


political affairs

OCTOBER 1957 • 35 CENTS

- 
- [11] **Anglo-American Imperialism:
An Unequal Partnership**
- [31] **Multiple Parties in People's
China**
- [39] **Experiences in Prison:
China and America**
- [46] **Monopoly in the U.S.:
A New Study**
- [53] **Problems of American
Farmers**
- [61] **Letters from Readers**

THE CHALLENGE OF LITTLE ROCK

By James E. Jackson, Jr.

[1--10]

[19] **"Ideas in Our Time"**

JUST PUBLISHED!

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

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

PRICE \$2.75

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

50¢

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

15¢

NEW International BOOKS

PHILOSOPHY IN REVOLUTION, by Howard Selsam \$2.00

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

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, by Samuel Lilley \$3.75

Order from your local bookshop or

.....
New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The Challenge of Little Rock

By James E. Jackson, Jr.

The author, for many years in the forefront of the struggle to democratize the South and wipe out jim crow, is a member of the National Committee, CPUSA, and is its Secretary for Southern Affairs. This article was given to the printer several days before Federal troops were sent into Little Rock, Ark.—Ed.

AT SUNDAY SERVICES, on September 15 of this year, in New York City, a Negro Protestant minister, the Rev. Oberia D. Dempsey, of the Abyssinian Baptist Church, proudly observed:

The greatest contribution to the advancement of American democracy today is being made by the Negro youth in the deep South. They are carrying the cross for democracy in spite of violence, ill-will and hate. . . . Both youth and adults should find inspiration in America's Negro youth in the South.

A Roman Catholic monsignor, the Rev. Edward D. Klein, measured the shame of his white countrymen and warned:

As Americans we should either quit prattling about equality and the virtues of our democracy or begin to practice what we preach. . . . This nation's survival depends on whether or not Americans wake up to the fact that if one minority suffers in this country, all minorities suffer.

A Jewish rabbi, the Rev. Stephen Wise of the Free Synagogue, belabored those who stood passive before a great wrong-doing and summoned every man to assume his responsibilities to work for a better world:

How I had hoped that the President would speak out against the Governor's [Faubus'] use of the National Guard

to "protect" the Central High School against nine Negro students who had attempted to enter in compliance with the court's affirmation of their right. Instead we just hear about "confidence and patience." . . . The Civil Rights Law has been whittled down by fear. Are we now going to see these shameful things happen again and again? Even in our great city we see the bottling-up by the City Council of the Brown-Sharkey-Isaacs Bill that would make it illegal to practice racial discrimination in most of our New York City housing. Let every member of this congregation write a letter to Mayor Wagner urging the passage of that Bill to help remove the mote of "Levittown" from our own eye, and the stain of Governor Faubus' crime from our conscience!

These quotations from three conservative ministers, representing the major religious faiths of the American people, point up the universal impact of the mighty desegregation struggle which featured the opening of the new school term in the South. The pivotal place-name of this struggle was "Little Rock" but the action front was far-flung—from Maryland through the deep South, on into southwestern Texas. The whole nation is deeply involved in its conduct and outcome. This, and other aspects of the all-sided struggle of the American Negro people for the prompt implementation of their long-deferred Constitutional rights, will have somber implications and far-reaching consequences as regards the Government's posture in the eyes

of the world; and particularly significant will be its influence upon African and Asian public opinion.

* * *

What then is the meaning of "Little Rock"?

On the morning of September 9 the Governor of Arkansas, Orval E. Faubus, commandeered a unit of the National Guard, equipped with full field regalia and combat armament, and directed it to form battle stations around Little Rock's Central High School. They had orders to use all military means to "place the school off limits" to nine Negro students who had been designated to enroll there by the Board of Education in token compliance with a Federal Court order issued in conformity with the 1954 school-desegregation ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court. When he took this indefensible action, he set in motion a chain of events and activated social forces whose ultimate consequences can only result in defeat for the power position of Southern racism in the political and social life of the country.

Indelibly etched in the memories and on the conscience of the nation is the picture of a small, sweet-faced Negro teen-ager (Elizabeth Eckford), being menaced by the up-raised rifles of six-foot soldiers blocking her way to the school steps while the hate-twisted faces of white hoodlums close in upon her from the

rear
lar
of
and
lion
view
the
Am
prej
shoc
hum
was
into
the
tion
cour
It
ing
ily,
trad
chil
ness
their
with
shop
In
hibit
duct
the
scho
adm
cent-
They
diers
bodie
sadis
upon
lated
indec
unbo
prou

rear. This scene and scores of similar ones occupied the front pages of the newspapers of our country and the world for days. Tens of millions of television and newsreel viewers received a visual report of the truth and consequences of American anti-Negro racism and prejudice which was a stunning and shocking study in unreasoning, anti-human bestiality and depravity. It was a revelation to most, an insight into the terrible depths to which the toleration of racism in our national life has carried many of our countrymen.

It was the occasion for soul-searching in many a white American family, in the home of many a white trade unionist, church-goer, school child, apartment dweller and businessman, and for taking stock of their own pattern of relationships with their Negro fellow citizens, shopmates and neighbors.

In counterpoint to animal-like exhibitionism and brutal, cowardly conduct of the white supremacist mobs, the undaunted and fearless Negro school children won the compassion, admiration and gratitude of all decent-minded people everywhere. They tested the barrier of the soldiers' bayonets with their youthful bodies; they walked the gauntlet of sadistic hate-fired mobs who spit upon them and stoned them and violated their ears with every verbal indecency. With heads erect, backs unbowed, fearless and unafraid, proud of their place of honor in

the van of a whole people's iron-willed and determined march toward genuine freedom, the unfailing steps of the Negro youth have set a new pace for all those who struggle on the frontiers of social progress and a new and lofty standard of courage for its fighters to emulate.

* * *

Why did the cabal of Dixiecrat politicians, the arrant racists and the calculating profiteers in prejudice choose Arkansas and Little Rock in particular to make a show of force against the forces of school desegregation and democratization in the South? Why did the segregationists make this the place and time to challenge the federal judicial and executive authority?

In more than a historic sense, time is running out for the bigots of Southern Bourbonry.

1. Changes have occurred in the economic base. The cities have taken over from the counties in terms of population. Industry has taken over from agriculture in terms of product value, employment, invested capital and gains. Modern capitalist relations in agriculture have largely displaced the sharecropping plantation system. These changes have generated heavy objective pressures upon, and set in motion new forces against, the outdated, ultra-reactionary social patterns and political practices in the Southern states.

2. The Negro people's movement for civil rights and genuine freedom gains in strength. Encouraged by the minimal economic, educational and legal civil gains wrested in the war and post-war years, inspired by the world-changing victories secured by the revolting colonial millions of Asia and Africa, fortified by the occasional alliance and general sympathy of labor and liberal organizations, it has gained in membership, organization, unity, leadership, skill and militancy. Neither traditional KKK forays and police brutality, nor "new" terror tactics of economic sanctions, mass firings and foreclosures, nor outlawing and mass arrests of leaders have succeeded in interrupting its growth or corrupting its firm principles. The Negro people's movement has mounted successive southwide struggles in the form of the Montgomery and other bus boycotts, against segregation in public transportation and in the form of numerous actions of students to seek enrollment in former all-white schools (Little Rock, Nashville, Charleston, Arlington, Birmingham, etc.). It has announced plans for a southwide crusade to compel the registration of five million Negro voters by 1960. This new phase of the Negro freedom movement shows no indication of succumbing to the terror unleashed against it by Southern reaction.

3. Neither the outrages perpetrated by the KKK and White Citizens Councils, nor the threats of

nullification emanating from the Southern Governors' Conference, nor the Manifesto of the 100 Southern Congressmen for resistance "by all available legal means" to the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling of 1954, have caused the Federal Courts seriously to depart from their pattern of favorable rulings and orders for local school boards to proceed "with deliberate speed" to the lowering of the color bar in the public school system.

4. Weak shield though it is, the recently enacted civil rights (right-to-vote) law is viewed by the Southern governing class as a major clear and present danger to their unchallenged oligarchical rule. If vigorously and promptly enforced by the Courts and broadly used by the Negro masses, it could facilitate the fierce struggle of the disfranchised to secure the right to vote.

5. Recent developments in Arkansas suggested a disposition on the part of a considerable section of public opinion to accept the changes in the pattern of segregation as projected by the Supreme Court under the impact of the Negro people's long and militant struggle. Many local official personages like Mayor Woodrow W. Mann of Little Rock, Editor Ashford of the *Arkansas Gazette*, and former Governor Mahan openly began to identify themselves with the new enlightened sentiment among Southern whites in striving toward a new relationship with the Negro people on the basis of respect

for
Rock
deseg
state
Deep
prom
in th
resist
gatio

It
(thou
of al
chief
tion
reacti
culate
eviden
sition
remov
bar,
white
with
Guard
der"
while
Govern
ment.
vie-wp
segreg
further
desegre
signal
cute v
acted
In l
effort
slow
and d

for their citizenship rights. Little Rock had peacefully complied with desegregation of the buses and the state college, more than any other Deep Southern state. Arkansas gave promise of becoming the first breach in the ranks of the "solid core" of resistor states to the tides of desegregation and democratization.

* * *

It is for these reasons primarily (though the list is not exhaustive of all the factors at play) that the chief conspirators of the nullification forces of unregenerate southern reaction chose Arkansas. They calculated that if Arkansas, which had evidenced some progress and disposition to take halting steps toward removing certain rails of the color bar, could be made the scene of white supremacist demonstrations, with the gun play of National Guardsmen restoring "law and order" at the command of the erstwhile Southern style pseudo-liberal Governor Faubus, then the Government would adjudge the Southern viewpoints as unitedly opposed to desegregation and would act to curb further enforcement of the school desegregation ruling. This would signalize its intention not to prosecute with any vigor the newly enacted civil rights law.

In brief, Dixiedom made a bold effort to break down the forces of slow progress toward desegregation and democratization which are in-

vesting her and opening revolts throughout her realm. "Little Rock" was designed to strike terror into the hearts of Southern Negroes and stampede their white supporters there. By a massive dramatized display of terror, it sought to compel the Government to retreat from performing its responsibility to enforce school desegregation. It was as a flaming-cross warning to the Courts and the Government not to proceed to the enforcement of the new civil rights law. It was perpetrated to high-jack new "states rights" prerogatives at the expense of the federal government's authority to safeguard the Negro people in the exercise of their Constitutional rights.

The desperate offensive of the white supremacy forces at Little Rock won certain short-term advantages for the segregationists. By arraying armed force of the State National Guard against the Negro students, Faubus emboldened every gang of Negro-hating racist misanthropes in the country. The Hitlerite agitator John Kasper stirred a few hundred of the dregs of Nashville's white community into hysterical abuse of six-year old Negro first-grade tots, and this was climaxed in the dynamiting of a new half-million dollar school which had admitted one Negro tot the previous day. In Birmingham the venerated Negro militant, Rev. Shuttlesworth, was flogged with chains and brass knuckles when he sought to convoy some children to the white neighbor-

hood school. In nearby Marion, an innocent Negro veteran was fiendishly emasculated with a razor blade as an initiation test by a leadership candidate for a local KKK group. In Charlotte, North Carolina, gracious and St. Joan-like 15-year-old Dorothy Counts was made the target of spittle and brick bats from her schoolmates as she went to and from a formerly white school until a cut in the head forced her to abandon the unequal fight. Still the mob-makers could rally but a few thousands to counter the unwavering forward march of eleven million Southern Negroes determined to have their rights *now* though mobs stone their children, draw their blood, and dynamite their homes and churches.

* * *

But what Gov. Faubus and his "interposition and nullification" conspirators banked their hopes on most of all, was the demonstrated unwillingness of the Eisenhower Administration to invoke the executive powers of the Government to firmly back up the court's rulings. In this they were not disappointed. Throughout this critical struggle, Eisenhower voiced no words of comfort to the school children victims of the mob's fury. Neither did he utter a single reproach to the Arkansas governor whose action had triggered a chain of acts of racist infamy at numerous points in the South. Through his press secretary

he found only irrelevant inanities about "caution and patience" to address to the Negro victims while comforting the Arkansas Governor by "recognizing that responsibility rests with the Governor to preserve law and order in his state."

Taking his cue from the President, Attorney-General Brownell dragged his feet in bringing Faubus to trial for defying with force and threats of violence, the execution of federal court orders to withdraw the National Guard from the school. J. Edgar Hoover, FBI chieftain, also rushed into print to denounce those who entertain any hopes that FBI men would be used to provide protection for Negro school kids in the exercise of their constitutional rights.

The fact that the segregationists will not succeed in turning back the pages of history is no credit to the Eisenhower Administration which offered little or no opposition to the success of their dastardly scheme. Indeed Eisenhower bears a major responsibility for the infamous outrages in the South. As an editorial in the September 14th *People's World* declared:

. . . The Eisenhower Administration is responsible. Its weasel-worded hesitations and indecisions since the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling of May 17, 1954, have emboldened the terrorists, the dynamiters, the instigators of mob violence.

We say the Democratic "compromisers" are responsible. Their maneuvers at the Democratic convention last

year
blo
con
hav
ers.
I
ism
a h
I
swi
E
Pre
call
frie
con
wit
sion
mor
ity
W
from
T
is th
be r
to g
Am
lute
is th
they
their
flow
To
mat
sacri
aged
ment
pove
unco
and
prem
gro

year, their "deal" with the Southern bloc on the civil rights bill in the just concluded session of Congress—these have encouraged the would-be lynch-ers.

For more than three years "gradualism" has held sway. It has reaped a harvest of hate and terror.

It is time for action, for justice—swift and stern.

But in the face of all this, the President could do no more than call a wilful violator of the law into friendly conference. And to Faubus' continued defiance, he could answer with nothing better than an expression of "disappointment"! Can a more craven abdication of authority be imagined?

* * *

What conclusions are to be drawn from Little Rock?

The first revelation of Little Rock is that the Negro people shall not be moved from their determination to gain their total rights as free-born Americans, come what may. So resolute is their will, so all-pervading is their confidence of victory that they have not hesitated to commit their six-year-old toddlers and the flower of their youth to the struggle. To their noble resolve they have matched glorious deeds of selfless sacrifice and heroism. Undiscouraged by the indifference of governmental leaders, undaunted by the poverty of successes thus far realized, uncowed by the frenzy of the mobs and defamations of the white supremacists, the flambeau of the Negro people's struggle for equality

and freedom blazes ever brighter against the long night of Southern tyranny.

Little Rock revealed that ever more millions of white Southerners are casting off their heavy veil of racial bigotry and unreasoning prejudices. Never before have so many white Southerners, albeit timidly and uncertainly, dissociated their voices from those of the mob where the rights of Negroes were concerned. The mass of white Southerners were silent in their sympathies but they *did not* rally to the call of the wild unreason of the professional Negro-haters. Not all white Southerners limited their support to the Negroes' just struggles by mere abstinence from the assault on them. More of them spoke up against the depredations of the segregationists than ever before. They included the Mayor of Little Rock, the Governor of Tennessee, a Federal Judge and numerous clergymen and teachers. But the white Southerner whose supporting role was in the measure equal to the challenge of the situation, to the quality of aid required, was Little Rock's courageous Mrs. Grace Lorch. It was she who broke through the mob to take her stand beside tiny 15-year-old Elizabeth Eckford, to envelope her in her arms in demonstrative defiance of the white supremacists, and arm in arm to share the remainder of her walk through the gauntlet. Mrs. Lorch's deed pre-viewed the coming of the second Southern emancipation—that is, of

the white Southerner from the blindfold of his racial prejudice.

Little Rock made vivid to the nation what every thoughtful person suspected: that the Negro's freedom cause is one with democracy's survival. That the democratic rights of the people as a whole remain restricted and insecure as long as they are denied to the Negro people. That the means required to hold the Negro in an oppressed status constitute a threat to constitutional government itself.

In response to the challenge of Little Rock, there issued forth from all corners of the nation a veritable avalanche of letters to newspapers from people in all stations of life. There appeared unprecedented editorial expressions of revulsion, shame and outrage at Faubus' foul blow, as well as whole-hearted sympathy for his child-victims and their people's cause, reflecting the sentiments of millions.

As a consequence of Little Rock a qualitatively new and favorable climate now exists in the country for mounting even bolder initiative towards speeding the advance of the Negro people to full freedom from discrimination and segregation. Indeed, the deepest currents of emancipation are just now beginning to flow in our national life.

But if the contest at Little Rock and the reaction to Little Rock hopefully awaken new and powerful forces to the cause of the struggle for Negro rights, the fact that Little

Rock did occur is an alarming danger-signal, an index of the terrible depths of the wounds of anti-Negro racism that bleed our national life.

* * *

The trade-union movement—the Negro people's strategic ally in the freedom struggle—has not adequately measured up to its responsibility in this crisis. This is not to say that nothing has happened. There have been numerous indignant statements from national labor leaders, and sharply-worded resolutions have been issued by a number of non-southern trade-union bodies.

Outstanding among these is the action of the California State Federation of Labor, at whose recent convention more than 2,000 delegates unanimously approved a resolution strongly suggesting President Eisenhower's impeachment if he failed to uphold the Constitution in Little Rock. The resolution further called on Congress "to prohibit any public official from thwarting national law and undermining federal authority."

Such actions are of great importance and call for the widest emulation. But by themselves they are inadequate. Can mobs and misled uniformed men with sub-machine guns and bayonets be countered only with resolutions? The voice of labor in a multi-millioned chorus ought to have answered the "war against the children" with the declaration that the workers would lay down their tools until Faubus lays

dow
ity
ers
called
ber o
(and
fense
to fu
allian
Th
their
ganiz
South
of th
initia
ties t
respe
equal
The
the F
by nu
spect
Negro
violat
open-
union
(It is
cial n
from
who
invest
of tra
mouth
"law
leader
again
chieft
The
to the
get o
drive

down his guns. Such was the quality of initiative from the leaders of labor that the situation called for. But short of this, a number of concrete steps could have been (and still ought to be) taken in defense of the national interests and to further strengthen the bonds of alliance with the Negro people.

The international unions can use their large staffs of international organizers to assist the locals in the South to rebuff the counter-offensive of the segregationists and take the initiative in rallying the communities to uphold the Constitution and respect the Negro citizens' full and equal rights under its provisions.

Those southern states which defy the Federal government and courts by nullifying the Constitution in respect to the citizenship rights of the Negro people, are the lead states in violating the rights of labor, the open-shop havens of the infamous union-busting "right-to-work" laws. (It is an ironic commentary on official morality that it is *the Senator from Arkansas*, John B. McClellan, who heads the Senate Committee investigating corruption in the circle of trade union leaders. This loud-mouthed crusader for respect for "law and order" by erstwhile labor leaders, uttered no words of criticism against the crimes of his own rebel chieftain, Orval Faubus.)

The clear challenge of Little Rock to the trade-union movement is to get on with its too-often-shelved drive to organize the millions of un-

organized Southern workers in the plants and on the plantations. The cause of democracy and desegregation in the South will make swifter progress when the front of struggle of the Negro people is supported by the opening of a second front of social struggle by the labor movement. A requisite for success is that the labor movement must militantly struggle against the sadistic and divisive influence of the White Citizens Councils and the revived KKK, and abide by the cardinal organizational class principle of non-discrimination and Negro and white workers' unity.

The challenge of Little Rock obligates the trade unions to resolutely level all those remaining discriminatory barriers of the color bar in the job market, in upgrading and promotion practices, in job and apprenticeship training programs, and in the inner-life and leadership of the unions themselves. Labor must intervene on a more massive and sustained scale in the all-sided struggles of the Negro people for equality and against Jim Crow—in the community and before the legislative chambers, as well as on the job front.

The fight against segregation in housing in the North is the companion issue to the fight to desegregate the schools in the South in the democratic struggle for Negro freedom. In this hard-fought social struggle the trade unions must everywhere be helped to display initiative and render practical aid toward

securing a swift and victorious outcome.

The consequences of Little Rock in particular, and the course of the civil rights struggle in general, will influence profoundly the political attitudes, alliances and outlook of all the Negro, and many millions of white voters in the period immediately ahead. The fact that the leaders of both the Democratic and Republican parties share in the guilt and responsibility for Little Rock will not escape the voters. How this revelation may affect the course and tempo of independent political action and new initiatives on the part of the Negro people, the workers and their more conscious allies, will be the subject of a sequel to this article.

For now, let labor and the popular forces render every material aid to the newly launched crusade of the Southern Negroes *to secure to themselves the tools of effective political action—the right to vote and to stand for election.* The "register and vote" campaign, with its goal

to qualify 5,000,000 Negro voters by 1960, is now getting under way throughout the South, under the leadership of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference headed by the Rev. Martin Luther King. As this movement succeeds, new, progressive alliances and Negro-white mass political relations will be born of it; the South will witness the emergence of a different sort of power relation in its political complexion, which will be altogether favorable to the cause of social progress and working-class advance in the nation as a whole.

The response to Little Rock has signalized that ours is a time ripe with opportunity to secure major victories in the cause of Negro freedom. Such victories will help rout anti-Negro racism from our national life, thereby creating the conditions and arraying the allied forces for opening wide the doors to great new initiatives of struggle to advance, under the leadership of the working class, along the whole social frontier.

By J

It is
accom
philos
"realis
of gr
sional
not b
(Lord
is the
East
that E
ing c
role o
imper
This
cussion
ical c
new o
of del
tracti
decisi
and
them
Obser

Anglo-American Imperialism: An Unequal Partnership

By John Williamson

From London, we are happy to bring our readers this analysis of some of the fundamentals behind Mr. Dulles' numerous and hasty trips. The author will be well known to many readers: a member of the National Committee of the CPUSA, John Williamson was among the original victims of the Smith Act. After serving his sentence he was subjected to deportation, and for some years he, and his family, have been living—and battling for Socialism—in England. With the increasing exposure of the fraud of Smith Act prosecution, it is to be hoped that the Williamsons will soon find it possible to return to our—and their—country.—Ed.

IT IS NOT WITHOUT great difficulty—accompanied by a combination of philosophical reference to Britain's "realism" and "traditional" residue of greatness," together with occasional shrill outcries that "We will not be bullied . . . or sermonized" (Lord Hailsham) and that the U.S. is the "prime enemy" in the Middle East (Mr. Paul Williams, M.P.)—that British Imperialism and its ruling class adjusts itself to its new role of junior partner of American imperialism.

This is a constant subject of discussion and debate in British political circles and in the press. Each new crisis brings forward a torrent of debate but at the end, after extracting some small concessions, the decisive forces of British imperialism and their Tory spokesmen adopt themselves to U.S. domination. The *Observer* tries to be "realistic" and

declares editorially: "This reduction of Britain to the ranks of the secondary Powers has been evident for a long time," and it is necessary to recognize we are not "the leading Power, able to decide policy on our own and demand that others should follow our lead" in the spheres of the Atlantic community, the European family, the U.N. and even the British Commonwealth.

At the height of the Suez crisis, the Beaverbrook *Evening Standard*, in fright and panic declared: "Day by day the tide of anti-American feeling gathers force in Britain." According to the same editorial, "Underlying these attacks is the feeling that Britain has been let down by the U.S.," and that now was "a time for realism and a fresh appraisal of the Atlantic alliance."

The *Daily Telegraph*, close to the Foreign Office, recently published

a 16-page supplement on the United States with the aim of "Know your Friends." In explaining the reasons for issuing it, one reads, "that recent years have been marked by worsening Anglo-American relations" and that at long last a "sense of realism should be permeating our attitude to the U.S." This is explained as Britain being "forced" to look at America "not with the superficial toleration of a friendly neighbor, but as someone who is now sharing the same house—and living in the best rooms as well."

The latest aggressive moves of the U.S. in relation to Syria and the Middle East—following on its declaration during Suez that British influence "is now in ruins" and that "a reassessment of British foreign policy" was needed—finds *The Times* accompanying its criticism of the Soviet Union, with a declaration that "the tone and attitude of American dealings in the near Middle East have at times been vigorous to the point of being provocative."

The "old Lady of Threadneedle Street" with her usual pomposity then asks:

Must Britain's part in this rivalry of the giants be merely to follow passively in the wake of an American policy which to many British eyes must seem clumsily directed and which might at times tread British interests inadvertently underfoot?

Added to the constant worries of British imperialism is the fear that West Germany might replace Britain as the junior partner in the cap-

italist world leadership. This fear has been enhanced as the pound has been subject to great pressure from the West German mark, and there is constant talk of devaluing the pound. During August the British gold and dollar reserves fell by \$225 millions. In addition there was a deficit of £63½ millions with the European Payments Union.

The *Observer* of September 8, while declaring that "devaluation is certainly not a suitable policy," says the real situation is worse and "has been camouflaged" by various transactions and "the truth is that sterling is now in a chronically weak position."

In their desperation at the continuing crisis of British imperialism, the Tories make concessions after concession to Wall Street and Washington. The Eisenhower Doctrine in the Middle East means the U.S. takes over Britain's imperialist position in that area, while safeguarding its own investments there (now at 58% compared to Britain's 31%, in contrast to a pre-war ratio of 30% and 58% respectively).

Likewise the Tories reorganize their military forces based on atomic weapons supplied by the U.S. and thus increase Britain's subservience. On every front, with momentary British resistance and hesitations, U.S. imperialism calls the tune and strengthens its position at the expense of Britain. These actions generally keep the cold war "heated up," and in some cases they adventurously play with actual war, while further undermining Britain's

national independence and the economic position of the British workers at home. That is why the British Communist Party Congress this year declared:

The Tories are making a desperate effort to save British imperialism. But because their class interests conflict with the national interests of Britain, they are bringing the country to the verge of ruin.

* * *

Accompanying all these developments, U.S. imperialism is systematically penetrating Britain and interfering in its affairs. Some of the more superficial and irritating expressions of this—such as American army installations being close to the large cities and large numbers of U.S. military personnel walking around in uniform—have ceased. However, American films still constitute over 80% of those shown, and Coca Cola, Esso, Kellogg and Ford ads appear as numerous as in their country of origin.

More fundamental however is the U.S. political and economic penetration and domination, with its accompanying effects on cultural, racial and security aspects of British life.

The Bermuda Conference decisions and the subsequent Defense Minister Sandy's 5-year plan of military reorganization predicated on the false assumption of nuclear deterrence, all emphasize further the role of the British Isles as one of America's overseas atomic and rocket bases. This not only seals Britain's subservience to the U.S. but

means that tens of thousands of American troops will continue to be quartered here, with an accompanying outlay by Britain of tens of millions of pounds towards maintaining them.

Early this year, Mr. Macmillan declared in the House of Commons that the "agreement for the stationing of U.S. troops in this country provides that they will remain so long as . . . their presence in the U.S. is desirable. . . ." The fact that he added "the use of bases by these forces in an emergency would be a matter for joint decision at the time by H. M. Government and the U.S. Government" is of little comfort to anybody.

The arrogance with which U.S. military leaders refer to this, show who is "boss." General McAuliffe, Commander of U.S. forces in Europe, said in London last year: "You can take it that American Air Force units anyway are here for good."

It is difficult to obtain figures about the cost to Britain of U.S. troops. Up to 1954 it was in the region of £203½ million, of which Britain paid 40%, plus giving the land for the bases rent free.

A U.S. House of Representatives report in 1954 showed that the U.S. would provide £98 million in cash and nearly £8 million in military labor force, for the U.S. bases in Britain, while Britain would provide £22 million in cash, over £74 millions worth of facilities, plus the necessary land and the use of a 400-mile pipeline built during the war at a cost of £28 million.

One effect on British life has to do with housing. In June, 1956 Macmillan, in answer to a question, said:

We have agreed with the U.S. Government . . . on a transaction involving \$12 million worth of tobacco for sterling. . . . The U.S. for their part undertake to provide housing for U.S. Service personnel and their families . . . providing for up to 1000 houses, possibly with some communal facilities, in addition to the 1500 houses being built under previous arrangements.

The same Tories have since adopted a vicious Rent Act authorizing rent increases and decontrol of houses while enforcing a decrease in the number of new houses being built for British people to live in.

Economically the U.S. continues its penetration at the expense of British firms at home and abroad. The resistance is broken down by allowing British participation so that they get a share of the profits. Closely allied to this is the subordination of Britain to U.S. cold war policies, with its consequent diversion of industry to armaments production and of army manpower from industries that could be producing for export purposes. Another consequence of subordination to U.S. cold-war policies is that Britain spends more than any other European power per capita on its defense program.

While Britain spends 9.3% of its national income on defense, this compares with France (7.8%), Germany (5.3%), Italy (4.7%), Holland (6.5%) and Belgium (4%). Fur-

thermore, Britain produces £500 millions of goods for the defense forces. If this was switched to production for export purposes it would ease Britain's economic situation.

Similarly, a cut in the Call-Up to one year's service would mean releasing between 250,000 and 300,000 men for industry and adding at least £200 million to the national product. While the Tories talk of abolition of the Call-Up this is predicated on sufficient volunteers which so far are not forthcoming. The "abolition" promise may prove to be a swindle before long.

Britain is further handicapped by American interference in its trade with the Socialist world. During the last year in particular there has been a mounting pressure from both employers and trade unions to abolish the trade embargoes that have been decided upon by the legislative bodies of a government 5,000 miles away from the "Mother of Parliaments."

Finally this summer, Britain defied the U.S. on China and substantially reduced the scope of the embargo. The Conservative *Daily Telegraph* said "The time has come when Britain should agree to differ from the U.S. on this question," while the *Daily Herald* asserted: "Britain lives by world trade and has every right to decide for herself what she will sell and to whom. It is time we not only asserted that but did it." Exports of British manufactures to China during the first seven months of 1957 have increased by 25% in value, compared with the corresponding months of a year ago.

However, the continued operation of the Battle Act results in the £1,000 million order that the Soviet Union was ready to place here, being sharply limited. This order ranged from complete rolling mills and dry docks to razor blades. While two-thirds of the items in this order are embargo-free, there will be far less than two-thirds in value of orders finally realized. This is because many embargo-free items have small pieces of embargoed items in them, e.g., electronic controls. Without the completed item, the rest is valueless and consequently the entire item is cancelled.

American interference with British trade is one of the sharpest issues, but in this as in all other things, British capitalism squirms and protests, but so far fails to adopt an independent policy.

Full data on direct U.S. investment in Britain are hard to ascertain. Sir Edward Boyle, economic secretary to the Treasury, said in the House of Commons in 1955 that in 1953 it amounted to £400 million. The *Daily Telegraph* in July 1957 said that by 1955 it had increased to £500 million. It is estimated that there are at least 700 American companies in Britain. The greater part of American investment in Britain since the war—80%—has been in Scotland, where wages are cheaper than in England.

The perspective is for a continuation of this investment. The Director of the Association for the Development of Industry in Lancashire said last year that in 1954 and 1956

Britain had received many representatives of American firms studying on-the-spot possibilities of opening branch firms. The presidents of both General Motors and Ford said that in the next five years they intended to increase their investments in Britain by £100 million.

The main source of private U.S. investment in Britain is the surplus value already extracted from British workers. Between 1946 and 1953, two-thirds of the U.S. investment were from profits of earlier invested capital. The profits of American firms in Britain are approximately \$150 million annually of which \$75 million is returned to the U.S., while the remainder is used for increasing fixed capital and other payments. In the first nine post-war years, U.S. companies received net profits, after taxation, of about \$1,300 million, of which \$650 million was returned to the U.S.

At the end of 1953 no less than 48% of all American investments in Western Europe were in Britain. The average rate of return on U.S. capital in Britain was 16½% compared with 13% for all U.S. overseas investments together.

One of the important aspects of U.S. investment in Britain is the ability to exploit the sterling bloc market from which direct U.S. exports are excluded. They are able to use the advantages of imperial preference and the accompanying currency advantages in direct competition with what was formerly overwhelming British manufactures.

Through these American subsidi-

aries in Britain, U.S. capitalism is able to pour into such countries as South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, etc., their manufactured goods. In some cases these British factories can provide exports to the U.S. cheaper even after tariff and transportation costs. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, "some 25% of the total exports to the U.S. from foreign countries is produced by U.S. direct investment abroad."

Already in 1953, of the 700 American firms in Britain, 17 of them owned 46% of the total capital invested. There is no reason to believe that this process has declined in the ensuing years.

A further examination indicates that in the production of the following products the U.S. controlled companies in Britain had the following share in United Kingdom production in 1954:

Machine Construction

Tractors and other Agricultural Machinery	55%
Tractors for road building	50%
Refrigerators	60% x
Industrial instruments	60% x
Calculating machines, typewriters, etc.	50%

Other branches

Grinding equipment	40%
Oil refining	35%
Plastic materials	45%
Antibiotics	60% x
Carbon black	70% x

x Key British firms are producing on an American license.

U.S. companies in Britain are controlled in various ways. Many have a majority of British directors and some are apparently "all British," but are nevertheless U.S. controlled or influenced.

American controlled firms include:

Motors:

Fords, Briggs Body, Kelsey Hayes, Lockheed, Vauxhall and Bedford Motors (G.M.); Ford and Vauxhall account for two out of every five cars

and lorries produced in the U.K.

Electrical Engineering:

Monsanto and Bakelite (Union Carbide).

Soaps and Detergents:

Hedleys (Proctor & Gamble) and Colgate-Palmolive.

Miscellaneous:

Kodak, Hoover, Singers, Woolworths, Gillette, Rem-Rand, Standard Telephones, Waygood-Otis, Frigidaire (G.M.), Heinz, National Cash Register, Caterpillar Tractor, Addresso-

graph-Multigraph, Burroughs, United Shoe Machinery.

U.S. controlled companies also account for two-thirds of detergents and one-third of the gasoline sold in Britain. Esso is the leading oil company and has just built the largest refinery in Britain at Fawley.

Another by-product of this, to which the workers and unions are alert, is the introduction of American speed-up systems and a "get tough" handling of trade unions and shop committees as was experienced earlier this year at Fords and Briggs.

* * *

In addition to these major aspects of the political and economic penetration and interference in the life and affairs of the British nation and people—and to which the bourgeois and their Tory spokesmen subordinate themselves, however uncomfortably—this American influence has other negative expressions.

American influence in cultural life—films, television, comics and magazines—is growing steadily. In only one aspect of this development, comics, was the proportion of the protest such as to eliminate the worst of them. However, on the TV you can find more than a dozen American shows each week, while a score of other American programs have been adapted, such as the 64,000 Shilling Question.

The British film industry has suffered severe blows at the hands of Hollywood. The *Daily Telegraph* in July of this year wrote that "everywhere outside the Iron Curtain, the cinema's wares are largely

or predominantly American."

The British Government signed an agreement which provides for a 30% quota of British films to be shown in the United Kingdom. However, by 1956, U.S. money was also behind one-third of these quota films. The Trade Union of the movie and television workers has carried on a consistent fight against U.S. replacement of the British film industry. To protect British workers the Union insists that on "quota films" American companies taking over British studios must employ 90% British personnel. In June 1957 the Union successfully served notice of a complete ban on American companies if they did not stop violating this 10% agreement.

There is intense resentment at this double Yankee invasion of the film and television industry. By using British studios, the U.S. companies not only qualify for the already limited British quota of 30%, but also get a share of the "easy money" from the government-financed British Film Production Fund.

While in Britain there is no comparable condition of discrimination against colored people, and no Jim Crow areas or segregation, the ever-constant presence of U.S. troops here contributes towards racist anti-Negro attitudes. These particularly find expression in hostility of white soldiers to the free social intermingling of Negro soldiers and British girls.

Likewise the Tory subservience and dependence on U.S. imperialism results in the U.S. Government pressing for the McCarthy type of so-

Ameri-
f them
dital in-
believe
l in the

ndicates
follow-
ntrolled
follow-
om pro-

0%
0%
0% x
0% x
0%

0%
0%
0%
0% x
0% x
0%

U.K.

ion Car-

and Col-

Wool-
Standard
rigidaire
h Regis-
Addresso-

called security measures affecting civil servants and ordinance workers. Mr. Stanley Mayne, leader of the Institution of Professional Civil Servants, charges that in one respect the situation is worse than in the U.S. He writes that a "major defeat" in the system "is the refusal to allow the person charged to be accompanied at interviews by either a trade union official or a legal adviser." Bad as it is, those who have been removed are transferred to other government employment—much different than in the U.S.

Last year a minor scandal developed when the U.S. Embassy in London instructed Dr. Edward Ackerman, assistant general manager of TVA, to withdraw as a participant in the International Conference on Regional Planning and Development because the Home Office issued a last minute warning about the alleged "undesirable political affiliations" of some of the organizers. To his credit, Dr. Ackerman insisted upon delivering his paper and then withdrew. However, some 60 delegates did withdraw. The *Observer* called it "the first cause celebre of a British version of McCarthyism," while characterizing the conference as a "bona fide professional body with no ulterior political aims, no security risks, and no greater participation of fellow travelling Leftists than can normally be expected."

The U.S. Embassy and Consulates have an extensive information ser-

vice, with special material on American trade unions. A special effort is made to influence British trade unionists by building up a large mailing list, by inviting hand-picked delegations of trade unionists to visit the U.S. and in bringing here constantly delegations of American trade-union officials who are given an extensive itinerary.

The concern in American ruling class circles about influencing Britain through systematic interference came to light when the curtain was lifted a wee bit before the House Appropriations Committee last year. The *London Star* quotes Mr. Theodore Striebert, director of Voice of America, asking for £17,800 which "they plan to spend on pamphlets to be distributed in England" on the subject of Eisenhower's inspection plan. If this much is spent on one single issue, how much money is appropriated to interfere in the affairs of the British people the year round?

U.S. interference in the affairs of the British people and nation is contrary to their self-interest. The Tory Government's continued capitulation to U.S. imperialism enables it to strengthen its position at the expense of Britain. The Congress of the British Communist Party this spring correctly emphasized that Tory policy "increases Britain's political and military dependence on the U.S. and this . . . still further endangers Britain's national independence."

FROM
mon
dred
birth
Mini
wort
temp
in o
great
Unit

I'm
me
uncor
woul
even

My
they
the n
a sw
daugh
when
door
in my

We
licked
are n
certain
holdin
with

WI
were
neigh
see o
thing
I thin
they

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

FROM HIS HOSPITAL BED, in the ninth month of the one thousand nine hundred and fifty-seventh year after the birth of Jesus Christ, a Protestant Minister, the Rev. F. L. Shuttlesworth, having been beaten for attempting to lead children to school in one of the States forming that great bastion of the Free World, the United States of America, speaks:

I'm not angry at the men who beat me. I'm even sorry in a way that I unconsciously struck back at those who would have killed me. I'm not angry even now. But I am determined. . . .

My wife got out of the car when they were beating me up, and one of the men slashed her on the hip with a switchblade knife. My youngest daughter's ankle was almost broken when one of them slammed the car door on her leg. They took five stitches in my wife's hip. . . .

We may be beaten but we are not licked. We may be wounded but we are not dead. We may be down, but certainly not out. We're going to keep holding our heads up and press on with this fight. . . .

When we got to the school, there were only a few policemen in the neighborhood. And as far as I could see only one of them tried to do anything to keep me from being killed. I think I almost fainted twice when they were knocking me down. They

hit me in the ear with a steel chain that had a ball on it. They kicked me in the back and really hurt my kidneys.

I think I almost passed out when I was down that last time. But something within me—it must have been God—said: "Get up," and I got up. It was then that I struck back; that I fought my way through them and back to the car.

The children were the real heroes. They were ready to go back today in spite of all that happened. But we must plan our next step. And whatever it is, the children will be ready.

The President of the Bastion of the Free World, interrupts his golfing at an exclusive* country club long enough to urge "patience" from those who want an end to Jim Crow; the *New York Times* (Sept. 18, 1957) in an editorial entitled, "Slow But Deliberate" says the supporters of racism are yielding, but that: "The yielding will be slow and it cannot be hurried. But sooner or later they will yield."

Why must the yielding be slow? Why can it not be hurried? What is the virtue of patience, when one is patient with unspeakable evil? How slow is slow and how much

* In the American language, "exclusive" in this context means that only white, rich, non-Jews are welcomed, and preferably non-Catholic.

patience makes one patient?

The American Negro people have been slandered and starved and beaten, humiliated, underpaid and spat upon for over three hundred years. Is this not long enough? Freedom was legally promised the Negro people ninety-two years ago; has its denial not been postponed long enough? Full citizenship rights were legally guaranteed ninety years ago; has the failure to implement this lasted long enough? Complete enfranchisement of the Negro was constitutionally provided eighty-seven years ago; has the defiance of the Constitution not yet exhausted our patience? And it is already more than three years that the Supreme Court of the United States agreed that jim crow schools represented a denial of constitutional guarantees going back almost a century and were in fact an extension of a people's special oppression that went back over three hundred years.

Furthermore, whatever advances have been made by the Negro people in the United States have come as the result not of patience and moderation—which are synonyms for passivity and inaction—but of passionate resistance and heroic struggle. That is the indubitable historical record. The Negro people know that truth in their bones and they are acting upon that truth.

Other truths are not so well known, but they need constant reiteration. The Negro's oppression dilutes the white's freedom and well-

being; its maintenance requires the vitiating of the white's freedoms. The advances of the Negro people have been commensurate with the degree of Negro-white unity achieved. The advances made by the Negro people have been hallmarks of the general democratic advance made in our country. Negro-white unity *has* existed in the past in this country; and it has reached notable dimensions *inside the South* several times in the past.

It is the degree of success of Negro-white unity, especially in the South in the past, which terrifies the rulers of this country and of that section. It is the mounting blows which the whole edifice of white supremacy has received within our own country which terrifies the Bourbon. The South has been divided not only in terms of Negro and white, but also in terms of rich and poor, exploited and exploiters. Racism as the trump card of the exploiters is less effective now than it has ever been in Southern history; more and more its postulates in the fields of history, psychology, anthropology, biology have been successfully refuted and that refutation has influenced increasing numbers of Southern white people, especially the younger among them.

Now as the system of jim crow is set up for a series of devastating blows—coming as the result of national and international popular struggles—the ruling class in the United States seeks to divert, con-

fuse
equi
T
pati
are
and
The
of t
its v
scale
impl
tion
ence
for
a re
the
and
ever
Th
is th
more
the
less
less
roker
and
of th
force
Th
when
made
ous
noun
have
Presi
fitted
that
widel
possib
in mi
But

fuse, frighten, delay the battlers for equality.

The cries for deliberation and for patience that come from high places are cues for resistance to the law, and for the organization of violence. The fact is that if the Government of the United States would throw its weight and its influence into the scales against further delay in the implementation of an anti-segregation program, would call for obedience to law instead of urging patience for law-breakers, we would witness a real undercutting of segregation, a thorough extension of the suffrage and a profound democratization of every aspect of national life.

The more completely that weight is thrown into the balance and the more thoroughly it seeks to destroy the whole system of jim crow—the less it encourages "moderation," the less it appears to be satisfied with token compliance—the more easily and effectively will the Constitution of the United States be really enforced.

The historical record shows that whenever constituted authority has made perfectly clear that it is serious in its anti-segregationist pronouncements, those pronouncements have come alive in actual practice. President Eisenhower is peculiarly fitted to testify to that. He knows that during World War II, it was widely insisted that it would be impossible to integrate officer training in military camps within the South. But he knows that such integration

was carried out in artillery and infantry and engineer schools within Oklahoma, Georgia and Virginia. He knows that tens of thousands of Negro and white men, from every state in the Union, trained and studied and lived together for months; he knows that while the complaints were numerous in the beginning and threats were not absent, the complaints died down and the threats did not materialize when it became clear that the United States Government meant business and needed officers in a hurry and was not going to let jim crow interfere with getting them.

General Eisenhower was the Supreme Commander who, faced by the German advance threatening Antwerp in 1944, and needing thousands of replacements quickly, adopted the proposal to integrate Negro troops within several divisions then holding the lines in France and Belgium. He knows that Army investigators reported that most of the white troops and officers in those divisions said they would rather throw down their guns than fight with Negroes. But he knows, too, that in the face of the desperate need, Negro troops were called upon to volunteer for combat, that thousands of them did, that they fought magnificently within white divisions, and that not a white soldier carried out the threats of desertion. They did not carry out the threats because it was made perfectly clear to them that if they did they would

face the sternest punishment by the United States. And General Eisenhower knows that white and Negro fought together in the weeks of the Battle of the Bulge, side by side; and that when it was over the same white men who had said they would rather throw down their rifles than fight with Negro comrades, now with unanimity said that they wanted their divisions to remain Negro-white outfits, and so to be worthy of the titles of fighters against tyranny.

If one says: "But that was wartime and the emergency was pressing," I reply that this is freedom-time and the emergency is quite as pressing. I reply, too, that token action, hesitant and transient, serves to encourage racists, not end segregation; moreover, the calls for violence by the segregationists are becoming ever bolder and more disgusting.* I reply, too, that sixteen million people are united in their resolve to be no longer denied equality and dignity; and that increasing millions of white people, including Southerners—are tired of being cheated of good schools for themselves and free speech for them-

* For example, at a public meeting attended by 15,000, held in 1956 in Montgomery, Alabama, and addressed by Senators, Mayors, Attorneys General, and other officials, thousands of copies of a printed leaflet were distributed, saying: "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary to abolish the Negro race, proper methods should be used. Among these are guns, bows and arrows, sling shots and knives. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all whites are created equal with certain rights; among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of dead niggers"—and more of the same filth. This is in J. B. Martin's *The Deep South Says Never* (Ballantine Books, N. Y., 35c), p. 39.

selves and democratic political parties for themselves; are tired of paying for jim crow in lower wages for themselves, in less effective trade unions for themselves; millions of white Americans are sick and tired of being ashamed of their country because of the existence of a damnable jim-crow system.

* * *

If the President urges patience in the face of violent defiance of law and decency within the United States, his Administration manifests remarkable impatience when it comes to Hungary. The United States Government insisted in the winter of 1956 upon the creation at once of a United Nations Committee to investigate the Hungarian uprising; it was most prompt, not to say precipitate, in endorsing that Committee's Report issued in June, 1957. It could not wait for the reassembling of the normal session of the UN General Assembly but pressed for a special session whose sole business was to be this Report. At that session, concluded this September, the United States was foremost in demanding acceptance of the Report, and showed no concern over moderation in the language with which its own delegation discussed the Hungarian events.

Let us recapitulate a bit and see what it is that has just been endorsed by such freedom fighters as the rulers of Guatemala, Cuba, Colombia, Venezuela, Taiwan—not to speak of

Her
Bro
T
Un
app
nati
dipl
ject
gari
vest
Hun
natu
the
givi
to e
desp
eral
mitt
quir
T
ing
hun
had
upri
were
don,
T
1957
Aust
mitt
the
So
in te
just
dign
it w
timin
cause
T
vale

Henry Cabot Lodge and the Dulles Brothers.

The "Free World" bloc in the United Nations, in January, 1957, appointed a Committee from five nations, chaired by an Australian diplomat, to make "a full and objective investigation" of the Hungarian events and "to base its investigation on direct observation in Hungary." The manifestly hostile nature of the proceeding precluded the Hungarian Government from giving this Committee permission to enter its territory. Nevertheless, despite the requirement of the General Assembly resolution, the Committee went forward with its inquiry.

The Committee did this by spending five months interviewing one hundred and eleven individuals who had fled Hungary after the armed uprising had failed; these individuals were questioned in New York, London, Geneva, Vienna and Rome.

The *New York Times*, June 21, 1957, reported an interview with the Australian chairman of this Committee of Inquiry, explaining how the story was put together:

Sometimes the missing bit was given in testimony by a chauffeur who had just happened to drive a Hungarian dignitary to a certain spot. Sometimes it was a valet who remembered the timing of an historic event simply because he was in the room serving tea.

This may be called the "chauffeur-valet" theory of historical method-

ology. It is beneath contempt from the viewpoint of scientific investigation; it is peculiarly appropriate for the whole conception and purpose of this Committee of Infamy.

The Report contains 150,000 words. The *New York Times*, of cited date, said that the Chairman of the Committee "drew three broad conclusions from its exhaustive inquiry." In the words of that newspaper, these conclusions were:

1. The Soviet Union intervened by force in Hungary to crush a popular uprising and, in the second instance, to overthrow a legal and popularly supported government.

2. The uprising of the Hungarians was a spontaneous demonstration and not assisted from the outside. It was not an attempt to restore the old pre-war form of government, an allusion to the Soviet contention that the uprising was a counter-revolution aimed at restoring to power capitalists and landlords.

3. The Kadar Government did not at the time of its installation and does not now have popular support and the Soviet military command in fact administered the country for some time after the Kadar Government was formed November 4.

In every instance the truth is more or less exactly the opposite of the assertions of this Committee. The resort to violence on October 23, 1956 was the work of a minute minority from among the 150,000 Hungarians peacefully demonstrating in Budapest in recognition of and in

furtherance of a process of the purification of the socialist system of their country. At no time were more than a few thousand Hungarians actually participating in armed rebellion; in terms of the nine millions in the country, an infinitesimal fraction of the nation resorted to violence.

The first Soviet intervention—very partial, lasting three days, and confined to Budapest—came as a direct result of the request of the legally-constituted authorities of Hungary, and was offered in full accordance with the requirements of the treaty ending Soviet-Hungarian hostilities after World War II, and of the Warsaw Pact.

The second Soviet intervention, starting November 4, did not come in order to overthrow a legal and popularly supported government. The fact is that by November 1, increasing anarchy prevailed in Hungary, widespread White Terror was appearing, dozens of villages were besmirched by pogroms, and effective central authority in Budapest was disintegrating. This second intervention made possible the termination of anarchy and mass lynchings, prevented a full-scale repetition of the kind of general White Terror that took tens of thousands of lives under Horthy and the Allies from 1919 to 1921 and was followed by 24 years of fascism, and may very well have staved off the outbreak of general war in Europe.

The resort to arms beginning Oc-

tober 23 most certainly was not a "spontaneous demonstration" and as certainly was "assisted from the outside." The most careful distinction must be made between the really popular and mass character of the demonstration on that day, and the resort to arms by a small segment of the demonstrators.

Those who first resorted to arms had been prepared for their role long beforehand. They wore similar identification bands, they carried small arms and were trained in their use, they had carefully selected objectives (a motor park, a radio station, a newspaper office, the Party headquarters, etc.) and carried out their missions with military precision explicable only on the basis of trained veterans carrying out clearly conceived plans. This resort to arms was supported with money and guidance from the outside—especially by the United States Government and its Intelligence Services, in active cooperation with similar services of other Western countries, particularly the notorious Gehlen organization of West Germany. Hungarian fascist veterans, of the Arrow Cross Party and the Szalasi army, poured into Hungary from all of Western Europe, and some even came, as they have boasted in print, from the United States. This does not mean that all who at any time took up arms during the Hungarian uprising were of this calibre or political orientation; many were not, and were moved by genuine griev-

ance
the
derst
and
lead
attac
and
the e

TH
arme
torat
ism,
ticip
had
Hun
were
gand
anti-
gary,
char,
the
Sere
way,
dred
fore
in 10

TH
move
even
can
whor
garia
mode
of th
pro-r
tiona
fasci
man
lande
Chur
of th

ances and by sincere devotion to the needs of Socialism as they understood them. But the organizers and the precipitators and the main leaders and bulwark of the *armed* attacks were counter-revolutionary, and many were directly working for the agencies named above.

The effective leadership of the armed uprising did aim at the restoration of capitalism and landlordism, and many of its outstanding participants were actually figures who had played important roles in fascist Hungary. Among these, for example, were the man in charge of propaganda for the ultra-reactionary and anti-Semitic Szalasi regime in Hungary, Odon Malnasi, and the man in charge of Szalasi's Department for the Extermination of Jews, Moklos Serenyi—which Department, by the way, did exterminate several hundred thousand Jews in the weeks before the Red Army freed Budapest in 1945.

The armed uprising actually moved "too far to the Right too fast" even for some officials of the American Embassy in Budapest, certain of whom tried to prevail on the Hungarian leaders after October 31, to moderate the public pronouncements of their anti-Socialist, anti-Soviet and pro-reactionary aims. Ultra-reactionary parties, which had ruled in fascist Hungary, reappeared and demanded the restoration of the landed estates, the reinstatement of Church-State unity, the elimination of the secularization of the schools,

etc. The leading figure groomed to take over actual control was Cardinal Mindzsenty—a medievalist in outlook, who, in 1948, told the *New Statesman and Nation* correspondent that "Charles Darwin was a dangerous heretic who should have been burned at the stake." By November 3, the Cardinal was publicly calling for the return of the lands to the Church, the return of education into the Church's hands, the destruction of Socialism, and in fact, a return to all the splendid "freedoms" identified with the name of Admiral Horthy.

The "assistance" from the outside did not end with millions of dollars nor with continual calls for violence from the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, nor with actual military-tactical instructions coming from other radios outside Hungary. It did not end with the distribution of thousands of leaflets in the Russian language in Hungary calling upon the Soviet troops to mutiny, which leaflets had been printed earlier in Italy. This "assistance," this intervention, was a clearly formulated policy of Anglo-American imperialism, which pursued it actively ever since 1944. It was, indeed, a policy institutionalized in legislation still in effect in the United States, as the Lodge Act for the recruiting of a fascist-minded Foreign Legion, the Kersten Amendment to the Mutual Security Act appropriating millions every year for the declared purpose

of subversion in the lands of Socialism, and the Central Intelligence Agency with its billions of dollars, scores of thousands of employees, and its aim of destroying Socialism.

The Kadar Government came into being in the course of struggle against Rakosite repression, aberration and illegality, on the one side, and against fascist, war-inciting restorationism on the other. It was the only force within Hungary having sufficient coherence, will and organization—and a program—to terminate the anarchy, eliminate the danger of successful counter-revolution from within, repair the damage to the nation, preserve Socialism, and press forward the process of purifying Socialism that had been going on in Hungary ever since 1953, and had made notable, though still quite insufficient, progress by October, 1956.

The vast majority of Hungarians do not want the factories returned to the bosses (most of whom had not been Hungarians, by the way); they do not want the land returned to the magnates and bishops; they do not want the educational system to return to the backwardness of the Church hierarchy; they do not want Hungary as the outpost of the "Free World" pointing like a dagger into the USSR and the East European socialist countries, in a world refrozen into a Cold War. The Kadar Government is pledged to prevent all this, and whatever may be the hostility and suspicion that remains, and the changes and renova-

tions that still need completion, that Government is certainly closer to the desires of the Hungarian people than are the purposes and aims of Messrs. Dulles and Lodge.

The UN Committee Chairman in summarizing the findings refers to "the Soviet contention that the uprising was a counter-revolution aimed at restoring to power capitalists and landowners." This contention is by no means confined to the Soviet Union; it is held by practically every Communist Party in the world, from China to Poland to Italy, from India to France to England. It is also the contention of a number of Socialist and Social-Democratic leaders and organs throughout the world, including the United States, England, West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Chile, Indonesia, and elsewhere. These, in the main, stressed the danger of a fascist revival in Hungary and the threat there to Socialism and, above all, to world peace.

In rejecting the falsehoods contained in the Report of the UN Committee of Inquiry, now just again "reconfirmed" by the General Assembly's condemnatory action of September, 1957, there is no intent on my part to minimize, let alone deny, the grave mistakes and grievous malpractices of the Communist Parties in both Hungary and in the USSR, which led to serious errors of judgment and practice, gross violations of legality, insensitivity to national sentiment, and inequality in

inter
ist P
cons
degr
isted
out
rialis
wou
In r
ther
igno
of t
Part
tituc
the
requ
and
ism.
In
men
the
attem
worl
purp
viks
of t
Russ
an
men
by t
true
histo
pudi
but
know
forg
In
cil c
secu
dom
pers

international relations among socialist powers. These were of decisive consequence in explaining the large degree of mass discontent that existed in the New Hungary, without which the basic drive of imperialism to induce counter-revolution would have fallen short altogether. In rejecting these falsehoods, also, there is no intent to minimize or ignore the very knotty questions of theory and practice—involving Party organization, bureaucracy, attitude toward religion, functions of the State, and other problems which require the most thorough study and challenge adherents of Socialism.

In 1918 the U.S. State Department was responsible for fabricating the notorious Sisson documents and attempting to foist these upon the world as authentic. The documents purported to prove that the Bolsheviks in Russia were really agents of the Kaiser, and that the whole Russian Socialist Revolution was thus an alien imposition. These documents were vouched for repeatedly by the Government and certified as true by distinguished professors of history; they have never been repudiated by the U.S. Government, but the entire world of scholarship knows today that they are as crude forgeries as the Protocols of Zion.

In 1919 the Allied Supreme Council charged the Horthy regime with securing to all Hungarians full freedom in all respects. When reports persisted that the Horthy govern-

ment was remiss in carrying out this charge, inquiry was made of the Inter-Allied Military Mission in Budapest, and it reported in March, 1920: "There is nothing in the nature of a terror in Hungary"; the British member of that Mission went out of his way to add personally that Admiral Horthy was "a strong character, a man of liberal tendencies, whose government was a Christian one in a Christian country." The Mission in general and its British member in particular, were falsifiers and while they falsified, thousands of Communists, Socialists, democrats, Jews—men, women, and children—were being slaughtered.

The imperialist powers foisted these forgeries upon the world because they hate and fear Socialism and because they want human exploitation and colonialism to endure forever, for they fatten on it and secure power from it. The UN Committee of Inquiry Report on Hungary is a forgery of a piece with these predecessors. Its aims are basically the same as these earlier efforts; but specifically in our time, the concocters of this mockery of truth seek to intensify international tensions, confuse world opinion (especially American opinion), obscure their own bestialities in Mississippi and Cuba and Guatemala and Colombia and Taiwan and Kenya and Algeria, and thwart promising efforts for disarmament. They want to undercut the mounting popular demand for peaceful co-existence.

* * *

Momentous have been recent decisions by Federal courts in connection with prosecutions of Communists under the conspiracy section of the notorious Smith Act. In June, the Supreme Court reversed the convictions of Party leaders in California and directed the acquittal of several; now in September, a Federal Judge has dismissed the indictments in the prolonged Pennsylvania litigation, and the Court of Appeals in Connecticut, by a vote of 2-1, reversed conviction and directed acquittal.

It is the decision in the Connecticut case which is of the greatest interest for its reasoning was the least technical and the most substantive of all those so far announced. Here was a decision which directly denied the prosecution's case and amounted to a severe condemnation of the Government for having instituted it; yet it is noteworthy—and characteristic—that the press of the United States, with hardly any exceptions, tried its best to ignore the matter. And yet it is exactly this matter which has dominated the pages of that press for the past ten years. So far as I know the only newspaper to publish substantial sections of this historic decision was the *Daily Worker* (Sept. 19).

Where the prosecution charged conspiracy to advocate the forcible overthrow of the U.S. government, the Court found that the record showed "the strongest possible proof

that no such advocacy occurred." Where the prosecution insisted that the essence of Marxism-Leninism was its advocacy of the overthrow of government (and specifically the U.S. government) by violence, the Court found Marxism-Leninism to consist of a vast "body of literature" containing many different, and sometimes apparently contradictory strands of thought. Further, the Court held:

While some strands are so common to all the Marxist literature that they can be equated with it, the notion that force and violence must be used against the Government of the United States is not such a strand.

The Court noted that the Government brought forward witnesses who were informers in its employ and who had been in the Party, but it held that their testimony was not convincing evidence at all of what the Government sought to prove. On the contrary, the Court was satisfied that the defendants' insistence that they did not advocate violence and had in fact specifically denounced such advocacy was true.

On these fundamental grounds, and since the Court could find in the record "nothing even mildly incriminating," it saw no point in a retrial. Hence, reads the Court's conclusion: "We order the district court to enter judgment acquitting all five appellants."

This is a momentous victory for the Communist Party of the United

Sta
fir
Co
fac
pri
low
ph
Co
ran
tic
cat
in
in
siv
ag
Co
to
fea
the
pe
fin
esp
is
of
Irv
an
jus
Ge
dr
wh
T
Co
th
co
th
bu
no
ap
de
ni

States and, once again, history confirms its position. Once again, the Communists who stood firm in the face of prison and the threat of prison, in the face of separation of loved ones, loss of jobs, vilification, physical assaults; once again the Communists who were in the front ranks fighting back against injustice and tyranny have been vindicated. And once again, as so often in the past, the Communists served in fact as a vanguard of all progressive and democratic forces. Once again, as so often in the past, the Communists helped rally those forces to offer indispensable support in defeating reaction's effort to destroy the Bill of Rights and threaten world peace.

Now, in the face of these recent findings by the federal judiciary, and especially the Connecticut decision, is not the continued imprisonment of Gil Green, Henry Winston and Irving Potash shown to be, without any question, a gross violation of justice? Now, is it not clear that the Government should feel obliged to drop all additional indictments, whether under the Smith Act or the Taft-Hartley Act, which seek to jail Communists and others on the hoax that Communism is equivalent to a conspiratorial effort to violently overthrow the U.S. government? Is it not but common decency to demand, now, that the Government publicly apologize for its imprisonment and deportation of scores of Communists under the Smith Act, and that

it make good that apology by returning to them their full civil rights and privileges (as FDR did in the 1930's for those convicted under the Espionage Act during World War I)?

Do not these decisions put additional emphasis upon the atrociousness of the execution of the Rosenbergs? Do they not add up to a directive for the release of Morton Sobell from his tomb in Alcatraz—or, at the very least—to the granting of a retrial for that living martyr to McCarthyism?

* * *

I want to use what remaining space I have this month to call attention to three recent works that are of great importance in understanding the reality of our country today. First, there is the remarkable volume, *The Shaping of American Diplomacy*, edited by Professor William A. Williams of the University of Oregon and published some months ago by Rand McNally (Chicago, \$7.50). This book of over 1,000 oversize pages contains important readings and documents in American foreign relations, from 1750 through 1955, plus the pithy commentary of the editor.

Second, there is the illuminating study of *The American Class Structure*, by Professor Joseph A. Kahl, of Washington University (Rinehart, N. Y., \$6). Here Professor Kahl summarizes and analyzes the considerable literature on the values, standards, features, and motivations of the classes that make up the

American social order—this very matter-of-factly in the midst of all the ballyhoo about our “classless” society and our “people’s capitalism.”

Third, there is the Yearbook Number of *The Journal of Negro Education*, entitled “The Negro Voter in the South” (Howard University, Washington, \$2.50). This volume, of over 200 pages, actually includes more than its title suggests. It not only contains detailed studies by separate authors of the situation in eleven Southern states, but also useful essays on the general position of the Negro voter in the country, studies of his behavior in the Far West and in a border region, and accounts

of the historical and legal background.

I have some points of difference with all these works, and perhaps will have the opportunity of commenting upon some of them in the future; more important, however, is that their existence be known and that their contents be examined.

I would suggest that if one added to these three volumes, the study of *The Power Elite* by C. Wright Mills and the just-published volume by Victor Perlo (reviewed elsewhere in this issue) he would have five indispensable studies of very significant aspects of the United States at the present time.

A QUOTATION FOR “FREE WORLD” INHABITANTS

“It seems to me to be amazing that our eyes have been so blinded to what is going on that we do not realize we are permitting the giant corporations to take over not only the concentrated economic control of the business, but also of the foreign policy, of the United States.”—Senator Joseph C. O’Mahoney (D., Wyo.), speaking to his fellow Senators, Congressional Record, March 1, 1957.

By S

is
pr
et
w
w
LTHE
in an
anno
mun
basic
ence
ties,
them
greet
bers
ties,
is de
the p
still
this
peop
effect
amor
ChinNEW
UNTH
the
this

Multiple Parties in People's China

By Shen Chih-yuan

One of the noteworthy developments in the socialist revolution as it is developing in China, is the existence of a multiple-party form of the proletarian dictatorship. Naturally, this has attracted great interest; in an effort to bring our readers some illumination concerning this question we publish below an article written by an outstanding Chinese economist who is chairman of the Shanghai Committee of the China Democratic League.—Ed.

THERE HAS BEEN widespread interest in and considerable discussion of the announcement by the Chinese Communist Party that it adheres to a basic policy of long-term co-existence with the other democratic parties, and mutual supervision among them. The announcement was greeted with enthusiasm by the members of the various democratic parties, who recognized that this policy is designed to foster the growth of the people's democracy, and give it still greater vitality. Application of this policy undoubtedly will help the people's state to mobilize still more effectively all the positive elements among the various social groups in China for the building of socialism.

NEW APPLICATION OF THE UNITED FRONT

There was nothing fortuitous in the timing of the announcement of this policy. It is based on a political

principle that has been adhered to consistently by the Chinese Communist Party for many years; it is, in fact, a very practical application of the united front policy of the Communist Party in the new historical conditions of today.

Mao Tse-tung, in a speech delivered on November 21, 1941, declared:

Communists must listen open-mindedly to the opinions of people outside the Party and must give them an opportunity to have their say. . . . Communists are in duty bound to cooperate in a democratic spirit with non-Party people and have no right to exclude them or to monopolize everything. . . . This principle of the Communist Party for cooperation in a democratic spirit with non-Party people has been firmly laid down and will never change. So long as parties exist in society, people who join party organizations are always fewer than those who do not, hence our Party members must al-

ways cooperate with non-Party people.*

In his opening address at the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China on September 15, 1956, Chairman Mao Tse-tung said:

Although there are over ten million members in our Party, they still constitute a very small minority of the country's population. In the various organs of state and in public affairs much work has to be done by non-Party people. It is impossible to get the work done well unless we are good at relying upon the masses, and unless we cooperate with non-Party people.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party and Chairman Mao have, in fact, repeatedly emphasized that the Party must unite closely with the masses and put the Party and its every member under the supervision of the masses. This is essential, for the Party is the party of the proletariat, of the working class, and it is not working for its own self-interest but in the service of the people. All its principles and policies are formulated in the interests of the people. This is the basis of the mass line which the Party observes in its work to keep in close touch with the masses and rely on them; to listen open-mindedly to their opinions and accept their supervision so that with the benefit of

their wisdom and strength it can serve the country better.

MY OWN EXPERIENCE

Judging from my experience in the past five years on the Shanghai Committee of the China Democratic League, I feel that the Shanghai Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, through its united front work department, has been most modest in listening to the opinions and suggestions put forward by our democratic parties. I have, for instance, more than once told the Shanghai Committee of the Communist Party that the contacts between some branches of the Party and the Democratic League branches in local universities, research institutes and other cultural organs, were rather weak; that when certain important administrative measures were to be adopted the League branches were not previously consulted by the Party committees; that the style of work of some individual Communists was not all it should be and that they were not working in as democratic a way as they should. On these occasions, the Party organizations concerned immediately investigated and corrected such shortcomings.

I have found that the Party committee invariably shows a full sense of responsibility in dealing with members who have committed mistakes of one kind or another; sometimes those responsible for mistakes

* Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, pp. 26-27 (International Publishers, N. Y., 1956).
—Ed.

are even dismissed from office. On the other hand, if the facts and views we give are found not to be in accordance with the true situation or if our suggestions are found unworkable, a responsible official of the Party invariably gives us a full and acceptable explanation.

This sort of comradely give-and-take is a matter of daily life. Such systematic supervision helps the Communist Party, government departments, enterprises and schools to improve their work consistently. Joint consultation and work also helps the members of the various democratic parties to raise their political level and improve their parties' work.

The organizational principles of our other democratic parties differ from those of the Communist Party. While the Communist Party is the political party of one class, the working class, the other democratic parties are mainly composed of representatives of various other democratic classes and strata (mainly the national bourgeoisie and the upper strata of the petty-bourgeoisie and their intellectuals) other than the working class and the peasants. These parties are much smaller than the Communist Party but they exercise a considerable influence in society. Most of their members are able to represent or influence part of the masses in the social strata with which they are connected or in the various places where they work.

Some of the more prominent

democratic personalities exercise an influence among the masses on a much broader scale. Take, for instance, the Shanghai Committee of the China Democratic League. There are League organizations at eighteen out of the nineteen universities or colleges in Shanghai. The great majority of the members in these branches are presidents, deans of studies, heads of departments or teaching and research groups, professors, assistant professors and lecturers of colleges or universities who are representative of their colleagues and whose opinions are often representative of a very considerable and influential body of public opinion.

Furthermore the membership of these various democratic parties is growing. Their energetic recruitment of members has been encouraged by the policy of the Communist Party and the new conditions resulting from socialist transformation and socialist construction. In 1956 membership of the Democratic League in Shanghai increased by 150 per cent. Such facts illustrate how this policy of long-term co-existence of the Communist Party and the other democratic parties helps to promote democratic life in our country.

CHINA'S PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

The principle of "long-term co-existence and mutual supervision" is of major theoretical and practical

importance. It signifies that during the historical period of socialism China will, over a long period of time, implement a multi-party system to carry out mutual supervision, to supplement and mutually educate the parties, expose shortcomings and correct faults in time, to improve the conduct of state affairs and speed up the tempo of socialist construction. This is another example of the advantages inherent in the Chinese people's democratic system.

We all know that the people's democratic dictatorship in China is in essence the dictatorship of the proletariat. In his *Critique of the Gotha Program* Karl Marx clearly stated that a state which is in the process of transformation from capitalism to socialism can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. The proletarian dictatorship envisaged by Marx is in substance working-class leadership of the state (through the Communist party), suppression of the people's enemies who have been overthrown, the socialist transformation of hundreds of millions of individual peasants, the transformation of small private owners into builders of socialism, the changing of the private ownership of the means of production into socialist ownership and the elimination of capitalism and all other types of exploitation and all class differences. In China today, all these objectives are being gradually realized and we have already scored a victory of a decisive

nature in realizing them. That is why we say that the system of people's democratic dictatorship is in essence the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the Soviet Union the proletarian dictatorship is carried out in the form of a one-party system. But China's historical conditions have determined that it should take a different form with us. Before liberation China was a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country and, with the exception of the landlords and the bureaucrat-capitalists who represented only a small minority of the population, the overwhelming majority of the people of other classes—including the national bourgeoisie—all suffered from oppression by imperialism and feudalism, and therefore had revolutionary demands. During the period of the people's democratic revolution the upper strata of the petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie set up their own political organizations which co-operated with the Communist Party and participated in the democratic revolutionary struggle.

Since liberation they have continued to play a positive part in the economic rehabilitation of the country, in carrying out various democratic reforms and socialist transformation and construction, and also in the struggle that had to be waged against enemies both inside and outside the country and to safeguard world peace. In all these activities they have played an important role

in rallying and mobilizing all the positive forces in the country and also made a useful contribution to mutual supervision among the parties. These are the conditions that have made it both necessary and possible for the proletarian dictatorship in China to adopt a multi-party system based on the leadership of the Communist Party and the principle of long-term co-existence of the various democratic parties.

In the past seven years these parties, prominent non-party democrats and people's organizations, have, through the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (which is composed mainly of people from the various political parties and people's bodies), consulted on and debated the government's administrative program, the Constitution, state policies, laws and plans; they have criticized, inspected and investigated the work of the various government departments and given them suggestions; they have criticized and exposed the shortcomings and mistakes of various officials, and regularly passed on to the government the opinions, demands and suggestions of the people they represent.

Experience shows that all this has been of great help in strengthening the leadership given by the Communist Party and the government, improving the work of government and consolidating the people's democratic dictatorship.

The China Democratic National

Construction Association, for instance, has been of great assistance in helping accomplish the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce—a difficult and complicated process. The China Democratic League and the China San Society have played an equally active part in the remoulding of intellectuals and the application of the Communist Party's policy on and measures affecting intellectuals. During the inquiry into the problems of intellectuals made by the Shanghai Committee of the China Democratic League in the winter of 1955, we held many discussions with university professors, scientists, engineering and technical experts and medical workers, in public meetings and in private talks, and visited many of them in their homes.

In this way we got a detailed picture of the problems faced by intellectuals and were able to present a lengthy report on the subject to the authorities concerned. This gave concrete facts about the way intellectuals were being employed and also dealt with other problems connected with their living conditions and working facilities. It also included many practical suggestions to the leadership of the Party and the government. These were found to be extremely useful and were later used in the drafting of the "Program of Work Among Intellectuals in Shanghai" adopted by the Shanghai Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

The Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference played a markedly useful part as an organization of the united front in ensuring mutual supervision of the parties since liberation while the process of democratic reforms and the work of socialist transformation and socialist construction has gone ahead. The work of socialist construction is no easy matter in a country like China with its vast territory, immense population of many nationalities and very diversified natural, historical, economic, social and cultural conditions. Furthermore, we lack experience, and it is not to be expected that our public officials should all be free from shortcomings in their way of thinking and style of work. Shortcomings and mistakes in our work are therefore inevitable, but under the keen eyes and with the help of the masses and mutual supervision of the various democratic parties, we hope to get our work done well and keep shortcomings and mistakes down to a minimum.

LEADERSHIP OF COMMUNIST PARTY

The prerequisite for this policy of "long-term co-existence and mutual supervision" of the democratic parties is the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. This policy is designed to further consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and facilitate the advance to socialism; and we know that it is impos-

sible to realize the dictatorship of the proletariat and build socialism without the leadership of the Communist Party.

Our confidence in that leadership is based on the abundant practical proof we have of the fundamental correctness of the Party's political and organizational policies and of the boundless devotion and outstanding ability it has shown in the struggle for the welfare of the people. In exercising this leadership, the Chinese Communist Party always ensures by its practical work, explanation and consultation with them that its policy is willingly accepted by all other parties. It never imposes its policy upon them. That is why leadership by the Communist Party does not detract from the status of equality, nor from the function of supervision exercised by the other democratic parties. On the contrary, the unanimity in political ideas that has been achieved and the friendly mutual supervision we engage in ensures that the democratic parties voice their opinions without reserve.

In combating any individual deviations from these policies that may occur we know that we have the wholehearted support of the Communist Party. It is this unanimity of political ideas, their acceptance of leadership by the Communist Party and their participation in the founding of the people's state power that distinguish our democratic parties from bourgeois parties in capitalist countries. Demagogic re-

crimination, mutual strife and antagonism are the order of the day among such parties. In China our democratic parties co-operate with sincerity, help each other and learn from each other, in the common cause of building a socialist society. The relationship between them is as close as that which exists in a united family.

AFTER SOCIALISM IS BUILT

Implementation of the principle of "long-term co-existence and mutual supervision" means that China will have a multi-party system not only now but even after completion of the building of socialism. Marxism-Leninism tells us that political parties are class products and will inevitably disappear with the elimination of classes. This theory is correct, but we should not interpret it in a dogmatic manner. It is true that the national bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie which are the social soil from which the Chinese democratic parties spring are in process of elimination as classes. But after socialist transformation and the elimination of these classes, their members will become part of the socialist workers. In that event the democratic parties which represent these classes and social strata will become the political parties of this part of the working people. In a socialist society, that is, besides the Communist Party, which will serve as the core of leadership of the state,

considerable importance attaches to the other parties working for socialism which will continue to exist as assistants of the Communist Party.

In addition to the points mentioned above, it is also important to remember that although exploitation disappears and the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie are eliminated as classes with the building of socialism in China, the ideas, habits and styles of work characteristic of these classes will remain with us over a relatively long period and will be reflected in the activities of many people, especially among those who spring from these classes. New China is still young and her six hundred million people differ greatly in their level of political consciousness. Although the majority of our people are now politically progressive, a small part of them are still not as progressive as they should be, or are even politically backward. It is part of our regular political task to educate those who are not progressive enough or are backward to be more progressive and help those who are progressive to be even more progressive. It is clearly the interests of socialism to rally all those of non-working-class origin, to see that their interests are represented, to educate them and unite them through the medium of the democratic parties, the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, its organs at all levels, and the various people's organizations.

The Chinese people have already

scored considerable successes in their united efforts to build socialism. Implementation of this policy of "long-term co-existence and mutual supervision" of parties will cement their unity still more firmly around the Communist Party. It will help to bring all the vital and dynamic forces

in the country more fully into action. These are powerful forces and their rallying will ensure that all difficulties will be overcome in our march to socialism. Our cause will triumph much more speedily than we ever expected.

In our November issue, William Z. Foster analyzes Milovan Djilas' *The New Class*.

Experiences in Prison: China and America

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

SHORTLY AFTER MY release, on May 25, 1957, from the Federal Reformatory for Women at Alderson, West Virginia, I came across a book entitled *Prisoners of Liberation** at a friend's home. With that title you will understand that this book was among the very first that I read outside of prison.

The book was especially interesting to me because it described prison life within the Chinese Republic about the same period that I was experiencing it here. The authors are a young American couple who went to China in 1948 to study, financed by a Fulbright scholarship, under a treaty between the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek government.

During World War II, Allyn Rickett had served as a Marine Intelligence Officer in the Pacific area. Before leaving for China he had been called to the Office of Naval Intelligence in Seattle and asked to collect information. It had seemed "inconsequential" at the time. He writes: "I had no realization that my espionage activities would involve me in any serious trouble."

Three years later the Ricketts were arrested as spies by the New

China. They remained in custody for four years, and were expelled in 1955. Their story would have been an ordinary one, and they would have been the object of favorable publicity and much sympathy, except for what they said in their separate interviews. To the astonishment of the newspapermen, both stated that their arrests had been justified, that they had been guilty of espionage, and that they had been treated fairly in China. With this frank admission of guilt as American spies, they became the target of bitter attacks in the American press, were described as "hopelessly brainwashed"; even their sanity was questioned.

How they came to take so bold a stand is the story in *Prisoners of Liberation*. But I was particularly interested in a comparison of prison methods there and here, which are basically different, although their methods approach some of the more advanced American theories of penology.

* * *

The book is a fascinating story of their seven years in China. On their

* *Prisoners of Liberation*, by Allyn and Adele Rickett, Cameron Associates, N. Y., 288 pages, \$4.75.

arrival they became part-time English teachers at Tsinghua Nationalist University, outside of Peking and also enrolled as students in the Chinese Department. Their Fulbright grants paid them \$150 a month, which was affluence in contrast to the \$20 a month pay of Chinese professors. They described their impatience with the poverty, misery and dirt of the city, created by the Japanese occupation and Nationalist rule. They felt a sense of superiority as foreigners, to the native people, even to their colleagues, the Chinese students and teachers. Their social life was spent at the American and British consulates. Allyn Rickett reported regularly to the American Consulate on all political and economic information, which he gathered from the professors and students. The Nationalist Government collapsed. The Communists took control of the city in 1949. Many of the liberal professors who had been persecuted by Chiang's secret police, now became important figures. He continued to report on them to the British after the American representatives withdrew, because: "Britain and the U.S. had a joint intelligence command in London." After the outbreak of war in Korea in 1950, his reports included data on Chinese troop movements.

The couple had an increasing realization of the danger involved in being caught as wartime spies, but they felt that his position as "one of the last American observers in Peking was too important to be

given up at that time unless it became absolutely necessary." So they enrolled as students in Yenching, an American missionary university, when their teaching contracts were not renewed at Tsinghua. Anti-American feeling had grown strong, after American troops entered Korea, and President Truman had sent the 7th Fleet to Taiwan to protect Chiang Kai-shek. They became alarmed and requested exit permits to leave the country, but after a long wait the reply came: "Temporarily denied." They now felt injured and persecuted. They resented the independent attitudes of the Chinese professors and students, especially those educated in America, who became increasingly identified with the activities and aims of their own country. With some malice Allyn deliberately "pumped" these people. At this point they collected information from the two universities and turned it over to the British Consulate and also to a British Negotiations Commission then in China.

At the end of 1950, a Law for the Suppression of Counter Revolutionaries was passed, necessitated by the activities of Nationalist and other agents. The penalty under this law could be life imprisonment or death. A Chinese friend warned the Ricketts at this time about going to the British offices regularly and "telling them what's going on here!" A Chinese professor asked Allyn Rickett if he did not "feel under a strain" because of the new laws. His attempts to pass as a simple stu-

dent
tions
Corp
Reser
sent
dress

ARR

He
Adel
arrest
invol
since
ogniz
into
lenie
cases
After
the
mon
taken
that
Ac
in F
and
serve
porte
1955
Chin
six
four
relea
quir
the
told
viso
Chi
Wh
thei
ther
self
out

dent were shattered by communications in 1950 from the U.S. Marine Corps ordering him to report as a Reserve Officer. The Marine Corps sent many letters and bulletins addressed to 1st Lieut. W. A. Rickett.

ARREST AND TRIAL

He was arrested on July 25, 1951. Adele Rickett was held under house arrest, pending investigation of "her involvement in her husband's crime," since the People's Government recognized that many wives are forced into becoming accomplices and leniency is the procedure in such cases (an action unheard of here.) After fourteen months, during which the People's Government lent her money for living expenses, she was taken to jail. It had been decided that she too was guilty of espionage.

Adele was tried in a military court in February, 1955, sentenced to three and a half years, the time already served, and was immediately deported. Allyn was tried in August, 1955, in a civil court, under the new Chinese Constitution, sentenced to six years, forthwith paroled on the four years' time already served, and released for deportation. Both inquired as to the money they owed the People's Government and were told to forget it. A Woman Supervisor said to him: "You owe the Chinese Government a lot of things!" What happened to the Ricketts, after their arrests, obviously changed them from being animated only by self interest, to people with "a moral outlook on life." Their own con-

clusion is: "To return to the ivory tower existence we prized so highly before would be to us now nothing short of contemptible—the concept that one must find his own happiness in that of the common good provides for us the only possible way to live." To arrive at this was the result of a long and painful self-examination.

The physical conditions of the jail, which the Communists inherited, were very bad. The food was poor and sparse. The routine was similar to prisons here (from rising at 6:15 to bed at 9:15) except for the inclusion of *study periods*, three times daily. The inmates were spies, saboteurs, speculators, landlords guilty of murder, rape and theft. Allyn Rickett commented: "In my over four years in prison I knew thirty or forty prisoners and there was not one who did not belong there."

REFORM, NOT REVENGE

But even in the midst of a revolution the Chinese Government did not plan prisons solely for detention and punishment. *Reformation*, not detention, as here, is the main purpose of imprisonment in China. One of the inmate group leaders outlined this as follows:

We are all criminals undergoing punishment, but the purpose of this punishment is not revenge, as it was in old China, but education, so that some day we can return to society and start anew. However this means that we must change our outlook on life, so that we won't try to repeat the mistakes we made before. Most of us be-

came counter-revolutionaries and ended up here because we have spent our lives trying to get something for nothing at the expense of others. There is no place for such people in the new society. We must therefore examine our old ideas. In other words, we must reform our thoughts. The only way to do this is through study and mutual criticism, in order to clarify in our minds right from wrong.

The Chinese prison officials were not bent on converting the Ricketts to Communism. They sought rather to convince them that what they had done was morally and ethically wrong because it was injurious to the building of good relations between the U.S.A. and China; their point was that good morals and ethical conduct are based not on self interest, but on the welfare of society as a whole.

An elaborate system of self-examination as to one's actions and motives was based on a series of official interrogations, followed by group discussions (similar to group therapy practiced by advanced psychiatrists in this country). The preparation of self-critical statements was undertaken by all inmates. The admission of the crimes committed and the realization of their social gravity, from the viewpoint of humanitarian morality, was a necessary preliminary to a new way of thinking about such crimes and a determination to pursue a new standard of conduct. This is reformation and rehabilitation, sending prisoners out capable of being useful and responsible members of society. It was of

course primarily directed to Chinese prisoners. The Ricketts were exceptional and unique in such a setup. How it affected their future outlook in a non-Socialist society was their problem, not that of the Chinese.

It was certainly not easy for them in prison. They were foreigners and intellectuals, accustomed to a comfortable way of life and the individualistic methods of the American scene. Prison is prison anywhere in the world. They suffered from close and often disagreeable companionship, separated from family, friends, work, and many books and papers to which they were accustomed. At least thirty of us, American Smith Act political prisoners, suffered from like conditions here in the United States during the past six years. The key turning in the lock on the outside of the door has the same impact in any country, as I well know. Naturally, the food and physical conditions in general are far better in U.S. Federal prisons, though there are state penitentiaries and prison camps, particularly in the South, in which they are as bad, if not worse, than in China, and where violence and brutality are practiced of a character unheard of in a Chinese prison.

I found myself making comparisons between American and Chinese penal methods, as I read this book. In the Federal Reformatory for Women in West Virginia, where I served my 28 months' sentence, there are about 600 women from all parts of the country, of varied national

back;
educ
tion.
thou
habit

JAIL

Th
gram
and
comp
and
Ther
writi
and
cann
servi
plem
stitu
respe
is co
Craf
ics,
taug
only
ders
help

T
no
are
turo
bein
beco
to S
ing
retu
thei
viou
cur
mer
preg
con
pau

backgrounds, races, religions, ages, education, and intelligence. *Detention* is the main purpose there today, though its original purpose was *rehabilitation*.

JAIL IN WEST VIRGINIA

The very limited educational program helps illiterates to learn to read and write, and eligible inmates to complete their high school education and secure a West Virginia diploma. There are voluntary courses in typewriting, sewing and beauty culture, and required industrial courses in canning, house-painting and food service. The latter groups are supplementary to the work of the institution and elicit only a lukewarm response from the inmates. There is considerably greater interest in the Craft Shop where weaving, ceramics, leather and metal work, are taught. This is in charge of the only Occupational Therapist at Alderson, and does much good in helping inmates.

There are no social workers and no psychiatrist there, though there are obviously many mentally disturbed inmates, who are continually being sent to "seclusion." If they become too advanced they are sent to St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D. C., and on "recovery" are returned to Alderson to complete their sentences. Considering the obvious emotional disturbances that occur with many women around their menstrual periods, in relation to pregnancy especially under prison conditions, and during the menopause, the special attention of psy-

chiatrists is necessary for them. The effect of long sentences and denial of parole also affect many women very adversely, especially mothers separated from their children, to the point of extreme melancholy and attempted escape or suicide. Special consideration for the biological and emotional problems of women as women, is basic for a program of their *rehabilitation*.

Some in Alderson frankly admit their guilt. Usually these are from the underworld, have been in prison before, are resentful that they were caught, and plan bigger and better jobs on their release. Others regardless of the facts, pleaded guilty on advice of court-appointed lawyers. Some are first termers, bewildered and fearful, many very young. The majority are poor women, Negroes and Puerto Ricans, and quite a few whites are from the farm areas of the South. The crimes for which they are being punished include sale and use of narcotics, the Mann Act (transportation of women for immoral purposes across international or state borders), theft of cars over state lines, forging of checks, murder on Government reservations, kidnapping, bank and post-office robberies, counterfeiting, and extortion.

Outside of one course of lectures given by a teacher on "Right Living," and based on religion, which is voluntary to inmates, no attempt is made to *reform* the inmates. Parole officers are occupied with a hundred and one routine questions. *Discipline* deals with all sorts of infractions of rules, from a dirty ash tray

to Lesbian practices, and carries penalties of six o'clock lock-up or loss of smoking privileges to "seclusion." But no one in charge is assigned or competent to discuss at length in a sympathetic way, with an inmate, why she is there. What did she do? Why did she do it? What does she think of herself? Was it wrong? Why was it wrong? Whom did it hurt? Whom does she blame? Would she do it again? What conditions of her life would have to be changed to prevent a repetition? Does she need to move to another city? Does she need a new job? Does she need funds to get started? These latter four questions harass most of the inmates and no provisions are made to answer them by the Prison Department.

Nothing is done in Alderson to convince the narcotic addicts of the moral evil and physical dangers *to themselves* of their habit; to treat them as sick people, which is done in England and in all the Socialist countries. Nothing is done to help them on their release, so that they could stay away from their old haunts and companions. Most of them, even on ten-year sentences, long for their first shot, dream of how much better they will then feel. Of necessity they go right back to where they were last. Parole regulations make this obligatory, especially as they receive only their return fare and a few dollars for the trip expenses. Not enough is done to dry up the sources of supply of narcotics, which make millions of dollars profit for unseen figures, who

are rarely arrested. Those in Alderson are all little people, tools of larger forces.

Nothing is done to help overcome weaknesses and faults, to develop better character and to prepare the inmate to return to society as a mature responsible human being. Many have been conditioned by their lives to be self-centered, greedy, avaricious, indifferent to the rights of others, lazy, evasive of responsibilities. Yet there are many fine qualities latent in the most difficult women there, which come into play when death strikes the family of an inmate, or when a friend is sick, or if they feel an injustice is done.

Commissary is shared with penitents ones, although it is against the rules. Cottages and chapels are beautifully decorated for Christmas and Easter. Birthdays are celebrated. Beautiful gifts are knitted or made in the craft shop for birthdays, newborn babies, etc. Everyone rejoices when a release date arrives or unexpected parole is granted. We who were "politicals" were respected and treated with the greatest courtesy and consideration by our fellow inmates. No foul language was consciously used in my presence. I am convinced that organized group discussions in the cottage living rooms could be carried out successfully. Anti-social acts within the house such as petty pilfering, could be the take-off point, leading to self-examination and mutual critical aid on larger issues. Instead, the living rooms are given over to card playing, tiresome radio programs, bicker-

ing and griping, and tall tales of criminal exploits. Occasionally a discussion spontaneously rises to a higher level. When Negro spirituals came on the radio and the women joined in, one could sense a deep reservoir of suffering, self reproach, and desire to change, even under the hardest and most resistant exterior. Many came to us to ask advice on their parole applications and told me the hard and bitter story of their lives. They felt a need for understanding, direction and help. If this could be met in an organized manner, great benefit would accrue to all. Surely this can hardly be characterized as "brain-washing."

* * *

The result of the present method of mere detention is that the majority of inmates, especially the impressionable young, become more bitter, more defiant, more rough and hard, more resolved on following their own criminal course than they were before they entered prison.

There is thought control in American prisons and we who were "politicals" experienced it. We were warned not to speak of our views nor write of them in letters, on pain of punishment. Our letters were doubly censored, by the regular mail officer and then by our parole officers. Reading matter which we ordered was censored. I was not allowed to receive *The Mandarins* as "too political." In spite of the threat of isolation, we answered all

sincere questions from interested inmates, avoiding the obviously provocative stool pigeons. I would have welcomed any attempts to "reform" me, which would have given me an opportunity to express my thoughts and discuss and defend them with administration or inmates. Instead I was told in effect—"Silence or seclusion." As far as "rehabilitation" or "reformation" is concerned, Alderson is for practically all inmates a complete wash-out. All that I saw and heard in that sad and futile place of human suffering and sorrow and all the stories I heard of broken, thwarted and exploited lives, strengthened me in my conviction of the need of a Socialist society.

* * *

Prisoners of Liberation is fine reading and the kind of book that provokes thought and stays with you long after you have finished the last page. In my own case, for obvious reasons, it stimulated the kind of comparison of prison life and administration that I have offered; but for any reader it will serve to illuminate the basic nature of the Great Chinese Revolution of October, 1949.

How any society concerns itself with the poorest and the most forsaken is an acid test of its morality and humanity. The People's Republic of China, from the beginning of its historic revolution, has concerned itself, in the midst of enormous and overwhelming problems, with "the least of these."

Monopoly In the U. S.: A New Study

By Hyman Lumer

A PROMINENT FEATURE of today's economic scene in this country is the rapidly mounting public awareness of monopoly price-fixing as a source of rising living costs. The fact that, even in the face of stagnant demand and undercapacity operation, prices of many commodities can continue to be raised is eloquent testimony to the growing grip of monopoly on the American economy.

Fearful of the people's reaction to its domination and plunder of the economy, big business has sought to cloak itself in the myth of "people's capitalism." The ownership of the giant multibillion-dollar corporations is being diluted and spread among millions of stockholders. These vast enterprises are run not by capitalist owners but by a new managerial class whose primary concern is not maximum profits but maximum efficiency of production. And the distribution of income is shifting progressively in favor of the working people. So runs the myth.

Whatever credence this fairy tale receives is due in large measure to the fact that ownership of large enterprises and the extraction of profits from their operation are not open for all to see, but are concealed behind a dense, tangled web of financial con-

trol and manipulation. The penetration of this web, the disclosure of the lines of control, structure and mode of operation of American finance capital, and the cataloging of its "Who's Who"—these are the tasks which Victor Perlo sets himself in his latest book, *The Empire of High Finance*.*

A FRESH VIEW

Such an undertaking is not new. Many writers have probed this subject in the past. Outstanding among these earlier works is Anna Rochester's *Rulers of America*, published some twenty years ago, which presents a comprehensive study of American monopoly capital. But since then much has happened to require a new study. Perlo writes:

A great war, an enormous extension of the influence of American monopoly, and a doubling of its industrial plant, have brought significant changes. Twenty years after the publication of *Rulers of America*, with anti-monopoly battles of even greater consequence than those of the New Deal period in the offing, a fresh look and an attempt

* International Publishers, New York, 351 pp., \$5.50.

at a fuller understanding of the economic and political workings of big business are in order.

But Perlo does much more than bring Rochester up to date. Not only does he present a fresh and more rounded view of many aspects of American finance capital, but he also tackles a number of questions which have not been adequately dealt with before. A companion piece to his earlier work, *American Imperialism*, this book is an impressive addition to our knowledge of the workings of big business in this country. It is a solid edifice, built on a foundation of extensive, painstaking research. Moreover, it is well-organized and well-written, and presents a body of complex subject matter in lucid, readily understandable terms. It is, in short, a book which will well repay study.

The content of the book is divided into three main sections. Part One deals with the general structure of finance capital—the relations between finance and industry, the nature of corporate control, the functioning of various types of financial institutions, and the battles for control between different interest groups. Part Two describes the leading financial empires, and Part Three deals with the relations between government and business.

In the first part, Perlo lays to rest some of the chief fallacies propagated by the exponents of "people's capitalism." He shows that in recent

decades not only has economic concentration grown considerably, but above all the power of the banks and other financial institutions has enormously increased. The merger of financial and industrial capital, he writes, "has increased so markedly that in their totality, the relationships between big finance and big industry are more intimate than ever before."

He disposes, too, of the myth of managerial control of corporate affairs, showing that the great majority of directors of the biggest corporations are not salaried officials but representatives of financial interests. And he effectively disproves the thesis that Wall Street is no longer the financial center of the country. He demonstrates that despite the growth of other regional interest groups it remains unquestionably the center of power.

There follow detailed explanations of how the biggest stockholders exercise control of a corporation though owning but a small percentage of the total stock outstanding, and of the control exercised by banks in industrial corporations through financing operations and stock ownership. An especially valuable section deals with the "profits of control," that is, the profits extracted by the controlling stockholders by virtue of inside knowledge, funneling of lucrative business to themselves, stock market and real estate deals and similar channels. Such profits, according to Perlo's estimates, range from 25

per cent on investment to as high as 50 per cent. Here lies the basic reason for the mad scramble by various financial groups for control of big corporations, with all the attendant chicanery and financial manipulation.

Perlo goes on to untangle the "spider web" of control, to analyze the part played by different types of financial institutions—commercial banks, trust companies, investment banks, insurance companies and others. He discusses the devious methods employed—the secrecy of stock ownership and other concealments, designed to steal a march on would-be rivals. He describes the shifts in control and battles for supremacy which take place as part of the process of increasing concentration, and the methods by which the process is effected.

THE TOP EIGHT

Part Two is concerned with the financial oligarchy. Here Perlo presents a highly illuminating dissection of the major financial groups, their inter-relationships, the shifts in power among them and the causes of these shifts. Into these questions he delves much more deeply than has any previous writer on the subject.

Prior to World War II, the eight leading interest groups were Morgan, Rockefeller, Mellon, du Pont, Kuhn-Loeb, Chicago, Cleveland and Boston. Since then, significant changes have occurred. Kuhn-Loeb and the Boston group have dropped

out of the top eight. Into their places have stepped the First National City Bank of New York (which Perlo asserts should have been included even prior to the war) and the Bank of America, a center of power of the rising California interests. And the House of Morgan, which had long held unquestioned supremacy, must now share it with the Rockefellers, who have attained equal financial power.

Underlying these shifts are important changes in the economic weight of key industries. The course of economic development has witnessed "the growing predominance of heavy industry over light, substitution of auto and aircraft for railroads, and the increasing economic weight of oil, aluminum and chemicals." Those groups whose holdings have been concentrated in such industries have correspondingly grown in relative strength.

Of special significance is the shift in relative importance of oil and steel. With reference to this, Perlo states:

The basic reason for the shift in relative economic power from the Morgans to the Rockefellers has been the change in the industrial structure of the country. . . . As steel has been the untouchable core of the Morgan power, so oil has been for the Rockefellers. And what has happened is that oil has surpassed steel in scope. . . . As of 1954 . . . the giant oil companies had more assets than the combined total of the next three largest industries.

It is manufacturing and mining enterprises which form the heart of a financial empire and determine its economic power. For these are the most lucrative source of profits, and hence of funds for further investments and attacks on the strongholds of other empires. And it is the unequal development of different industries which makes possible the successful challenge of one group by another for control of major corporations by means of an increased army of dollars. Thus, Morgan has been forced to share control of AT&T with Rockefeller, and the rising Cleveland group has succeeded in taking over the New York Central Railroad.

Consequently, despite the growing concentration and community of interest by which the financial oligarchy is marked, there is at the same time a continual rivalry among its members. Instead of the super-merger of finance capital into a single all-controlling group, there is the persistence of discrete groups, with common interests to be sure, but also in constant conflict with one another.

Nevertheless, in the face of these rivalries and shifts in power, there is a remarkable degree of stability in the general relationship of forces. Though the Morgan group has declined relative to the Rockefellers, both have grown in strength and remain the dominant duumvirate of finance capital. And the Wall Street interests as a whole have retained

and even strengthened their top positions of power.

This they have done by virtue of their unshakeable control of the key financial institutions and hence of the financial life-blood of big business. All other groups are in varying degrees dependent on them for financing of their ventures. The Cleveland group, despite its rapid rise in recent decades, has been unable to achieve financial independence. Even the powerful, relatively independent Chicago group is subject to substantial Wall Street penetration.

The newly-arrived California magnates are heavily dependent on Wall Street financing. And the recent spectacular crop of Texas millionaires, despite their reputedly astronomical incomes, are but servants of the Wall Street oil companies.

Perlo's portrayal, within the framework of growing concentration, of the incessant conflict and rivalry among the top financial groups is perhaps the most outstanding single feature of the book. It effectively disposes of any notions of a domestic counterpart of the concept of ultra-imperialism, that is, of the emergence of a single, all-embracing group of finance capitalists controlling the entire economy.

However, in dealing with "the very real, very intense competition that prevails within the upper reaches of finance and industry," he confines himself to "the most far-reaching aspect, the changes in power and position of the super-empires of the

oligarchy." He does not concern himself, except in passing, with the competition that exists among the top firms in a given industry and flares up from time to time into cut-throat struggles for supremacy, such as that now raging in the auto industry. To this he devotes only a brief section on the decisive role of the banks in the war between General Motors, Ford and Chrysler.

This competition among corporate giants of monopolized industry, taking place within the context of monopoly price-fixing, is radically different in character from that which prevailed in an earlier era. The methods by which it is conducted and the effects of interlocking financial controls on its nature and extent, as well as other features, are questions which deserve much more extensive investigation. So too does the relationship between the big monopolies and small concerns, both in general and in particular industries.

These are important aspects of competition. However, their omission is cited not as a criticism of the book, since they do not necessarily fall within its purview, but rather as an indication of the scope of the question of monopoly and competition and of the work yet to be done.

THE GRAND MERGER

The third part of the book covers the political aspects of monopoly. A chapter entitled "The Grand

Merger with the State" deals with the growth of state monopoly capitalism. Here Perlo outlines the various forms of state intervention in the economy for the benefit of big business. In the following chapter, he discusses the growing direct participation of top representatives of big business in the federal government, culminating in the "Cadillac Cabinet."

The concluding chapter deals with foreign investments and their relation to foreign policy. Total foreign investment, at a conservative estimate, has quadrupled since 1939. In 1956, profits after taxes on this investment amounted to about \$3.2 billion, or nearly 15 per cent of total corporate profits. If the various hidden forms of profit are added, the total take of big business from foreign holdings is more than \$11 billion a year. This is truly a huge bonanza, which American foreign policy is counted upon to protect.

These investments, however, are not evenly divided among different financial groups. By far the most prominent are the Rockefellers with their enormous oil holdings in Latin America and the Middle East, and the Morgans, who predominate in Western Europe. These differences in foreign holdings Perlo associates with differences in emphasis on foreign policy which the various groups seek to impose.

Thus, the Rockefeller-Standard Oil interests play a leading part in shaping foreign affairs and "have

been among the most consistent in promoting aggressive, brink-of-war, 'cold war' policies." Perlo refers also to other divergences based on particular profit interests compounded with numerous other motives—"Asia First" versus "Europe First," airpower versus "balanced forces," support or opposition to foreign aid programs, varying support to trade with socialist countries, varying degrees of pressure for military spending, and so on.

This part of the book contains much that is valuable. It is, however, less thorough than the first two parts, and necessarily so, since it covers a range of material which could easily form the subject of a volume equal in size to the present one. State monopoly capitalism is a complex subject with many ramifications, and it has so far received little systematic study. A single chapter can do little more than present its highlights.

* * *

This, on the whole, Perlo does effectively. There is one shortcoming, however. State monopoly capitalism is not simply an outgrowth of the development of monopoly. Its growth is associated primarily with the unfolding of the general crisis of capitalism, a point which he does not sufficiently make clear or attempt to develop.

In dealing with differences in emphasis on foreign policy, Perlo recognizes these as being conditional and limited. But in some instances

perhaps greater qualification is required. To be sure, the Rockefellers with their far-flung oil empire have a greater stake in an aggressive foreign policy than do, say, the du Ponts, whose profits no longer depend on munitions and armaments in the proportion they once did. But, while today only some 7 per cent of General Motors' business is in armaments, the wartime proportion was much higher. And given appropriate shifts in the economic and political climates, the prospect of future profits from this source as the single largest recipient of war orders, could readily take on a new attractiveness, and the difference vanish or be reversed. Hence, in the opinion of this reviewer, such a difference is even more transitory and fluctuating than Perlo indicates.

Moreover, differences with regard to government policy are motivated by political as well as economic factors. Though the latter are basic, politics has a logic and compulsion of its own. Not to take this fully into account is to risk falling into economic determinism. All this is not to gainsay the essential correctness of Perlo's contentions, but rather to indicate the incompleteness of the picture and the need for more extended and rounded study.

Finally, the book has one serious technical shortcoming. For a work which will be used very largely for reference purposes, its index is highly inadequate. It is to be hoped that a

future edition may provide an opportunity to enlarge and improve it.

A WEAPON AGAINST MONOPOLY

The Empire of High Finance appears at a time when popular resentment against the trusts is growing rapidly, and when the groundwork is beginning to be laid for a united anti-monopoly movement. For the building of such a movement, the book is an asset of tremendous value. Whatever minor flaws it may possess, it is a penetrating, thoroughly documented and highly effective exposure of this enemy of the American people. It presents not merely the face of the enemy but the innermost details of his internal anatomy.

It is a book capable of exerting

widespread influence, extending far beyond the ranks of the Left. It needs to be read by large numbers of labor, farm, Negro and other civic leaders throughout the country, and to be distributed as widely as possible.

Further, as a first-rate Marxist work on a very important aspect of the American economy, it deserves to be studied by Marxists everywhere. It should be used not only for individual study, but as a text for classes and study circles.

As a source of knowledge and a weapon against monopoly, the book cannot be too highly recommended. Many have said that there is an acute need in the Left for more "study of America." Here is a book that goes a long way towards meeting that need.

By

In
vers
exar
pres
eral
thes
H
can
just
that
mac
com
agri
tally
tinu
"Bu
lead
are
cies
activ
to b
ord
ture
omy
year
T
tion
unic
* c
and 7
when
the S
Soth
zer P
deleg

Problems of the American Farmers

By Erik Bert

In *Farm Trouble* (Princeton University Press, \$3.75) Lauren Soth,* examines U.S. farm problems and presents what can be called a "liberal" approach to the resolution of these problems.

His main premise is that "American agriculture still has a great adjustment to make" and implicitly, that if the "great adjustment" is made, we shall attain stability. A companion premise is that our non-agricultural economy is fundamentally in good shape, and will continue to be so. Thus, Soth contends: "Business management, labor union leadership, and the government all are learning how to adapt their policies to maintain stable economic activity. . . . There is every reason to believe that the stabilization record will be even better in the future" than during the "new economy" of the post-World War II years."

The analysis and the recommendations that Soth presents are not unique with him. They are similar

* Soth, an editor of the *Des Moines Register and Tribune*, was thrust into the limelight in 1955 when his suggestion was instrumental in bringing the Soviet farm delegation to the United States. Soth toured with the delegation and won a Pulitzer Prize for his initiative in the exchange of farm delegations.

in substance to the approach taken by "liberal" spokesmen in the labor and farm movements. It is worth presenting them in detail and, where necessary, to indicate their inadequacy or incorrectness. Here they are:

I. U.S. poverty. *"The rural poor . . . form the largest single block of real poverty in the United States today, and little is being done about it."* *"They are the flotsam and jetsam of the American economy."*

The "greater share" of these people "are in the South," where they also embrace the bulk of the Negro tillers of the soil. "Some are in the cut-over lands of the Great Lakes states and the far Northwest and in isolated mountain areas of the West. Some are in the hilly southern fringe of the rich Corn Belt states." The agricultural wage workers, the "forgotten men," especially the migrants, constitute a distinct sector of the rural poor.

II. The major farm problem. *The "major farm problem" is "low*

income—poverty—and what we may call non-commercial agriculture."

"Poverty in rural America is our number one farm problem." (Soth's emphasis.) "One-third of American farm families live in poverty even during boom times."

III. The "commercial" farm problem. *The other sector of the "farm problem" is the "imbalances in commercial farming"—the "mal-adjustments which afflict commercial farmers."*

"Commercial farming is faced with the possibility of another long depression, a cost-price squeeze, like that of the 1920's." "Probably a majority" of the 1,200,000 commercial farmers who sold less than \$2,500 worth of products in 1949 "have been sinking further into debt in the last several years or have been failing to build reserves for depreciation of buildings and equipment or for maintenance of the soil. In other words their families have been living partly on capital."*

* Soth, in contrast to the above, talks elsewhere of "the progress of commercial agriculture." Furthermore, "commercial agriculture has advanced along with the rest of the economy; farmers have paid off debts and accumulated reserves; farm families have vastly improved their mode and level of living."

The apparent contradiction in Soth's estimate of the status of "commercial agriculture" reflects the contradictory development at the two poles of commercial agriculture: the advance of the biggest farms and the sinking of the smallest commercial farms. In the later quotations he identifies "commercial agriculture" with the biggest, or the upper middle, farms.

IV. Causes of the farm problem. *Three "fundamental reasons account for the disparity between farm and non-farm income, hamper agricultural adjustment, and help create 'the farm problem.' They are: (a) "Surplus population" on the farm; (b) "the nature of the pricing and marketing mechanisms in agriculture"; (c) "the tendency of agriculture to overproduce in relation to demand."*

(a) The "surplus population" theory places the onus for superfluity on the people; the poorest people have not established their right to existence. An alternative that Soth fails to consider is that there may be a "surplus" of capitalists, of those who prey on the farm population, that, in fact, the capitalist system may itself be superfluous since it dooms part of the people to redundancy.

(b) The "pricing and marketing mechanism in agriculture," which Soth decries, is a capitalist mechanism. The markets into which agriculture sells, and from which it buys (aside from wage labor) are dominated by monopolies. (The market for farm wage labor is the most vulnerable labor market in the country.) All the proposals made for improving the lot of the farmer by altering the conditions under which he sells or buys, are based either on a thorough disregard for the monopoly nature of our economy or, while

recognizing the monopoly characteristics, on the assumption that these can be frustrated by cooperatives, or packaging, or better grading, or culling the substandard portion of the crop, or brand names, or some other such device.

V. The tendency to surplus production. *There "is a powerful tendency for farm output to grow faster than the demand for farm products."*

This is the "basic cause" why "commercial agriculture is faced with the possibility of another long depression, a cost-price squeeze, like that of the 1920's."

Soth says that the "American farmer's unexcelled productiveness has turned like a Frankenstein's monster to injure its creator." The possibilities for the rapid growth of farm output have been told over and over: the expansion and improvement of farm machinery; the greater use and improvement in fertilizer; the improvement in seed, feed, breeding stock, disease control; and the like. The pressures for rapid growth lie in the necessity for enlarging production in order to compete more successfully in the market.

The reasons for the retarded demand for farm products, however, are not usually enumerated so distinctly. Let us cite three: (1) The inflation of the price of commodities having their origins on the farm,

through the monopoly profits exacted by food processors, railroads, and the like. The consequence is curtailment in the amount that could be sold. (2) Eight million multiple and single-person families in the United States have incomes under \$2,000. If they "were brought up to a moderate standard of diet and nutrition, the additional annual consumption of farm products would approach the average annual size of 'surplus' production during the past three years (1953-1955)," according to the report of the Conference on Economic Progress, *Full Prosperity for Agriculture*.^{*} The rapid growth in productivity in agriculture is accompanied in the non-agricultural sections of the economy by a rapid growth in monopoly and in monopoly profits.

VI. Eliminate the surplus farm population. *There are too many people in agriculture, if there were fewer, those remaining would be better off; therefore, the major task is to get rid of a substantial portion of those now on the farms.*

"There are just too many people to divide up the income which the American economic system allocates to food producers. . . . The real solution to the farm problem of the United States, then, is to transfer people out of farming into other occupations at an even faster rate

^{*} Published by the Conference, 1001 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C., 50c.

than at present." Again:

"The major solution to the surplus situation is to help people to get out of farming."

The theory, adopted by Soth, that if some farmers are eliminated then stability will be established for those remaining, is supported by what is generally considered the "Left" wing among national and state farm leaders. It is, therefore, of more than theoretical importance.

Between 1940 and 1954 the number of farms dropped from over six million to 4.8 million, or 20 percent. In those fourteen years the number of farms decreased by somewhat over 80,000 farms a year. Despite this, in the "fifteen-year boom" after 1940 "the lower third of agriculture . . . remained virtually stagnant."

There are two distinct sectors to the "farm problem," according to Soth; the poverty among the poorest farmers, and the pressures on the commercial farmers. If the bottom one-third of the present farm population, say about 1.6 million farmers, were eliminated, that would eliminate the worst poverty. Soth believes that "the fewer people the nation needs to employ in the production of food and fiber . . . the better off farm people are."

Thus, if 1.6 million are eliminated then the *average* of the 3.2 million remaining is higher than the *average* of the 4.8 million was. But it does not follow that the bulk of the 3.2 million remaining are any better off

than they were (not to speak of those who are eliminated). They might be worse off. Soth's argument reduces itself to the simple proposition that if the pie is cut into four parts there is more in each part than if it were cut into five. Such simple arithmetic yields an inadequate analysis. If the best of the 1.6 million farms eliminated are taken over by the bigger commercial farmers (and the rest of the 1.6 million grow to weeds) the situation of the smaller remaining farmers will be aggravated, not eased. The bigger farms will become larger, more formidable in the market. The smaller remaining farms will be squeezed harder than they were.

As we shall see below, Soth emphasizes the necessity of getting rid of a mass of commercial farmers to circumvent cost-price squeeze. His program therefore has two aspects: get rid of the poorest farmers—to eliminate rural poverty; get rid of a substantial number of commercial farmers to end the "imbalance" that exists in that area of the farm economy. This second phase is essential because the small farmers do not produce enough. They could all be eliminated, without affording any substantial relief to the commercial sector of agriculture which is plagued by the disparity between the volume of its products (which it is continually enlarging) and the size of the market.

VII. The nature of our federal farm

pol
Un
lar
n
thi
ha
or
Of
U.S.
produ
produ
farme
the p
The
adjust
tion p
gover
agric
main
ers."
VIII.
"T
th
of
"
co
te
fa
an
Th
ing
Unic
(St.
ism.
ager
to th
area
North
Wis
most
pop

policies. *"Our farm policies in the United States . . . were written largely for the higher-income commercial farmers."* *"The reason for this is easy to see: the programs have been based on commercial or market production."*

Of the 4.8 million farmers in the U.S. 1954 Census, 2 million farmers produce about 85 per cent of the products marketed, and 2.8 million farmers produce about 15 percent of the products for market.

The "price support programs, crop adjustment programs, soil conservation programs, and most of the other government activities in behalf of agriculture have been of benefit mainly to these higher-income farmers."

VIII. Prospects for the family farm.

"There appears to be no important threat to the family-type farm operation in the United States."

"One could . . . make a pretty convincing argument that new technology has strengthened the family farm in the Middle West and other general farming areas."

The *Farm Income Survey* (covering 1955) sponsored by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association (St. Paul, 1956) refutes Soth's optimism. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the GTA, in an introduction to the survey, says that in the 5-state area covered—Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin: "We are witnessing the most rapid annual decline in farm population and in the number of

family-operated farms." The survey results, he said, "verify our fears for the survival of family-type farming as we now understand it. . . ."

Based on the Survey, the farm families of this area, [Thatcher said] are in economic danger. Our findings lead us to believe that:

Only the largest family farms can survive under today's prices and even these will not be able to maintain their farms and homes as they have been.

Medium and small family farms will either be heavily mortgaged or lost to big operators.

Only a few more years like the present will eliminate many of the younger farmers, many of whom are GIs' trying to make a home for their growing families.

IX. Soil conservation subsidies. *The present system of price supports ("parity price-fixing loans and government purchases") should be replaced by "subsidies . . . in direct form," that is, by "subsidies for genuine soil conservation."*

Soth offers no evidence that the system of soil conservation which he proposes will be any improvement over previous conservation payment systems. These he says, "tended to help well-to-do farmers become more well-to-do, rather than providing a lift for the farm people who need it most."

Such a proposal as Soth advances might well be used, however, by the foes of federal farm aid as an excuse to eliminate all price supports. Inadequate though a parity-support

program is, both in the crops covered and in the distribution of the benefits, its elimination should be combatted, unless and until a substitute has been provided that will serve better the small and middle farmers. They will not be served better by elimination of the little they now get.

X. Progress through improvement in marketing. *"Farm groups are wiser to seek continually for ways to force improvement in efficiency in marketing—by means of cooperative bargaining and cooperative competition in food processing, by means of government 'watchdog' operations" instead of "merely berating the middleman and charging him with the blame for declines in prices of farm products. . . ."*

Soth proposes that the struggle against the monopolies—as purchasers of farm products, and as sellers to the farmers—should be abandoned; and that reliance should be placed, instead, upon "cooperation." The abandonment of the struggle against the monopolies—admittedly, a struggle of limited possibilities within a system of monopolies—means also abandoning the indictment of the monopolies as the appropriators of extravagant profits at the expense of the rural population, and as the dominant economic and political force in our society.

XI. Technology. *New technology should be slowed down. "Why not slow down expansion" in "new technology," Soth asks. He suggests "it might be a good idea to spend . . . less on new production technology."*

The proposal to throttle the development of technology is a logical answer to what Soth calls the "farm paradox—the paradox of bountiful production and low income for the producers of the bounty." It is a logical answer to a situation which Soth calls "crazy." It is also a basic indictment of our social system. This is the first time, to my recollection, that such a proposal has been made since the days of the depression. Implicit in Soth's proposal, though he is undoubtedly unaware of it, is the alternative of capitalism or socialism. Soth's proposal admits in effect that under capitalism new technology must be repressed if this monster of progress is not to turn on Frankenstein.

XII. Marxism and the trend of U.S. agriculture. *"Marxist critics of the American economic system long have talked about the 'disappearance' of the family farm, or the 'tendency to accumulation' of the land as Marx himself put it, under capitalism." The Marxists' "misinterpretation of the effects of economic development in this country often is swallowed by sincere, anti-socialist agricultural leaders."*

Soth, himself, could readily be mistaken for one of the "sincere, anti-socialist" persons who has "swallowed" part of the Marxist "misinterpretation of the effects of economic development." He has said that "in the last fifteen years there has been sort of a polarization in the farm community, with the spread between the upper and lower income groups growing wider."

Similarly, the (non - Marxist) Conference on Economic Progress cited earlier might be indicted for it has said: "About 100 thousand very large or giant farms contribute about 26 percent to total sales," while "in the middle, about 2 million adequate family type farms are losing ground."

These facts confirm a Marxist view of the development of U.S. agriculture under capitalism. Soth, consequently, should revise his concept of what is the "Marxist" view. The fact that U.S. agriculture is not embraced completely in giant "factories in the field," and its farm lands in huge feudal-type holdings, does not deal Marxism a fatal blow. I suggest (subject to proof at some later date) that, contrary to Soth's rejection of Marxism, the present state of U.S. agriculture can best be understood on the basis of a Marxist analysis.

XIII. Marxism and the family farm.

"Marxists are not interested in preserving the family farm, of course. They are interested in fanning dissent and creating dissatisfaction."

Who is "interested in preserving the family farm"? Soth believes he is. But he says there is no place in U.S. agriculture for the smallest "family farms"—those which represent rural poverty. He urges that they be abandoned as soon as possible. He also supports the proposal of Theodore W. Schultz, agricultural economist, for getting family-farmers out of agriculture through a subsidy payment. Recipients of this payment would not be the poorest farmers but those who "had produced at least \$2,500 worth of farm products in the preceding years." This proposal to extinguish masses of family farms is not mitigated by the fact that their land would, allegedly, be appropriated by "larger family farms." The 1.2 million commercial farmers who had produced less than \$2,500 worth of products in the preceding years would not be eligible for the subsidy. They would be extinguished, apparently, without subsidy. Thus the burden of proof, as to who is interested in preserving the family farm, still rests on Soth. He has not established his bona fides.

He charges that the Marxists are "interested in fanning dissent and creating dissatisfaction." The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's *Family Farm Survey*, to which we referred earlier, is proof that it requires no Marxists to create "dissatisfaction" on America's family farms. The field hearings of the House and Senate agriculture com-

mittees in recent years confirm that fact emphatically. Soth's own book is testimony to the existence of widespread, non-Marxist-inspired, dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction is a mass phenomenon on America's family farms. Soth does not alter that fact by charges which substitute what might be called "red baiting" for sober and frank discussion.

How about the Marxist attitude to the family farm, especially to the small family farm? Let us cite the words of Frederick Engels, one of the founders of Marxism, written in 1894. In the *Peasant Question in France and Germany*—in my view, *the most important Marxist work on the agrarian question*, Engels said, over 60 years ago: "The greater number of peasants whom we can save from being actually hurled down into the proletariat, whom we can win to our side while they are still peasants, the more quickly and easily the social transformation will be accomplished."*

Engels spoke as the representative of a party that saw the doom of the small peasant as inevitable under capitalism, which saw a social transformation of society and of agriculture, as the only rational solution. And, as the representative of a party

with that socialist perspective and goal, Engels called for support of the small peasant—under capitalism—as a peasant. Clearly, Soth is mistaken in his understanding of the Marxist attitude to the family farm.

XIV. The future. "*We will continue to muddle along by compromise, experimentation, and half-measures. This is the way of democracy, and it is the best way.*"

These words are the grimmest in *Farm Trouble*. They represent, in effect, an abandonment of struggle to meliorate the condition of the bulk of the farm population, and to subside into passivity. To "muddle along" is not the "best way"—the price is too high. To "muddle along," is not the "way of democracy." The "way of democracy" requires not the passivity to which Soth resigns himself—and thus propagates—but the heightened activity on the part of the rural poor, the middle farmers and, above all, of the labor movement. The task is to meliorate the condition of the bulk of the farmers, to sustain them on their farms, to expand the consumption of the products that they produce, to raise drastically the living standards of the farm workers and sharecroppers. This, I think, is a better way of democracy than is embraced in Soth's advocacy of muddling along.

* This essay may be found in the second volume of Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* (Moscow, 1951).

Letters from Readers

Philadelphia, Pa.

Readers interested in automation will find Bulletin No. 1198 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of value.

Under the title *Automatic Technology and its Implications*, the 78-page bulletin lists a "selected annotated bibliography" of material available to June of last year.

The 359 references listed "present more or less non-technical descriptions of the operations of automated equipment in business and industry, analyses of the conditions for their use, and discussions of the implications for labor, management, government, and the economy." The bulletin continues: "The broad standard for selecting references was their value to persons primarily interested in the social and economic aspects of current developments in automation. Technical information addressed chiefly to engineers was excluded."

References are classified under 14 broad subdivisions, with those under each subdivision arranged alphabetically by title. Each reference is briefly annotated.

Subdivision 1 includes all material dealing with background, development, principles, definition and examples of various types of automation.

Subdivisions 2, 3, and 4 cover automation in metal-working,

handling of bulk materials and electronic goods, respectively.

Subdivision 5 covers automatic control in processing (feed-back devices) while subdivision 6 covers such controls in the operation of machine tools.

Subdivisions 7, 8, 9 and 10 cover electronic computers in their technological aspects, in business operations, in science and engineering generally, and in controlling plant operations.

The largest subdivision—11—deals with the economic and social implications. Subdivision 12 includes those references which handle the attitudes and policies of the labor movement to automation.

Subdivision 13 covers the impact on business organization and management. The last subdivision—14—lists bibliographies and glossaries.

The bulletin may be secured from the Supt. of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., 45 cents.

This bulletin should have been noted in Lumer's review of Lilley's *Automation and Social Progress* in the August issue. Where such reference material exists, I believe it should be brought to the attention of our readers. Many of them—particularly in the labor move-

ment—would, I am sure, appreciate the help in enabling them to do their own follow-up.

An interesting illustration which Lumer might have cited from Lilley's book regarding the approach of Soviet engineers to practical mastery of automation in manufacturing processes was their selection of the manufacture of car pistons on a completely automatic basis "precisely because it was complicated and difficult, because that one project would force them to master the automation of every basic process in engineering production."

J. D.

* * *

Toledo, Ohio

Recently, there has been considerable interest in long-range perspectives and programs projected in search of an American road to socialism, or possibly, if there is but one road to socialism, an American vehicle to take us down that road.

There are many gaps in the writings about these remote prospects. In the draft resolution, we turned a page to be confronted suddenly with a stable socialist majority in Congress. Many important problems are skipped over. One whole field that has been neglected is the idea of implementing, under capitalism, structural changes in government, that could facilitate progress in many spheres and help

ruling class and a source of suffering for working people. Differences in tax rates and corresponding variation in services always hurt labor. In a state like Michigan, where a vigorous labor movement is able to secure a higher level of social service, the tax rate needed to sustain this service is a pretext for the runaway-shop bosses, whose "decentralization" program is causing mass unemployment. One place where these shops are moving to is Ohio, which collects only one sixth as much of its total general revenue from industry as Michigan. The services of the state, such as workmen's compensation, education and mental health are correspondingly inadequate. But the wheel turns and other bosses are running away to Arkansas and Tennessee, where taxes and services are even lower.

Another argument against the present state structure is that, invariably, political power is improve the living conditions of the working masses.

The subdivision of this country into forty-eight states, while it has historic roots that antedate the birth of our republic, seems to be a stumbling block to progress. The most reactionary forces are invariably the jealous guardians of the states' residual powers. This can be seen in the field of civil rights. It also manifests itself in an uneven economic development of the country, a source of great profit for the

portio
areas
worki

So
be fr
struct
liame
with
at a
The
fly in
holds
also
expl
In th
stitu
Anot
ther
Cons
tions
gang
drast
law.
are
They
the
From
Fu
rena
and
mass
we
same
shou
the

H
revis
Phil

portioned in favor of the rural areas to the detriment of urban working class areas.

Some inquiry would probably be fruitful into reforms in the structure of government. A parliamentary form of government with proportional representation at all levels might work better. The objection that such proposals fly in the face of historic tradition holds no water, because this country also has a tradition of capitalist exploitation which we want to end. In the process, many traditional institutions may have to be altered. Another objection may be that there is a need today to defend the Constitution against the depredations of the Dixiecrat-McCarthy gang rather than to project a drastic overhauling of our basic law. But the changes envisioned are not on the agenda for today. They may be a necessary part of the struggle for and by a Popular Front type of political alignment.

Fundamental to all of this is a renaissance of labor political action and a great upsurge of democratic mass activity. It is to that end that we bend our daily efforts. At the same time, our theoretical writers should examine questions such as the one indicated here.

A READER

• • •

Portland, Ore.

Harry K. Wells in his July, 1957 review of Dr. Selsam's new book *Philosophy in Revolution* makes

a comment that is extremely sectarian.

On p. 32 he writes: "The weakness inherent in all non-working class (I assume he means non-Marxist-Leninist) materialism renders 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."

This example of Communist arrogance is entirely uncalled for. It leads to all sorts of difficulties when carried out in life. It is an example of what the argument for the last two years has been all about. The source of this philosophical arrogance is found in "Stalin's formula that in different revolutionary periods, the direction of the main blow was to isolate the middle-of-the-road social and political forces of the period" ("Historical Experiences of Proletarian Dictatorship," *Political Affairs*, May 1956, p. 27).

This doesn't say that "non-working class" philosophies should not be criticized, but each different group of ideas should be criticized on its own merits and not be dismissed with the pat little formula that "it inadvertently serves ulti-

mately the obscurantist purposes of the most reactionary class in our country."

There has been too much of this in our work during the past period. Until now we find as the Chinese Communists found during the "ten years of civil war from 1927 to 1936" ". . . that instead of isolating the real enemy we isolated ourselves and inflicted losses on ourselves while benefiting the real

enemy" (same source).

I hope from these few remarks no one gets the idea that I am commenting in any way upon Dr. Sel-sam's new book. I haven't read it. I do, however, consider myself one of the ". . . tens of thousands of readers who have cut their ideological-philosophical molars on his books and articles." And I am looking forward to reading his latest.

H. S.

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

KEY BOOKS FOR OUR TIME

THE EMPIRE OF HIGH FINANCE

By VICTOR PERLO

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$5.50

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

A LONG DAY IN A SHORT LIFE

By ALBERT MALTZ

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$3.75

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

DECISION IN AFRICA

By ALPHAEUS W. HUNTON

(INTERNATIONAL) Price \$4.00

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

THE ORDEAL OF MANSART

By W. E. B. DU BOIS

(MAINSTREAM) Price \$3.50

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

AT MOST BOOKSTORES

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY

By **HERBERT APTHEKER**

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

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

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

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

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

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

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

on.
ro-
k-
re,
an

ut-
ny
its
can

ny
pic-
ind
his

ully
ing

with
tion
ary,
lysis
he
has