecrat alliance. Various speakers registered themselves as opponents of Communism. But this is the sort of competition that Communists welcome in the

free  
mai  
red-  
tion  
agai  
only  
derc  
and  
sire  
irre-  
labe  
the  
dign  
W  
mur  
Ner  
the  
seen

T  
"in  
sein  
Was  
only  
this  
alrea  
the  
is "  
is th  
to V  
ened  
call  
cove  
We

T  
was  
ple's  
all  
the  
gori  
and  
lack

free, open market of ideas. It remained for Randolph to introduce red-baiting with false characterizations of "disruption and infiltration" against the Communist Party. Not only are such characterizations slanderous and untrue, they are old hat and don't meet the strong, wise desire of the Negro people for unity irrespective of political or any other label as long as one is fighting for the universal cause of human dignity.

When the aggressively anti-Communist weekly, the *Amsterdam News*, had this to say editorially on the eve of the Pilgrimage, it would seem that others would take note:

Those who would keep the Negro "in his place" are keenly interested in seeing that the Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington will fail by producing only a handful of Negroes. Towards this end a whispering campaign has already been started to the effect that the Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington is "Commie inspired." The hope here is that many Negroes who were going to Washington would become frightened and stay away. . . . But do we call off the ball game because we discover a Communist in the grandstand? We do not.

The Pilgrimage demonstration was the spearhead of the Negro people's movement. This movement in all its forms as a whole, embracing the Negro population in all categories, together with its white labor and progressive allies, shows the lack of a strong united and van-

guard Communist Party. Moreover, this writer was one of the individual Communists who attended the "ball game" and who sought to persuade his neighbors to attend irrespective of their color, religion or race. The columns of the Lincoln Memorial did not collapse. Indeed, actual subversive forces did not seek to build the Pilgrimage or the Negro movement as a whole, but rather to prevent its success, and to give aid and comfort to the Eastland racists and Dixiecrats, and to the do-nothing stance of the Administration.

The building of the Communist Party is an essential part of the fight for a powerful, militant and united movement for the achievement of every partial civil rights reform. Communists are among those most conscious of the fact that the white workers and popular masses should see the struggle for Negro rights as in their own self-interest, and simultaneously that the Negro people's movement needs white allies and should combat all go-it-alone tendencies. Communists, no less than any other Americans, Negro and white, or any other partisans of human dignity, fight for the indivisibility of the struggle for freedom. Conscious participants in the upward struggles of peoples and societies, Communists move with confidence in the triumph of socialism, and have no need of mechanical piches or captures of movements and organizations. Those are the anti-democratic methods of fascist reaction, and imperialism.

The most active contradiction within American society today is the struggle for the full citizenship of the Negro people—for civil rights—against the system of national oppression and jim-crow imposed upon Negro people. It is a struggle that takes place on many fronts—economic, social, political and legislative—the core of which is in the

South, where the right to vote is the next big crusade of the freedom fighters, actively supported by labor and democratic forces all over the country. The whole future of the nation depends upon the sharpening and quick resolution of this struggle in a democratic manner, and on the immediate agenda is civil rights legislation in Congress.

With this issue, Comrade V. J. Jerome no longer appears as Editor. Comrade Jerome, who recently completed a three-year jail sentence under the infamous Smith Act, served as Editor for many years. He has indicated his desire to make his contribution to the cause of Socialism by devoting himself very largely to the field of creative writing, where his *Lantern for Jeremy* registered such success. The Editor knows that he speaks for thousands of "Jerry's" friends, throughout the world, in hailing his return to active work, and in wishing him well.

# "The Truth About Hungary"

By HYMAN LUMER

*No more urgent, and controversial, question has appeared in modern times than that regarding the 1956 uprising in Hungary. Very recently a full-length study of this event by Herbert Aptheker was published. Below is offered an estimate and analysis of this work by Hyman Lumer, author of War Economy and Crisis (1954), and a member of the National Committee, CPUSA.—Ed.*

GREAT HISTORICAL upheavals can never be fully evaluated at the time of their occurrence; a rounded, balanced analysis is attainable only in the perspective which comes with the passage of time. But for those who live at the particular moment, the luxury of perspective—of mature reflection and thorough examination of the facts—does not exist. They are compelled to pass judgment at the moment itself, to determine on which side they stand. Nor can a choice be evaded. The very effort to seek neutrality, to temporize or to delay decision has the effect, objectively, of giving support to one side or the other.

And so it was on November 4, 1956, the fateful date on which the Soviet troops in Hungary, having left Budapest, retraced their steps and returned to that city. This was the climactic moment in the Hungarian uprising, which had begun less than two weeks before. It was a moment which confronted Communists and progressives everywhere with the necessity of making a choice.

How they chose is a matter of record. In this country, the crisis gave rise to widely varying reactions within the Left and within the Communist Party itself. Some joined in the hysterical chorus of denunciation of the Soviet Union, and in the characterization of its actions as the drowning of a popular revolt in blood. Some regarded these actions as a tragic error, and some were simply left shaken and bewildered by the flood of events. But others—and I believe these were the most numerous—defended the Soviet actions.

## THE NEED TO UNDERSTAND

This divergence of views still exists. But the questions posed by the Hungarian events demanded answers at the time and demand them no less today. For "Hungary" has become the catchword of reaction, its synonym for the alleged moral bankruptcy of socialism, its "proof" of its endlessly repeated allegations of Soviet brutality and terror. This is the refrain of the highly publi-

cized report just issued by the UN Special Committee on Hungary, a self-serving distortion designed to fan the flames of anti-Soviet sentiment and to aid the Dulles-Radford forces in their efforts to thwart the London disarmament negotiations.

What is needed today, however, is not the swift, sharp reaction that was called for at the time of the crisis, but rather detailed study and analysis of the facts leading to a full, rounded explanation of the uprising and its sources, from which the necessary lessons can be drawn.

Toward the attainment of such an understanding, Herbert Aptheker's book, *The Truth About Hungary*,\* is an extremely valuable contribution. The work of a highly competent Marxist historian and scholar, it provides a well-documented, detailed account of the upheaval and its background. This is the first book of its kind to be published anywhere, and it is particularly fitting that it should come from the pen of an American writer.

Aptheker's account is marked by a high level of objectivity, yet it is not an "impartial" picture drawn by a disinterested observer. Rather, the book was written because its author felt that basic precepts to which he had long adhered were being challenged and that he had to test the challenge against the facts.

To launch such a project in the white heat of the events themselves

and to complete it within a period of six months—this is indeed a prodigious undertaking. Nevertheless, writes Aptheker, "the attempt is made—the reader having been forewarned—because the author *had* to try to understand that upheaval, is bold enough to feel that he has gained some kind of a reasonable picture of the event, and desires to put that picture to the finality of print and the ordeal of careful scrutiny."

Written in these circumstances, the book can of course make no pretensions to being a complete or definitive work on the subject. However, it does, in the opinion of this writer, present a "reasonable picture of the event," one which will, on the whole, stand up well under scrutiny.

Most of the book deals with background; only one-fourth is devoted to the uprising itself. Aptheker probes back into Hungary's history. He describes the prewar Hungary, her role in World War II, and the developments of the postwar years. Only against this extensive backdrop does he proceed to analyze the events of the uprising, because only so can they be comprehended.

What emerges will give cold comfort to those who accept the *New York Times'*, and similar versions of the uprising. It will give equally cold comfort to those who have maintained that there never was any socialism in Hungary, that the uprising was basically nothing more than a popular revolt against tyrann

\* Mainstream Publishers, N. Y., 256 pp., \$2 (paper), \$3 (cloth).



ny, or that the Soviet intervention was either a crude act of aggression or, at best, an ill-advised blunder. On the contrary, it bears out the opposing position — the position which, sooner or later, came to be adopted by nearly every Communist Party. This was the position also of many Western European socialists, as Apteker demonstrates in quotations from the organs of the Socialist Parties of West Germany, Belgium, Italy and France.

The main portion of the book begins with an examination of the special features of Hungary's development. A non-Slavic people surrounded by Slavic neighbors, Hungary developed an exceptionally intense nationalism. A feudal country with little industry (and that little owned almost exclusively by foreign capital), Hungary was dominated by a handful of big landowners. Affected relatively little by the Protestant Reformation, she was, like Spain, also dominated by the Catholic Church, which was the second-largest landholder in the country and which, as the established state church, controlled 65 per cent of all schools. Its life largely unpenetrated by the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the mid-nineteenth century, Hungary remained a backward feudal land ruled by a tiny elite.

With this extreme clerico-feudalist background, Hungary was a ripe plum for fascism. With the crushing of the Bela Kun revolt in 1919 there took place, under the rule of

Admiral Horthy, a period of White Terror followed by twenty-five years of a fascist dictatorship which came closer than any other to that of the Nazis in Germany. The Communist Party was virtually wiped out while the Social-Democratic Party, in open betrayal of the working people, functioned as an appendage of the Horthy dictatorship.

In the war, Hungary became Hitler's closest ally. Hungarian troops on Russian soil matched the atrocities committed by the German forces. In the closing days of the war the fanatical Szalasi regime, which had replaced Horthy, slaughtered hundreds of thousands of Jews. And Hungary, unlike its neighbors but like Nazi Germany, was liberated not by its own resistance movement but by the Red Army.

#### SOCIALIST TRANSFORMATION

In the light of this background, the postwar reconstruction and revolutionary transformation of Hungary constitute a truly remarkable achievement. Beginning with the Land Reform Act of 1945, a Free Hungarian Coalition Government ranging from Ferenc Nagy of the Smallholders to Matyas Rakosi of the Communist Party launched a series of reforms which destroyed the foundations of feudalism, nationalized the large industrial enterprises and the big banks, and laid the foundations for a socialist society. Steps were taken to sepa-

rate Church and State and toward removal of the schools from church control. And in 1947, with the Three-Year Plan, the industrialization of the country was launched.

From all these developments, the Hungarian people benefitted greatly. The Communist Party, which had led in fighting for them, advanced from 17% of the popular vote in 1945 to 22% (the largest single party vote) in 1947. In the latter year, the combined Communist and Social-Democratic vote was 38% of the total, and in 1948 the two parties fused to form the Hungarian Workers Party.

By 1949, the main foundations of a socialist society had been laid, and the political expression of these changes was embodied in the new Constitution of the Hungarian People's Republic, which became effective in August of that year. Accomplished in such a backward country and in so short a time these were indeed phenomenal achievements.

But they were far from secure. The enemies of socialism, within and without, remained very much alive and active. Within the country, the adherents of the old order were still numerous and much in evidence, always dreaming of counterrevolution. And the forces of world imperialism, led by the United States, worked unremittingly to undermine and destroy the people's democracies and to establish a modern version of the *cordon sanitaire*. This was an essential feature of the cold war, embodied in

the military, diplomatic and economic policies of the American government, and supported by an extensive program of fifth-column activity within the socialist countries.

Devoted to fomenting sabotage and counterrevolution is a host of agencies, both public and private, of which Aptheker presents about the most complete picture in print anywhere. Indeed, the account which he gives constitutes by far the most devastating critique of the machinations of American imperialism to be found in any work. He states:

... the extent of this covert activity is so extraordinary—I think unprecedented in all history—and is so revealing of the real aims of the responsible Power, that it is worth extended notice. Moreover, as an American, the author feels it incumbent upon him to contribute his bit to the effort to inform others of this activity, because just as it is certain that the American people never authorized it, it is equally certain that were they properly informed about it, they would demand its cessation.

These agencies range from the ultra-secret Central Intelligence Agency headed by Allen W. Dulles to the Big Business-supported Committee for a Free Europe which, among a host of other ventures, is the sponsor of Radio Free Europe. Of the nefarious character of their activities, Aptheker's description leaves no doubt whatever. And a chief point of concentration, because

of i  
was

ERR

B

men  
face  
tion  
year  
serie  
in th  
force  
port  
whic  
tion

In  
vanc  
these  
Ther  
heav  
great  
recte  
such  
in 19  
actua  
there  
for

there  
on C  
1952  
budg

To  
ment  
one-s  
in i  
well-  
majo  
tribu  
popu  
Su  
fome

of its location and special features, was Hungary.

### ERRORS AND CRIMES

But if the remarkable achievements of 1945-49 were made in the face of the all-out efforts of reaction to destroy the revolution, the years following witnessed a growing series of errors and crimes which, in their cumulative effect, gave the forces of counterrevolution an opportunity to open a bloody revolt which went far toward the restoration of Horthyism in Hungary.

In the economic sphere, while advances continued to be registered, these became increasingly one-sided. There was an overemphasis on heavy industry which became so great that it had urgently to be corrected. But this was followed by such a degree of overcorrection that in 1954 the output of heavy industry actually declined. In agriculture there was a self-defeating pressure for haste in collectivization. And there was an unduly heavy emphasis on defense expenditures, which in 1952 took 36% of the national budget.

To be sure, economic development continued. But the growing one-sidedness and the resultant halt in improvement of the material well-being of the people became a major source of irritation and contributed greatly to a rising tide of popular discontent.

Such discontent was, of course, fomented continuously by the for-

mer ruling elements and their followers, aided and abetted by the policies of world imperialism. It is these factors, Aptheker asserts, which are the underlying source of the upheaval. But the discontent derived also from internal failings—from the mistakes and crimes of the leaders. Of these, Aptheker says:

It is of the utmost importance to understand these failings—the failings from within—because without these, it is clear, the tragic events in Hungary of October-November, 1956, would never have occurred. We repeat, the fundamental sources of the upheaval were the machinations and the pressures of imperialism, but decisive to the actual outburst of that upheaval were the errors on the part of those charged with building and safeguarding Socialism.

In other words, it is these failings which made it possible for the machinations and pressures of imperialism to be effective. Aptheker classifies them as follows:

. . . 1) a failure to properly evaluate the national feelings of the Hungarian people; 2) persistence in a badly one-sided economic policy resulting in a halt to the improvement of the material conditions of the masses, and for certain periods, a decline in such conditions which never, at any time, had exceeded rather limited standards; 3) an insistence upon monolithic unity in all spheres of life, enforced with terrible rigidity, deteriorating into crass administrative bullying and intolerable violations of legality, humanity and sheer decency; 4) a failure to preserve

the revolutionary elan and purity of the Marxist-Leninist party.

With these he deals at some length, particularly the development of rigid bureaucratism and "monolithic unity" and their offshoots, extending to the resort to terror as a method of rule. Of the crimes committed by the leaders, he presents a graphic description which pulls no punches.

But at the same time, beginning in 1953, there were serious efforts at change. The death of Stalin and consequent developments, and the reduction of world tensions leading to Geneva, as well as internal pressures, led to efforts to democratize both Party and State and to remove the sources of discontent. There was rectification of errors in economic policy. Major legal reforms were instituted with the rehabilitation of those unjustly punished. Attempts were made to reduce over-centralization and to eliminate bureaucratic methods. The composition of the Central Committee of the Party was changed to give greater representation to those who stood for democratization.

To be sure, there was serious resistance and lagging by a number of top leaders, particularly Rakosi, who was compelled to resign as Party Secretary. And to be sure, the efforts fell short in many respects. But the fact remains that, under the pressure of the people, inside and outside the Party, genuine progress was being made. It was

to fight for further progress in order to advance the cause of socialism that the huge youth and student demonstration of October 23—supported by the Party—was organized. Aptheker states:

It is with the knowledge of this that one can comprehend, I think, the desperation of counter-revolutionary forces that very soon showed their hand. The evidence persuades me that it is because of the great advances made in Hungary towards solving the problems posed by errors and misleadership and because greater advances distinctly portended, that external and internal counter-revolutionary, restorationist, fascist and "liberating" forces (notably those in the pay of CIA and other such "freedom" organizations) decided that it was now or never for them.

Such was the situation on the eve of the revolt.

### THE UPRISING

Initially, events in Hungary developed along similar lines to those in Poland. But in Hungary, in contrast to Poland, reaction was able to get the upper hand and to convert peaceful popular demonstrations into a bloody counterrevolution. How did this come about?

Chief among the reasons, Aptheker shows, in addition to Hungary's special history, were the remarkable lack of wisdom displayed by some leaders of the Party, notably its First Secretary Erno Gero, in dealing with the demonstrations,

and the undermining of the Party by its own weaknesses and mistakes to the point where the enemies of socialism saw an opportunity to smash it altogether. Especially noteworthy was the erosion of the Party by factionalism, which Aptheker discusses and from which there are important lessons to be learned.

These enemies were on hand and active from the very beginning. And as time went on their activity progressively increased until it developed into a widespread White Terror, marked by the indiscriminate mass slaughter of Communists, alleged "police spies," Jews and others unfortunate enough to fall into their hands. There is ample evidence that the arming of these gangs was the result of long, careful preparation. There is clear evidence, too, of large-scale infiltration of fascist elements into the country.

These things could happen because there was a collapse of authority in the country. The Nagy regime, in its efforts to appease the anti-socialist elements, drifted further and further to the Right until it consisted in great majority of those dedicated to the destruction of socialism and the restoration of the prewar status. With this drift, conditions became increasingly anarchic.

The one authoritative figure who emerged in this process was the arch-reactionary Cardinal Mindszenty, hailed by reaction generally as the "savior of Hungary." To this relic of the Middle Ages, Aptheker devotes considerable attention, ex-

posing him as a medievalist and unabashed clerico-fascist, as a man who said he "regretted that Darwin had not been burned at the stake," and as an implacable foe of all progress. In this exposure, the book makes an especially important contribution.

Mindszenty's unconcealed aim was a complete return to the old Horthy Hungary, and he was undoubtedly the choice of American imperialism to head such a return. More and more, the country fell into the hands of those who sought a restoration of clerical fascism. There took place, says Aptheker, "an exceedingly rapid turn to the extreme Right which in fact posed, in the middle of Europe, the question of fascism and war." How far this turn to the Right went is shown by the fact that numerous observers who were friendly to the counter-revolutionary elements felt that they had gone "too far and too fast."

A major factor in the success of the counterrevolutionary forces was the disintegration of the Hungarian Workers Party, which left the workers headless and with no effective means of organizing resistance to the growing fascist trend. It is this, and not mass support of the Hungarian people, which gave these reactionary forces their strength. Though there was a degree of mass popular participation, the vast majority, Aptheker shows, took no part in the fighting but remained neutral, passive or apathetic. This is a particularly important point, in

view of the widespread assertion that this was basically a mass popular revolt.

By November 4, there existed a state of chaos, with no effective government, and a raging White Terror. It was at this point that the Kadar government came into existence. Formed by a group of anti-Rakosi Communists as the Hungarian Revolutionary Worker-Peasant Government, it offered a program which called for the defense of national independence and socialism, and called upon the assistance of the Soviet armed forces to help smash the counterrevolution and restore order.

#### THE ROLE OF THE RED ARMY

Soviet troops first entered Budapest on October 24, at the request of the Hungarian government for their help. On the next day, at a demonstration on Parliament Square, shooting occurred involving Soviet tanks, and there were a number of casualties. The accounts of this incident are extremely confused; apparently, no one knows how it started or how many were killed and injured.

On October 28, in the belief that the worst was over, the withdrawal of the Soviet troops was announced, and by October 31 they had left the city. When they returned on November 4, they faced a different situation. "What the Soviet Union faced in Hungary by November 3,"

Aptheker writes, "was the certainty, if nothing were done to alter matters, of a Mindszenty-Hungary, bordering Austria and adjacent to a remilitarized West Germany, heavy with American atomic cannon." The threat of a fascist Hungary in the midst of the Eastern European people's democracies was very real, and the repeated calls being made for Western intervention made the threat of war equally real.

What the Soviet troops did, then, was to give support to the only trend in Hungary capable of averting these threats—the Kadar government. In the words of Palmiro Togliatti, whom Aptheker quotes, the Red Army "could not watch with indifference a development the consequences of which were clear to all." Togliatti goes on to say that despite the mistakes of the Communists,

. . . it cannot be denied that there in Hungary we found ourselves at a decisive moment in a struggle, perhaps of decisive character, between the forces of reaction and war and those of revolution and peace. When such a conflict opens . . . the place of the working man, the place of the man of the people and of the democrat who has the sense of revolutionary reality, is on the side of revolution and not on the side of reaction.

#### LESSONS OF THE UPRISING

The ultimate source of aberration in the socialist countries, Aptheker asserts, is the system of imperialism

with its reactionary, brutal and warlike policies. He states: "It is pressures from this kind of a system which is a basic source of the difficulties experienced in building Socialism. He who ignores or minimizes this—who does not estimate it at its full and overwhelming significance—does not comprehend the world today. . . ."

But a socialist country cannot react to this by stifling every vestige of dissent and by resorting to terror. "What is required," Aptheker writes, "is the institutionalizing of the right to dissent. What is needed is the institutionalizing of the protection of the full legal rights of everyone." What is required is confidence in legal procedure, and above all a dedication to humanness.

For the American Left, a most important lesson is the need to oppose every manifestation of imperialism at home or abroad. In this "lies the greatest single contribution that the American Left could offer to the purifying and strengthening of world socialism, to the cause of world peace, to the welfare of their own people, and to the rebuilding of its own strength."

#### IS THE PICTURE CORRECT?

In the foregoing pages, we have outlined the picture which Aptheker's book paints of the Hungarian events. We have done so because it is a single, coherent picture which must be viewed in its entirety, and

not piecemeal, if it is to be properly understood.

How is such a book to be approached? Certainly not as the last word on the subject, complete in every detail and providing the answer to every question. This it does not pretend to be. The question is, rather, does it present a picture which is *basically* correct? This writer is convinced that it does—that the author's conclusions as to the nature of the uprising are supported by an array of facts and documentation more than adequate to prove them.

There are, however, certain omissions of sufficient consequence to be worth noting. For one thing, in dealing with the unjust arrests and executions, Aptheker says little about the Rajk case, and does not deal enough with the relation of this and perhaps other less-known cases to the Soviet break with Yugoslavia and its condemnation of Tito and others as imperialist agents and fascists. The fact is that Rajk and the other defendants were tried on charges of plotting with Titoite elements in Yugoslavia to overthrow the Hungarian government. That there was no basis for such a trial became evident as soon as Khrushchev admitted that the charges against the Tito regime had proved to be unfounded. The impact of this and similar Soviet errors on Hungary is not made sufficiently clear.

Likewise, the book does not deal with the fate of Imre Nagy and

the circumstances of his deportation to Rumania. However, these omissions do not destroy the basic correctness of the picture presented.

But there are others who will disagree with this estimate of the book. In fact, the immediate effect of its appearance will be to stimulate and sharpen debate, not to end it. At the same time, the discussion will take place on a different level than in the past, thanks to Aptheker's yeoman work in mustering the facts. Hence the book should help to narrow the area of disagreement.

Moreover, the main import of the book is that it makes possible, for the first time, an answer to the epithet "Hungary" which reaction in this country has been able to fling about recklessly with no real opposition up to now. Whether or not one agrees with every detail of it, the book is a major contribution toward refuting this false indictment of socialism. As such, it can help greatly to unify the ranks of the Communist Party.

But it must be approached objectively, and not in a factional manner. Just as the author was motivated in writing the book by the need to understand, the reader should approach it with a similar motivation.

To the extent that disagreements arise from confusion or differences over facts, the book can go far to help clear them up. But a factual

presentation alone, however complete or objective, will not suffice to resolve all the differences that exist. For these arise not merely from disagreements as to what the facts are, or even as to how they should be interpreted. To a considerable extent, they grow out of underlying ideological differences which affect much more than the Hungarian situation.

There are some, for example, who have ceased to view historical developments in the light of the class struggle, and have substituted a bourgeois-liberal approach in which judgments are based on abstract, formal principles of morality and democracy, without regard for the concrete realities of the situation. Such individuals will draw different conclusions, even from the same facts, than those who approach them from a Marxist viewpoint. For this reason, they will not be convinced by Aptheker's presentation.

Nevertheless, discussion based on a more extensive knowledge of the facts will be of tremendous value in arriving at a correct common estimate of the Hungarian events. Aptheker deserves high commendation for his courage in undertaking such a task. In writing the book, he has performed a signal service. *The Truth About Hungary* is an exciting book that deserves the widest possible study and discussion.



# "Philosophy in Revolution"

By HARRY K. WELLS

Philosophical questions are, of course, of primary consequence to Marxism-Leninism. International Publishers has just issued a new work in this area by Howard Selsam; it is evaluated in the following pages by one who was a lecturer in philosophy at Columbia University, on the staff of the Jefferson School of Social Science, and who is the author of *Process and Unreality*, a critique of A. N. Whitehead's philosophy, published in 1950, *Pragmatism, Philosophy of Imperialism*, published in 1954, and, most recently, a study of Pavlov: *Toward a Scientific Psychology and Psychiatry*.—Ed.

The Webster Dictionary defines *ideology* as "the manner or content of thinking of an individual or a class; as *bourgeois ideology*." Howard Selsam's latest book, *Philosophy In Revolution*,\* is concerned with the most general manner or content of thinking of the various classes which have played, or are playing, revolutionary or dominant roles in the course of historical development. Viewed as a form of ideology, philosophy ceases to float in some rarefied intellectual stratosphere, is brought down to earth and is treated as a highly partisan participant in the actual living of individuals, classes and peoples in given times and places.

For a quarter of a century now, as teacher and writer, Dr. Selsam has been interpreting the philosophy of the modern working class to his fellow Americans. Literally thousands of students and tens of thousands of readers have cut their ideological-philosophical molars in his classrooms and on his books and

articles. It is no exaggeration to say that he has introduced an entire generation of thinking non-conformists to the simplicities and profundities of Marxist-Leninist philosophy—the present writer included. Investigating Committees and Boards notwithstanding, Howard Selsam has already won a permanent place in the swirling current of rebel thinkers, which is and always has been the mainstream of American thought.

The publication of a new book by Howard Selsam is therefore at any time a major event. Coming in these troubled times of confusion and search, when long-established principles are questioned and there is much backing and filling as well as hard and straight thinking, one opens Dr. Selsam's book with more than ordinary anticipation. We expect guidance—and are not disappointed. For *Philosophy In Revolution* is a polemical book scathingly debunking those modern philosophers who degrade philosophy, science, thought and everything human. At the same time it is a ring-

\*International Publishers, N. Y., 160 pages, \$2.

ing reaffirmation of Marxist-Leninist principles, from philosophy and ethics to economics and politics. Here there is no hint of revisionism, but rather a deep understanding and conviction of, and rededication to, the manner and content of thinking of the working class, national and international, fused as they must be.

Throughout the five topical chapters that comprise the book, Dr. Selsam interweaves five major themes. With regard to each subject, be it the problem of knowledge or the matter-mind problem, or some other, he treats it first historically in terms of concrete conditions of class struggle, time and place. He then deals with the classic idealist position on the subject, with particular reference to Plato, Aristotle and theology, revealing the essential errors and misconceptions, the one-sidedness and abstract character of their thought. In each case, he shows how the philosophical position expresses, and is partisan to, the class with which the given philosopher identifies himself.

Third, he reserves his sharpest criticism for those modern philosophers who, in the name of philosophy and science, would destroy all philosophy and science—the latter-day Berkeleyists and Humeans, the positivists and pragmatists, particularly William James and John Dewey. He shows that, whatever their personal politics and predilections, and without regard to personal motivation, these nihilists of knowledge perform an important ide-

logical function for that class in the United States which above all fears knowledge, science and truth. As a matter of fact, these philosophers are exposed as ready, willing and able to dispense with all the classical philosophical questions and to reduce science to "logical," "semantical" or "practical" modes of organizing individual or common experience.

The fourth theme interwoven into Dr. Selsam's treatment of the major philosophical issues comprises a *partially* adequate answer to both the classic objective idealism and the nihilistic modern subjective idealism of the positivists and pragmatists—namely mechanical or metaphysical materialism. He briefly traces the course of the great struggles carried on by Democritus and Lucretius, Diderot, d'Holbach and Feuerbach against the dominant and entrenched forms of idealism. He gives them great credit but at the same time reveals the shortcomings of all the mechanical materialists, their one-sided, spectator view of the world and society and their consequent reliance on individual sense-experience rather than on social practice in changing the environment. The weaknesses inherent in all non-working class materialism render it essentially inadequate, and in the last analysis ineffective in combatting the tenets of idealism. Indeed, current mechanical materialism tends to lead straight into philosophical subjective idealism—in short, to be the other side of the coin to its

idealist counterpart. Thus today it inadvertently serves ultimately the obscurantist purposes of the most reactionary class in our country.

The main theme of Dr. Selsam's book is, of course, that only the working class can, with no reservations whatever, create and consistently maintain a many-sided, dynamic and thorough-going materialist philosophy which adequately reflects the motion and inherent contradictions and hidden interconnections of the world of modern science and complex social developments. His exposition of dialectical and historical materialism is masterly and at the same time fresh and original. Best of all, he shows the Marxist-Leninist philosophy at work in finally solving those great questions with which no previous philosophy has been able to deal without recourse to speculative system-building or self-destructive refutation of the questions themselves.

Underlying all five themes is the central thesis of the book, directly related to its title: materialism is and always has been the philosophy of rising revolutionary classes; while idealism is and always has been the world view of dominant classes entrenched in class power and with the sole concern to preserve the current social order. In elaboration of his historical thesis, he shows first that objective idealism was the philosophy of the slave-owning and feudal ruling classes, and second, that subjective idealism is the predominant view of the capitalist class. This

class employs pragmatism and positivism in its last-ditch desperate struggle to keep the chains shackled on the working and colonial peoples by nullifying the knowledge which alone could furnish the key to unlock them. Mechanical materialism has historically been the philosophy of rising, revolutionary classes prior to the modern working class. These former rebel classes were themselves sooner or later to become ruling, exploiting and oppressing classes and therefore embraced materialism and science with severe restrictions and reservations. Only the modern proletariat can embrace materialism and science with no reservations of any kind. Dialectical materialism is unreserved materialism, the world outlook of a class which terminates all exploitation and oppression and therefore is free to reflect the world and society truly as it is in reality, with no special-privilege axe to grind.

Dr. Selsam develops these themes and this thesis with the freewheeling skill possible only in a mind which loves, and is thoroughly familiar with, his subject. Whether speaking of classes or of classics, he is equally relaxed and in full control of the intricate intermeshed connections. *Philosophy In Revolution* is a vibrant, even witty book written by a master among philosophers. It is, I believe, as simply written as possible for a highly serious work on philosophy, without verging on oversimplification. For these reasons it should be widely read and studied.

One test of the value of a scientific book is the degree to which it pushes toward the frontier of knowledge in the given field. In my estimation, Dr. Selsam pushes close up to the frontier of philosophical thought, and may even impel the reader to attempt a crossing, but he himself seldom crosses the undefined border. In short, he tends to limit himself for the most part to *exposition* of already well-established material. To be sure, his exposition is fresh and original, and highly instructive and illuminating. And again to be sure, there is a great need for highly competent exposition, particularly of Marxist philosophy.

But I have worked closely with him at the Jefferson School and in collaborating on articles and I know what a tremendously creative mind he has. Therefore, I am unable to settle for primarily expository work from him. He has a great deal to offer in the way of creative scholarship. I do hope that Dr. Selsam, now that he has been relieved, through no fault of his own, from executive and administrative responsibilities, will be able to devote his time, energy and exceptional ability to producing, in addition to expository volumes, the creative books we have a right to expect of him.

There are a few instances in the present volume where Dr. Selsam could, I believe, have materially strengthened his arguments by pressing closer to the frontier of

knowledge. I will limit myself to one such instance, the choice being determined by my own current special interest.

In a chapter entitled "Matter and Mind," Dr. Selsam discusses the central question which divides all philosophy into two camps—the relation of mind to the material world, which is primary and which derivative? In his attempt to buttress the classic materialist answer to this question—that mind is derivative from material evolution—he musters all the arguments of ancient and modern philosophy including those of Marx, Engels and Lenin. But he completely neglects the new scientific evidence amassed in the past half-century by Ivan P. Pavlov and his co-workers in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, including our country.

It has long been an accepted *principle* in materialist philosophy and science that mind is a function of the material brain of animal and man and that therefore prior to the evolution of the brain there could have been no mind. Thus mind is secondary to and derivative from material evolution. This has been the decisive argument in favor of the materialist position. But it has always contained a weakness which was of course exploited by all who opposed a thoroughly scientific and materialist position. This weakness lay in the fact that science had not as yet been able to demonstrate *how* the brain gives rise to thought.

As long as cerebral physiology, psychology and psychiatry could not discover the mode and laws of the functioning of the highest part of the brain, the cerebral cortex, the seat of mind, there was an hiatus in human knowledge—and more particularly, there was a gap in the materialist position—through which the obscurantists could preach the mystery of mind. Pavlov and his followers closed this loophole by discovering at least the most essential facts and laws of the functioning of the cerebral cortex in higher animals including man.

This work of Pavlov, called "the science of higher nervous activity," constitutes one of the great achievements in all the history of science. In addition to laying the groundwork for a truly scientific psychology and psychiatry, it immeasurably strengthens the materialist thesis that mind is secondary to and derivative from matter. By experimentally demonstrating *the way in which* the brain gives rise to all the phenomena of mental and spiritual life—thought, emotions, memory, will, etc.—the science of higher nervous activity finally and conclusively and scientifically *proves* the materialist contention. After Pavlov there can be no question any longer, in my opinion, of the absolute truth

of materialism. It is now a *scientific fact* as well as a *philosophical principle*.

It is, indeed, surprising that such a philosopher as Howard Selsam, while dealing with the subject with regard to which Pavlov's discoveries are wholly relevant and even decisive, should completely neglect them—not even so much as a bow in passing.

This instance illustrates the point that Dr. Selsam tends to stop short of the frontier, and further that materialist philosophy in general and his book in particular suffer thereby.

With this said, however, *Revolution In Philosophy* is far and away the most readable book on Marxist philosophy, and the best book of any "school" by an American philosopher, to appear in the last two decades. I would like to stress again that it is a timely book. For when faced with crucial tactical questions, it is all too easy, and often too common, to water down and neglect tried and tested essential principles. Dr. Selsam reminds us afresh of the great transforming power of Marxist-Leninist thought. In doing so at this particular juncture, he is performing a highly important task of a socialist philosopher.

\* \* \*

In our next number, Louis Fleischer contributes a thorough analysis of Paul A. Baran's *The Political Economy of Growth* recently published by the Monthly Review Press—Ed.

# On Contradictions Among the People

By MAO TSE-TUNG

*We bring to our readers the complete text, in official translation as issued by the Hsinhua News Agency, in Peking, on June 18, 1957, of a speech made by Chairman Mao Tse-tung at the Supreme State Conference, held February 27, 1957. The News Agency, in releasing the English text, stated: "The author has gone over the text based on the verbatim record and made several additions." The significance of this speech cannot be exaggerated; let it simply be remarked that it is one of the fundamental historic documents of the epoch of Socialism.—Ed.*

OUR GENERAL SUBJECT is the correct handling of contradictions among the people. For convenience's sake, let us discuss it under twelve sub-headings. Although reference will be made to contradictions between ourselves and our enemies, this discussion will center mainly on contradictions among the people.

## I

### TWO DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONTRADICTION

Never has our country been as united as it is today. The victories of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the Socialist revolution, coupled with our achievements in Socialist construction, have rapidly changed the face of old China. Now we see before us an even brighter future. The days of national disunity and turmoil that the people detested have gone forever. Led by the working class and the Communist party, and united as one, our 600,000,000 people are engaged in the great work of building socialism.

Unification of the country, unity of the people and unity among our various nationalities, these are the basic

guarantees for the sure triumphs of our cause. However, this does not mean that there are no longer any contradictions in our society. It would be naive to imagine that there are no more contradictions. To do so would be to fly in the face of objective reality. We are confronted by two types of social contradictions; contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people. These two types of contradictions are totally different in nature.

If we are to have a correct understanding of these two different types of contradictions, we must first of all make clear what is meant by "the people" and what is meant by "the enemy."

The term "the people" has different meanings in different countries, and in different historical periods in each country. Take our country for example. During the Japanese aggression, all those classes, strata and social groups that opposed Japanese aggression belonged to the category of the people, while the Japanese imperialists, Chinese traitors and the pro-Japanese elements belonged to the category of enemies of the people.

During the war of liberation, the United States imperialists and their henchmen, the bureaucrat-capitalists and landlord class, and the Kuomintang reactionaries, who represented these two classes, were the enemies of the people, while all other classes, strata and social groups that opposed these enemies, belonged to the category of the people.

At this stage of building socialism, all classes, strata and social groups that approve, support and work for the cause of Socialist construction belong to the category of the people, while those social forces and groups that resist the Socialist revolution, and are hostile to and try to wreck Socialist construction, are enemies of the people.

The contradictions between ourselves and our enemies are antagonistic ones. Within the ranks of the people, contradictions among the working people are nonantagonistic, while those between the exploiters and the exploited classes have, apart from their antagonistic aspect, a nonantagonistic aspect. Contradictions among the people have always existed, but their content differs in each period of the revolution and during the building of socialism. In the conditions existing in China today what we call contradictions among the people include the following:

Contradictions within the working class, contradictions within the peasantry, contradictions within the intelligentsia, contradictions between the working class and the peasantry, on the one hand, and the intelligentsia on the other, between the working class and other sections of the working people, on the one hand, and the na-

tional bourgeoisie, on the other; contradictions within the national bourgeoisie, and so forth.

Our people's Government is a Government that truly represents the interests of the people and serves the people, yet certain contradictions do exist between the Government and the masses. These include contradictions between the interests of the state, collective interests and individual interests; between democracy and centralism; between those in positions of leadership and the led, and contradictions arising from the bureaucratic practices of certain state functionaries in their relations with the masses. All these are contradictions among the people. Generally speaking, underlying the contradictions among the people is the basic identity of the interests of the people.

In our country, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie is a contradiction among the people. The class struggle waged between the two is, by and large, a class struggle within the ranks of the people. This is because of the dual character of the national bourgeoisie in our country.

In the years of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, there was a revolutionary side to their character; there was also a tendency to compromise with the enemy; this was the other side. In the period of the socialist revolution, exploitation of the working class to make profits is one side, while support of the constitution and willingness to accept Socialist transformation is the other.

The national bourgeoisie differs from the imperialists, the landlords and the bureaucrat-capitalists. The contradiction between exploiter and

exploited, which exists between the national bourgeoisie and the working class, is an antagonistic one. But, in the concrete conditions existing in China, such an antagonistic contradiction, if properly handled, can be transformed into a nonantagonistic one and resolved in a peaceful way. But if it is not properly handled, if, say, we do not follow a policy of uniting, criticizing and educating the national bourgeoisie, or if the national bourgeoisie does not accept this policy, then the contradictions between the working class and the national bourgeoisie can turn into an antagonistic contradiction as between ourselves and the enemy.

Since the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people differ in nature, they must be solved in different ways. To put it briefly, the former is a matter of drawing a line between us and our enemies, while the latter is a matter of distinguishing between right and wrong. It is, of course, true that drawing a line between ourselves and our enemies is also a question of distinguishing between right and wrong. For example, the question as to who is right, we or the reactionaries at home and abroad, that is, the imperialists, the feudalists and bureaucrat-capitalists, is also a question of distinguishing between right and wrong, but it is different in nature from questions of right and wrong among the people.

Ours is a people's democratic dictatorship, led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance. What is the purpose of this dictatorship? Its first function is to suppress the reactionary classes and elements and those exploiters in the country who range themselves against

the Socialist revolution, to suppress all those who try to wreck our Socialist construction; that is to say, to solve the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy within the country, for instance, to arrest, try and sentence certain counter-revolutionaries, and for a specified period of time to deprive landlords and bureaucrat-capitalists of the right to vote and freedom of speech, all this comes within the scope of our dictatorship. To maintain law and order and safeguard the interests of the people, it is likewise necessary to exercise dictatorship over thieves, swindlers, murderers, arsonists, hooligans and other scoundrels who seriously disrupt the public order.

The second function of this dictatorship is to protect our country from subversive activities and possible aggression by the external enemy. Should that happen, it is the task of this dictatorship to solve the external contradiction between ourselves and the enemy. The aim of this dictatorship is to protect all our people so that they can work in peace and build China into a Socialist country with a modern industry, agriculture, science and culture.

Who is to exercise this dictatorship? Naturally it must be the working class and the entire people led by it. Dictatorship does not apply in the ranks of the people. The people cannot possibly exercise dictatorship over themselves; nor should one section of them press another section. Lawbreaking elements among the people will be dealt with according to law, but this is a different principle from using the dictatorship to suppress enemies of the people.

What applies among the people is democratic centralism. Our Constitution provides that citizens of the Peo-



ple's Republic of China enjoy freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of association, or procession, of demonstration, of religious belief and so on. Our Constitution also provides that state organs must practice democratic centralism and must rely on the masses; that the personnel of state organs must serve the people. Our Socialist democracy is democracy in the widest sense, such as is not to be found in any capitalist country.

Our dictatorship is known as the people's democratic dictatorship, led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance. That is to say, democracy operates within the ranks of the people, while the working class, uniting with all those enjoying civil rights, the peasantry in the first place, enforces dictatorship over the reactionary classes and elements and all those who resist Socialist transformation and oppose Socialist construction. By civil rights, we mean, politically, freedom and democratic rights.

But this freedom is freedom with leadership and this democracy is democracy under centralized guidance, not anarchy. Anarchy does not conform to the interests or wishes of the people.

Certain people in our country were delighted when the Hungarian events took place. They hoped that something similar would happen in China, that thousands upon thousands of people would demonstrate in the streets against the People's Government. Such hopes ran counter to the interests of the masses and therefore could not possibly get their support. In Hungary, a section of the people, deceived by domestic and foreign counter-revolutionaries, made the mistake of resort-

ing to acts of violence against the People's Government, with the result that both the state and the people suffered for it. The damage done to the country's economy in a few weeks of rioting will take a long time to repair.

There were other people in our country who took a wavering attitude toward the Hungarian events because they were ignorant about the actual world situation. They felt that there was too little freedom under our people's democracy and that there was more freedom under Western parliamentary democracy. They ask for the adoption of the two-party system of the West, where one party is in office and the other party out of office. But this so-called two-party system is nothing but a means of maintaining the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; under no circumstances can it safeguard the freedom of the working people. As a matter of fact, freedom and democracy cannot exist in the abstract, they only exist in the concrete.

In a society where there is class struggle the exploiting classes are free to exploit the working people while the working people have no freedom from being exploited; where there is democracy for the bourgeoisie there can be no democracy for the proletariat and other working people. In some capitalist countries Communist parties are allowed to exist legally but only to the extent that they do not endanger the fundamental interests of the bourgeoisie; beyond that they are not permitted legal existence.

Those who demand freedom and democracy in the abstract regard democracy as an end and not a means. Democracy sometimes seems to be an end, but it is in fact only a means. Marxism teaches us that democracy is

part of the super-structure and belongs to the category of politics. That is to say, in the last analysis, it serves the economic base. The same is true of freedom. Both democracy and freedom are relative, not absolute, and they come into being and develop under specific historical circumstances.

Within the ranks of our people, democracy stands in relation to centralism, and freedom to discipline. They are two conflicting aspects of a single entity, contradictory as well as united, and we should not one-sidedly emphasize one to the denial of the other. Within the ranks of the people, we cannot do without freedom, nor can we do without discipline; we cannot do without democracy, nor can we do without centralism. Our democratic centralism means the unity of democracy and centralism and the unity of freedom and discipline. Under this system, the people enjoy a wide measure of democracy and freedom, but at the same time they have to keep themselves within the bounds of Socialist discipline. All this is well understood by the people.

While we stand for freedom with leadership and democracy under centralized guidance, in no sense do we mean that coercive measures should be taken to settle ideological matters and questions involving the distinction between right and wrong among the people. Any attempt to deal with ideological matters or questions involving the right and wrong by administrative orders or coercive measures will not only be ineffective but harmful. We cannot abolish religion by administrative orders; nor can we force people not to believe in it. We cannot compel people to give up idealism, any more than we can force them to be-

lieve in Marxism.

In settling matters of an ideological nature or controversial issues among the people, we can only use democratic methods, methods of discussion, of criticism or persuasion and education, not coercive, high-handed methods. In order to carry on their production and studies effectively and to order their lives properly, the people want their Government, the leaders of productive work and of educational and cultural bodies to issue suitable orders of an obligatory nature. It is common sense that the maintenance of law and order would be impossible without administrative orders. Administrative orders and the methods of persuasion and education complement each other in solving contradictions among the people. Administrative orders issued for the maintenance of social order must be accompanied by persuasion and education, for in many cases administrative orders alone will not work.

In 1942 we worked out the formula "unity-criticism-unity" to describe this democratic method of resolving contradictions among the people. To elaborate, this means to start off with a desire for unity and resolve contradictions through criticism or struggle so as to achieve a new unity on a new basis. Our experience shows that this is a proper method of resolving contradictions among the people. In 1942 we used this method to resolve contradictions inside the Communist party, namely the doctrinaires and the rank-and-file membership, between doctrinairism and Marxism. At one time in waging the inner-party struggle, the "Left" doctrinaires used the method of "ruthless struggle and merciless blows." This method was wrong.

In place of it, in criticizing "Left" doctrinarism, we used a new one: to start from a desire for unity; and thrash out questions of right and wrong through criticism or argument, and so achieve a new unity on a new basis. This was the method used in the "rectification campaign" of 1942. A few years later, in 1945, when the Chinese Communist party held its Seventh National Congress, unity was thus achieved throughout the party and the great victory of the people's revolution was assured. The essential thing is to start with a desire for unity. Without this subjective desire for unity, once the struggle starts it is liable to get out of hand.

Would not this, then, be the same as "ruthless struggle and merciless blows?" Would there be any party unity left to speak of? It was this experience that led us to the formula: "unity-criticism-unity." Or, in other words, "take warning from the past in order to be more careful in the future," and to "treat the illness in order to save the patient." We extended this method beyond our party. During the war this was used very successfully in the anti-Japanese bases to deal with relations between those in positions of leadership and the masses, between the Army and the civilian population, between officers and men, between different units of the Army, and between various groups of cadres.

The use of this method can be traced back to still earlier times in the history of our party. We began to build our revolutionary armed forces and bases in the south in 1927 and ever since then we have used this method to deal with relations between the party and the masses, between the

Army and the civilian population, between officers and men, and in general with relations among the people.

The only difference is that during the anti-Japanese war, this method was used much more purposefully. After the liberation of the country, we used this same method of "unity-criticism-unity" in our relations with other democratic parties and industrial and commercial circles.

Now our task is to continue to extend and make still better use of this method throughout the ranks of the people; we want all our factories, co-operatives, business establishments, schools, Government offices, public bodies—in a word, all 600,000,000 of our people to use it in resolving contradictions among themselves.

Under ordinary circumstances, contradictions among the people are not antagonistic. But if they are not dealt with properly or if we relax vigilance and lower our guard, antagonism may arise. In a Socialist country, such a development is usually only of a localized and temporary nature. This is because there the exploitation of man by man has been abolished and the interests of the people are basically the same. Such antagonistic actions on a fairly wide scale as took place during the Hungarian events are accounted for by the fact that domestic and foreign counter-revolutionary elements were at work. These actions were also of a temporary, though special, nature. In cases like this, the reactionaries in a Socialist country, in league with the imperialists, take advantage of contradictions among the people to foment disunity and dissension and fan the flames of disorder in an attempt to achieve their conspiratorial aims. This lesson of the Hungarian events de-

serves our attention.

Many people seem to think that the proposal to use democratic methods to resolve contradictions among the people raises a new question, but actually that is not so. Marxists have always held that the cause of the proletariat can only be promoted by relying on the masses of the people; that Communists must use democratic methods of persuasion and education when working among the working people and must on no account resort to commandism or coercion. The Chinese Communist party faithfully adheres to this Marxist-Leninist principle. We have always maintained that, under the people's democratic dictatorship, two different methods, dictatorial and democratic, should be used to resolve the two different kinds of contradictions, those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people. This idea has been explained again and again in our party documents and in speeches by many responsible party leaders.

In my article, "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship," written in 1949, I said: "These two aspects, democracy for the people and dictatorship over the reactionaries, when combined, constitute the people's democratic dictatorship." I also pointed out that, in order to settle questions within the ranks of the people, the methods we use are democratic, that is, methods of persuasion and not of compulsion.

In addressing the second session of the National Committee of the People's Political Consultative Conference in June, 1950, I said further:

"The people's democratic dictatorship uses two methods. In regard to the enemies, it

uses the method of dictatorship, that is: it forbids them to take part in political activities for as long a period of time as is necessary; it compels them to obey the law of the people's government, compels them to work and to transform themselves into new people through work. In regard to the people, on the contrary, it does not use compulsion, it uses democratic methods, that is: it must allow the people to take part in political activities, and, far from compelling them to do this or that, use the democratic methods of education and persuasion. This education is self-education among the people, and criticism and self-criticism is the fundamental method of self-education."

We have spoken on this question of using democratic methods to resolve contradictions among the people on many occasions in the past, and, furthermore, we have in the main acted on this principle, a principle of which many cadres and many people have a practical understanding. Why then do some people now feel that this is a new issue? The reason is that in the past, an acute struggle raged between ourselves and our enemies both within and without, and contradictions among the people did not attract as much attention as they do today.

Quite a few people fail to make a clear distinction between these two different types of contradictions, those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people, and are prone to confuse the two. It must be admitted that it is sometimes easy to confuse them. We had instances of such confusion in our past work. In the suppression of the counter-revolution, good people were sometimes mistaken for bad. Such things have happened before, and still happen today. We have been able to keep our mistakes within bounds because it has been our policy to draw a sharp line

between our own people and our enemies and, where mistakes have been made, to take suitable measures of rehabilitation.

Marxist philosophy holds that the law of the unity of opposites is a fundamental law of the universe. This law operates everywhere in the natural world, in human society, and in man's thinking. Opposites in contradiction unite as well as struggle with each other, and thus impel all things to move and change. Contradictions exist everywhere, but as things differ in nature, so do contradictions; in any given phenomenon or thing, the unity of opposites is conditional, temporary and transitory, and hence relative, whereas struggle between opposites is absolute.

Lenin gave a very clear exposition of this law. In our country a growing number of people have come to understand it. For many people, however, acceptance of this law is one thing, and its application in examining and dealing with problems is quite another. Many dare not acknowledge openly that there still exist contradictions among the people, which are the very forces that move our society forward. Many people refuse to admit that contradictions still exist in a Socialist society, with the result that when confronted with social contradictions they become timid and helpless. They do not understand that Socialist society grows more united and consolidated precisely through the ceaseless process of correctly dealing with and resolving contradictions. For this reason, we need to explain things to our people, our cadres in the first place, to help them understand contradictions in a Socialist society and learn how to deal with such contra-

dictions in a correct way.

Contradictions in a Socialist society are fundamentally different from contradictions in old societies, such as capitalist society. There they find expression in acute antagonisms and conflicts, in sharp class struggle, which cannot be resolved by the capitalist system itself and can only be resolved by Socialist revolution. Contradictions in Socialist society are, on the contrary, not antagonistic and can be resolved one after the other by the Socialist system itself.

The basic contradictions in Socialist society are still those between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base. These contradictions, however, are fundamentally different in character and have different features from contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base in the old societies. The present social system of our country is far superior to that of the old days. If this were not so, the old system would not have been overthrown and the new system could not have been set up.

When we say that Socialist relations of production are better suited than the old relations of production to the development of the productive forces, we mean that the former permits the productive forces to develop at a speed unparalleled in the old society, so that production can expand steadily and the constantly growing needs of the people can be met step by step. Under the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, production in old China developed very slowly.

For more than fifty years before liberation, China produced only a few

score thousand tons of steel a year, not counting the output of the north-eastern provinces. If we include these provinces, the peak annual output of steel of our country was only something over 900,000 tons. In 1949, the country's output of steel was only something over 100,000 tons. Now, only seven years after liberation of the country, our steel output already exceeds 4,000,000 tons. In the old China, there was hardly any engineering industry to speak of; motorcar and aircraft industries were non-existent; now, we have them.

When the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism was overthrown by the people, many were not clear as to where China was headed, to capitalism or socialism. Facts give the answer: Only socialism can save China. The Socialist system has promoted the rapid development of the productive forces of our country. This is a fact that even our enemies abroad have had to acknowledge.

But our Socialist system has just been set up; it is not yet fully established, nor yet fully consolidated. In joint state-private industrial and commercial enterprises, capitalists still receive a fixed rate of interest on their capital, that is to say, exploitation still exists. So far as ownership is concerned, these enterprises are not yet completely Socialist in character. Some of our agricultural and handicraft producer cooperatives are still semi-Socialist, while even in the fully Socialist cooperatives certain problems about ownership remain to be solved. Relationships in production and exchange are still being gradually established along Socialist lines in various sectors of our economy and more and more appropriate forms are being

sought.

It is a complicated problem to settle on a proper ratio between accumulation and consumption within that sector of Socialist economy in which the means of production are owned by the whole people and that sector in which the means of production are collectively owned, as well as between these two sectors. It is not easy to work out a perfectly rational solution to this problem all at once.

To sum up, Socialist relations of production have been established; they are suited to the development of the productive forces, but they are still far from perfect, and their imperfect aspects stand in contradiction to the development of the productive forces. There is conformity as well as contradiction between the relations of production and the development of the productive forces; similarly, there is conformity as well as contradiction between the superstructure and the economic base.

The superstructure, our state institutions of people's democratic dictatorship and its laws, and Socialist ideology under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, has played a positive role in facilitating the victory of Socialist transformation and establishment of a Socialist organization of labor; it is suited to the Socialist economic base, that is, Socialist relations of production. But survivals of bourgeois ideology, bureaucratic ways of doing things in our state organs, and flaws in certain links of our state institutions stand in contradiction of the economic base of socialism. We must continue to resolve such contradictions in the light of specific conditions.

Of course, as these contradictions are resolved, new problems and new

contradictions will emerge and call for solution. For instance, a constant process of readjustment through state planning is needed to deal with the contradiction between production and the needs of society, which will of course long remain with us.

Every year our country draws up an economic plan in an effort to establish a proper ratio between accumulation and consumption and achieve a balance between production and the needs of society. By "balance" we mean a temporary, relative unity of opposites. By the end of each year, such a balance, taken as a whole, is upset by the struggle of opposites, the unity achieved undergoes a change, balance becomes imbalance, unity becomes disunity, and once again it is necessary to work out a balance and unity for the next year. This is the superior quality of our planned economy. As a matter of fact, this balance and unity is partly upset every month and every quarter, and partial readjustments are called for. Sometimes, because our arrangements do not correspond to objective reality, contradictions arise and the balance is upset; this is what we call making a mistake. Contradictions arise continually and are continually resolved; this is the dialectical law of the development of things.

This is how things stand today! The turbulent class struggles waged by the masses on a large scale characteristic of the revolutionary periods have, in the main, concluded, but the class struggle is not entirely over. While the broad masses of the people welcome the new system, they are not yet quite accustomed to it. Government workers are not sufficiently experienced, and should continue to ex-

amine and explore ways of dealing with questions relating to specific policies.

In other words, time is needed for our Socialist system to grow and consolidate itself, for the masses to get accustomed to the new system, and the Government workers to study and acquire experience. It is imperative that at this juncture we raise the question of distinguishing contradictions among the people from contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, as well as the question of the proper handling of contradictions among the people, so as to rally the people of all nationalities in our country to wage a new battle, the battle against nature, to develop our economy and culture, enable all our people to go through this transition period in a fairly smooth way, make our new system secure, and build up our new state.

## II

### THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION

The question of suppressing counter-revolutionaries is a question of the struggle of opposites in the contradiction between ourselves and the enemy. Within the ranks of the people, there are some who hold somewhat different views on this question. There are two kinds of persons whose views differ from ours. Those with a Rightist way of thinking make no distinction between ourselves and the enemy and mistake our enemies for our own people. They regard as friends the very people the broad masses regard as enemies. Those with a Leftist way of thinking so magnify contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, that

they mistake certain contradictions among the people for contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, and regard as counter-revolutionaries persons who really are not.

Both these views are wrong. Neither of them will enable us to handle properly the question of suppressing counter-revolution, or to correctly assess the results in this work.

If we want to evaluate correctly the results of our efforts to suppress counter-revolution here, let us see what effect the Hungarian events had in our country. These events caused some of our intellectuals to lose their balance a bit but there were no squalls in our country. Why? One reason, it must be said, was that we had succeeded in suppressing counter-revolution quite thoroughly.

Of course, the consolidation of our state is not primarily due to the suppression of counter-revolution. It is due primarily to the fact that we have a Communist party and a Liberation Army steeled in decades of revolutionary struggle, as well as a working people that has been similarly steeled. Our party and our armed forces are rooted in the masses; they have been tempered in the flames of a protracted revolution; they are strong and they can fight. Our People's Republic was not built overnight. It developed step by step out of revolutionary bases. Some leading democrats have also been tempered in one degree or another in the struggle, and they went through troubled times together with us. Some intellectuals were tempered in the struggles against imperialism and reaction; since liberation many of them have gone through a process of ideological remoulding that was aimed at making a clear distinction between

ourselves and the enemy.

In addition, the consolidation of our state is due to the fact that our economic measures are basically sound, that the people's livelihood is secure and is steadily being improved, that our policies toward the national bourgeoisie and other classes are also correct, and so on. Nevertheless, our success in suppressing counter-revolution is undoubtedly an important reason for the consolidation of our state. Because of all this, although many of our college students come from families other than those of the working people, all of them, with few exceptions, are patriotic and support socialism. They did not give way to unrest during the Hungarian events. The same was true of the national bourgeoisie, to say nothing of the basic masses, the workers and peasants.

After liberation, we rooted out a number of counter-revolutionaries. Some were sentenced to death because they had committed serious crimes. This was absolutely necessary; it was done to free the masses from long years of oppression by counter-revolutionaries and all kinds of local tyrants; in other words, to set free the productive forces. If we had not done so, the masses would not have been able to lift their heads.

Since 1956, however, there has been a radical change in the situation. Taking the country as a whole, the main force of counter-revolution has been rooted out. Our basic task is no longer to set free the productive forces but to protect and expand them in the context of the new relations of production. Some people do not understand that our present policy fits the present situation and our past policy fitted the past situation; they want to make use



of the present policy to reverse decisions on past cases and to deny the great success we achieved in suppressing counter-revolution. This is quite wrong, and the people will not permit it.

As regards the suppression of counter-revolution, the main thing is that we have achieved successes, but mistakes have also been made. There were excesses in some cases and in other cases counter-revolutionaries were overlooked. Our policy is: "Counter-revolutionaries must be suppressed whenever they are found, mistakes must be corrected whenever they are discovered." The line we adopted in this work was the last line, that is the suppression of counter-revolution by the people themselves. Of course, even with the adoption of this line, mistakes will still occur in our work, but they will be fewer and easier to correct. The masses have gained experience through this struggle. From what was done correctly they learned how things should be done. From what was wrong they learned useful lessons as to why mistakes were made.

Steps have been or are being taken to correct mistakes which have already been discovered in the work of suppressing counter-revolutionaries. Those not yet discovered will be corrected as soon as they come to light. Decisions on exoneration and rehabilitation should receive the same measure of publicity as the original mistaken decisions. We promise that a comprehensive review of the work of suppressing counter-revolution will be made this year or next to sum up experience and foster a spirit of righteousness and combat unhealthy tendencies.

Nationally, this task should be han-

dled by the Standing Committee of the National Peoples' Congress and the Standing Committee of the Peoples' Political Consultative Conference; and locally, by the provincial and municipal peoples' councils and committees of the Peoples' Political Consultative Conference. In this review, we must help and not pour cold water on the large numbers of functionaries and activists who took part in the work. It is not right to dampen their spirits. None the less, wrongs must be righted when they are discovered. This must be the attitude of all the public security organs, the procuracies and the judicial departments, prisons or agencies charged with the reform of criminals through labor. We hope that wherever possible members of the Standing Committee of the National Peoples' Congress and of the Peoples' Political Consultative Conference and the peoples' deputies will all take part in this review. This will be of help in perfecting our legal system and also in dealing correctly with counter-revolutionaries and other criminals.

The present situation with regard to counter-revolutionaries can be stated in these words: there still are counter-revolutionaries, but not many. In the first place, there still are counter-revolutionaries. Some people say that there are none and that all is at peace; that we can pile up our pillows and just go to sleep. But this is not the way things are. The fact is that there still are counter-revolutionaries (this, of course, is not to say you will find them everywhere and in every organization), and we must continue to fight them. It must be understood that the hidden counter-revolutionaries still at large will not take it lying down, but

will certainly seize every opportunity to make trouble, and that the United States imperialists and the Chiang Kai-shek clique are constantly sending in secret agents to carry on wrecking activities.

Even when all the counter-revolutionaries in existence have been routed out, new ones may emerge. If we drop our guard we shall be badly fooled and suffer for it severely. Wherever counter-revolutionaries are found making trouble, they should be rooted out with a firm hand. But, of course, taking the country as a whole, there are certainly not many counter-revolutionaries at large. Acceptance of that view will also breed confusion.

### III

#### AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION

We have a farm population of more than 500,000,000 so the situation of our peasants has a very important bearing on the development of our economy and the consolidation of our state power. In my view, the situation is basically sound. The organization of agricultural cooperatives has been successfully completed and this has solved a major contradiction in our country, that between Socialist industrialization and individual farm economy. The organization of cooperatives was completed swiftly, and so some people were worried that something untoward might occur. Some things did go wrong but, fortunately, they were not so serious. The movement on the whole is healthy. The peasants are working with a will and last year, despite the worst floods, droughts and typhoons in years, they were still able to increase the output of food crops.

Yet, some people have stirred up a miniature typhoon. They are complaining that cooperative farming will not do, that it has no superior qualities. Does agricultural cooperation possess superior qualities or does it not? Among the documents distributed at today's meeting is one concerning the Wang Kuofan cooperative in Tsunhwa County, Hopei Province, which I suggest you read. This cooperative is situated in a hilly region, which was very poor in the past and depended on relief grain sent there every year by the people's Government. When the cooperative was first set up in 1953, people called it the "pauper co-op." But as a result of four years of hard struggle, it has become better off year by year, and now most of its households have reserves of grain. What this cooperative could do, other cooperatives should also be able to do under normal conditions, even if it may take a bit longer. It is clear then that there are no grounds for the view that something has gone wrong with the cooperative movement.

It is also clear that it takes a hard struggle to build up cooperatives. New things always have difficulties and ups and downs to get over as they grow. It would be sheer fancy to imagine that building socialism is all plain sailing and easy success, that one will not meet difficulties or setbacks or need not make tremendous efforts.

Who are the staunch supporters of the cooperatives? They are the overwhelming majority of the poor peasants and lower middle peasants. These together account for more than 70 per cent of the rural population. Most of the rest also cherish hopes for the future of the cooperatives. Only a very small minority are really dissatis-

fied. But quite a number of persons have failed to analyze this situation. They have not made a comprehensive study of the achievements and shortcomings of the cooperatives and the causes of these shortcomings; they take part of the picture for the whole. And so, some people have stirred up a miniature typhoons around what they call the cooperatives' having no superior qualities.

How long will it take to consolidate the cooperatives and end these arguments about their having any superior qualities? Judging from the actual experience of many cooperatives, this will probably take five years or a bit longer. As most of our cooperatives are only a little over a year old, it would be unreasonable to expect too much from them so soon. In my view, we will be doing well enough if we succeed in establishing the cooperatives during the period of the first five-year plan and consolidating them during the second.

The cooperatives are steadily being consolidated. Certain contradictions remain to be resolved, such as those between the state and the cooperatives, and those within and among the cooperatives themselves.

In resolving these contradictions we must keep problems of production and distribution constantly in mind. Take the question of production. On the one hand, the cooperative economy must be subject to the unified economic planning of the state but at the same time it should be allowed to retain a certain leeway and independence of action without prejudice to unified state planning or the policies and laws and regulations of the state. On the other hand, every household in a cooperative can make its own plans in

regard to land reserved for private use and other economic undertakings left to private management, but it must comply with the overall plans of the cooperative or production team to which it belongs.

On the question of distribution, we must take into account the interest of the state, the cooperative, and the individual. We must find the correct way to handle the three-way relationship between the tax revenue of the state, accumulation of funds in the cooperative and the personal income of the peasant, and pay constant attention to making readjustments so as to resolve contradictions as they arise. Accumulation is essential for both the state and the cooperative, but in neither case should this be overdone. We should do everything possible to enable the peasants in normal years to raise their personal incomes year by year on the basis of increased production.

Many people say that the peasants lead a hard life. Is this true? In one sense, it is. That is to say, because the imperialists and their agents oppressed, exploited and impoverished our country for over a century, the standard of living not only of our peasants but of our workers and intellectuals as well is still low. We will need several decades of intensive efforts to raise the standards of living of our entire people step by step. In this sense, "hard" is the right word. But from another point of view, it is not right to say "hard." We refer to the allegation that, in the seven years since liberation, the life of the workers has improved but not that of the peasants. As a matter of fact, with very few exceptions, both the workers and the peasants are better off than before.

Since liberation, the peasants have rid themselves of landlord exploitation, and their production has increased year by year.

Take food crops. In 1949, the country's output was only something over 210,000,000,000 catties.\* By 1956, it has risen to something over 360,000,000,000 catties, an increase of nearly 150,000,000,000 catties. The state agricultural tax is not heavy, amounting only to about 30,000,000,000 catties a year. Grain bought from the peasants at normal prices only amounts to something over 50,000,000,000 catties a year. These two items together total over 80,000,000,000 catties. More than half of this grain, furthermore, is sold in the villages and near-by towns. Obviously one cannot say that there has been no improvement in the life of the peasants. We are prepared to stabilize over a number of years the total amount of the grain tax and the amount of grain purchased by the state at approximately something over 80,000,000,000 catties a year.

This will help promote the development of agriculture, and consolidate the cooperatives; the small number of grain-deficit households still found in the countryside will no longer have a deficit so that with the exception of certain peasants who grow industrial crops, all peasant households will then have reserves of food grain or at least become self-sufficient; in this way there will be no more poor peasants and the standard of living of all the peasants will reach or surpass the level of that of the middle peasants.

It is wrong to make a superficial comparison between the average annual income of a peasant and that of

a worker and draw the conclusion that the one is too low and the other too high. The productivity of the workers is much higher than that of the peasants, while the cost of living for the peasants is much lower than that for workers in the cities; so it cannot be said that the workers receive special favors from the state. However, the wages of a small number of workers and some Government personnel are rather too high, the peasants have reason to be dissatisfied with this, so it is necessary to make certain appropriate readjustments in the light of specific circumstances.

#### IV

#### THE QUESTION OF INDUSTRIALISTS AND BUSINESSMEN

The year 1956 saw the transformation of privately owned industrial and commercial enterprises into joint state-private enterprises as well as the organization of cooperatives in agriculture and handicrafts as part of the transformation of our social system. The speed and smoothness with which this was carried out are closely related to the fact that we treated the contradictions between the working class and the national bourgeoisie as a contradiction among the people. Has this class contradiction been resolved completely? No, not yet. A considerable period of time is still required to do so. However, some people say that the capitalists have been so remolded that they are now not much different from the workers, and that further remolding is unnecessary. Others go so far as to say that the capitalists are even a bit better than the workers. Still others say, if remolding is neces-

\* A ton is equal to two catties.—ed.

sary, why does not the working class undergo remolding? Are these opinions correct? Of course not.

In building a Socialist society, all need remolding, the exploiters as well as the working people. Who says the working class does not need it? Of course, remolding of the exploiters and that of the working people are two different types of remolding. The two must not be confused. In the class struggle and the struggle against nature, the working class remolds the whole of society, and at the same time remolds itself. It must continue to learn in the process of its work and step by step overcome its shortcomings. It must never stop doing so.

Take us who are present here, for example. Many of us make some progress each year; that is to say, we are being remolded each year. I myself had all sorts of non-Marxist ideas before. It was only later that I embraced Marxism. I learned a little Marxism from books and so made an initial remolding of my ideas, but it was mainly through taking part in the class struggle over the years that I came to be remolded. And I must continue to study if I am to make further progress, otherwise I shall lag behind. Can the capitalists be so clever as to need no more remolding?

Some contend that the Chinese bourgeoisie no longer has two sides to its character, but only one side. Is this true? No. On the one hand, members of the bourgeoisie have already become managerial personnel in joint state-private enterprises and are being transformed from exploiters into working people living by their own labor. On the other hand, they still receive a fixed rate of interest on their investments in the joint enterprises,

that is, they have not yet cut themselves loose from the roots of exploitation. Between them and the working class there is still a considerable gap in ideology, sentiments and habits of life. How can it be said that they no longer have two sides to their character? Even when they stop receiving their fixed interest payments and rid themselves of the label "bourgeoisie," they will still need ideological remodeling for quite some time. If it were held that the bourgeoisie no longer has a dual character, then such study and remolding for the capitalists would no longer be needed.

But it must be said that such a view does not tally with the actual circumstances of our industrialists, business men, nor with what most of them want. During the last few years, most of them have been willing to study and have made marked progress. Our industrialists and business men can be thoroughly remolded only in the course of work; they should work together with the staff and workers in the enterprise, and make the enterprises the chief centers for remolding themselves.

It is important, that they change certain of their old views through study. Study for them should be optional. After they have attended study groups for some weeks, many industrialists and business men, on returning to their enterprises find they speak more of a common language with the workers and the representatives of state shareholdings, and so work better together. They know from personal experience that it is good for them to keep on studying and remolding themselves. The idea just referred to, that study and remolding are not necessary, does not

reflect the views of the majority of industrialists and business men. Only a small number of them think that way.

## V

### THE QUESTION OF INTELLECTUALS

Contradictions within the ranks of the people in our country also find expression among our intellectuals. Several million intellectuals who worked for the old society have come to serve the new society. The question that now arises is how they can best meet the needs of the new society and how we can help them to do so. This is also a contradiction among the people.

Most of our intellectuals have made marked progress during the past seven years. They express themselves in favor of the Socialist system. Many of them are diligently studying Marxism, and some have become Communists. Their number, though small, is growing steadily.

There are, of course, still some intellectuals who are skeptical of socialism or who do not approve of it, but they are in a minority.

China needs as many intellectuals as she can get to carry through the colossal task of Socialist construction. We should trust intellectuals who are really willing to serve the cause of socialism, radically improve our relations with them and help them solve whatever problems that have to be solved, so that they can give full play to their talents.

Many of the comrades are not good at getting along with intellectuals. They are stiff with them, lack respect for their work and interfere in scien-

tific and cultural matters in a way that is uncalled for. We must do away with all such shortcomings.

Our intellectuals have made some progress, but they should not be complacent. They must continue to remold themselves, gradually shed their bourgeois world outlook and acquire a proletarian, Communist world outlook so that they can fully meet the needs of the new society and closely unite with the workers and peasants.

The change in world outlook is a fundamental one, and up till now it cannot yet be said that most of our intellectuals have accomplished it. We hope that they will continue making progress, and, in the course of work and study, gradually acquire a Communist world outlook, get a better grasp of Marxism-Leninism, and identify themselves with the workers and peasants. We hope they will not stop halfway, or, what is worse, slip back, for, if they do, they will find themselves in a blind alley.

Since the social system of our country has changed and the economic basis of bourgeois ideology has in the main been destroyed, it is not only necessary but also possible for large numbers of our intellectuals to change their world outlook. But a thorough change in world outlook takes quite a long time, and we should go about it patiently and not be impetuous.

Actually, there are bound to be some who are all along reluctant, ideologically, to accept Marxism-Leninism and communism. We should not be too exacting in what we expect of them as long as they comply with the requirements of the state and engage in legitimate pursuits, we should give them opportunities for suitable work.

There has been a falling off recent-

ideological and political work among students and intellectuals, and some unhealthy tendencies have appeared. Some people apparently think that there is no longer any need to concern themselves about politics, the future of their mother land and the ideals of mankind.

It seems as if the Marxism that was once all the rage is not so much in fashion now. This being the case, we must improve our ideological and political work. Both students and intellectuals should study hard. In addition to specialized subjects, they should study Marxism-Leninism, current events and political affairs in order to progress both ideologically and politically.

Not to have a correct political point of view is like having no soul. Ideological remodeling was necessary in the past and has yielded positive results. But it was carried on in a somewhat rough-and-ready way and the feelings of some people were hurt. This was not good. We must avoid such shortcomings in the future.

All departments and organizations concerned should take up their responsibilities with regard to ideological and political work. This applies to the Communist Party, the Youth League, Government departments responsible for this work, and especially heads of educational institutions and teachers. Our educational policy must enable everyone who gets an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a cultured, Socialist-minded worker.

We must spread the idea of building our country through hard work and thrift. We must see to it that all our young people understand that ours is still a very poor country, that we can not change this situation radi-

cally in a short time and that only through the united efforts of our younger generation and all our people working with their own hands can our country be made strong and prosperous within a period of several decades.

It is true that the establishment of our Socialist system has opened the road leading to the ideal state of the future, but we must work hard, very hard indeed, if we are to make that ideal a reality. Some of our young people think that everything ought to be perfect once a Socialist society is established, and that they should be able to enjoy a happy life, ready-made, without working for it. This is unrealistic.

## VI

### THE QUESTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES

The people of the national minorities in our country number more than 30,000,000. Although they constitute only 6 per cent of China's total population, they inhabit regions which altogether comprise 50 to 60 per cent of the country's total area. It is therefore imperative to foster good relations between the Han people\* and the national minorities.

The key to the solution of this question lies in overcoming Great-Han chauvinism. At the same time, where local nationalism exists among national minorities, measures should be taken to overcome it. Neither Great-Han chauvinism nor local nationalism, can do any good to unity among the nationalities and they should both be

\* The majority nationality in China.—Ed.

overcome as contradictions among the people.

We have already done some work in this sphere. In most areas inhabited by national minorities, there has been a big improvement in relations among the nationalities, but a number of problems remain to be solved. In certain places, both Great-Han chauvinism and local nationalism still exist in a serious degree, and this calls for our close attention.

As a result of the efforts of the people of all the nationalities over the past few years, democratic and Socialist transformations have in the main been completed in most of the national minority areas. Because conditions in Tibet are not ripe, democratic reforms have not yet been carried out there.

According to the seven-point agreement reached between the Central People's Government and the local government of Tibet, reform of the social system must eventually be carried out. But we should not be impatient; when this will be done can only be decided when the great majority of the people of Tibet and their leading public figures consider it practical.

It has now been decided not to proceed with democratic reform in Tibet during the period of the second five-year plan, and we can only decide whether it will be done in the period of the third five-year plan in the light of the situation obtaining at that time.

## VII

### OVER-ALL PLANNING,

### ALL-ROUND CONSIDERATION AND PROPER ARRANGEMENTS

The "over-all planning and all-round consideration" mentioned here

refers to over-all planning and all-round consideration for the interests of the 600,000,000 people of our country. In drawing up plans, handling affairs or thinking over problems, we must proceed from the fact that China has a population of 600,000,000 people. This must never be forgotten.

Now, why should we make a point of this? Could it be that there are people who still do not know that we have a population of 600,000,000? Of course, everyone knows this, but in actual practice some are apt to forget it and act as if they thought that the fewer the people and the smaller their world the better.

Those who have this exclusive club mentality resist the idea of bringing all positive factors into play, of rallying everyone that can be rallied, and of doing everything possible to turn negative factors into positive ones serving the great cause of building a Socialist society.

I hope these people will take a wider view and really recognize the fact that we have a population of 600,000,000, that this is an objective fact, and that this is our asset.

We have this large population. It is a good thing. But, of course, it also has its difficulties. Construction is going ahead vigorously on all fronts; we have achieved much, but in the present transitional period of tremendous social change we are still beset by many difficult problems.

Progress and difficulties—this is a contradiction. However, all contradictions not only should but can be resolved. Our guiding principle is over-all planning and all-round consideration and proper arrangements. No matter whether it is the question of food, natural calamities, employment, education, the intellectuals, the united



front of all patriotic forces, the national minorities, or any other question, we must always proceed from the standpoint of overall planning and all-round consideration for the whole people; we must make whatever arrangements are suitable and possible at the particular time and place and after consultation with all those concerned.

On no account should we throw matters out the back door, go around grumbling that there are too many people, that people are backward, and that things are troublesome and hard to handle.

Does that mean that everyone and everything should be taken care of by the Government alone? Of course not. Social organizations and the masses themselves can work out ways and means to take care of many matters involving people and things. They are quite capable of devising many good ways of doing so.

This also comes within the scope of the principle of "overall planning, all-round consideration and proper arrangements." We should give guidance to social organizations and the masses of the people everywhere in taking such action.

## VIII

### ON "LETTING A HUNDRED FLOWERS BLOSSOM"

"Let a Hundred Flowers Blossom," and "Let a Hundred Schools of Thought Contend," "Long-Term Co-existence and Mutual Supervision," how did these slogans come to be put forward?

They were put forward in the light of the specific conditions existing in China, on the basis of the recognition that various kinds of contradictions

still exist in a Socialist society, and in response to the country's urgent need to speed up its economic and cultural development.

The policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend is designed to promote the flourishing of the arts and the progress of science; it is designed to enable a Socialist culture to thrive in our land. Different forms and styles in art can develop freely and different schools in science can contend freely. We think that it is harmful to the growth of art and science if administrative measures are used to impose one particular style of art or school of thought and to ban another.

Questions of right and wrong in the arts and sciences should be settled through free discussion in artistic and scientific circles and in the course of practical work in the arts and sciences. They should not be settled in summary fashion. A period of trial is often needed to determine whether something is right or wrong. In the past, new and correct things often failed at the outset to win recognition from the majority of people and had to develop by twists and turns in struggle.

Correct and good things have often at first been looked upon not as fragrant flowers but as poisonous weeds. The Copernicus theory of the solar system and Darwin's theory of evolution were once dismissed as erroneous and had to win through over bitter opposition. Chinese history offers many similar examples. In Socialist society, conditions for the growth of new things are radically different from and far superior to those in the old society. Nevertheless, it still often happens that new, rising forces are

held back and reasonable suggestions smothered.

The growth of new things can also be hindered, not because of deliberate suppression, but because of lack of discernment. That is why we should take a cautious attitude in regard to questions of right and wrong in the arts and sciences, encourage free discussion, and avoid hasty conclusions. We believe that this attitude will facilitate the growth of the arts and sciences.

Marxism has also developed through struggle. At the beginning, Marxism was subjected to all kinds of attacks and regarded as a poisonous weed. It is still being attacked and regarded as a poison weed in many parts of the world. However, it enjoys a different position in the Socialist countries. But even in these countries, there are non-Marxist as well as anti-Marxist ideologies. It is true that in China, Socialist transformation, so far as a change in the system of ownership is concerned, has in the main been completed, and the turbulent, large-scale class struggles characteristic of the revolutionary periods have in the main been concluded.

But remnants of the overthrown landlord and comprador classes still exist, the bourgeoisie still exists, and the petty bourgeoisie has only just begun to remold itself. Class struggle is not yet over. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between various political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will still be long and devious and at times may even become very acute.

The proletariat seeks to transform the world according to its own world outlook, so does the bourgeoisie. In

this respect, the question whether socialism or capitalism will win is still not really settled. Marxists are still a minority of the entire population as well as of the intellectuals. Marxism therefore must still develop through struggle. Marxism can only develop through struggle. This is true not only in the past and present, it is necessarily true in the future also. What is correct always develops in the course of struggle with what is wrong. The true, the good and the beautiful always exist in comparison with the false, the evil and the ugly, and grow in struggle with the latter. As mankind in general rejects an untruth and accepts a truth, a new truth will begin struggling with new erroneous ideas. Such struggles will never end. This is the law of development of truth and it is certainly also the law of development of Marxism.

It will take a considerable time to decide the issue in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism in our country. This is because the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the intellectuals who come from the old society will remain in our country as the ideology of a class for a long time to come. Failure to grasp it, or still worse, failure to understand it at all, can lead to the gravest mistakes, to ignoring the necessity of waging the struggle in the ideological field.

Ideological struggle is not like other forms of struggle. Crude, coercive methods should not be used in this struggle, but only the method of painstaking reasoning. Today, socialism enjoys favorable conditions in the ideological struggle. The main power of the state is in the hands of the working people led by the proletariat. The Communist Party is strong and its prestige

stand  
Al  
takes  
perso  
the  
mine  
toget  
have  
achie  
majo  
lectu  
ciety  
to s  
moth  
turn  
and  
Comm  
one t  
to lo  
Pec  
accep  
in ou  
can r  
As a  
no cr  
defeat  
worth  
ists cr  
in all  
harbo  
wish  
cizing  
Ma  
critici  
contra  
prove  
tions  
storm  
again  
cinate  
munit  
takes  
house  
Carr  
hundr  
dred  
not w

stands high.

Although there are defects and mistakes in our work, every fair-minded person can see that we are loyal to the people, that we are both determined and able to build up our country together with the people, and that we have achieved great successes and will achieve still greater ones. The vast majority of the bourgeoisie and intellectuals who come from the old society are patriotic; they are willing to serve their flourishing Socialist motherland, and they know that if they turn away from the Socialist cause and the working people, led by the Communist Party, they will have no one to rely on and no bright future to look forward to.

People may ask: Since Marxism is accepted by the majority of the people in our country as the guiding ideology, can it be criticized? Certainly it can. As a scientific truth, Marxism fears no criticism. If it did, and could be defeated in argument, it would be worthless. In fact, are not the idealists criticizing Marxism every day and in all sorts of ways? As for those who harbor bourgeois ideas and do not wish to change, are not they also criticizing Marxism in all sorts of ways?

Marxists should not be afraid of criticism from any quarter. Quite the contrary, they need to steel and improve themselves and win new positions in the teeth of criticism and the storm and stress of struggle. Fighting against wrong ideas is like being vaccinated: a man develops greater immunity from disease after the vaccine takes effect. Plants raised in hot-houses are not likely to be robust. Carrying out the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend will not weaken but strengthen the lead-

ing position of Marxism in the ideological field.

What should our policy be toward non-Marxist ideas? As far as unmistakable counter-revolutionaries and wreckers of the socialist cause are concerned, the matter is easy; we simply deprive them of their freedom of speech. But it is quite a different matter when we are faced with incorrect ideas among the people. Will it do to ban such ideas and give them no opportunity to express themselves? Certainly not.

It is not only futile but very harmful to use crude and summary methods to deal with ideological questions among the people, with questions relating to the spiritual life of man. You may ban the expression of wrong ideas, but the ideas will still be there. On the other hand, correct ideas, if pampered in hothouses without being exposed to the elements or immunized from disease, will not win out against wrong ones. That is why it is only by employing methods of discussion, criticism and reasoning that we can really foster correct ideas, overcome wrong ideas, and really settle issues.

The bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie are bound to give expression to their ideologies. It is inevitable that they should stubbornly persist in expressing themselves in every way possible on political and ideological questions. You cannot expect them not to do so. We should not use methods of suppression to prevent them from expressing themselves, but should allow them to do so and at the same time argue with them and direct well-considered criticism at them.

There can be no doubt that we should criticize all kinds of wrong ideas. It certainly would not do to refrain from criticism and look on while

wrong ideas spread unchecked and acquire their market. Mistakes should be criticized and poisonous weeds fought against wherever they crop up. But such criticism should not be doctrinaire. We should not use the metaphysical method, but strive to employ the dialectical method. What is needed is scientific analysis and fully convincing arguments. Doctrinaire criticism settles nothing. We do not want any kind of poisonous weeds, but we should carefully distinguish between what is really a poisonous weed and what is really a fragrant flower. We must learn together with the masses of the people how to make this careful distinction and use the correct methods to fight poisonous weeds.

While criticizing doctrinairism, we should at the same time direct our attention to criticizing revisionism. Revisionism, or Rightist opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought which is even more dangerous than doctrinairism. The revisionists, or Right-opportunists, pay lip-service to Marxism and also attack doctrinairism. But the real target of their attack is actually the most fundamental elements of Marxism. They oppose or distort materialism and dialectics, oppose or try to weaken the people's democratic dictatorship and the leading role of the Communist Party, oppose or try to weaken Socialist transformation and Socialist construction. Even after the basic victory of the Socialist revolution in our country, there are still a number of people who vainly hope for a restoration of the capitalist system. They wage a struggle against the working class on every front, including the ideological front. In this struggle, their right-hand men are the revisionists.

On the surface, these two slogans "Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend" have no class character; the proletariat can turn them to account, so can the bourgeoisie and other people.

But different classes, strata and social groups each have their own views on what are fragrant flowers and what are poisonous weeds. So what, from the point of view of the broad masses of the people should be a criterion today for distinguishing between fragrant flowers and poisonous weeds?

In the political life of our country, how are our people to determine what is right and what is wrong in our words and actions? Basing ourselves on the principles of our Constitution, the will of the overwhelming majority of our people and the political programs jointly proclaimed on various occasions by our political parties and groups, we believe that, broadly speaking, words and actions can be judged right if they:

1. Help to unite the people of our various nationalities, and do not divide them;
2. Are beneficial, not harmful, to Socialist transformation and Socialist construction;
3. Help to consolidate, not undermine or weaken, the people's democratic dictatorship;
4. Help to consolidate, not undermine or weaken, democratic centralism;
5. Tend to strengthen, not to cast off or weaken, the leadership of the Communist Party;
6. Are beneficial, not harmful, to international Socialist solidarity and the solidarity of the peace-loving peoples of the world.

Of these six criteria, the most im-

portant are the Socialist path and the leadership of the Party. These criteria are put forward in order to foster and not hinder, the free discussion of various questions among the people.

Those who do not approve of these criteria can still put forward their own views and argue their cases. When the majority of the people have clear-cut criteria to go by, criticism and self-criticism can be conducted along proper lines, and these criteria can be applied to people's words and actions to determine whether they are fragrant flowers or poisonous weeds. These are political criteria.

Naturally, in judging the truthfulness of scientific theories or assessing the aesthetic value of works of art, other pertinent criteria are needed, but these six political criteria are also applicable to all activities in the arts or sciences. In a Socialist country like ours, can there possibly be any useful scientific or artistic activity which runs counter to these political criteria?

All that is set out above stems from the specific historical conditions in our country. Since conditions vary in different Socialist countries and with different Communist Parties, we do not think that other countries and parties must or need to follow the Chinese way.

The slogan: "Long-term Coexistence and Mutual Supervision" is also a product of specific historical conditions in our country. It was not put forward all of a sudden, but had been in the making for several years. The idea of long-term coexistence had been in existence for a long time, but last year when the Socialist system was basically established the slogan was set out in clear terms.

Why should the democratic parties

of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie be allowed to exist side by side with the party of the working class over a long period of time? Because we have no reason not to adopt the policy of long-term coexistence with all other democratic parties which are truly devoted to the task of uniting the people for the cause of socialism and which enjoy the trust of the people.

As early as at the second session of the National Committee of the People's Political Consultative Conference in June of 1950, I put the matter in this way:

"The people and the people's Government have no reason to reject or deny the opportunity to anyone to make a living and give their services to the country, so long as he is really willing to serve the people, really helped the people when they were still in difficulties, did good things and continues to do them consistently without giving up halfway."

What is defined here was the political basis for the long-term co-existence of the various parties. It is the desire of the Communist Party, also its policy, to exist side by side with the other democratic parties for a long time to come. Whether these democratic parties can long exist depends not merely on what the Communist Party itself desires, but also on the part played by these democratic parties themselves and on whether they enjoy the confidence of the people.

Mutual supervision among the various parties has also been a long-established fact, in the sense that they advise and criticize each other. Mutual supervision, which is obviously not a one-sided matter, means that the Communist Party should exercise super-

vision over the other democratic parties, and the other democratic parties should exercise supervision over the Communist Party.

Why should the other democratic parties be allowed to exercise supervision over the Communist Party? This is because for a party as much as for an individual there is great need to hear opinions different from its own.

We all know that supervision over the Communist Party is mainly exercised by the working people and Party membership. But we will benefit even more if the other democratic parties do this as well.

Of course, advice and criticism exchanged between the Communist Party and the other democratic parties will play a positive role in mutual supervision only when they conform to the six political criteria given above. That is why we hope that the other democratic parties will all pay attention to ideological remodeling and strive for long-term coexistence and mutual supervision with the Communist Party so as to meet the needs of the new society.

## IX

### ON DISTURBANCES CREATED BY SMALL NUMBERS OF PEOPLE

In 1956, small numbers of workers and students in certain places went on strike. The immediate cause of these disturbances was the failure to satisfy certain of their demands for material benefits, of which some should and could be met, while others were out of place or excessive and therefore could not be met for the time being.

But a more important cause was bureaucracy on the part of those in positions of leadership. In some cases, responsibility for such bureaucratic mistakes should be placed on the higher authorities, and those at lower levels should not be made to bear all the blame.

Another cause for these disturbances was that the ideological and political educational work done among the workers and students was inadequate. In the same year, members of a small number of agricultural cooperatives also created disturbances, and the main causes were also bureaucracy on the part of the leadership and lack of educational work among the masses.

It should be admitted that all too often some people are prone to concentrate on immediate, partial and personal interests; they do not understand, or do not sufficiently understand, long-range, nation-wide and collective interests. Because of their lack of experience in political and social life, quite a number of young people cannot make a proper comparison between the old and new China.

It is not easy for them to thoroughly comprehend what hardships the people of our country went through in the struggle to free themselves from oppression by the imperialists and Kuomintang reactionaries, or what a long period of painstaking work is needed before a happy Socialist society can be established.

That is why political educational work should be kept going among the masses in an interesting and effective way. We should always tell them the facts about the difficulties that have cropped up and discuss with them how to solve these difficulties.

We do not approve of disturbances,

because contradictions among the people can be resolved in accordance with the formula "unity—criticism—unity," while disturbances inevitably cause losses and are detrimental to the advance of socialism.

We believe that our people stand for socialism, that they uphold discipline and are reasonable, and will not create disturbances without reason. But this does not mean that in our country there is no possibility of the masses creating disturbances. With regard to this question, we should pay attention to the following:

(1) In order to get rid of the root cause of disturbances, we must stamp out bureaucracy, greatly improve ideological and political education, and deal with all contradictions in a proper way. If this is done, there would not usually be any disturbances.

(2) If disturbances should occur as a result of bad work on our part, then we should guide those involved in such disturbances on to the correct path, make use of these disturbances as a special means of improving our work and educating the cadres and the masses, and work out solutions to those questions which have been neglected in the past.

Handling any disturbances, we should work painstakingly, and should not use over-satisfied methods, nor declare the matter closed before it is thoroughly settled. The guiding spirits in disturbances should not be removed from their jobs or expelled without good reason, except for those who have committed criminal offenses or active counter-revolutionaries who should be dealt with according to law.

In a big country like ours it is nothing to get alarmed about if small

numbers of people should create disturbances; rather we should turn such things to advantage to help us get rid of bureaucracy.

In our society there is also a small number of people who are unmindful of public interest, refuse to listen to reason, commit crimes and break the law. They may take advantage of our policies and distort them, deliberately put forward unreasonable demands in order to stir up the masses, or deliberately spread rumors to create trouble and disrupt social order. We do not propose to let these peoples have their way. On the contrary, proper legal action must be taken against them. The masses demand that these persons be punished. Not to do so will run counter to the popular will.

## X

### CAN BAD THINGS BE TURNED INTO GOOD THINGS?

As I have said, in our society it is bad when groups of people make disturbances and we do not approve of it. But when disturbances do occur, they force us to learn lessons from them, to overcome bureaucracy and educate the cadres and the people. In this sense bad things can be turned into good things. Disturbances thus have a dual character. All kinds of disturbances can be looked at in this way.

It is clear to everybody that the Hungarian events were not a good thing. But they, too, had a dual character. Because our Hungarian comrades took proper action in the course of these events, what was a bad thing turned ultimately into a good thing. The Hungarian State is now more

firmly established than ever, and all other countries in the Socialist camp have also learned a lesson.

Similarly, the world-wide anti-Communist and anti-popular campaign launched in the latter half of 1956 was, of course, a bad thing. But it educated and steeled the Communist Parties and the working class in all countries and thus turned out to be a good thing.

In the storm and stress of this period a number of people resigned from the Communist Parties in many countries. Resignations from the Party reduce Party membership and are, of course, a bad thing, but there is a good side to this also. Since the vacillating elements unwilling to carry on have withdrawn, the great majority of staunch Party members are more firmly united for the struggle. Is not this a good thing?

In short, we must learn to take an all-round view of things, seeing not only the positive side of things but also the negative side. Under specific conditions, a bad thing can lead to good results and a good thing to bad results. More than 2,000 years ago Lao Tzu said: "It is upon bad fortune that good fortune leans, upon good fortune that bad fortune rests."

When the Japanese struck into China, they called it a victory. Huge areas of China's territory were seized, and the Chinese called this a defeat. But China's defeat carried within it the seeds of victory, and Japan's victory carried within it the seeds of defeat. Has not this been proved by history?

People all over the world are now discussing whether or not a third world war will break out. In regard to this question we must be psychologically prepared and at the same time

take an analytical view. We stand resolutely for peace and oppose war.

But if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war we should not be afraid of it. Our attitude on this question is the same as our attitude toward all disturbances: Firstly, we are against it; secondly, we are not afraid of it.

The First World War was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200,000,000. The Second World War was followed by the emergence of the Socialist camp with a combined population of 900,000,000.

If the imperialists should insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism. Then there will not be much room left in the world for the imperialists, while it is quite likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse.

## XI

### THE PRACTICE OF ECONOMY

Here I wish to speak briefly on practicing economy. We want to carry on large-scale construction, but our country is still very poor. Herein lies a contradiction. One way of resolving this contradiction is to make a sustained effort to practice strict economy in every field.

During the San Fan movement in 1952, we fought against corruption, waste and bureaucracy and the emphasis was on combatting corruption. In 1955 we advocated the practice of economy with considerable success; our emphasis then was on combatting unduly high standards for non-productive projects in capital construction, and economy in the use of



raw materials in industrial production.

But at that time economy as a guiding principle was not conscientiously carried out in all branches of the national economy, nor in government offices, army units, schools and people's organizations in general. This year we have called for economy and the elimination of waste in every respect throughout the country.

Given specific conditions, the two aspects of a contradiction invariably turn into their respective opposites as a result of the struggle between them. Here the conditions are important. Without specific conditions neither of the two contradictory aspects can transform itself into its opposite.

Of all the classes in the world the proletariat is the most eager to change its position. Next comes the semi-proletariat, for the former possesses nothing at all while the latter is not much better off.

The present situation in which the United States controls a majority in the United Nations and dominates many parts of the world is a transient one which will eventually be changed.

China's situation as a poor country denied her rights in international affairs will also be changed—a poor country will be changed into a rich country, a country denied her rights into a country enjoying her rights—a transformation of things into their opposites. Here the decisive conditions are the Socialist system and the concerted efforts of a united people.

We still lack experience in construction. During the past few years great successes have been achieved but there has also been waste. We must gradually build a number of large-scale modern enterprises, as the mainstay of

our industries; without these we shall not be able to turn our country into a modern industrial power in several decades.

But the majority of our enterprises should not be built in this way; we should set up a far greater number of small and medium enterprises and make full use of the industries inherited from the old society so as to effect the greatest economy and do more things with less money.

Since the principle of practicing strict economy and combatting waste was put forward in more emphatic terms than before by the second plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in November, 1956, good results have been obtained. This economy drive must be carried out in a thorough, sustained way.

Just as it is with criticism of our other faults and mistakes, combatting waste is like washing our face. Do not people wash their faces every day? The Chinese Communist Party, the other democratic parties, Democrats not affiliated to any party, intellectuals, industrialists and business men, workers, peasants and handicraftsmen—in short, all the 600,000,000 people of our country—must increase production, practice economy and combat extravagance and waste.

This is of first importance both economically and politically. A dangerous tendency has shown itself of late among many of our personnel—an unwillingness to share the joys and hardships of the masses, a concern for personal position and gain. This is very bad. One way of overcoming this dangerous tendency is, in our campaign, to increase production and practice economy, to streamline our or-

ganizations and transfer cadres to lower levels so that a considerable number of them will return to productive work.

We must see to it that all cadres and all our people constantly bear in mind that while ours is a big Socialist country, it is an economically backward and poor country, and that this is a very great contradiction. If we want to see China rich and strong, we must be prepared for several decades of intensive effort which will include among other things the carrying out of a policy of building our country through hard work and thrift, of practicing strict economy and combatting waste.

## XII

### CHINA'S PATH TO INDUSTRIALIZATION

In discussing our path to industrialization, I am here concerned principally with the relationship between the growth of heavy industry, light industry and agriculture. Heavy industry is the core of China's economic construction. This must be affirmed. But, at the same time, full attention must be paid to the development of agriculture and light industry.

As China is a great agricultural country, with more than 80 per cent of its population in the villages, its industry and agriculture must be developed simultaneously. Only then will industry have raw materials and a market, and only so will it be possible to accumulate fairly large funds for the building up of a powerful heavy industry. Everyone knows that light industry is closely related to agriculture. Without agriculture there

can be no light industry. But it is not so clearly understood that agriculture provides heavy industry with an important market. This fact, however, will be more readily appreciated as the gradual progress of technological improvement and modernization of agriculture calls for more and more machinery, fertilizers, water conservation and electric power projects and transport facilities for the farms, as well as fuel and building materials for the rural consumers.

The entire national economy will benefit if we can achieve an even greater growth in our agriculture and thus induce a correspondingly greater development of light industry during the period of the second and third five-year plans. With the development of agriculture and light industry, heavy industry will be assured of its market and funds, and thus grow faster. Hence what may seem to be a slower pace of industrialization is actually not so, and indeed the tempo may even be speeded up. In three five-year plans or perhaps a little longer China's annual steel output can be raised to 20,000,000 tons or more from the pre-liberation output of something over 900,000 tons in 1943. This will gladden people both in town and countryside.

I do not propose to talk at length on economic questions today. With barely seven years of economic construction behind us, we still lack experience and need to get more. We have no experience to start with in revolutionary work either, and it was only after we had taken a number of tumbles and learned our lesson that we won nationwide victory. What we must do now is to cut the time we take to gain experience in economic construction to less than it took us to get

expe  
not  
sh  
but  
high  
tion  
W  
is in  
the  
Socia  
unde  
need  
contr  
as a  
perso  
thos  
unde  
thos  
relati  
a co  
Ever  
realit  
stand  
we c  
In  
into  
learn  
vance  
The  
socia  
ure i  
I  
equip  
for u  
Brita  
the S  
beca  
se  
cr  
th

experience in revolutionary work and not pay such a high price for it. We shall have to pay some sort of price, but we hope that it will not be as high as that paid during the revolutionary period.

We must realize that a contradiction is involved in this question between the objective laws of development of Socialist economy and our subjective understanding, a contradiction that needs to be resolved in practice. This contradiction will also manifest itself as a contradiction between different persons, that is, a contradiction between those who have a relatively accurate understanding of objective laws and those whose understanding of them is relatively inaccurate; and so this is also a contradiction among the people. Every contradiction is an objective reality, and it is our task to understand it and resolve it as correctly as we can.

In order to transform our country into an industrial power, we must learn conscientiously from the advanced experience of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been building socialism for forty years and we treasure its experience.

Let us consider who designed and equipped so many important factories for us. Was it the United States? Or Britain? No., neither of them. Only the Soviet Union was willing to do so because it is a Socialist country and

our ally. In addition to the Soviet Union some fraternal countries of Eastern Europe also gave us assistance. It is perfectly true that we should learn from the good experience of all countries, Socialist or capitalist, but the main thing is still to learn from the Soviet Union.

Now, here are two different attitudes in learning from others. One is a doctrinaire attitude: transplanting everything whether suited or not to the conditions of our country. This is not a good attitude. Another attitude is to use our heads and learn those things that suit conditions in our country, that is, to absorb whatever experience is useful to us. This is the attitude we should adopt.

To strengthen our solidarity with the Soviet Union, to strengthen our solidarity with all Socialist countries—this is our fundamental policy, therein lies our basic interest. Then, there are the Asian and African countries, and all the peace-loving countries and peoples; we must strengthen and develop our solidarity with them. United with these two forces, we will not stand alone. As for the imperialist countries, we should also unite with their peoples and strive to coexist in peace with those countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbor any unrealistic notions about those countries.

Starting with our August issue, we shall have a "Letters from Readers" section. Please share with us your ideas, experiences, suggestions, and criticisms. Try to keep your letters this side of 700 words, and we'll print them. The main thing is: Let's hear from you!—Ed.

Now Available—

## THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY

*By Herbert Aptheker*

A full-length study of the 1956 uprising in Hungary which fearlessly brings to light every aspect of the complex political event that aroused such differences in world opinion. It probes deeply into the sources of popular discontent, the nature of the uprising, the various forces—progressive and counter-revolutionary—involved, and the day-by-day course of the Budapest events. Hungarian-Soviet relations are examined critically, and the whole meaning of Hungary for world Socialism, and the lessons the uprising holds for Marxists, socialists and democrats of all persuasions are dealt with at length.

*Paper \$2.00; cloth \$3.00*

## THE ORDEAL OF MANSART

*By W. E. B. Du Bois*

A monumental study, in the form of a novel, of what it has meant to be a Negro in the United States from 1870 to the present. The overall title of this 1500-page trilogy is *The Black Flame*. The first volume, entitled *The Ordeal of Mansart*, has just been published. It depicts on a vast canvas the impact of the Civil War's after-effects, the surge of Reconstruction and the counter-revolutionary attempt to wipe out every vestige of freedom won by the Negro, portraying these historic events as seen and experienced by a cross-section of contemporary Americans—former slaves, landed gentry, Northern businessmen, poor whites, preachers and politicians. A major work of literary art by the dean of American letters.

*Price \$3.50*

AT ALL BOOKSTORES

**MAINSTREAM PUBLISHERS** • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Hungary  
comes in  
popu-  
rious  
olved,  
Hun-  
l the  
d the  
and  
ngth.  
\$3.00

what  
from  
page  
titled  
t de-  
War's  
coun-  
re of  
toric  
con-  
ntry,  
oliti-  
n of  
\$3.50

N. Y.