

political affairs

AUGUST 1958 • 35 CENTS

July
EUGENE DENNIS

[18]

The Struggle for Peace

BOB THOMPSON

[37]

On the Work and Consolidation of the Party

HERBERT APTHEKER

[53]

The Mid-East: Peace or War?

HERTTA KUUSINEN

[62]

The Recent Elections in Finland

A POLICY FOR AMERICAN LABOR [1-17]
by National Committee, CPUSA



Now Ready

NO MEN ARE STRANGERS

BY JOSEPH NORTH

A book of affirmation in these troubled days is like a fountain of clear waters in a parched time—it is good for the health! Joe North's *No Men Are Strangers* (International Publishers, price \$3.25) is such a book, a kind of modern Pilgrims' Progress except that, instead of dealing in allegory, the author writes of living facts, observed at first hand, reportage from all the fighting fronts of man's struggle for a better world, the human documentation of the most turbulent, swift-moving, epochal half-century of modern history.

Truly a reporter of a special kind, North chronicles his earliest remembrance of his blacksmith father, soon after the turn of the century in Pennsylvania, the shock of his first contacts with bigotry and hardship, his first meeting with Communists. "The beginning of wisdom came when I encountered men who introduced me to a philosophy which scientifically explained Man's existence, and indicated the inevitability of his triumph over hunger, oppression and war."

His on-the-spot observations of America during the Great Depression; his activity in founding the weekly *New Masses* and his lively contacts, as editor of that soon-to-become famous magazine, with the best known writers and artists of that day; his eye-witness narratives of the militant sit-down strikes which helped to usher in the C.I.O.; his stirring coverage of the battlefronts of Spain during the Civil War; his danger-fraught voyages on convoys crossing the Atlantic in World War II; his first grisly entrance into the still-smoking hell of Dachau, all are brilliantly told in this book. Don't fail to order your copy from your nearest bookstore or, by mail, from—

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

A Policy for American Labor*

By National Committee, CPUSA

I. LABOR AND THE DEPRESSION

THE NATION IS once again in an economic crisis. According to conservative estimates, more than five million are unemployed. Millions more are on short work weeks. In the past year and a half, industrial production has fallen nearly 15 per cent. And we have not yet hit bottom.

This is not a temporary decline. We are in for a prolonged period of depressed conditions and mass unemployment. Even on the basis of optimistic assumptions, the Congressional Joint Economic Committee staff predicts that there will be at least 5 to 5½ million jobless through next winter, and the situation may well become much worse. For the millions who are jobless, it is becoming worse day by day. In short, unemployment will remain a number one problem for a long time to come.

Especially hard hit are the Negro, Puerto Rican, and Mexican-American workers. So, too, are the large number of agricultural laborers,

many of them Negro, who are deprived of virtually all benefits of unionization and social welfare.

Layoffs, loss of overtime, and short work weeks have eaten seriously into take-home pay. As the toll of depressed industries and cities grows and, in the words of AFL-CIO president George Meany, "unemployment feeds on itself," rising monopoly-fixed prices "feed" on the people and eat further into reduced purchasing power.

American workers, under capitalism, have never had any real security. The past forty years have seen ten years of boom, ten years of depression, and many years of inflation brought about by wars already fought or preparation for nuclear war in the future.

Not so long ago, the economy was booming. Industrial capacity was being expanded as if the sky alone was the limit. In a year and a half, investment in new plant and equipment jumped 50 per cent. There was, of course, no such growth in the consumer market; consumer spending rose less than 10 per cent. As a result of the unbridled expansion

* This Statement was adopted by the National Committee on June 29, 1958.

sion overproduction and surplus capacity rapidly developed, production was cut and workers were laid off. The boom ended and the slump set in. The age-old pattern of boom and bust, an inevitable feature of capitalist production for profit, repeated itself.

How is this national emergency being met?

ATTITUDE OF THE GOVERNMENT AND BIG BUSINESS

Eisenhower plays a modern version of Hoover's ill-fated role, while the Democrats are far from repeating FDR's New Deal role. The way is barred to tax cuts for the working people. The cry for a sorely needed public works program goes unheeded. The appeal for improved unemployment benefits is met with a grossly inadequate temporary extension which perpetuates past evils and gives no aid to a large part of the unemployed. Meanwhile relief rolls mount, city after city confronts a budget crisis, and growing numbers face hunger and delay.

Big business seeks to take the cost of depression out of the hides of the workers, and to maintain its profits through layoffs, speedup and wage cuts. It sees an opportunity to use hunger against labor—to sharpen the competition for jobs and set employed against unemployed, white against Negro, skilled against unskilled, young against old, men against women, native against foreign-born. It hopes to settle scores

with organized labor, to take back labor's gains, and to weaken or destroy the unions.

This is evident in the termination of the UAW contracts by General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler. It is evident in the union-busting drive to pass "right-to-work" laws, in the new legislation to "regulate" labor growing out of the McClellan Committee hearings, in the Taft-Hartley prosecutions of union leaders, and in many other ways, all part of a growing anti-labor offensive.

In a word, Big Business seeks to use the depression as a club to beat labor into submission.

LABOR'S ROLE

Faced with this critical situation sections of organized labor have responded with alarm and militancy and with a constructive program. But it must be said that the response of labor as a whole falls considerably short of what is required.

Basing itself on the need to expand workers' purchasing power, the AFL-CIO has come forward with a program which calls for higher wages, tax cuts for lower income groups, an increase of the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour with expanded coverage, improved unemployment compensation along the lines provided in the Kennedy-McCarthy bill, increased social security benefits, an extensive program of public works, an expanded federal housing program, greatly increased school construction and aid to education,

and federal aid to distressed areas.

Buttressing this program is a series of actions which point the way to combat the effects of depression. Among these are the AFL-CIO Conference on Unemployment held in Washington last March, the AFL-CIO march on Lansing in Michigan, the labor caravan to Springfield in Illinois, the mass delegation to Washington from the Retail and Department Store Workers' Union in New York, and the organization of unemployed workers by some unions.

In such ways, organized labor is playing quite a different role than it did after the outbreak of the great depression of the thirties. Its program and actions along these lines are worthy of the widest support.

But at the same time it must be frankly recognized that the program and even more the *activities* of organized labor fail to meet the needs of this critical situation. Therein lies the danger.

The economic crisis found the leaders of labor inadequately meeting the demands of the situation because of 1) their illusions in a crisis-free "people's capitalism," 2) their commitment to an armaments program as a main prop against unemployment, 3) their routine reliance on smart lawyers and clever negotiations, and 4) their failure to take steps to close the growing gap between themselves and the rank and file.

Following a class-collaborationist line, most labor leaders have re-

sisted mobilization of the rank and file and the launching of mass struggles. Hence the offensive has been surrendered to Big Business, which is using it to the full, as the present plight of the UAW in its negotiations with the Big Three dramatically shows.

What is vitally needed is to project a course of action that will meet the Big Business offensive with a militant counter-offensive by labor and its allies.

THE WAGE FIGHT

A key objective of Big Business' "depression offensive" is to block labor's traditional and necessary demand for wage increases as a major point in contract negotiations. This, if successful, would be but a prelude to wage cuts. Indeed, this is Big Business's main weapon for protecting its profits at the expense of the workers.

The fight for wage increases is the very heart of the struggle to maintain and extend the workers' standard of living, and to protect them against the effects of depression. There are some in labor's ranks who would abandon this battle. But this position was rejected by the latest AFL-CIO convention, whose resolution on collective bargaining declared that "the very fact of an economic slackening makes it doubly imperative that unions gain sizeable increases to bolster consumer buying power and thereby provide a needed

stimulating force for an upturn in the economy."

Wage demands cannot be won, however, without aggressive struggle. And there are alarming tendencies, as in the UAW negotiations, to reduce or give up such demands without a fight. All such tendencies must be vigorously combatted. Aggressively fought for, the demand for higher wages will provide a necessary cornerstone for a broad offensive against Big Business.

FOR A STRENGTHENED PROGRAM

Labor's program is lacking in important respects. Some points require greater emphasis and concreteness, while other essential elements are missing. These include:

1. *Unemployment Compensation.* Every unemployed worker should receive at least two-thirds of his previous earnings for as long as he is unemployed. A major step in this direction, as well as toward other vital reforms, is contained in the provisions of the Kennedy-McCarthy bill.

2. *Tax Reductions.* The vague or inadequate proposals so far advanced must be replaced by a clear-cut set of demands based on increasing personal income tax exemptions to at least \$1,000.

3. *Shorter Work Week.* The demand for a shorter work week, in particular the 30-hour week without decrease in take-home pay, is a key

anti-depression measure. This vital demand cannot be brushed aside but must be brought forward more aggressively, both in contract negotiations and as a legislative demand.

4. *Speedup.* In times of depression, capitalists seek to sustain their profits through intensified speedup. Hence the fight against speedup cannot be lessened, but must be greatly increased.

5. *Prices.* A campaign to curb monopoly price manipulation is needed. In addition to the AFL-CIO proposal for a Congressional investigation, we urge government regulation of other monopoly-fixed prices based on the principle now applied to public utilities, and, where necessary, government operation of enterprises. All such measures should provide proper guarantees of union rights and conditions.

6. *Credit.* There is growing need for legislation establishing a moratorium on mortgage and other debt payments, and protection against foreclosures and evictions.

7. *Discrimination.* The rate of unemployment among Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans, according to the conservative government figures, is more than twice as high as among other groups. In some cities, it is more than four times as high. And as jobs become scarcer, discrimination against these workers grows. The fight against job discrimination, through FEPC legislation, fair practices clauses in contracts, the work of union fair

pract
sum
a ke
empl
8.
cially
great
is ir
grow
mark
able.
youth
finan
discr
supe
exter
satio
mar
9.
men
elim
less
gard
ards,
wom
cupa
sever
ciall
gro
figh
evils
10
hits
seve
agai
caus
be r
othe
11
swer
prep

practices committees, etc., today assumes increasing importance. It is a key part of the fight against unemployment.

8. *Youth.* Young people are especially hard hit by depression. The greatest proportion of layoffs today is in the 20-24 age group. And growing numbers enter the labor market for whom no jobs are available. Special measures in behalf of youth are needed, such as federally-financed training programs, without discrimination and under trade union supervision and control, as well as extension of unemployment compensation to those entering the labor market and unable to find work.

9. *Women.* With rising unemployment, there are growing efforts to eliminate women workers regardless of seniority provisions, to disregard special safety and health standards, and to cut wages. The many women in the poorly paid service occupations are subjected to especially severe exploitation. This is especially true of large numbers of Negro women workers. A vigorous fight must be waged against all these evils.

10. *Older Workers.* Depression hits older workers with particular severity. A fight must be waged against discrimination in hiring because of age. Retirement ages should be reduced and social security and other pensions substantially increased.

11. *Peace and Trade.* The answer to depression does not lie in war preparations. On the contrary, the

workers' interests call for peace and trade with other countries.

A vast market beckons—the 900 million people of the Soviet Union, China, and other socialist countries. The Soviet Union and China have repeatedly offered trade. Just as our country needs a sane nuclear policy, so too does it need a sane trade policy. A great market also exists in the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, provided trade and aid are given without interference or attempts at domination by American monopoly capital.

Such trade means jobs. The AFL-CIO should be in the forefront of the fight to develop trade with all countries, regardless of their social systems.

We Communists have no illusions in the possibility of insuring capitalist economy against depression. Neither labor's program, nor that presented here, can do away with depression. But we fully support labor's program for immediate steps, and add our own proposals, to meet the impact of unemployment, to cushion its effects on the people, and to transfer the burden of depression to the shoulders of the big monopolies.

MOBILIZATION FOR STRUGGLE

The demands of labor and the people cannot be won unless they are fought for. The days of "easy" ne-

gotiations are gone. The period of sharp struggles is here. This calls for greater reliance on the power of organization, on rank-and-file militancy, on unity of labor with the farmers, Negro people, and small businessmen.

But labor is not yet geared to meet this situation. In the face of a difficult and disadvantageous economic picture, it remains encumbered with the baggage of disunity and jurisdictional squabbles, of the class-collaborationist policies of its leadership, of the harmful effects of systematic ouster of Left leadership, and of illusions and lethargy among its rank and file, fed by more than fifteen years of relative prosperity.

Today the workers, spurred by mounting unemployment and economic hardship, are increasingly ready to fight, provided they are given the proper leadership. However, while some labor leaders realize this, such awareness does not permeate the thinking or actions of the main AFL-CIO leadership. But it is vital, if labor is to conduct a successful fight, that the rank and file be mobilized for mass struggle. A sharp turn is needed to put the labor movement into fighting shape.

In this, a primary requisite is *organization of the unemployed* and the unity of employed and unemployed in battle for their common interests. Equally essential is unity of Negro and white workers. A third requirement is unity and solidarity of the labor movement itself,

and fourth is unity of labor with its allies.

A great people's fight-the-depression movement can and must be brought into being. All but a handful of monopolists can be rallied to such a movement. It can turn Eisenhower's threat to labor that "the public is looking over the shoulders of those sitting at the bargaining tables" into a boomerang. Organized labor can and must rally the people to sit on *its* side at the bargaining table.

Such a people's movement can compel the Eisenhower Administration and Congress to provide the necessary relief against the ravages of capitalism's unemployment. And it can form the foundation of an anti-monopoly coalition under labor's leadership, which can set in motion the long-needed offensive to curb the political and economic power of the trusts—of the men whom FDR once aptly labelled "economic royalists."

This is the perspective with which labor must view its immediate problems and tasks.

II. *The Road Ahead for American Labor*

Related to these urgent issues in the economic field are a number of long-range problems and tasks which organized labor faces. Among these, the following are the chief ones.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

American monopoly capital, in its

ceases
nation
the ma
war.

Cont
CIO le
cies of
for dra
and job
among
welcom
from s
on thei

It is
a "defe
provide
cause f
and tax
world
co-exist
Moreov
product
explode
ployme
odd bi
arms.

under i
a polic
of the r
of scho
fare.

Great
as well
wide m
nuclear
dous in
unilate
country
of new
the sam
leads to

ceaseless drive for profits and domination of other countries, is today the main source of the danger of war.

Continued adherence of the AFL-CIO leadership to the cold war policies of big business is one of the major drawbacks in the fight for peace and jobs. The advocates of cold war, among them the worst union haters, welcome the cooperation they receive from some of the top labor leaders on their foreign policy.

It is time to abandon support of a "defense" program that not only provides no defense but is a prime cause for increasing tension abroad and taxes and inflation at home. In a world of H-bombs, peace based on co-existence is the only real security. Moreover, the notion that armaments production means prosperity is being exploded by the mounting unemployment in the face of the forty-odd billions now being spent on arms. Labor cuts the ground from under its own feet when it supports a policy which swallows two-thirds of the national budget at the expense of schools, hospitals, and social welfare.

Great opportunities for peace exist as well as new dangers. The worldwide movement for the cessation of nuclear tests has been given tremendous impetus by the Soviet Union's unilateral halting of tests. In our country, this has led to peace actions of new scope and proportions. At the same time, the economic decline leads to pressure for a more adven-

turous foreign policy on the part of a profit-hungry monopoly capital.

The strength of the movement for peace can be vastly increased by the active participation of the trade unions. There are some beginnings. Unions like UAW, Packinghouse, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and the California CIO have been pressing for at least some departure from the cold war policies. Some others, such as the West Coast Longshoremen, UE, Mine-Mill, and the Distributive Workers in New York, have gone much further in the development of a positive program for peace. But on the whole, labor remains conspicuous in the peace movement by its absence.

Recent developments, however, open the way to a major advance in labor's participation in the fight for peace. The workers' economic problems are not being solved by military programs. There is no great enthusiasm among them for Meany's cold-war policies. On the contrary, there is growing realization that the solution is to be found only along the path to world peace. This has had its impact among the top labor leaders, and has led to some soft-peddalling of the demand for increased arms expenditures as an answer to the depression.

Communists and progressives will support every step toward peace by the trade unions. We will work toward bringing American labor in step with the millions of other Americans who are advancing on the

path to peace. We will strive to win labor's support, in alliance with the peace movements now developing, to the following vital steps for world peace:

Cessation of all nuclear tests.

An end to the trade embargo against People's China; increased trade with the socialist countries.

A big-power summit meeting.

Extension of cultural ties with the socialist countries and establishment of trade-union relationships.

Recognition of People's China.

AUTOMATION AND THE SHORTER WORK WEEK

In capitalist production, the development of machinery leads to the displacement of workers and to the creation of a reserve army of unemployed. Automation, with its phenomenal capacity for eliminating human toil, greatly accelerates this process. It has not only served to aggravate the present economic situation, but threatens increasingly, as it is further developed, to become a life-and-death question for unions. Labor can no longer leave this question for panel discussions and future considerations.

Automation cannot be permitted to be the private preserve of monopolists, under the cover of "management rights" contract clauses which prohibit unions from "interfering" in production. A struggle is required for retraining of workers at company expense, protection of seniority, safeguarding of standards and wages in

the skilled crafts, higher wages for workers operating automated equipment, guarantees against elimination of Negro workers, prevention of speed-up, and other measures to protect the interests of workers threatened by automation.

Above all, labor should insist that automation should result in a shorter work week, not a shorter work force. Indeed, automation greatly intensifies the need for shortening hours, for only in this way can workers truly share in its benefits and materially limit its disastrous effect on unemployment.

The thirty-hour work week is not a mere anti-depression measure. Like the establishment of the eight-hour day, it is a step of historic significance for the entire working class. It is a major goal for organized labor in the coming period, a goal which will be won only over the all-out resistance of big business. Communists will do all they can to encourage and support this basic struggle.

At the same time, Communists will seek to educate workers on the differences in the effects of automation under capitalism from those in a socialist society, where it does not deprive workers of their jobs but truly means more leisure and higher living standards for all.

ORGANIZATION OF THE SOUTH

What the eight-hour day and the organization of the basic industries meant for the past advances of or-

ganize
the So
opmen
ventio
states:

The
would
factor
liance
the D
stacle
people
labor
the o
merge
of ou
battle
the A
better

For
termi
right
litica
for e
or N
cial s
ment
rest o
to w
statu
force
(par
and
Sout
6) a
for s
Su
labo
tend
com

ganized labor, the organization of the South means for its future development. As the CPUSA's 16th convention Draft Labor Resolution states:

The southern organizing drive would be the single most powerful factor in welding the Negro-labor alliance in a common struggle against the Dixiecrats, who are the main obstacle to the freedom of the Negro people and the forgers of chains for labor in the halls of Congress and in the open shops of the South. The merger of these two great struggles of our time into one great common battle would mark the high point of the American people's struggles for a better America. . . .

For the South, this calls for a determined struggle to secure 1) the right to vote and participate in political activity for all; 2) equal pay for equal work without North-South or Negro-white differentials; 3) social security, welfare and unemployment benefits equal to those in the rest of the nation; 4) repeal of "right-to-work" laws and other repressive statutes; 5) full application and enforcement of the U.S. Constitution (particularly the First, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments) for all Southerners, Negro and white; and 6) a just share of industrial jobs for southern workers.

Successfully to organize the South, labor must break completely with all tendencies toward appeasing or accommodating itself to the South's

Jim-Crow practices. Courageous leadership in this historic battle to give the death-blow to Jim-Crow would unite the southern workers and the Negro people into an invincible combination, before which no open-shop citadel could hold out.

Without this, on the other hand, labor's path to further advance remains blocked by an impassable obstacle.

THE NEGRO-LABOR ALLIANCE

The indispensable role of Negro-white unity in the organization of the South underlines the importance of the Negro-labor alliance, which today faces severe tests arising from the present economic situation. From these tests it can emerge either enormously strengthened or seriously weakened—a setback which would be fraught with the most harmful consequences for labor as well as the Negro people.

Negro workers have been more than doubly hit by unemployment and discrimination. Long barred from white-collar, professional and skilled occupations which are less affected by the depression, they are now being displaced in large numbers from steel, auto and other basic industries. Even their tenure of those undesirable jobs usually "reserved" for Negroes is being threatened. As a result, stark misery, the companion of depression, has already made itself at home in every Negro community.

All this occurs at a time when the

Negro people, fed up with Jim Crow, are already on the march and knocking loudly at freedom's door, as in Little Rock, Montgomery and the Powell movement in Harlem. To these militant demands for equality no one can plead deafness. Yet in the chorus for freedom led by Reverend King, the Negro students of Little Rock, and so many others, the voice of George Meany and his colleagues have been feeble indeed. Labor's aloofness from these struggles does serious harm to the cause of Negro rights, but it is even more damaging to the cause of labor itself. In the thirties, Negro-white unity was the key to organization of the basic industries. Today the Negro industrial workers are a far more powerful force than in the thirties, and they are part of a far more militant and aggressive Negro liberation movement.

With the proper initiative of labor, a powerful coalition with the Negro people can be built, directed against the mutual foes of both—the big trusts and their Dixiecrat allies. But without such unity, labor cannot win the big battles which lie ahead.

To cement this alliance, organized labor should first of all clean its own house of Jim Crow practices. It needs to match its resolutions with deeds, to implement more aggressively its ban on discrimination as well as to conduct a much more vigorous campaign against job discrimination by employers. It must

put teeth in fair practice clauses in contracts, and fight to eliminate bias in upgrading.

It should frankly discuss with Negro trade unionists and organizations the problems arising for Negro workers from the practice of "last hired, first fired" and seek a common solution.

It should emulate the inspiring example of the Hotel Workers' Union in New York, which dramatized the Negro-labor alliance by giving its Award of the Year to the Little Rock school children.

Labor must, in particular, make enactment of state and federal fair practices laws an immediate, urgent part of its program. It should also give full support to the independent mass movements now developing in some areas to open jobs in white-collar and other fields to Negroes.

In this connection, it must be recognized that the failure to organize the South has had the objective effect of placing an added burden on the Negro people in their fight for freedom. Moreover, the complacency with which many union leaders view the displacement of Negro workers from the shops and the writing off of these workers from union rolls weakens Negro-white unity and harms the labor movement itself.

Labor, if it takes its proper place in the great democratic struggles to attain full citizenship for the Negro people, will thereby lay the necessary foundation for its own advance and growth in the coming years.

INDEP
ACT

The
hower
ing at
trolled
menace
alliance
the ne
politic
tion o
who v
progra
pro-lab
strengt
pressio
on org
to the
gro, a
Congr
Tod
the at
though
of sup
as its
indep
much
Hence
for ne
these
But
this, a
its a
party
for l
pend
work
their
party
event
mon

INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION

The Hoover-like line of the Eisenhower Administration, the do-nothing attitude of the Democrat-controlled Congress, and the growing menace of the Dixiecrat-Republican alliance—all these emphasize afresh the need for greater independent political action by labor. The election of Congressmen and Senators who wholeheartedly support labor's program—of trade unionist as well as pro-labor candidates—will greatly strengthen the fight against the depression and the mounting attacks on organized labor. It will contribute to the fight for building labor, Negro, and farmer representation in Congress.

Today the economic situation and the attacks on labor are forcing it, though still within the framework of support to the Democratic Party as its vehicle for expression, into independent political action to a much greater extent than before. Hence there are realistic possibilities for new and greater advances along these lines.

But labor must go further than this, and must eventually break with its adherence to the present two-party system. Communists will strive for labor's *complete* political independence, "for in the long run the working class and its allies will have their own anti-monopoly coalition party capable of bringing about the eventual election of a people's anti-monopoly government." (Main po-

litical resolutions, 16th National Convention, CPUSA.) The achievement of such independence would mark a most significant new stage in the development of American labor.

An important step toward this goal would be the building by labor of its own independent political action machinery in the communities, much along the lines already advocated by the UAW. Through such machinery, labor can work effectively for *any* candidates of its choice, independent as well as on the Democratic or Republican tickets.

Political cooperation based on mutual economic interests and interdependence between labor and farmers has helped to register big gains in the past, notably in states like Minnesota and Wisconsin. Recently, such coalitions have fought jointly against passage of "right-to-work" laws and in support of farmers' demands for full parity. In such industries as farm equipment and meat packing, labor and the farmers have made common cause against the squeeze of the trusts.

Such electoral coalitions need to be constantly enlarged and built, and should include the Negro voters and other allies of labor, in addition to the farmers. And they must be based on the development of rank-and-file action and organization, and not alone on top actions and agreements.

All the major issues which confront labor will enter into the 1958 elections.

The Eisenhower Administration and the Republicans generally, with

their open partisanship for big business and their callous disregard of the people's needs, clearly merit no support. At the same time, the great majority of the Democrats, while hoping to capitalize on the economic situation in the elections as a "Republican recession," have done little to distinguish themselves in Congress as fighters for the people's interests.

Labor cannot, therefore, give blanket support to Democrats, but should judge all candidates individually on the basis of their stand on the important issues in regard to peace, jobs, the rights of labor, and civil rights. It is necessary also to develop mass pressure on candidates to take a correct position on these issues. Even more, labor should seek out and encourage independent candidacies, especially among labor and Negro representatives.

Adherence to such policies, with the building of labor's own political machinery to carry them out, will contribute greatly to advancing labor's interests in the elections and to its development as an independent political force in American life.

UNIFICATION AND STRENGTHENING OF LABOR

1. *Strengthen United Action and Organic Unity.* The need for maximum united efforts of organized labor to combat depression, defend itself against attack, organize the South, build independent political ac-

tion, etc., urgently demands completion of unification of the house of labor.

This means joint action and solidarity among all unions at all levels, especially in the fight against unemployment. It means working to promote maximum organic unity of all labor. It means elimination of jurisdictional struggles, uniting all state and city labor bodies, moving more rapidly toward amalgamation of former AFL and CIO unions in the same fields, ending of policies of expulsion or secession as means of resolving issues, and full adherence to trade union democracy and the traditional principle of autonomy in labor's federation. It means striving to unify the skilled and unskilled workers by giving common attention to the special problems of the skilled workers in industry who, in a number of instances, are now seeking a solution through separate craft unions.

Labor's advance depends particularly on how strongly the most advanced unions and the rank and file make their influence felt. The most progressive unionists should be the strongest upholders of the merger and the staunchest fighters making the fullest use of labor's united strength. And they should strive energetically, in the process of unification, to advance Negro-white unity, trade union democracy and the interests of all sections of the working class.

Finally, in addition to unity of the American labor movement, greater attention must be given to strength-

ening
other
American
specially
exploita
2. *E*
unionis
Comm
purpos
undern
labor's
the ca
behind
welfare
thorou
wrecki
Comm
guise
must
Meany
yield t
as the
union
and h
to all
ence a
At
eteers
ethics
are a
body
and
be re
the la
Clella
to la
Lal
again
demo
supp
ment
up co

ening its solidarity with labor in other lands, above all in the Latin-American countries which suffer especially from American imperialist exploitation.

2. *End racketeering and business unionism.* The Senate McClellan Committee hearings have one main purpose: to provide the basis for undermining unions and destroying labor's gains. This objective, which the capitalist press tries to conceal behind a demagogic concern for the welfare of the rank and file, must be thoroughly exposed, and the labor-wrecking legislation proposed by the Committee and others, under the guise of "reforming" labor unions, must be defeated. The readiness of Meany and other labor leaders to yield to and support such legislation as the Kennedy-Ives bill disarms the unions in the face of the attack, and hands the labor movement over to all kinds of government interference and "regulation."

At the same time, the labor racketeers, spawned by the dog-eat-dog ethics and practices of Big Business, are a parasitic growth feeding on the body of labor—at once a drain upon and a disgrace to it—which must be removed. It is this weakness of the labor movement which the McClellan Committee has seized upon to launch its attack.

Labor must wage its own struggle against racketeering and for union democracy. Full encouragement and support should be given to movements within labor's ranks to clean up corruption and democratize union

life. This is essential if unions are successfully to meet the depression-induced onslaught of big business against them. The corrupt practices of the corporations have no place in the labor movement. Labor has its own principles, namely that unions are formed to serve the workers and that labor leaders are servants of the membership.

The importation of corporation practices into the labor movement, or business unionism, is manifested in long-term contracts, neglect of grievances and problems of speed-up and working conditions, preoccupation with investment operations, and similar practices. It is manifested also in the viewing of unions as a business, with huge salaries for union officials, and the spreading of corruption—both open and subtle—and the milking of treasuries at all levels of the union. It is business unionism which, in collaboration with the employers, opens the door to labor racketeering. A determined struggle must be waged to eradicate it.

3. *Rebuild the Influence of the Left.* This is vital for unification of the labor movement, to whose solidarity and militance the Left has made big contributions in the past.

Within the labor movement there exist differences of outlook on many issues, differences which the worsening economic situation is bound to sharpen. Underlying many of these is the conflict between class struggle versus class collaborationist policies. There are differences on whether to

retreat or counter-attack in the face of the big business attempts to use unemployment against labor standards; whether to give full rein to the militancy of the workers or to discourage and restrain it; whether to tap the great reservoir of experience of Left, progressive, and Communist trade unionists or to continue to deny them full citizenship; whether to unleash a democratic struggle against corruption or to proceed by top edicts; whether to devote the union's energies to organizing the unorganized or to enbroilment in jurisdictional disputes. Differences are revealed on the role of the unified central bodies, the struggle for civil rights, peaceful coexistence and a host of other questions.

The Communists strive to win the trade unions to a more consistent program of class struggle and militant action in defense of the immediate interests of the working class. To achieve these objectives, they join with other Left forces in the ranks of labor.

The Left must strive to join with all segments of the labor movement for the promotion of labor's best interests and in the defense of labor against its enemies. It must, further, seek to unite those elements which take a progressive stand, whether on a single issue or a broad range of questions. In this manner, an effective fight can be made to reconstitute the Left, to unite it and to rebuild its influence.

Today, under the impact of the economic situation and the attack on

labor, new forces and new alignments are emerging. In the shops, a growing number of militant workers are shedding their anti-Communist prejudices, and are ready to unite with all forces, including the Left, to fight the company attacks. A variety of rank-and-file movements, among them a number of Negro caucuses, are developing as expressions of dissatisfaction with the inadequacies of the labor leadership.

Experience has long demonstrated that the collaboration of the Left with those broader forces in the unions who follow a relatively progressive policy, whether in general or on some major issues, is in the best interests of the working class and the labor movement. This is confirmed by every major advance of labor, including the birth of the CIO and the historic gains in organization of the unorganized. And conversely, whenever these forces retreat and join hands with the more conservative and reactionary elements to fight the Left, labor is weakened and the way is opened for a capitalist offensive against it. This is confirmed by the most recent experiences in the labor movement.

The struggles of the present period, in our opinion, will give rise to new alignments between such a reconstituted Left and the broader progressive trends which will increasingly come forward.

III. *The Role of the Party*

The present economic situation and its ramifications affirm once

again the need for the Communist Party.

Millions of American trade unionists know through their own experiences the role of Communists in building their unions. Thousands of union stewards, shop chairmen and other leaders, received their training in the art of organization at the hands of Communists. Much of what was once considered part of the Communist program has been taken over by the labor movement and thousands were themselves at one time or another members of the Communist Party, and contributed to the advance of the trade union movement as Communists.

Yet, while the past year has witnessed a significant reaffirmation of individual liberty by the federal courts and public opinion, the trade union leadership still persists in its denial of the right of legal existence to Communists and Left-wingers. Paradoxically, though the trade unions have played an important part in rolling back the McCarthyite tide, they have in this respect succumbed to its vicious influence.

For this, all labor has paid a price, not alone in loss of democratic rights, and in anti-labor legislation like the Taft-Hartley Act and the "right-to-work" laws, but above all in dimming the spark of militance that is the heart of unions through its own persecution of some of its most active and devoted fighters. If the crusading spirit of '36 is to be revived, and if the problems arising

from the growing depression are to be met, an end must be put to the harassment of Communists, Left-wingers and trade-union militants.

WHAT CAN COMMUNISTS CONTRIBUTE?

As the record shows, Communists have given much to advance the cause of labor. They courageously led the great hunger marches and struggles during the Great Depression of the thirties, struggles which helped erect the "cushions" of unemployment compensation, social security, relief and welfare from which working people benefit today.

They fought for many years, at times almost alone, for industrial unionism and organizing the unorganized in the basic industries.

They added militancy and stimulated rank-and-file struggle in the settlement of grievances and the fight for better working conditions in the shops.

They pioneered in winning recognition by white workers that it was in the interests of all to fight for equal conditions and rights for their Negro brothers.

Their struggles against racketeering in past years are well known.

During the worst days of the cold war and McCarthyite hysteria, they stood up, often alone, in defense of democratic rights. And at a time when the word "peace" was virtually illegal, they courageously defended the cause of world peace. Thus they

aided, in behalf of all Americans, in upholding civil liberties, world peace, and the honor of our country.

Today, however, our strength and relative position in the trade unions are greatly reduced. It is a difficult matter again to play a role in the labor movement in the spirit of past traditions. The long period of persecution, compounded by our own errors, and the ravages of two years of bitter internal struggle, have had their effects.

Moreover, McCarthyism is not entirely dead. Faced with growing popular resistance to the effects of the depression, big business seeks to revive it. Nor has labor yet rid itself of the anti-Communist clauses and other manifestations of this virus. There remain formidable obstacles to the full participation of Communists in the life of the unions.

How can these obstacles be surmounted and our isolation overcome? Much will depend on our ability to develop correct policies and methods of work. But fundamentally the answer lies in the fact that the Communist Party is a product of the need of the American working class, as it is of the working class in every country.

The present growing depression, with its shattering anew of illusions of "permanent prosperity," is greatly sharpening the class struggle. The impact of mounting unemployment tends to dispel the atmosphere of class collaboration and to heighten the workers' militance. It tends to

increase the pressure of the workers for militant leadership and to create new, dynamic forces in their ranks.

But the effect of prolonged unemployment and hardship can also be to create demoralization, and to render many workers easy prey to big business anti-labor propaganda and the panaceas of fascist demagogues and crackpots. In determining the outcome, the role of the Communists is decisive, far out of proportion to their numbers.

Communists are called on to contribute to preparing the trade union movement for the battles ahead, to putting it into fighting trim, to reviving the crusading spirit of the thirties. Communists must help stimulate mass struggle and rank-and-file activity to impel the labor movement forward to fight the depression, to win the 30-hour week at the same pay, to organize the South, to oust racketeering and business unionism, to complete the unification of the labor movement. Communists must work to impel labor to play its proper role in the struggle for peaceful coexistence and in the fight for Negro rights. And they must strive to bring about labor's fulfillment of its leading role in welding a broad people's anti-monopoly movement.

In the course of the struggle for such goals, Communists can once more demonstrate in deeds the role they can play. As they do so, labor will begin to shed the slanderous anti-Communist misconceptions foisted on it by big business. It

will n
real er
longer
to be
Hist
the A
come
provid
or "I
again,
forces,
the co
tant p
a new

FOR

Our
with
the er
are fa
unexc

The
sharpe
Amer
not in
our o

Wh
cessio
durin
ley R
tor, c
Car
ing w

Th
to the
by th
list s
lead
thoug
ism.

will more fully recognize that its real enemy is monopoly and will no longer allow its strength and unity to be dissipated in witch-hunts.

Historically, the great advances in the American labor movement have come about through the stimulus provided by the more class-conscious or "Left-thinking" forces. Once again, under new conditions, these forces, of whom the Communists are the core, can and will play an important part in preparing the way for a new advance of labor.

FOR A SOCIALIST AMERICA

Ours is a country rich in resources with an industrial capacity that is the envy of the world. Our workers are famed for their know-how, their unexcelled productivity.

The present depression once again sharply brings home to all thinking Americans that "something is rotten" not in the state of Denmark but in our own country.

What is it that has brought us recession and depression eight times during the past forty years, as Stanley Ruttenberg, CIO Research Director, correctly asks?

Can we have "prosperity" only during war?

The persistent pursuit for answers to these fundamental questions, aided by the consistent projection of socialist solutions by Communists, will lead ever increasing numbers of thoughtful trade unionists to socialism.

More and more, workers will come to the conclusion that what's rotten in our country is the capitalist system run by and for a handful of billionaire businessmen.

They will realize that our vast industrial capacity and tremendous ingenuity, which under a system that produces only for profits becomes a periodic curse, under socialism will be a permanent blessing.

Where other less fortunate countries had to pay a costly price and make bitter sacrifices to construct their socialist economy, ours already possesses an industry capable of giving every American a happy life.

Poverty, disease, juvenile delinquency, racial intolerance, not to speak of the periodic scourges of war and depression, can be things of the dark past.

Such a vision, the majority of American labor will learn in time is not a dreamer's "utopia" but a practical necessity that a sane and peaceful life demands.

With typical American common sense, they will one day conclude that there must be something to socialism if it can transform a once semiliterate nation like the Soviet Union into the scientific and educational leader of the world.

We Communists, in the course of struggling side by side with our union brothers and sisters for their urgent needs, will do our utmost to speed the day when American labor joins its brothers all over the world in adopting socialism as its goal.

The Struggle for Peace*

By Eugene Dennis

I WISH TO DEAL with some aspects of the international situation and the struggle for peace.

In our country, as in other lands, there is considerable alarm regarding the latest turn of events in France and the sharp re-emergence of the Yugoslav question in international affairs. The war clouds over Lebanon and the anti-Soviet campaign being whipped up around Nagy are also causes for deep concern.

Likewise the possibility that the preparations for a summit conference may be torpedoed is creating wide apprehension everywhere. And the question is now being posed in some quarters as to whether or not these developments signify that the possibilities and grand perspectives for averting war and promoting peaceful coexistence—which were signalized at the 20th Congress of the CPSU and by our 16th national convention—are diminishing, if not being cancelled out.

These are serious, in fact life and death questions. Hence the significance of each event and issue needs to be examined and weighed in the light of the over-all relationship of

forces and the main trend in world developments. Towards this end, I would like to address my remarks, fragmentary and inadequate as they may be.

DEVELOPMENTS IN FRANCE

First, a few observations about the grave turn of events in France. A basic analysis of these is contained in Comrade Stachel's article in *The Worker* of June 8th which embodies the views of the NEC; and in the perceptive interview with Comrade Duclos which appeared in *The Worker* of June 15th.

The 200 Families of France—counterparts and allies of the Rockefellers and DuPonts, the Thyssens and Krupps—are seeking a fascist military solution of the profound political, financial and economic crisis into which France has been plunged as a result of the protracted and disastrous colonial wars waged in Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and Indochina, and because of the intolerable burdens which the NATO policy of war preparations and poverty has inflicted on the French nation.

A reactionary, authoritarian gov-

* Report made June 28, 1958 to the National Committee, CPUSA.

ernment headed by De Gaulle has been imposed on France by treachery and violence following the recent military putsch in Algeria and the threat of a military coup d'etat in France. This new government is supported by a part of the leadership of the Socialist Party and the Radical Socialists, and by all the forces of reaction in France and Algeria, including the most chauvinist and fascist circles.

But an examination of the situation also shows that while the danger of fascism in France is exceedingly grave and imminent—*fascism has not yet triumphed*. As Comrade Duclos notes: while the "powerful demonstrations in Paris and the Provinces, the strikes and other activities of all kinds which multiplied in the recent period were not able to prevent the coming of personal power," nonetheless "the events did not unfold entirely according to the plans conceived by the seditious elements," and the CP of France succeeded in alerting the working class and the nation in good time, thus creating the conditions allowing the people to mobilize for the defense of the Republic.

Since the investiture of De Gaulle there is developing, under the intrepid leadership of the great Party of France, a powerful national front of resistance and a growing unity of action of Communists, Socialists, Catholics and Republicans to save the French Republic, to defend democracy and to end the

brutal war of colonial repression in Algeria. All of these developments bear out the prognosis of Comrade Duclos who emphasizes that despite all difficulties "the social and political forces exist in France to bar the road to fascism and to check the exercise of personal power."

Undoubtedly the course of the struggle in France and in Algeria in the next months, coupled with certain international factors, will determine which way France goes in the immediate period ahead. Judging by the course of developments thus far, there are grounds for concluding that: (1) Notwithstanding all obstacles, the people of France, who, thanks to the CPF, prevented the De Gaulles, the Caugolars, and the ultra colonialists from achieving their full objectives a month ago, are now in a position to exert greater influence on the course of events in the next round of struggle; (2) De Gaulle's proposal for "integration" will not solve but only aggravate the situation in Algeria, and the national liberation struggle will continue; (3) despite Washington's maneuvers and its efforts to woo De Gaulle, the contradictions between American and French imperialism are bound to sharpen—both in relation to the struggle for control over North Africa and in respect to NATO and the re-arming of West Germany.

Clearly the fate of the French Republic and French democracy, and the cause of national independ-

ence in Algeria, is the vital concern of the American people and all progressive humanity. A victory for fascism in France would jeopardize the peace and security of Europe and spread the "dirty" war in Algeria to Tunisia and beyond, with fateful consequences for world peace.

Certainly we Communists, together with other anti-fascists, must find the ways and means to alert wider sectors of the American labor and people's movements to their stake in the momentous struggles in France and Algeria, and to express their solidarity with the French and Algerian peoples.

Likewise the events in France must be utilized to once again drive home to the American Left and other democratic Americans a number of historic lessons: (1) Wherever the policies of anti-Communism gain currency the people pay a big and costly price; (2) In France and elsewhere it is not the Communists but the forces of reaction and fascism which seek to destroy the parliamentary system and democratic rights; (3) While there is a welcome and promising process of differentiation taking place in the ranks of social democracy in France and in certain other countries, nonetheless the role of social democratism continues to be that of opening the road to extreme reaction; (4) The French crisis, precipitated by the Algerian War, demonstrates anew the poisoning effect of racism; it shows how the oppression of one people by

another seriously weakens the democratic capacities of the oppressing people; (5) The French events bring home dramatically that the most aggressive and chauvinist circles of monopoly capitalism naturally move, in our day, towards fascism; it emphasizes the reality of the danger of fascism, and war, in the present-day world; and (6) In France, as elsewhere, the Communist Party as the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the working class is the staunchest and most effective leader and fighter for the best national interests of the people, for their democratic rights, freedom and national security, as well as for the realization of their socialist aspirations.

CONCERNING YUGOSLAVIA

The Yugoslav question has again come to the fore as a matter of international controversy and friction.

As is known, the 7th Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists rejected the fraternal criticism of the Communist and Workers Parties and adopted a program which departs basically from the principles of Marxism-Leninism in a number of instances. These include their estimate of the international situation, the two world social systems, and the course of the war danger; their analysis of the contemporary role of imperialism and the capitalist state; their views on the role of Marxist vanguard parties of the working class and the road to so-

cialism
peric
ing cl
tory o
sociali
The
revisio
is outl
carrie
15th.
passin
has re
of the
Partie
line of
it ha
falsely
menta
nomic
world
politic
trying
with t
Comp
was b
result
icy" o
Fur
sert t
regula
prop
and s
relatio
"to re
and c
capita
tions
ciety."
Litt
slavs
the ex

cialism, and on the generalized experiences of the international working class in the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution and socialist construction.

The approach of our NEC to the revisionist program of the Yugoslavs is outlined in the digest of a report carried in *The Worker* on June 15th. Here I would only note in passing that the Yugoslav leadership has repudiated the Peace Manifesto of the 64 Communist and Workers Parties which it had signed and the line of the 20th Congress with which it had professed agreement. It falsely describes the two fundamentally different world social-economic systems as a "division of the world into two antagonistic military-political blocs." Not content with trying to "equate" the socialist camp with the imperialist camp, Tito and Company allege that this division was brought about primarily as the result of "the Stalinist foreign policy" of the USSR.

Further, the Yugoslav leaders assert that the capitalist state is "a regulator in the sphere of labor and property relations, of social rights and social services and other social relations" which tends increasingly "to restrict the role of private capital and deprive the owners of private capital of certain independent functions in the economy and in the society."

Little wonder then that the Yugoslavs gloss over the lessons of history, the experiences of the socialist coun-

tries, deprecate the revolutionary role of the working class and its vanguard and claim that "the swelling wave of state capitalist tendencies in the capitalist world is the obvious proof that mankind is indomitably moving into the era of socialism through a wide variety of different trends."

On the other hand, the Yugoslav program describes social ownership by the whole people, public ownership of the main means of production and distribution by the state in the socialist countries as "state capitalism." It contends that inevitably *this* so-called "state capitalism" gives rise to "bureaucracy and bureaucratic statist deformities." In this manner the Yugoslav leaders attempt to smear the state power of the working class and its allies and to glorify the capitalist state, the dictatorship of monopoly capital.

Obviously, the Yugoslav program is not an academic matter, not merely a subject for philosophical discussion and classroom debate. It is a theoretical program *and* a guide to action of a party that presently guides the destinies of a nation that started to build socialism. It is a program of action brought forward with the aim of splitting the international Communist movement, disrupting the solidarity of the socialist countries and weakening the relationships between the lands of socialism and the Bandung nations. It is, of course, in short, a program that can benefit only imperialism,

and American imperialism in the first place.

According to the program and the pronouncements of Tito and his colleagues, Yugoslavia is not allied with nor an adherent of the socialist commonwealth of nations. This, unfortunately, is true. But it is also a fact that Yugoslavia is not "neutral" and does not stand "outside" the socialist camp *and* the imperialist camp—as Tito claims.

There are a number of countries—although not socialist, such as India, the United Arab Republic, and Indonesia—which have adopted a policy of neutrality which opposes war and colonialism and supports peace and national freedom. While striving to develop normal and peaceful relations with all countries, their stand for peaceful coexistence and their generally anti-imperialist course has brought them into close, friendly and mutually beneficial relations with the socialist countries. This strengthens the cause for peace, freedom and progress.

But over the past decade the Yugoslav leadership, for the most part, has never been "neutral." Ever since 1948, and now with the adoption of its new program, Tito and Company, except for a brief interlude in 1955, have always directed the spearhead of their attacks against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, and have sought to whitewash and extol American imperialism.

Tito and Company were not

neutral when the Yugoslav government signed the Balkan pact and entered into military agreements with Turkey and Greece—agreements which are still operative. Similarly, the Eisenhower Administration, like its predecessor, was and is not neutral in extending over two billion dollars in aid and credits to Yugoslavia—nearly one-half of which has been grants in planes and other war material.

Tito and his co-workers were not neutral when they tried to fish in the troubled waters of Poland and Hungary in the autumn of 1956. Or when they intervened in the counter-revolution in Hungary on the side of Nagy and the so-called "Workers Councils." And they are not neutral today when they try to export to the East and the West their "new," "modern" and systematized version of revisionism, their program of "national communism."

If there were any doubts as to the real nature of Tito's brand of "neutrality" and present political role, suffice it to refer to the news dispatch from Belgrade published in the *New York Times* of June 16, 1958, reporting excerpts of a speech by Tito. In this speech Tito scurrilously accused the leaders of the Chinese People's Republic "with opposing any relaxation of East-West tensions, 'just as do warmongers in the West,'" and also maliciously charged, echoing Dulles and Knowland, that China's leadership "is counting on war to consolidate its rule in Asia."

As for the claim of the Yugoslav leaders that their reliance on U.S. foreign "aid" is consistent with socialist principles, suffice it to note that there are a number of socialist countries, including the USSR, which at times have sought or received loans and credits from various capitalist countries, as well as having entered into, or sought, extensive and mutually beneficial trade agreements with the West. This is part and parcel of the socialist foreign policy of promoting peaceful coexistence, as well as furthering the co-related Leninist principle of utilizing all contradictions in the camp of imperialism to strengthen the economy and positions of socialism.

However, the validity of this Leninist principle and policy has nothing in common with the present course of the Yugoslav leadership and its distorted application of this basic concept. For the Yugoslav leaders try to utilize the contradictions between the socialist and the capitalist systems not to weaken imperialism but to foster dissension and rifts within the camp of socialism. They now seek and receive large sums of U.S. "assistance" as the price and reward for asserting their "independence" from and non-cooperation with the socialist camp. In the process they are deforming the line of Yugoslav social-economic development and are becoming increasingly dependent upon American loans and military "aid."

How timely and correct is the Dec-

laration of the 12 Communist and Workers Parties in emphasizing that revisionism is the main danger in the international Communist movement! How sound is the conclusion that the influences of bourgeois nationalism are the internal source of revisionism, while imperialist pressures and influences are its external source!

It is obvious that to wage a successful struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, as well as for socialism, it is necessary that our Party and all adherents of Marxism and proletarian internationalism wage a resolute political and ideological struggle against the neo-revisionism and the splitting tactics of the Yugoslavs and their American backers and counterparts. It is likewise necessary to couple this decisive struggle with a firm and systematic struggle against dogmatism and sectarianism.

In doing this, we, like the Communists of other lands, must seek to avoid the mistakes and excesses which were made in the period between 1948-54 when the form of this struggle was erroneous and harmful. Although it is even clearer today that the 1948 estimate of the dangerous revisionist and bourgeois nationalist course of Tito and Company was also valid at that time.

In this connection, it is worthy to note and most encouraging that the Communist Parties and the governments of the socialist countries are pursuing a course of maintaining normal diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia, while conducting an all-

out ideological and political offensive to defeat revisionism and isolate its proponents. This increases our confidence that the heightened unity of the international Communist movement and the enhanced solidarity of the socialist camp which were registered in the December 1957 meetings of the Communist and Workers Parties, and again in the recent conference of the members of the Warsaw Treaty in Moscow, will grow and prove invincible.

Whatever momentary difficulties the latest ventures of the Yugoslav leadership may create will be surmounted, and much more quickly than after 1948.

HUNGARY

As is well known, the recent announcement that several of the Hungarian ring-leaders of the pro-Horthyite and CIA-inspired counter-revolutionary putsch in 1956 have either been executed or sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, has been seized upon as a cause celebre by the State Department and the American delegation in the UN for inciting a new anti-Soviet and anti-Hungary campaign.

In the autumn of 1957 the loaded report of the UN special committee was seized upon as pretext for diverting public opinion from the tri-power aggression against Egypt, from the machinations of the architects of the Eisenhower Doctrine in Jordan and Syria, and for counter-

acting the worldwide demand for East-West negotiations. So today, too, the question of Hungary is being raised again to divert world attention from the imperialist interference of the U.S. in Lebanon and Indonesia, and especially as a means of dynamiting the preparations for a heads-of-government conference.

Naturally, one's opinion as to whether or not the Nagys and Malestars should have been severely dealt with by the Hungarian Democratic Republic does *not* depend upon how one estimates the mistaken and harmful policies of Rakosi or Stalin at a certain period in the past. It depends, first of all, upon how one views the American-inspired counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary in the autumn of 1956, and upon one's class approach to justice.

As to whether the action taken against Nagy and Company was timed in connection with the developments around Yugoslavia and as a stern warning that the lands of socialism, while correcting previous errors of policy and violations of socialist legality, will not tolerate counter-revolution from revisionists or from any other apologists or accomplices of imperialism—this is matter of judgment. But it is not a matter of conjecture that Nagy and Malestar were executed *not* for their ideas and beliefs, but for their direct and leading participation in an armed insurrection which tried to destroy the Hungarian Republic and socialism.

It is common knowledge that the

State
aloo
peato
justi
or e
worl
cialis
ingte
suffe
scien
with
bear
ter
ficht
geria
Sout
and
Or
to e
happ
clud
Brot
that
most
head
adv
cialis
of r
and
lems
tion
gate
seek
Hum
min
natio
Hum
help
defe
the i
dupe

State Department which remains aloof and silent on Little Rock, repeatedly finds obstacles and "moral" justification for not negotiating with, or entering into agreement with, the working class governments of the socialist countries. However, Washington finds no such difficulty and suffers no so-called pangs of conscience when it comes to negotiating with the heads of governments which bear the responsibility for the slaughter and repression of the freedom fighters in Kenya, Cyprus and Algeria, in Taiwan, South Korea and South Vietnam, in Cuba, Guatemala and Spain.

One thing is clear: It is necessary to explain again and again what happened in Hungary in 1956, including the sinister role of the Dulles Brothers. It is imperative to show that in the autumn of 1956 the most aggressive imperialist circles, headed by the U.S.A., sought to take advantage of a period when the socialist countries were in the midst of rectifying certain past mistakes and overcoming certain new problems of socialist growth and cooperation. These reactionary forces instigated an armed uprising in Hungary, seeking to make a breach through Hungary and to divide and undermine the commonwealth of socialist nations. But, as is well known, the Hungarian people with the fraternal help of the Soviet Union decisively defeated the intrigues and attacks of the imperialists and their agents and dupes. In this connection, it is im-

portant to make far greater use of Herbert Aptheker's book, *The Truth About Hungary*, which is a well-documented and basic analysis of the events in Hungary in 1956, and their background.

It is also necessary to remind our fellow Americans of the special issue of *Life Magazine* which inadvertently revealed how Nagy and Company shared responsibility for the massacre of hundreds of Communists, trade unionists, and Jews, and how they connived to transform the Hungarian Workers Republic into its opposite.

Above all, it is essential to hammer home to the American people that irrespective of differing views on the fate of anti-Socialist counter-revolutionists, *nothing* and *no one* should be allowed to interfere with the promotion of East-West negotiations to lessen world tensions and to avert an atomic war—a war in which *one single* H-bomb in the megaton category could have the destructive power of *all* the bombs dropped on Germany and Japan in World War II.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Next, a few observations on the progress of preparations for a summit conference.

Despite the overwhelming desire and hopes of the peoples of all nations for an early summit meeting, there is now great anxiety regarding the course of the diplomatic talks

that were supposed to culminate before the end of the year in East-West negotiations at the top level.

The facts are that the State Department has thus far succeeded in delaying and thwarting headway leading towards talks at the summit. The prospects for an early conference are presently cloudy and uncertain.

It is well known that from the inception, starting from the Soviet proposal of last December and during the exchange of letters between Bulganin, Khrushchev and Eisenhower in February and March, Washington strongly opposed any and all initiatives for convening a top level East-West conference.

But the temper of world democratic opinion, the rising popular demand to halt the atomic arms race, influenced certain governments of the West to press for negotiations and compelled the Eisenhower Administration to agree reluctantly to a summit conference—after “adequate preparations.”

Following the historic decision of the USSR to unilaterally suspend A- and H-bomb tests—plus the impact of the Polish plan to create an atom-free zone in Central Europe—the pressure for East-West talks mounted, especially as government spokesmen in India, Japan, Indonesia, Burma, and some of the Scandinavian countries declared that the time for banning nuclear weapons and tests was now.

From outright opposition and later agreeing to preliminary talks at

lower levels ostensibly to prepare exchanges at the top, Washington then resorted to a series of delaying actions to bog down and stymie a summit gathering. In rapid succession it proposed a preliminary conference of Foreign Ministers, then prior meetings of ambassadors, and later it insisted on exploratory and non-committal talks of technical experts. At the same time, it insisted that prior agreements be reached on questions and areas which do not fall within the jurisdiction of a heads-of-government meeting, such as the internal affairs of the People's Democracies and of Germany—questions around which fundamental differences exist between the East and West.

The USSR, despite well-founded misgivings, subsequently agreed to the procedures proposed by the West, making it clear however that the discussion and disposition of all substantive questions were the province of the projected meeting at the summit. It stressed that on its part the USSR desired and proposed to search out a number of minimal questions around which East-West negotiations could result in limited, though important, agreements—i.e., the suspension of nuclear weapon tests; a universal declaration outlawing the use of A- and H-bombs; a reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces; the promotion of mutually advantageous trade, cultural and scientific exchanges.

In the interim Dulles participated

in the
when
aid to
rising
NATO
where
the all
summi
visable
to exp
contro
territo
ers.

Foll
days a
ter to
chev a
expert
workin

enforc
names
well a
ing ta
British
and o

Hung
are vi
basis
ing th
prepar
ment

at the
stalem

Wh
no rea

Bas
in the
circles
spearh
Ponts
—have

in the Spring conference of SEATO where decisions were taken to step up aid to the counter-revolutionary uprising against Jakarta, as well as the NATO meeting at Copenhagen where efforts were made to convince the allies of the U.S. that East-West summit talks were futile and inadvisable and that it was imperative to expedite the establishment of U.S.-controlled missile-rocket sites on the territories of all the NATO powers.

Following the public release ten days ago of Khrushchev's latest letter to Eisenhower in which Khrushchev agreed to a meeting of technical experts for the specific purpose of working out an inspection system to enforce an agreed-upon objective, namely to suspend nuclear tests, as well as noted the devious and stalling tactics adopted by the American, British and French ambassadors—and on the heels of the news from Hungary—Dulles stated that there are virtually no prospects nor any basis for convening a summit meeting this year. In any event, the preparations for a heads-of-government meeting are now bogged down at the technicians' level and virtually stalemated.

What are the reasons why there is no real progress towards the summit?

Basically the answer is to be found in the fact that the most aggressive circles of American monopoly—spearheaded by the Rockefellers, DuPonts and certain Morgan interests—have learned nothing and have for-

gotten nothing. Ignoring the verdict of history they provocatively, but futilely, pursue their quest for world domination. They seek a reactionary, imperialist solution of the current economic crisis and of the general crisis of world capitalism. They and their representatives in the Administration and the Congress doggedly persist in the bankrupt "positions of strength" policy, even though from time to time they are forced to yield to diverse pressures and reluctantly enter into East-West negotiations and limited accords. They are hell-bent on continuing their cold war program with its colossal military buildup, atomic and missiles arms race, its interventionist Eisenhower doctrine—all of which is so highly advantageous to the most bellicose monopoly groups in terms of amassing super-profits.

Leading American monopoly circles and their chief political spokesmen are dragging their feet and setting up one roadblock after another because they realize that a summit conference resulting even in partial agreements—such as to suspend nuclear tests, let alone in a pact to prohibit nuclear warfare, would considerably lessen international tensions. And any substantial relaxation in world tensions would remove the pretext for NATO and SEATO, would make it necessary to scrap the Pentagon's military strategy which is based on nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and warfare, on 275 military bases in foreign lands

and on an ever expanding military budget; and hence would weaken and set back the drive of the Rockefellers, DuPonts and others to place their NATO allies in receivership and expand their imperialist dominions.

Two related questions arise: First, can Washington and Wall Street succeed in continuing to block a summit conference? This is possible for a time, although developments in the next months, especially a further advance of the struggle for peace, could alter this state of affairs. And here it should be borne in mind that despite its opposition and reluctance, Washington was compelled to confer at the summit in Geneva in 1955, and will find it necessary to do so again.

Secondly, is America's foreign policy "winning"? Is the course of world relationships and trends such that the possibilities for promoting peaceful coexistence are diminishing or nullified? To this the answer is a categorical No!

MAIN LINE OF DEVELOPMENTS

Notwithstanding all zigzags, temporary difficulties, and the recurring war threats and dangers engineered by monopoly and by the State Department and the Pentagon—the main line of direction in world affairs is undermining the positions of imperialism and enhances the struggle for peace, national liberation and

social progress. Even a cursory examination of recent international developments underscores this:

a) For one thing, the tidal wave of national liberation and the struggle against colonialism has swept from Asia to Africa and now to Latin America. Even in the short period since the last meeting of the NC this great anti-imperialist movement has made noteworthy advances, in the process of which U.S. foreign policy and influence has suffered a number of new and significant setbacks.

Despite large scale U.S. military assistance and the organization of "volunteers" of KMT mercenaries, Filipino soldiers and American fliers to aid the rebellion against the Indonesian Republic, plus the provocative deployment of the 7th Fleet in Indonesian waters and the pressure of the State Department to try to compel the Sukarno government to negotiate an armistice with the rebels—the national unity of the Indonesian forces of independence and democracy, in which the CPI plays a leading role, has been strengthened, and the Republic of Indonesia has crushed the backbone of the American-inspired revolt.

Notwithstanding the intrigues of Anglo-American imperialism, the United Arab Republic has been formed, an anti-imperialist union which is consolidating its independence and security and is undermining the privileged position of the imperialist powers.

In Lebanon the growing struggle

for n
freed
spite
aid to
Cham
direct
terven
that c
front
come
and
strugg
Presic
his te
consti
tralist

• O
half o
the fol
"The
into Le
interve
try. It
sovereig
invasion
to plun
fiat. I
peace,
of the
others r
to nucl
"This
Eisenho
the oil
of the
said vic
it takes
tion of
Hamm
strictly
doubted
perialis
in inte
country
"Lik
ian C
actions.
Iraq, J
tries. V
military
East. W
Doctrin
adheren
ference
And w
confere
United
ful sen
sil oth

for national sovereignty and Arab freedom and solidarity continues despite extensive American military aid to the pro-Western regime of Chamoun and the grave threat of direct Anglo-American military intervention in the internal affairs of that country.* A powerful national front of all opposition parties has come into existence, and a united and effective political and armed struggle is being waged to prevent President Chamoun from extending his term of office in violation of the constitution and for ensuring a neutralist, anti-imperialist course in for-

* On July 15, 1958, Eugene Dennis, on behalf of the National Committee, CPUSA, sent the following telegram to President Eisenhower:

"The sending of American armed forces into Lebanon is an act of aggressive imperialist intervention in the internal affairs of that country. It menaces the national independence and sovereignty of all the Arab nations. Like the invasion of Egypt in October, 1956, it threatens to plunge the entire Middle East into armed conflict. It constitutes a grave menace to world peace, which endangers the lives and security of the American people no less than those of others and which, if not checked, could well lead to nuclear holocaust.

"This action is the inevitable fruit of the Eisenhower Doctrine which, in the interests of the oil trusts, calls for interference in the affairs of the Middle East nations, by-passing the UN and violating its charter and principles. Indeed, it takes place on the very heels of the declaration of a UN commission and Secretary-General Hammarskjöld that the struggle in Lebanon is strictly an internal affair. Moreover, it is undoubtedly directed against the present anti-imperialist actions of the people of Iraq, and aims at interference in the internal affairs of that country as well.

"Like millions of other Americans, we American Communists are deeply alarmed at these actions. With them we say hands off Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan, and all other Middle Eastern countries. We demand the removal of all American military forces from Lebanon and the Middle East. We call for abandonment of the Eisenhower Doctrine, an end to by-passing of the UN, and adherence to the principles of the Bandung Conference regarding peace and national sovereignty. And we urge the speedy convening of a summit conference of the big powers, including the United Arab Republic and India, to effect a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation and all other outstanding questions."

eign affairs, including the establishment of close ties with the United Arab Republic.

The conference of eight independent African states recently held in Accra has taken steps to safeguard their national independence and has pledged to support all African people struggling for freedom, including the Algerian liberation fighters who are now in the forefront of the struggle against colonialism in Africa.

And in Latin America, too—the hinterland of American imperialism—there is a marked upsurge of the movement for national sovereignty and democratic advance. The election results in Argentina, the overthrow of the Venezuelan dictator, Jimenez, the growth of the democratic forces in Colombia and Chile, the heroic struggle against the tyranny of Batista and the anti-Nixon demonstrations—all these testify to the growing anti-imperialist sentiment and struggles "south of the border."

This evidences the rising national and popular resistance to U.S. interference in the internal life of the Latin-American Republics, as well as the mounting opposition to the encroachments of the U.S. oil, mining and fruit corporations on their sovereignty, wealth and living standards—all of which has been aggravated by the catastrophic effects of the crisis on their economy and welfare. This is undermining still further the imperialist colonial system, including the positions and prestige

of American imperialism.

b) Then, too, there is the growth of the peace forces in virtually all countries, including our own. In the Western nations this is especially marked in Great Britain, West Germany, France and Italy, where the movement for banning H-tests, for East-West negotiations and in support of the Rapacki Plan for an atom-free zone in Central Europe has assumed nationwide proportions, involving not only the Communists and other organized partisans of peace, but also the British Labor Party, the German Social Democrats, and millions of Catholics. And in the recent elections in Italy and Greece the Communists and Left Socialists made noteworthy political advances at the expense of the parties of clerical and monopoly reaction, all of whom are supported by the State Department and the American trusts.

c) Another factor of special significance which is beginning to exert a profound influence on world developments is the worsening economic situation in the West. The severe economic crisis which has developed in our country, the end of which is not yet in sight, is now spreading. The indications are that it will shortly engulf the entire capitalist world.

Those nations which are more or less dependent on U.S. markets, quotas, tariffs and price-fixing—especially those which produce and export primarily raw materials and semi-finished goods—already have

been severely hit. This includes the nations of Latin America and most of Southeast Asia, as well as Pakistan and India. Moreover, a serious economic decline has begun in Great Britain, France and West Germany, and in Canada and Japan it is more advanced.

This developing world economic crisis, taking place on the basis of the accentuated general crisis of capitalism, is sharpening all inter- and intra-imperialist contradictions, as well as the class struggle within each country. One of the consequences of this is an intensification of the struggle among the members of NATO for markets and spheres of influence, plus a new impetus to expand East-West trade.

In respect to the latter issue, there is for instance the recent enlarged trade agreement entered into by West Germany and the USSR, as well as the efforts of the British and Canadian industrialists to extend further the list of non-embargoed goods available for export to the East. Together with this, the differences and rifts within NATO are multiplying, evidenced in part at the recent Copenhagen sessions of NATO where most of the thirteen small nations represented there insisted that the preparations for a summit conference should be continued and speeded up.

SOCIALISM CONTINUES TO ADVANCE

In contrast to the developing economic crisis in the West and the

decli
ist o
pros
vanc
ture.
whic
than
reve
men
Bo
proc
11 P
1958
as i
our
the
and
aliz
bou
the
will
And
Eco
of t
atte
othe
acco
mor
spe
ord
plan
T
nor
try
tem
ene
bro
kne
tort
shif
eco

decline of imperialism, the socialist countries are experiencing greater prosperity and registering further advances in industry, science and culture. The launching of Sputnik III, which is one hundred times larger than the Explorer and the Vanguard, reveals one aspect of socialist achievement.

But the fact that total industrial production in the USSR increased 11 per cent in the first quarter of 1958 as compared with 1957, whereas industrial production declined in our country over 11 per cent during the same period—is no less dramatic and significant. In China industrialization is also growing by leaps and bounds. During 1959, for example, the output of coal in People's China will surpass that of Great Britain. And at the recent meeting of the Economic Mutual Assistance Council of the members of the Warsaw Pact, attended by representatives of four other socialist countries, far-reaching accords were reached providing for a more effective division of labor, specialization in production and co-ordination of long-range socialist planning.

This will stimulate further the economic growth of each socialist country and strengthen the socialist system as a whole. Even such avowed enemies of socialism as the Dulles brothers have been forced to acknowledge, if belatedly and in a distorted way, how the scales have shifted in the spheres of peaceful, economic, technological and scienti-

fic competition between the two social systems.

At the same time the consistent peace policy and the series of new peace initiatives taken by the lands of socialism, including the steadfast efforts of the USSR to promote East-West negotiations at the summit; the historic decision of the Soviet Union in unilaterally suspending nuclear weapons tests; the solidarity and support rendered the United Arab Republic, Indonesia, etc.; the latest decision of the members of the Warsaw-Pact to cut their armed forces by an additional 419,000—bringing the reduction of their armed forces to 2,477,000 since 1955; the withdrawal of the Chinese volunteers from Korea, etc.—all this has advanced the cause of world peace and national liberation. It has had a profound effect in the countries of the West and among the uncommitted nations. It has strengthened the social system and enhanced the political influence of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union.

The aforementioned developments evidence beyond a shadow of a doubt that what is new in the international situation is *not* the recurrence of imperialist war threats and the periodic inflaming of tensions in the world, such as is again being organized by the State Department. What is new is the fact that the world relationship of forces are such, the strength of the forces of peace and socialism are such, that the aggressive imperialist bloc is now prevented

from going "hog wild." And when the imperialist camp does embark on aggression, as in Egypt, or resorts to crude imperialist interference, as in Indonesia, then it is repulsed and receives new and major setbacks. What is outstanding in world affairs is the fact that the overall conditions operating for a reduction in international tensions and for waging an ever more effective struggle for peaceful coexistence and for national freedom and social progress are becoming—whatever the ups and downs—more, not less, favorable.

THE PEACE STRUGGLE IN THE U.S.

Finally, I'd like to examine, if only sketchily, some facets of the peace movement and pro-peace trends within our own country.

It is no state secret that the struggle for peace in the U.S. has not yet reached the dimensions, militancy or clarity of the peace movements of a number of other countries, including that of India, Italy, Japan or Great Britain. This is not unrelated to the fact that within our country the virus of anti-Communism still poisons large sections of the labor and liberal movements; that the trade-union movement remains divided and that the working class has not yet emerged as a decisive and independent class-conscious force in national affairs; that the growing struggle for Negro freedom lacks adequate labor support and leader-

ship; that our Communist Party has not yet, on the whole, overcome its isolation; and that generally the widespread popular opposition to monopoly reaction remains by and large disunited and without a clear-cut perspective.

Nonetheless, this unsatisfactory state of affairs should not be allowed to obscure the fact that something big and important in the struggle for peace is beginning to unfold in our country. A new and promising trend and movement for peace is gathering momentum and has a great potential.

Stimulated by the decision of the Administration to proceed with the Atomic Energy Commission's current nuclear tests program in the Pacific, by the menacing increase of radioactive fallout, and by the peace initiatives of the USSR—as well as because of the political impact of the economic crisis and the militant moods of important sections of labor and the Negro people—a nationwide movement has developed demanding the cessation of nuclear tests and the prohibition of nuclear warfare.

Unfolding unevenly and with many diverse forms of expression, this mass movement is expanding and is exerting considerable political influence. In the past few months alone national and regional conferences of Lutherans, Unitarians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Negro Baptists have renewed their demands for a halt to nuclear tests. The Federation of American Scientists has

couple
pendi
an en
hoax
detect
rising
Carbo
Qua
Intern
for a
merou
group
tions,
demo
contin
the a
numb
—alth
joined
activi
ciation
conser
and
Marri
bright
public
In M
cratic
gone
nuclea
in th
in a r
sional
dates
progra
for pa
ton, Il
runni
dents
Robert
over

coupled its renewed plea for suspending A- and H-bomb tests with an effective exposure of the AEC's hoax that atomic explosions are non-detectable, as well as signaling the rising danger of Strontium 90 and Carbon 14.

Quakers, pacifists, the Women's International League, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and numerous educators and students' groups have organized mass petitions, scores of mass meetings and demonstrative actions protesting the continuation of H-bomb tests and the atomic missiles arms race. A number of trade unions and leaders—although still far too few—have joined one or another phase of this activity, as has the National Association of Social Workers. Certain conservative industrialists, bankers and politicians—like Cyrus Eaton, Marriner Eccles and Senator Fulbright—have expressed themselves publicly in a similar vein.

In New Jersey 10 out of 14 Democratic candidates for Congress have gone on record favoring an end to nuclear tests, as have 41 legislators in the State of Washington. And in a number of states and congressional districts independent candidates have come forward with a peace program, sometimes contesting major party primaries as in Washington, Illinois and Indiana, other times running as non-partisan independents as was the case of Holland Roberts in California who secured over 425,000 votes as a candidate

for Superintendent of Public Instruction on a platform of education for peace and democracy. In many instances, and notwithstanding all inadequacies, our Party and many of its members have made modest but effective contributions, have displayed political initiative in helping promote and advance one or another front of this promising struggle for peace.

During the past months there have also been other notable manifestations of the growing peace sentiments and activity in our country. The latest Gallup Poll reports that 60 per cent of the American people now favor the convening of a summit conference. As a result of the initial exchanges of American and Soviet artists, educators, scientists, athletes, editors, farmers, and industrial managers there is now coming to the fore a popular demand for the East and West to compete in solving the vexing problems of health, disease, and longevity, as well as to expand credits and aids to the underdeveloped countries. And slowly but surely additional labor and business spokesmen are beginning to speak out demanding an increase of East-West trade to cope with some of the pressing problems of the economic crisis, with the issues of jobs and markets.

Symptomatic of the present situation, and highly important, is the fact that new divisions and fissures are developing in the ranks of Big Business over various aspects of

American foreign policy, trade, foreign "aid" and taxes. Sometimes this expresses itself along partisan lines, although more and more frequently it manifests itself in pointed intra-party struggles.

Indicative of this are the publicized differences between Dulles and Stassen and between Acheson and Kennan on the question of East-West negotiations and on the proposal to "disengage" American-Soviet armed forces in Central and Western Europe. Illustrative too is the position of such staunch Republicans as Cyrus Eaton of Cleveland and Ryerson of Inland Steel—spokesmen of the Cleveland-Chicago monopoly grouping—who do not go along with the Dulles line and the Gaither and Rockefeller proposals for taking more "calculated risks," as well as for expanding U.S. military expenditures to the level of 70 billion dollars annually by 1968. Symbolic also are the differences within the Democratic Party, such as between Humphrey-Morse and Truman, and those within Administration circles, such as between Dr. Hans Bethe (chairman of the President's ad hoc committee on nuclear testing), and Admiral Strauss, over whether to suspend nuclear tests.

Also indicative is the position of Marriner Eccles, former chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who in a speech before the Institute of Industrial Banking on June 19, 1958, advocated that the U.S. should suspend tests, recognize China and trade

freely with the socialist countries. Likewise there is the stand of Senator Fulbright of Arkansas who declared on June 20th that the concept of "mutual nuclear deterrence" was fallacious and a national peril, and who urged that the Administration should recognize "that American bases near Soviet territory were a valid cause for Soviet alarm," and that the government "should take a more flexible position in negotiating this and other issues."

These rifts and disagreements in the ranks of capital and its major parties, which are accelerated by the economic crisis, are bound to increase in the coming period. And these can play an important, if indirect role in helping effect a positive change in America's foreign policy—providing the organized strength, unity and intervention of the popular forces in the struggle for peace, democracy and security are considerably reinforced.

Towards this end, and to advance the peace struggles of the American people generally, I would like to stress, even if only in capsule form, several inter-related propositions:

1) Greater attention is required to help *coordinate* and clarify, as well as to broaden the existing peace movement which is quite diversified and uneven in the level of its development and the forms of its activity. Everything should be done to expand all activity designed to halt nuclear weapons tests—the area of widest agreement among all peace forces—

and to systematically combine this with the struggle to outlaw nuclear weapons and with the demand for East-West negotiations at the summit. In this connection much more can and should be done by the organized peace forces, separately and collectively, to exert in numerous ways their growing political influence in the congressional elections. And here it should be borne in mind that the clarity which labor achieves and the headway it makes in the struggle for peace will provide one of the keys to advance the political independence and influence of labor and its allies.

2) The problem of how to activate and involve substantial sections of labor and the mass organizations of the Negro people in one or another aspect of the fight for peace must be viewed as one of the most challenging and basic tasks confronting the Left and all peace forces. An effective approach to solving this vital question seems to lie along the lines of stepping up and combining in a many-sided way the struggle for jobs and security with that of promoting East-West negotiations for expanded trade, as well as for nuclear disarmament and recognition of China. The possibilities here are all the greater now, with over five million workers totally unemployed and with many millions more working only part-time; for it must be hammered home that this recession has occurred in spite of all the assurances that armament-production and

the operation of a nearly war-time economy would assure "permanent prosperity." Now, everyone sees what Communists alone hitherto emphasized—that this was a mirage and that concentration on armaments far from ending the capitalist cycle would in fact deepen and sharpen it. It seems to lie along the lines of connecting more effectively the struggle for peace and national liberation in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. It seems to lie along the lines of broadening the exchange of East-West delegations to include trade-union and Negro delegations, as well as the representatives of artists, scientists, educators and industrialists.

3) More thought needs to be given on how to unfold the organizing and political initiatives of the Left and progressive forces, inclusive of us Communists. This is necessary in order to help spark and spur on broader united front peace activities. This is urgently required in order to help ensure that, there will be a more timely and effective popular response to such "incidents" as the Nike explosions in New Jersey and the accidental dropping of the A-bomb in South Carolina. This is needed to help mount an ideological counter-offensive of America's progressive peace forces and to answer with greater dispatch in words and deeds the innumerable cold war moves and the demagogic maneuvers of Dulles. This is required to help

stimulate timely and appropriate expressions of solidarity with the peoples of Cuba, Puerto Rico and Venezuela, Indonesia, Lebanon and Ireland, France and Algeria; and to popularize and acquaint the American people with the activity and policies of the peace forces of all countries, especially of the socialist lands.

4) In the struggle for peace and democracy our Party needs to display greater boldness and initiative in bringing forward its own views and independent position. It needs to do this in conjunction with waging a more determined effort to unfold its united-front policy and to search out the ways and means in every area and mass movement of helping crystallize the sentiment and pre-requisites for forging a broad anti-monopoly alliance or combination.

One of the central responsibilities we face in this respect is to develop further, popularize more widely, and to boldly and more skillfully implement our ideas and policy of a people's anti-monopoly program for jobs, civil rights and peace—a program of action to enable labor, the Negro people and the farmers to cope more unitedly and effectively with the acute problems arising from the economic crisis, the crisis in desegregation and the crisis in and bankruptcy of U.S. foreign policy.

What we Communists do in the coming months to help stimulate and influence the mass activity and movements of the Left, progressive and other democratic forces in the elections, in the economic struggles and the defense of collective bargaining and union rights, in the battles for civil rights and liberties, and in the struggle for peace—can help promote a democratic and peaceful solution of America's crisis, can hasten the trend towards a progressive and an anti-monopoly political realignment.

Even though we are a small party in a big country, and because we live and work in the center of imperialist reaction, we American Communists are confronted with gigantic responsibilities and big opportunities. We can discharge our obligations to our class and nation if we strengthen our ranks and mass ties, expand our independent activity, augment our Marxist-Leninist vanguard role and develop the broadest mass policy, free from Right-opportunist as well as Left-sectarian influences.

Recognizing that the issue of peace or war is the over-riding issue now confronting the American people and mankind, let this meeting of the National Committee resolve to mobilize our Party to make new contributions, new advances in the struggle for a democratic America in a world at peace.

By

THE
tion
it sin
crisi
Amo
half
them
facet
its e
the
take
Al
mad
ards
Caug
layof
time
pay
living
homo
Man:
speed
cond
the s
lion
winn
ment
inelig
pensa
paym
level

• 1

Com

On the Work and Consolidation of the Party*

By Bob Thompson

THE FEBRUARY MEETING of our National Committee was correct when it singled out the deepening economic crisis as the decisive feature of the American scene. In the four and a half months that have elapsed since then, the impact of this crisis on all facets of national life, and above all its ever-expanding consequences for the working people and youth, have taken clearer shape.

Already severe inroads have been made on the wage and living standards of the working class as a whole. Caught in the scissors of growing layoffs, virtual elimination of overtime pay and spreading part-time pay on the one hand, and rising living costs on the other, real take-home pay has been sharply reduced. Management efforts to intensify speed-up and break down work conditions have become general. At the same time there are several million families in which the breadwinner is totally without employment. Of these a large part, either ineligible for unemployment compensation or having exhausted their payments, have been reduced to a level near the despised relief stand-

ards of the '30's. In some predominantly Negro communities, which, as is always the case, have been hardest hit, this is beginning to approach a ratio of one out of every five families.

A new situation is being imposed on the trade-union movement. There are no longer so many crumbs on the negotiating table. The big corporations see in the crisis an opportunity for a union-busting spree. The situation in auto is a graphic illustration of this. Today defense of all unions against monopoly and governmental attacks takes on great importance and must be central in our Party's program. At the same time there is arising an imperative necessity for a clean-cut break with business unionism. The old philosophy, the old tactics, the old methods of leadership can no longer, under present changing conditions, produce results.

Objective conditions call for the rise of a new, militant unionism—a unionism that will work to pit the united strength of labor against the monopolies; that will work to organize the South; that will enlist the support of the Negro people, the youth, and of anti-monopoly allies

* Report to a meeting of the National Committee, CPUSA, June 28-29, 1958.

among farmers, professionals, and the middle class. The times demand a bold political perspective—a perspective of rapid, sweeping intervention of labor in national politics; of increasing direct representation in all legislative and executive bodies; of struggles to break the stranglehold of the machines in the two capitalist parties over national, state, and city politics; of a fundamental political realignment in the course of the period now opening up involving the emergence of a new People's Party in which labor plays a leading part.

It is a matter of great positive value that the working class still has within its living experience the memory of the major economic crisis which began in 1929. The impact of that crisis brought great rank-and-file pressures to bear on the union bureaucracy; it stimulated the emergence of a powerful Left current of which our Party was the heart; it created conditions which facilitated an alliance between this Left and forces seeking a middle course thereby breaking the dominance of the Green-Woll-Hutcheson conservative wing and making possible such historic advances as the organization of the unorganized and the formation of the CIO. On the political field also labor made significant advances, becoming a part, although all too subservient and non-independent a part, of a great majority coalition around Roosevelt which on some of the major issues confronting the nation and world, gave a progressive impetus. As a result,

while the crisis and depression-filled '30's were years of immense privation and hardship for the working people, the working class nevertheless emerged from them in a greatly strengthened position.

Today we have passed over the threshold into a new period of a serious cyclical economic crisis different in character from those that developed in 1949 and 1953. Basic class attitudes and relationships will be profoundly affected. How will the working class emerge from this crisis period? What will its status be in the nation? Will it emerge as a weakened, or even a defeated class? Or will it emerge with the status of a class that has taken long strides towards its rightful place as leader of the nation?

This large question is the center of our Party's concern as it drafts its program for the period ahead and shapes its labor policy.

The February meeting of our National Committee pledged that our Party, which has been without a defined labor policy for almost a year and a half, since its 16th convention, would at this June session be fully equipped with such a policy. This is the central and decisive task before this meeting.

Tomorrow a Draft Labor Policy statement will be presented for your consideration and action. This draft is in a large sense the product of three Party regional trade-union conferences held respectively on the West Coast, in the Mid-West and on the East Coast. It is estimated that

through these conferences, and through a series of additional meetings, a minimum of 200 comrades actively engaged in shop and union work participated in an organized way in shaping the estimates and policies that have gone into this draft. This is in its own right a modest, but by no means unimportant, accomplishment. Its impact on our Party has been to help establish a healthier outward orientation towards mass work and class problems and to put a damper on sterile factional bickering. It has had a stimulating effect on the activities of Party forces in a number of shops and unions. (I would add as an aside that the character of the discussions around this Draft Labor Policy statement should be some measure of reassurance to those sincere comrades who were fearful that a by-product of our February meeting might be the growth of undemocratic methods within our Party.)

When this National Committee meeting completes its work on it tomorrow, and adopts it, as I am confident it will, a landmark of great importance will have been passed in the rebuilding of our Party. Without a sound labor policy and tactical line, our Party doesn't amount to a hill of beans insofar as ability to influence the course of events is concerned. With such a policy and tactic, it can do a great deal even with its present reduced strength. What is more, the basis will exist for a rapid rebuilding of our Party's

strength and influence in the shops and locals.

The adoption of a National Labor Policy will at once confront this National Committee with additional tasks, and give the solution of these tasks a new urgency. Central among these is the developing of methods of work, and of a general leadership structure, that will guarantee a far higher level of sustained attention and direction to Party trade-union policies and activities.

Now if one examines what took place in the Garment general strike; what is happening in a number of areas in the auto, steel, packing-house and distributive industries; at the careful concentration activities in a number of other industries; then it is possible to find evidence of an improved situation with respect to some important phases of Party trade-union work.

In some areas this improvement is more visible. One of these is the manner in which our Party is reacting to the unemployment crisis. Our Party is beginning to speak out effectively on this issue in the *Worker*, through its national leaflets, through a number of excellent state and local leaflets and publications, and through an increasing number of mass meetings. In a number of important unions, and in some area-union conferences, Party forces as a part of a growing Left have been able to play a tangible and constructive part in the shaping of union programs and activities on the unemployment issue. Another such

area has been Party activities in the fight against anti-labor, so-called "right-to-work" legislation, particularly in California and Ohio.

All of this, and much more that could be added, is welcome evidence of the improving political health of our Party, the fact that it is overcoming the state of internal paralysis that fenced it off from workers and their problems and struggles.

We take note of these modest improvements in Party activity in the trade-union field, of this healthy trend, not for the purpose of manufacturing some basis for complacency. Lord knows one would have to look through a mighty powerful magnifying glass to find any such basis. Our purpose is the exact opposite. It is to establish the fact that these positive developments are being retarded because the national leadership has carried over from the recent past a lot of baggage with respect to methods of work.

This will not be changed overnight. Changing it will be a process. It need not, however, be a long-drawn-out process. In order to secure an improved caliber of Party leadership of our forces in the shops and unions, I suggest we undertake the following objectives in the period between this and our next N.C. meeting.

For the decisive heavy industry region surrounding the Great Lakes, a Party Co-ordinating Committee should be established. Operating under the N.E.C. its purpose will be to give sustained and on-the-spot assist-

ance to the State organizations in the region in the development of Party activity.

A network of three regional trade union commissions—mid-West, West Coast, and East Coast—shall be established to operate under the co-ordination and direction of the N.E.C.

The function of Labor Secretary will be undertaken by a competent comrade.

Questions of direct concern to comrades active in shops and unions must predominate in the agendas of all leading committees.

There must be an increase in the number—and I hope also the quality—of reports and articles elaborating Party policy on problems confronting the labor movement.

Comrades, if this National Committee meeting equips our Party with a strong and sound labor policy, and at the same time takes the necessary measures to strengthen the daily leadership of Party activities in this field, it will lay the basis for some very important advances in the coming months.

YOUTH

The economic crisis is confronting today's generation of youth for the first time with the most fundamental of all questions. This is the same question which in a different setting was paramount for the youth generation of the '30's. It is the question of whether or not they can find a place for themselves in the productive life of the nation. During the whole of their growing-up period,

today's youth have had dinned in their ears that they as individuals were assured such a place if only they would conform to the stereotype of a good American so largely drawn by the McCarthyites. They are now confronted with a situation where these answers don't ring true even on the surface. The basic pressures operating on the graduating classes this year are towards collective action, not individualism.

The problems they confront demand group struggle, not individual compliance. The questions they want answers to demand searching, social thought, not individual conformity. It is the corporations that have closed their doors to the youth. Youth must turn to labor to pry them open. It must turn to labor for initiating the formulation and enactment of youth legislation, going beyond the aid given by youth legislation of the New Deal period. The fully valid concept of a labor-youth alliance must be restored. Above all, youth must turn to itself, with the fullest support and assistance of all progressive working-class forces, to find the forms that will rapidly bring forth an organized Left in its ranks; and together with this the forms that will promote its unity as a progressive social force in the nation.

For some two or three years now it has been fashionable in our Party to bemoan the advancing age level of our membership. I think the time has come for us to stop moaning and to start doing something. If we start paying some really serious attention

to the youth and their problems, they in turn will pay attention to us.

What is possible for our Party to do here and now in this field?

The first thing that is possible for us to do is to keep clearly in mind a fundamental fact of life. This is that there is a tremendous gap—I am almost tempted to say chasm—in the life experience of class-conscious and Marxist workers of the age level of 35 years and over and the healthy, militant members of today's younger generation. They are products of two radically different social periods. The proposition put forth by Lenin that the old can never tell the young to tread in its footsteps is today true, doubled in spades.

The revisionist idea that our Party is an old and a senile Party is for the birds. Our Party is basically a Party of the youth, for its science deals with that which is new and growing in the social and political life of our country. There is a deep-going, rebellious, and pioneering spirit in this young generation of ours, and it is greater, not lesser, than that of past generations. A hundred years ago a Horace Greeley could undertake to give a geographical direction to this pioneering spirit of the youth with his battle cry: "Go West, young man, go West!" Today this pioneering spirit can be given no geographical direction. It must seek a political direction, it must pioneer social and political frontiers. To be a Horace Greeley in 1958 one must raise the battle-cry, "Go Marxist, young man, go Marxist!"

Our Party has a great role to play among today's youth. It has a vision of the future, a depth of class consciousness, a wealth of experience in the rough-and-tumble of class struggle, which the youth of this generation desperately need. It cannot fulfill this role if it sets out to preach to the youth. It cannot start out by telling young people, "Look, we did such and such in the past and you do so and so in the present." We must start out on a different basis. We must start out by listening to young people, by seriously undertaking to understand what is different in their life experience, by undertaking to assist, not boss.

Keeping this in mind, what is it possible for this National Committee to undertake between now and its next meeting in order to begin the development of a Party program and activity in the youth field?

To one degree or another, we can help see to it that the Marxist press and journals begin a systematic policy of carrying analytical articles and news stories dealing with problems and events of special concern to the youth.

We can begin the development of a conscious cadre policy towards young people in and around the Party. Let us give priority to listening to them and talking with them. Let us be as helpful as we can in stimulating and assisting in the formation of youth study circles that in one form or another will grapple with the content of Marxist-Leninist thought.

Let us become conscious of the fact that there already exists a wide

variety of youth groupings in which young Marxists play an important part. These range all the way from study groups and young explorer social clubs through chorus groups and bowling clubs. No Party club or section should be satisfied with its work unless it has a real connection with a grouping of young people of this character in its area. Perhaps in a year's time there will be 100 or 125 of such youth groupings throughout the country. Perhaps on the basis of their own experiences they will decide to convene a National Conference and establish a forward-looking socialist minded youth organization.

A number of young people, some in and some close to the Party, are already very active in attempting to shape Marxist policy in the youth field. Let us get together with these forces on an organized basis. Let us set our sights for a limited Party National Conference on Youth Policy for some time in September.

This meeting of our National Committee is, so to speak, starting from scratch with respect to a youth policy and program. It will take some time and experience before it can produce one. Let us make a start in this direction along the lines indicated. Youth has a way of asserting itself. If we oldsters take the hook off the latch, they will force the door open; and let us be secure in the knowledge that this door will lead forward, not backward.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT

The economic crisis is having a massive impact on the Negro peo-

ple's
signs
part
ing c
and i
to it.
Paul
of th
achie
Paul
in th
expre
of th
Negr
line
It w
of T
this
again
Harl
effect
from
carri
peop
for t
furth
Negr
doub
part
in its
a gr
and p
ly b
adv
ment
Th
today
of t
of th
of b
worl
tion

ple's movement. Already there are signs of a fuller and more prominent participation in it of the Negro working class and of the more advanced and militant quality this will impart to it. The national reception given Paul Robeson's book is an expression of this. So also is the new status achieved by such great figures as Paul Robeson and W. E. B. Du Bois in the Negro community. It finds expression also in the new quality of the revolt that is taking place in Negro communities against the old-line political parties and machines. It was this that led to the victory of Turner in New Jersey. It was this that led to the massive revolt against the old-Party machines in Harlem around Powell, which is in effect a declaration of independence from the old party machines and carries great meaning for the Negro people's movement nationally and for the labor movement as well. The further impact of the crisis on the Negro people's movement will undoubtedly not only lead to a greater participation of working-class forces in its leadership, but will bring about a greater stress on those economic and political issues felt most pressing by Negro workers, thus further advancing the character of this movement.

The Negro people's movement of today bears on it both the imprint of the special national oppression of the Negro people, and the imprint of being part of the rising tide of world-wide, anti-colonial and liberation struggles of the colored peoples.

Its path forward lies in alliance with the entire working class of our country. These special characteristics determine, however, that this alliance must be on a new basis of partnership and that the Negro component of this alliance will exert a new measure of initiative and trail-blazing.

Our Party needs a fresh theoretical appraisal of the status and path of development of the Negro people's movement. A serious beginning has been made on this. Comrade James Jackson has given a provisional report on this subject to the NEC and will lead a discussion on it at a National Negro Commission meeting in a few days. We should be prepared for a full-dress and definitive handling of this important question by the time of our next N.C. meeting.

In addition to resolving certain basic theoretical concepts pertaining to the status and course of development of the Negro's people's movement, there are a number of other problems that we must address ourselves to in the period between this and our next N.C. meeting.

Let us in a realistic and down-to-earth manner survey the adequacy of our Party's programmatic demands and activities, section by section, with respect to Negro working families, in the fields of job discrimination, unemployment compensation, welfare, and housing.

Let us undertake to guarantee that in every section of the labor movement in which Communists exert an in-

fluence there will be raised in the next six months in one form or another two demands:

- 1) The right of Negroes to register and vote in the Southern States, and
- 2) The need for a new initiative to expand unionism in the South.

Let us begin to assess the status of our Party in a few key areas such as Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, the South Side of Chicago, Cedar Central in Cleveland. What contacts do we have and what movements do we influence in these areas of Negro majority in the North?

POLITICAL ACTION

The effects of this economic crisis are particularly far-reaching, because, starting with the United States, it is rapidly becoming a crisis of the world capitalist system. In addition to imposing great hardship on the working people of all the developed capitalist countries, it is throwing into chaos the economies of those less developed countries that are dependent on a capitalist raw material market. It is developing at a moment when the socialist sector of the world is buoyantly moving from one economic success to another. The socialist sector is giving real aid on a vast scale to a growing number of countries. It has already surpassed the capitalist world in a number of areas of education, technology, and scientific advance. It has already surpassed large areas of the capitalist world in absolute standards of well-being for its people and is rapidly approaching the point where it will

compete on a per capita basis with the productivity of the most advanced capitalist nation, the United States. Under these circumstances, the outbreak of a serious economic crisis such as the present one carries implications for the future of world peace and of capitalism far different from the one of 1920.

In the '30's imperialism had a bigger say in the world. It could attempt the solution of its ills by launching a series of so-called little wars of aggression against relatively defenseless countries—China, Ethiopia, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia. It could bring fascism to power at those points where the working class most threatened it. It had the power to and ultimately did resort to World War.

This is a different period of world history. It is a period in which imperialism has lost much of its power to shape events. With respect to "little wars," the outcome of the attempted aggressions in Korea and in Indo-China, the Suez fiasco, and now the Algerian deadlock and the events in Lebanon, testify to this. The heroic struggles of the French working class led by its Communist Party, and of the French people, developed so well in the report of Comrade Dennis this morning, is proving that there is no easy road to power for fascism in this period. At the same time the growing strength of the socialist camp and above all of the Soviet Union makes the prospect of a third World War increasingly uninviting.

The impact of the crisis on certain imperialist forces in the United States will no doubt be to intensify efforts to find a war solution to their problems. It will not, however, increase their ability to find such a solution. On the contrary, the basic impact of the crisis will be to increase the tempo with which the relationship of forces on a world scale is changing in favor of peace and socialism. It will be to further impose the condition of peaceful co-existence on the imperialists as the framework within which the problems of the capitalist world must be met. Increasingly deprived of ability to impose a war solution, the monopolists are at the same time inherently incapable of a peaceful solution for that can be found only along anti-monopoly lines. It is this situation which poses before the working class the great democratic task of this period—the assumption of leadership in the fight for an anti-monopoly coalition capable of imposing on the monopolies a solution to the people's problems.

The 1958 elections have already become an important arena of struggle on many of the important issues confronting the people. There are clear indications that both labor and the Negro people's forces are participating more actively and more independently than has been true in recent years.

Labor's participation in the California primary campaign was an outstanding example of this. So also is the greatly increased number of direct labor candidates in Michigan

and throughout the Midwest. The revolt against both of the old Party machines that took place in Harlem around Powell is an important indication of the new moods that are arising among the Negro people.

Our Party is becoming more active in all of these situations. The presentation of a Party legislative program has been helpful in this. Of greatest importance is the fact that its electoral policy is taking clear shape nationally and in the various States.

Three propositions form the broad framework within which this policy is developed. These were stated by Arnold Johnson in his article on the 1958 elections in the June *Political Affairs*:

a) to do everything possible to influence the elections in the interests of the people.

b) to promote ever greater independence of labor and its allies and a broad people's coalition policy based on the workers, the Negro people, farmers, and all other democratic forces.

c) to bring forward the Party and its program, strengthen its influence and build it in the course of the campaign.

BUILD "THE WORKER"

The period since our February N.C. meeting saw the last desperate efforts of Gates and his revisionist cohorts to transform the Party crisis into a catastrophe. The key objective of this effort was to force the liquidation of *The Worker*, thus eliminating a national Marxist press in the

U.S. and clearing the road for their projected new Marxist publication and movement. In this effort they were ably assisted by the so-called ultra Left—by certain fanatical dogmatist factions who chose this moment to intensify their efforts to sabotage Party mass work and press-building efforts.

At this meeting of our N.C., it is possible to announce with assurance that this effort to eliminate a Marxist press in the U.S. has failed. It failed because our Party accepted the challenge and fought back as no other Party save a Communist Party can. There was one period where our New York Party raised \$20,000 in three weeks time to prevent the paper's collapse. Certain state organizations, such as Illinois, Minnesota and Michigan, responded with effective special efforts to build circulation. Some of the reviving morale and fighting spirit of our paper was expressed in the willingness of its staff to go four and five weeks without pay and the willingness of the comrades in the National Party Center to drop seven weeks behind in their wages so that the paper could survive.

This Party fight for *The Worker* has paid off. It has not missed coming out for a single issue. Despite drastic reductions in its staff, its quality has greatly improved. In relation to key problems confronting the working people it is displaying ability to develop sustained campaigns. It is developing the ability to effectively expound Marxist ideas

and to defend Communist policies and organization. It has expanded its total circulation by roughly 2,000 since our February meeting.

This meeting of our N.C. should also commend the staff of the *People's World*, the California Districts of our Party and our Washington and Oregon State organizations, for the successful fight they have put up to maintain and develop the *People's World*.

We can see a clear perspective ahead for establishing a growing circulation base and an expanding sale for *The Worker*. It will still take, though, a lot of hard work—an immense effort—to realize that perspective.

The current fund drive must be carried through to full success.

A district press apparatus must be organized in each state.

Above all, *The Worker* must begin to be used more fully in every phase of our Party's mass activities, in every campaign it mounts or participates in. *The Worker* is the chief direct contact between our Party and the masses, its chief instrument for overcoming isolation.

BUILD PARTY MORALE— ROUT REVISIONISM

We stand today on the threshold of a period of great change. It is this prospect of a fluid and changing period in American life that makes so imperative the rapid rebuilding and activation of our Party. This understanding of the vital and large role of our Party must permeate and

inspire our membership. It is the foundation upon which Party morale is built. It is the basis for Party consciousness, the highest expression of class consciousness.

Revisionist concepts have eaten deeply into this foundation. It is necessary that the damage be undone. This is especially the case because some of these concepts, which have in recent months been taking a beating on the American scene due to the harsh realities of life and an improving political climate in our Party, may be encouraged anew by the open banner of revisionism hoisted on the international scene by the Yugoslavs.

The fountain source among American Marxists of revisionist concepts of the role of our Party is a set of closely inter-related propositions put forth at various stages of the internal Party struggle by the Starobin-Kast-Gates-Clark cabal. These are:

1. Marxism is outdated and has lost its validity as the advanced science of the working class.

2. The Communist Party has become an obstacle to socialism and social progress.

3. What exists in the Soviet Union, China, and the other socialist lands is "something other than socialism."

This is revisionism in its crudest and most vulgar dress. Our Party has passed beyond the point where such concepts receive toleration, let alone are accorded legitimacy.

The problem is that revisionism has a rather extensive wardrobe. As

the political-theoretical health of our Party improves, the attire changes, it becomes more sophisticated and subtle.

The formula for such change runs somewhat as follows:

It is no longer possible to shout in strident tones as John Gates used to do that Marxism is outdated. All right, we recognize this. Let us then say the same thing in a different way. Let us say in sweet and gentle tones that Marxism is the greatest of all possible sciences in this greatest of all possible worlds, but that this of course does not mean that it has any universally valid principles, or that the 12-Party statement defining those principles is correct.

One no longer gets a hearing when one says that the Communist Party is an obstacle to the achievement of socialism and social progress. All right, let's put the idea differently. Let us say that the Communist Party is the most wonderful organization ever produced by this most wonderful of all possible countries and that the reason for this is that it can now eliminate itself by contributing to the formation of a new kind of organization, based on different principles.

It is no longer possible to say that the Soviet Union, China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, North Korea and Vietnam are not building socialism. Well, this is really unfortunate. But let us not be downhearted. Let us say without hesitation that these are the most wonderful of all coun-

tries in this most wonderful of all worlds. But then let us add, that the main thing about these countries is that they persist in doing the wrong things, at the wrong times, in the wrong ways, and that this, of course, is the source of the war danger.

This does not, of course, exhaust the trappings of revisionism. Perhaps mention should be made of one other. I have in mind, for example, the oft-repeated proposition that now that we have a strong trade-union movement, we don't really need a Party because after all this trade-union movement itself is raising the necessary demands. "Why do we need a Party" it is said, "to demand 25 cents more than a union is demanding? Why do we need a Party to demand a thirty-hour week when many unions are demanding a 35-hour week?" This, of course, is a caricature of the role of our Party, a revisionist caricature.

Our Party's great function is not that of taking note of, and then adding to, immediate demands of the unions and other working-class bodies. Of course, there do arise situations where our Party in its own name raises immediate demands that go beyond those being put forward by other organizations. Such is the case today, for example, in the legislative field where our Party has raised and has undertaken to popularize demands with respect to the unemployed and the right to jobs that go beyond those coming from other quarters. This is a valuable and a useful thing and one aspect

of the role of the Party. It is not, however, the central function of our Party. The central function of our Party is that it is the only organization on the American scene which, on the basis of an advanced science, understands the totality of the workings of the capitalist system and of the relationship of classes within it. It is the only organization in a position to properly relate the present level and immediate demands of the working class and its allies with the historic and objectively determined goals of that class. It is the only organization because it is a *party of its class* which is in a position to give comprehensive direction and a broad orientation to the Left and progressive currents arising out of the immediate struggles of the period. Our Party is not a Party of one segment of the working class. It represents the interests of the whole class in its activities in all facets of national life, in its activities in relation to the trade-union movement, the Negro people's movement, the youth movement, the women's movement, in the electoral field. It brings into the working-class movement the scientific outlook of Marxism-Leninism, and imparts to the working class on the basis of its own experience and struggles a socialist consciousness.

Can our Party meet the large challenge posed by the period that lies ahead?

This meeting of our National Committee must give a qualitatively different answer to this question than has been forthcoming in the past. It

must o
line o
decisi
ing.

Ofte
heard
lack o
ing hi
Haml
presti
Comm
dered
meeti
decide
Comm
shoul
who
tional
mann

No
have
tional
to su
with

Co
ty an
the
confi

its fr
no s
with
there

a co
that
lose
Party

the v
your
ing.
and
the
be

must do so on the basis of the general line of our 16th Convention and the decisions of our February N.C. meeting.

Often in recent months, I have heard George Blake proclaim his lack of confidence in our Party. Casting himself in the role of a political Hamlet and using to the full the prestige that goes with National Committee membership, he wandered on and off the stage of Party meetings proclaiming his inability to decide the question of whether this Communist Party of ours should or should not be. I have heard others who are still members of this National Committee perform in a like manner.

Now, Comrades, I say we must have done with this. I say the National Committee must put a stop to such goings on, must have done with them once and for all.

Confidence in the Communist Party and its future is nothing other than the highest political expression of confidence in the working class and its future. For a Marxist, there is no such thing as confidence in one without confidence in the other. If there are comrades here who hold a contrary view—who hold a view that it is possible for a Marxist to lose confidence in the Communist Party and still retain confidence in the working class—I ask that you put your views on the table at this meeting. Develop a thesis to this effect and we will debate it openly before the Party. I say no such thesis can be developed without abandoning

even the pretense of Marxism. I say further that the undermining of confidence in our Party and its role and the gutting of its working-class fighting spirit is the very essence of revisionism as it has developed on the American scene.

Now some may say we are trying to force confidence down the throats of members of this N.C., and that confidence is something that can't be forced on anyone. This National Committee can do little or nothing to force confidence in the Party and the working class on any of its members who may have lost that confidence. It can, however, do something else. It can, and in my opinion must, end the fiction that one can lose such confidence and still retain ability to give leadership to the Party and the working class. This meeting of our National Committee must re-establish beyond shadow of doubt, as its February meeting stressed, the basic Marxist concept that confidence in the future of the working class and of its Communist Party is the most fundamental of pre-requisites for real leadership of the Communist Party and of the working class. It must re-establish the concept that the function of leadership is to build up the morale and fighting heart of the organization, and that to undermine and destroy that confidence is a crime against the Party and the working class. Our Party has many real weaknesses. These weaknesses must be approached from the viewpoint of overcoming them, not exploiting them.

The improved political health of our Party and the beginnings that are being made in constructive mass activities provide a sound basis for confidence in our Party's future.

The chief disruptive phenomenon in our American Party during the recent past has been the rise of a powerful revisionist tendency and the achievement by it, for a period of time, of a status of semi-legitimacy in our ranks despite the struggle waged against it. It would be the gravest error, however, to conclude from this that somehow the deep-rooted danger posed by dogmatic and sectarian currents in our ranks which, like revisionism, have their base in objective conditions, has abated or lessened. On the contrary it has grown.

The fact is that revulsion against dogmatism, especially some of its most fanatical and extreme variants, has been a factor which influenced many staunch Party comrades who never agreed with the essence of Gates' revisionist views, towards becoming enmeshed in his grouping. Conversely, many staunch Party comrades, out of revulsion against the rampant revisionism of the Gates forces, and at inadequacy in the Party's struggles against this revisionism, have tended towards dogmatism, and in some instances have even become enmeshed in fanatical factional groupings.

What is the political face of dogmatism in our Party today? Ideologically and politically, what does it stand for? In essence it repre-

sents an effort to revert back to a pre-7th Congress, pre-1935, class against class, programmatic position. It would have our Party ignore the great changes wrought by an epoch of socialist victories and great class and people's struggles. It would ignore the phenomenon of the rise and existence of the threat of fascism and of the consequent necessity of the working class pursuing a line of popular and people's front alliances. It would ignore the new world role of the Soviet Union and of the vast changes in relationships of forces on a world scale and in individual countries which open up new forms and possibilities for social progress and advance towards socialism. It would ignore the important changes that have occurred as a result of the growth of the unions and the Negro people's movement in our country.

These factional groupings of dogmatists have been flooding our Party with tracts on the Negro question, the trade union question, the peace question, etc. Examine what is said in them and you will find that the central theme of everything they say is that the be-all and the end-all of revolutionary policy today is the reverting to the pre-7th Congress class against class line. This is not a policy for our Party or our class. It is not Marxism. It is political and ideological bankruptcy.

This underscores the validity of the way the February N.C. meeting placed the need for a two-front struggle against revisionism and dogmatism. The resolution states:

While vigorously opposing and consistently striving to overcome sectarianism and doctrinairism, we must also relentlessly combat the ideas and positions of revisionism. Without a decisive repudiation and defeat of the revisionist trend in our ranks, we cannot carry on a systematic and effective struggle against Left-sectarianism and dogmatism which have plagued us for decades and with which we are at present so deeply afflicted, and we cannot build our Party as a Marxist organization and surmount our isolation. It is in this sense, and in the spirit of our convention and its injunction to work to end our isolation that, in the words of the convention Resolution, "the struggle must be conducted on both fronts, with the main emphasis against that which threatens the Marxist line of our Party at the given moment." This will, of course, vary from one situation to another. Moreover, this struggle should be waged so as to help overcome the historic weakness of the American Marxist movement—its sectarianism and doctrinairism.

END FACTIONALISM— HALT PARTY WRECKING

The February meeting of our National Committee laid the basis for the breaking up of old alignments in our Party. This is the process that has been taking place. A new, a decisive, and a growing majority has emerged in our National leadership in most of our State organizations. This new majority has the adherence of staunch Party comrades associated with all past Party trends.

Its political solidity is founded on the explicit and unequivocal conviction that this Communist Party of ours has a vital and growing role to play in current struggles and that its future and the future of its science, Marxism-Leninism—is in the historic sense synonymous with the future of our class and country. It is a majority willing to fight for our Party against all attackers.

What has happened to these erstwhile leaders who continue today to adhere to the revisionist ideas associated with Gates? Many scarcely bother any more to appear at meetings and expound their bankrupt views. They have entered a new stage in their degeneration. They devote themselves to attempting to organize *coups* such as the public resignation of the California 26. They devote themselves to trying to demoralize individual members, clubs or sections. They plant scandalous lying stories in the capitalist press. This handful has entered into and is now engaged in Party wrecking.

What has happened to the hard core of dogmatic factionalists? For all practical purposes they have joined hands with the revisionist Party wreckers. They sabotage all Party activities and mass work. They refuse to support *The Worker*. They proclaim a policy of no-confidence in our Party and its future. They attempt to organize themselves and conduct themselves as a Party within a Party.

There was a time when Gates and Clark and Fast *et al*; were running

rampant, when our Party couldn't do much to defend itself against factionalism. Well, that day is past. Our Party is in the process of regaining its solidity as a Marxist-Leninist organization. This process has reached a point where it has the capacity to declare war on factionalism no matter what direction of the political compass that factionalism comes from—whether from the direction of revisionism or the direction of dogmatism.

The N.E.C. of our Party presented a line on this question of factionalism which was contained in the thesis of the interview I gave to *The Worker* on April 13. Between this and our next N.C. meeting practical measures should be undertaken to carry this line into effect. Let us undertake to move against and eliminate all significant factional groupings and all dual centers of leadership during this period.

LET US BE GARDENERS— NOT UNDERTAKERS

Let us at this N.C. meeting take a fresh look at our Party—at the direction in which it is moving—at its mass activities and at its inner life.

I would urge that we do so not from the viewpoint of the undertaker surveying his neighborhood for business prospects. Let us not be too obsessed with those negative things

which still exist, but which are in essence the carry-overs of a past period, and which are in the process of elimination and death.

I would urge rather that we adopt the viewpoint of the gardener. Let us consciously undertake to search out and pinpoint the new, the healthy, the productive things in our Party. Let us stimulate those trends so that in the shortest order they become the predominant characteristics of our Party in all phases of its work.

The most important part of the picture of our Party's current activities and status will come in the discussion. It will come from comrades in districts, and shops, and sections, who in life are putting an end to a period of sterile internal dissension in Party affairs and are helping the Party in their areas to grapple with the real problems confronting the working people of their shop and community.

This is a period in which the need for our Party is becoming increasingly manifest. Objective conditions are favorable for a rapid rebuilding of our Party's influence and strength. At the same time our Party's political health has improved to the point where it has a real capacity to take advantage of the new possibilities opened up by this objective situation. I think confidence that we are going to move forward from this N.C. meeting into a period of Party growth is fully justified.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE MID-EAST: PEACE OR WAR? (Part I)

The recently-founded National Church of Nigeria and the Cameroons has its own book of prayers and hymns. Here is a stanza from that book:

*From foreign rule and domination,
God of freedom deliver us
From oppression, suppressions and exploitations,
God of Freedom deliver us.*

This is the Battle Hymn of a Republic-in-Birth; and of a colonial world in new birth. The tempo of the struggle varies from one portion to another; at the moment the Arab peoples are in the headlines. "What's the name of this place?" a marine wants to know, as he digs in to the hard sand on a strange beach very far from home. "Is this what they call Beirut?"

The Middle East or the Near East—as Europeans have named the area with their characteristic self-centeredness—is made up of that part of the globe on which are concentrated the great and ancient Arabic peoples. It consists of West Asia and North Africa; of some four million square miles reaching from the Persian Gulf in the east to the Atlantic Ocean in the west, and from the Sudan in the south to Syria in the north. In this enormous bowl, astride the junction of three continents, live about eighty million people.

IMPOVERISHMENT

The vast majority of these eighty millions do not live well; indeed, nowhere in the world is there a more profound poverty and deeper human suffering than in this area where once bloomed the Garden of Eden. Emil Lengyel, in his *World Without End: The Middle East* (John Day, N. Y.), calls it "the poor-house of the world." Generally speaking, its death rate and illiteracy rate are the highest in the world. Most of the population is ridden with disease—pellagra, tuberculosis, dysentery, typhoid, trachoma, malaria. Some of the data are very nearly unbelievable in conveying such stark and mass impoverishment: Iraq has one doctor for each 7,000 inhabitants; in that land of six million people, 50,000 die every year from malaria; in Iran out of every 1,000 live births, 500 die in infancy; of 16 millions, one-fourth suffer from malaria.

The evidence points to a worsening of conditions in the Middle East (with some exceptions) especially since World War II, when the most rapid and intensive exploitation of the area's resources by Western capital has occurred. When one has conditions approximating starvation to begin with, intensified impoverishment is really something to conjure with; yet such appears to be the

fact. Thus, in Iran, the daily caloric content of food supply available for the population for the period 1934-1938 was 2,010; for the period 1946-1949 it was 1,811;* the latest UN report (*Economic Developments in the Middle East, 1956-57*, Columbia Univ. Press, \$1.75) notes a steady rise in the cost of living since 1950, which in Iran amounts to 54% and in Turkey to 55%; the deficit in the trade balance for the whole area is mounting steadily; and in some places there has been a sharp fall in agricultural production—cereals and fruits in Jordan, for instance. Professor J. C. Hurewitz, of Columbia University, declares in a volume published this year, that in much of the Middle East, since 1945, "there has, if anything, been a relative decline in living standards" (P. W. Thayer, ed., *Tensions in the Middle East* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, \$5.50, p. 28). This, too—the fact of intensified impoverishment of colonial peoples during the past generation—is a central theme in Germaine Tillion's *Algeria: The Realities* (Knopf, N. Y., \$2.50).

These are the material blessings brought the Arab masses by Western civilization; they are the facts after one disengages himself from the flood of propaganda as to the "benefits" coming from Big Business' investments of hundreds of millions of dollars. J. H. Huizinga, writing in 1956 of Iraq—supposedly one of the showplaces of Western philanthropy—declared "these vast expenditures are benefiting the contractors and entrepreneurs far more than the great sharecropping mass of the populace" (*The Reporter*, May 17, 1956). And Joe Alex Morris, Jr., Mid-East correspondent for the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*, also referring to Iraq, said (July 15, 1958) the expenditures had "not yet paid off in concrete terms for the man in the street"; for him it meant rather inflation and additional suffering. Mr. Morris added that "one sheik from the rural south of Iraq" had told him "that the country's feudal land-tenure system, plus the government's manipulations of crop prices, was ruining the villagers."

Imperialism, then, has been exploitative and parasitic; this has meant maintaining and worsening the minimal standards already endured by a people functioning under a semi-feudal system, with most of the land in the possession of a very few, and the vast majority, though dependent upon the land for their living, being totally landless.

OIL IMPERIALISM: SOME REALITIES

The practice in dominant American circles, assisted by the revolutionary and anti-colonial traditions of our country, has been to deny the existence of an American imperialism. In the past, it was acknowledged (sometimes insisted, depending upon circumstances) that there was a British or French or German or Italian or Dutch or Portuguese or Spanish or Belgian or Russian imperialism, but never, never, an American imperialism. Lately, the apologists for monopoly capitalism—with a noteworthy assist from revisionists of or defectors from Marxism—have been tending to declare that imperialism is old-hat, and doesn't "really" exist anymore except in the embalmed writings of Marx and Lenin and the even more embalmed brains of their bemused present-day partisans. Oh,

* Benjamin Shwadran, *The Middle East, Oil and the Great Powers* (N. Y., 1955, Praeger, p. 174.

yes—there was one other exception—imperialism, that is, real imperialism did exist, but that was only in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics!

Be my brain embalmed or otherwise, certain it is that imperialism—and in the forefront American imperialism—has not yet been embalmed. It exists and has existed for over fifty years. It is today more virulent and active than ever before; an especially potent ingredient in it is petroleum. The imperialism of oil giants—their aggressive searching for resources, their efforts to dominate transportation, refining and marketing, their interconnections with government, and their insistence that government actively support and further their own private interests—has been a fact, especially in connection with Great Britain, France and the United States, since some years prior to World War I.

This fact, and its relationship to the origins, course, and results of the First World War, are as firmly established by historical research as anything can be.*

With the end of World War I, the significance of oil and of the great oil corporations to the economies and governmental structures of the capitalist powers was enhanced; at the same time, the conflict among the powers—and especially between Great Britain and the United States—over oil, and over which government could most effectively further the interests of their "own" oil barons, became a central feature of diplomacy. It still is—only more so because the specific gravity of the oil industry in terms of the whole picture of industry and finance has very much increased, particularly since the end of World War II.

The inter-relation of government and the oil companies reached and today reaches the highest levels. Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, Commerce Secretary Hoover, Secretary of State Hughes, time after time were in the closest personal contact with oil barons—giving and taking advice drafting treaties, threatening (and using) violence.

Many present-day readers may have forgotten, or never learned, that three members of Harding's Cabinet were on the payroll of oil companies, and bartered away invaluable national resources to the private possession of those companies; that Wilson's son-in-law and Secretary of the Treasury (later a U.S. Senator, and very nearly Democratic Presidential candidate) William Gibbs McAdoo received a million dollar retainer from oil interests combatting nationalizing efforts by the Mexican government.

Today, as Victor Perlo, in particular, has made clear, we have witnessed a significant shift in the economy of our country; oil, not steel, is now king. From 1901 to 1953 steel production increased $7\frac{1}{2}$ times, oil 34 times. Today the oil companies have greater assets than those of all the companies in the next three largest industries, and their distribution of profits is relatively greater, too; hence, oil tycoons control investment funds very nearly the equal controlled today by the Morgan group.

Hence, too, today, oil leads in U.S. foreign investments; while it represented

* The interested reader is referred to the following works, and the sources cited therein: Louis Fischer, *Oil Imperialism* (International, N. Y., 1926); Parker T. Moon, *Imperialism and World Politics* (Macmillan, N. Y., 1926); Ludwell Denny, *We Fights for Oil* (Knopf, N. Y., 1928).

19% of all such investments in 1943, it held 30% twelve years later. So great are these investments and so lucrative, that more than half (in the case of Standard Oil of New Jersey, three-fourths) of the industry's profits come from foreign investments; the rate of return from foreign investments was six times greater than from domestic!

Reflecting this decisive position of the oil companies in the economy of our country, is their decisive position politically. This may be summarized by quoting a paragraph from the pen of Karl E. Meyer, of the staff of the *Washington Post & Times Herald*, who has made a close study of the matter. He wrote in *The Progressive*, May, 1957:

The American oil industry is one of the towering giants of the national economy. Its resources and profits are prodigious; its special tax privileges have no parallel in the business community; its impact on domestic political life is felt on every level of government; its influence in the field of foreign policy is often decisive. And yet this all-pervading industry enjoys an unusual freedom from government regulation and a remarkable immunity in the hands of the nation's press.

To give but two specific example from the recent past: It is well-known and has been openly admitted that the CIA had a major hand in overthrowing the government of Mossadegh in Iran in 1954; this government was destroyed because it had dared undertake the nationalization of its oil resources. But when the Mossadegh government was replaced by one headed by the leading Iranian collaborator with Nazis, General Zahedi, it not only had to arrest 600 protesting citizens and immediately execute twelve "Communists"; it had also to undo the nationalization. This was done with the major participation of an under-Secretary of State, Herbert Hoover, Jr., and when it was accomplished the stock of the interested oil corporation advanced in value 350%. At the same time, what had hitherto been entirely a British monopoly was now one in which the British shared their hold with five American corporations who together held a 40% interest in Iran's oil!

Henry Byroade, U.S. assistant secretary of state in charge of Near Eastern Affairs, became absolutely lyrical in commenting upon this Iranian achievement: "Out of the black cloud, white rain has descended. His Majesty the Shah and Prime Minister Zahedi are producing sweet remedies. Zahedi's advent to power is a repudiation of the sterile negative policies of the past."

Somewhat less well-known, because less spectacularly accomplished, were the State Department-oil companies' achievements about the same time in Turkey. That government, by a law passed in 1933—reflecting the continuing impact of the post-World War I national revolution—had forbidden the exploitation of its oil resources by foreign companies. This was long a target for diplomatic sniping. Beginning in 1952 U.S. Ambassador McGhee—formerly a geologist for several major oil corporations—concentrated all his efforts on undoing it. In November, 1952, the Turkish Cabinet announced its desire to

abolish the aforementioned law, and invited a Mr. Max Ball—formerly of Shell oil, and then a prominent Washington "petroleum consultant"—to come to Ankara and draft a new law. He did so, and in March, 1954 the Turkish Assembly passed Ball's law, permitting the exploitation of Turkey's oil resources by foreign companies.*

And at about the same time, Secretary of State Dulles was working out the plans for his Baghdad Pact, charter members of which would be the now thoroughly modernized governments of Iran and Turkey!

In connection with the intimate relationship between the present United States government and the oil monopolies, one further example may be offered. This has to do with the principle of the right of a sovereign country to nationalize any of its resources. The legality of such act, especially where compensation is offered, is universally recognized; yet there has been a continuing, though little publicized, campaign by the Eisenhower Administration to undo this. In December, 1952, the economic and financial committee of the UN approved a proposal made by Iran and Bolivia upholding the right of nationalization. This was aimed at the United States, which alone voted in opposition. Thereupon, the United States submitted an amendment asserting the right of foreign nationals to their investments; this was voted down 27 to 15; the entire Latin-American, Asian and Arabic bloc voted in opposition.

Dulles, however, has not altered his position. On the contrary, in a confidential meeting he held with leading oil producers in August, 1956—where he briefed the barons on the line he, the Secretary of State, would take in the forthcoming London Conference—Mr. Dulles insisted that it was legitimate to nationalize assets only if they "were not impressed with international interest." It is this which is basic to the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine; it is against this, in particular, that that Doctrine is aimed when it speaks of "subversion";** it is a fundamental motivation in the current Anglo-American invasions of Lebanon and Jordan.

Facts of this kind are to borne in mind when one reads the pious protestations of Dulles, or the sentimental claptrap written for the President. They are to be remembered when one reads: "A number of nations of the West, including the United States, are parties to the oil agreements made with the several sovereign nations of the Middle East." (*N.Y. Herald Tribune*, July 28, 1958). Such falsehoods are intended to lead the unwary reader to think in terms purely of a mythical "national interest" since oil monopolies are discreetly unmentioned. The deception is made explicit by the *N.Y. Times* in an editorial of July 19: "The United States did not go into Lebanon to 'protect the oil interests.'" The internal quotation marks take the place of evidence, of course; and one is asked to make a distinction between the private oil interests which just happen to own and exploit the oil of the Mid-East and some intangible, not to

* For the Iranian affair, see the work by Shwadran, previously cited; additional material on this, and information on the Turkish episode are in L. P. Elwell-Sutton, *Persian Oil* (London, 1955). By the way, Attorney General Brownell, in 1954, at the urging of the National Security Council, granted the five companies in the Iranian consortium, exemption from the anti-trust laws!

**For the UN action of 1952, see Harvey O'Connor, *The Empire of Oil* (Monthly Review Press, N. Y., 1955), p. 338; for the secret Dulles meeting, exposed by a Senate investigation of monopoly in 1957, see the *N. Y. Post*, May 8, 1957.

say invisible interest "of that larger stability which is vital to the whole world." But one cannot separate the oil of the Mid-East from the companies that own it, because that is the actual, real and living interest which exists right now. And the presence of instability in the world today, and in the Mid-East in the first place, is a characteristic of the situation as it now is, i.e., with the private, profit-making ownership of the oil. There is instability in the Mid-East and there is private, exploitative ownership of the basic resource of the Mid-East; these two facts are causally connected. To remove the instability now afflicting the area it is necessary, to begin with, to remove the private possession by alien, profit-making corporations of the basic wealth of the area.

THE DOLLARS—AND SENSE—OF THE QUESTION

American oil companies have about three billion dollars invested in the Middle East. Profits are fabulous, for the wells are very productive, the laborers put in a 12-hour day, and are paid one-eighth what American workers are paid. Moreover, while a barrel of oil costs about 30c to produce in the Middle East, and four times more in the United States, the basic price, set and controlled by the international oil cartel, is determined by cost in the United States. We will offer just two examples of the fantastic profits realized in Middle East oil operations: the Arabian-American Oil Company (Aramco), which has a 100% monopoly in Saudi Arabia and splits its take fifty-fifty with the ruler of that country, paid him from 1950-1952 the sum of \$437,000,000; the Standard Oil Company of California profited from its Middle East holdings, from 1948 through 1954, to the tune of \$645,000,000.

Concessions involve major portions of and sometimes entire countries. The Iraq Petroleum Corporation (in which American firms now have a large interest) has a concession covering over 79% of Iraq, which expires in the year 2013; the same corporation has a concession of 100% of Jordan, to expire in 2022.

To give some idea of the reach of the giants concentrated in the Middle East, let us offer one example: the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, in its report of December, 1951, listed its associated companies. These companies, in all sorts of enterprises related to the mining, refining, transporting, and marketing of petroleum and petroleum products, were located in sixty-five different countries throughout the world—veritably the entire Free World. An indication of the specific interest of American capital in the Middle East is the fact that although major concentration there, so far as oil is concerned, really began only in 1947, by 1953 U.S. interests controlled 70% of its oil production—a central feature, of course, in the mounting conflict between Great Britain and the United States. A study by the Middle East Institute, in Washington—F. C. Mattison, *A Survey of American Interests in the Middle East* (1953)—showed 512 corporations actively investing in the area, with the most significant field being oil. But in addition, such major firms as Chrysler, Firestone, International Harvester, Du Pont, and all the major banks—Chase National, Guaranty Trust, Irving Trust, etc.—are represented. In fact, down the main street of Beirut right now, Ameri-

"IDEAS IN OUR TIME"

can marines will find these and a dozen other names reminding them of home. It may even suggest to them why they are in Beirut.

We have mentioned the international oil cartel; let us offer a few additional words about this. It is the greatest cartel in the world. In it are five American and two foreign oil companies: Standard of New Jersey, Standard of California, Socony-Vacuum, Gulf, Texas, Anglo-Iranian, Royal Dutch-Shell. A Federal Trade Commission Report issued in 1952, entitled *International Petroleum Cartel*, declared that as of that date the cartel controlled 55% of oil production, 65% of oil reserves, 57% of refining capacity, and 66% of private tankers, outside of the Socialist world. This cartel controls Free World prices, production and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

In 1955, the Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Europe, of the UN, exposed certain features of the cartel's operation. This study was never published, but word of it leaked out, and a summary was issued. This summary condemned the cartel because it was responsible for "the wide divorce which persists between prices and production costs in the Middle East"; it held that its practices amounted to usury, citing the fact that in 1952 over 82% of the sale price of Aramco's oil represented profit!

Since men, once again, are being asked to die for oil, in the name of patriotism and other sacred causes, one might expect the companies who profit so heavily from the attention of the government to display something approximately patriotism themselves. But sentiment and business mix no better than oil and water. After lengthy hearings, a Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program published its report, in April, 1948, on Navy purchase, during the War, of Middle East oil. The *Report* concluded that the oil companies grossly overcharged the government, in time of war, and this despite the fact that the Government was subsidizing the Saudi Arabian government, and therefore the oil companies, to the tune of \$99 millions. "The government clearly was defrauded," said the *Report*. And specifically: "The U.S. Government was overcharged between 30 and 38 million dollars on sales made to the Navy by Aramco and its affiliates, between January 1, 1942 and June 30, 1947, by payment of prices higher than those the oil companies had a right to insist on. . . ." No prosecutions ensued.

In August, 1952 a Congressional sub-committee formally charged the International Petroleum Cartel with gross violation of the anti-trust laws of the United States. In August, 1952, the United States, with obvious reluctance, began a suit against the five American companies in the cartel. In December, 1952, the case was postponed until March, 1953. Then, with the Eisenhower Administration in office—and its ties to the oil monopolists being closer than that of the Truman Administration—there followed not delay, but the tacit dropping of the case altogether. From that day to this, not a further word has been heard about this "prosecution."

No wonder that, in the debate on the Eisenhower Doctrine, Senator Kefauver—who had played a leading role in investigating growing monopoly—said, in February, 1957: "I don't think the American people want a foreign policy based on the judgment of the international oil interests." He said more, and in the light of recent developments these remarks of a United States Senator made in 1957 merit quotation:

If, for whatever reason, any one of the oil producing countries in the Middle East were to nationalize its oil industry, it would follow as night follows day that the oil company involved would immediately call upon our government to protect its interests by intervention.

If we may reason from the past record of the Administration—from its record on the synthetic plants, on the consortium, on the recent price increases, on tidelands, on the natural gas bill—we can only conclude that such a demand for action would immediately be followed by actual intervention. As in the past, what the oil companies want, the oil companies get.

To complete the record of the oil companies' patriotism, mention should be made of their income-tax practices. With their fabulous profits, and with the enormous assistance rendered them in their business activities by the Government, one might expect a certain generosity in letting the Government have its share. But, once again, sentimentality is irrelevant to business. The fact is that the 27½ percent tax exemption which oil companies get, theoretically because of the rapid depletion of their resources *in this country*, is carried over to foreign enterprise, and profits made abroad also gain this same tax exemption. But that is not all; in 1918 a tax law was passed permitting an oil company to get an offset credit on all foreign taxes, so that all royalties paid foreign governments actually appear as offsets in profit statements by oil corporations! That is why, for example, in 1956, Aramco made a profit for itself of \$280 millions, and paid the United States the total sum of \$282,377 in income taxes!

ARAB NATIONALISM

Edward Crankshaw, writing in the *London Observer*, July 15, 1958, makes the point, really known by the entire world, that Eisenhower's insistence that he is invoking his Doctrine, providing for protection against "internal aggression from without," due to Communism, in intervening in Lebanon, was fraudulent. The danger, writes Crankshaw, is "Arab nationalism"; he then goes on to comment that this is really made up of "misty and often halfbaked aspirations," but that it is, nevertheless, a powerful force.

This dismissal of a phrase in this form is quite common; it is generally presented to the American people, when mentioned, as something altogether nebulous, rather "primitive," and nigh ridiculous were it not also, somehow, dangerous. Actually the concept of Arab nationalism is neither misty nor half-baked, and it is far from ridiculous. It has its roots in thousands of years of history; it has its first modern, fully organized expression in the meeting of the original Pan-Arab Congress in Paris in 1913. (Six years later, in the same city, with similar inspiration and intent, met the first Pan-African Congress led by Dr. Du Bois.)

Nationalisms differ—that of France associated with a great bourgeois-democratic revolution and invoking the concepts "liberty, fraternity, equality"; that

of Ger
and w
tion, a
four d
unity,
for so
domin
In
that sh
ward
Sin
excepti
the bo
the le
finds i
tends
form.
at the
Th
quick
insuff
the p
Co
able c
diatel
which
hones
on th
a
te
pr
po
Fo
attem
from
so m
hims
F
st
cl

Zaki
Polk

of Germany (or Hungary) dominated by ideas of monarchy, authority, racism, and war. Arab nationalism, born out of common language, culture and tradition, and out of alien domination and terrible oppression and deprivation, has four distinct components: 1) a passion for independence; 2) a strong urge for unity, to eliminate that disunity so useful to the alien oppressor; 3) a craving for social justice—that phrase (in Arabic, *Al-adalah al-ijtimaiyah*) forms the dominant theme in Arab nationalism; 4) the desire for a neutralist foreign policy.

In a way, the content of Arab nationalism may be summed up in phrases that should be familiar to every American: "All men are created equal"; "toward a more perfect union"; "avoid foreign entanglements."*

Since industry is hardly developed in the Arabic countries (with the partial exception of Egypt) there is a rudimentary working class; hence, in class terms, the bourgeoisie tends to dominate the content of this nationalism and to offer the leadership of the Arab Revolution. On the other hand, this bourgeoisie finds itself so shackled by the alien dominator and the feudal landlord, that it tends to be very advanced in its revolutionary passion and its demand for reform. Still, it remains bourgeois, and fears the development of the Revolution at the same time that it leads it.

The feudal landlords and ancient controllers are losing prestige and power quickly as capitalism develops, as their resistance to any kind of amelioration of insufferable social conditions hardens and, particularly, as their dependence upon the power of the despised alien overlord becomes more and more clear.

Confirmation of all this came from a rather unusual source in the remarkable editorial that appeared in the *New York Times* on July 15, 1958, immediately after word of the revolution in Iraq had gotten out. The haste with which this editorial must have been written manifests itself in the unusual honesty of its content. Given conditions in the Middle East, said the *Times*, on this occasion

a revolution would have two prime targets—feudalism, which is an internal conflict, and imperialism, which takes the form of a supposedly (!) predatory West, with Great Britain as the chief villain. From the Western point of view, therefore, the status quo was the best possible arrangement.

For the *Times*, amazingly accurate; and it is the American government's attempt to maintain an altogether rotting status quo, in a world quite different from that of the good-old gunboat diplomacy days, that makes its foreign policy so manifestly bankrupt—"insane," Mr. Sulzberger of the *N.Y. Times* permitted himself to say (June 28, 1958).

• • •

For reasons of space, we are forced this month to terminate our discussion of the crisis in the Middle East at this point. Next month the concluding installment will appear.

* The fullest account of this matter, in English, is *The Ideas of Arab Nationalism*, by Hazem Zaki Nuseibeh (Cornell Univ. Press, 1956); also useful is the article by R. H. Nolte and W. R. Polk in *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1958.

The Recent Elections in Finland

By Hertha Kuusinen

The world is witness today not only to the fact that 950 million people are busily engaged in building or consolidating Socialist societies; among the remaining portion of the population, a growing segment, when permitted to do so, is voting for Socialism. There are, in fact, a growing number of countries, not yet Socialist, where about one-quarter of the electorate—or more—guided and inspired by Marxism-Leninism, vote for Socialism. Very recently, to the list that includes France and Italy, Indonesia and India, have been added Greece and Finland.

In response to our request, the leader of the Communist Party of Finland, Hertha Kuusinen, has written the analysis of the momentous general elections held early in July which we print below.—Editor.

THE RESULTS OF the General Elections held in Finland, July 6-7, seem to have surprised our friends as well as our foes; especially our opponents express great astonishment, but, really, there was nothing very astonishing, or "supernatural" about those results.

The Finnish People's Democratic Union, to which the Communist Party of Finland belongs and of which it makes up perhaps fifty percent of the total membership, gained a convincing victory—that, certainly, is the main result. The number of votes of the Union increased over the last election both absolutely and proportionately, and now makes up more than 23 percent of the total. The People's Democratic parliamentary group is the largest; out of 200 seats in Parliament it holds 50. Of these fifty deputies, forty-six are Communists, the remainder belonging to other

organizations within the People's Democratic Union.

This result is an especially heartening one when one bears in mind the unprecedentedly vicious nature of the attack upon the People's Democratic Union made by Rightist circles, particularly towards the end of the campaign. The fact is that the gross lies and provocations of the Rightists no longer have any real effect upon major segments of the Finnish population, who have seen the advantages of the peaceful foreign policy, and friendship with the Soviet Union, most consistently put forward by the People's Democrats. Nor did intimidation arising out of the "Hungary question," or from the alleged dangers of a "People's Front" give the Right any good results. The working people of Finland have had too much experience with the realities of the terror and the horror of

counter-revolution and of the Right to fall for the "Hungary" propaganda; as for the "People's Front" the masses here know the good results that cooperation and unity brought immediately after the war.

In 1948, the Social-Democrats and the Agrarians denounced this unity and cooperation, and from that time on the People's Democrats have been banned from Government responsibility. A consequence of this has been the fact that the Big Owners have been able to dictate our country's economic policy; the result which everyone can see and feel has been wide unemployment, a radical fall in the standard of living, and a particularly rapid decline in home-market production and trade.

In 1957, occurred the third devaluation of the currency since the end of the War; this resulted once again in further transfer of wealth from the poor to the rich. Taxes upon the Big Businesses were cut and outright donations by the government were common; the result was what was called here the "cash crisis" and meant very unsound financial conditions. The solution of the Right was to cut appropriations for education and health; increase armaments; curb trade with the lands of Socialism; and redirect the trade of our country towards the West. And then came the "recession" in the West! It is to be borne in mind that in our country, one-third of its trade is normally with the East, and this trade is especially important for the

metal industry, so vital from the viewpoint of the general industrial development of Finland, and the independence of its economy.

The People's Democrats have been the only group to fight consistently against these disastrous policies. It was the struggle led by the People's Democrats which became most effective after the 1954 general elections, especially in holding the line against social welfare and security cuts. This struggle was conducted not only in Parliament but especially out among the masses of the people. Indeed, as a result of mass demands, Parliament was forced, in 1957, to increase pensions for the aged. Notable, too, was the Parliamentary obstruction campaign, lasting for fifty hours and led by the People's Democratic group which, in 1957, blocked the Government's efforts to reduce allowances for children and to postpone payment to mothers and to guardians.

In the struggle against unemployment, also, the People's Democratic Union was in the closest, living contact with tens of thousands of working people. Hundreds of worker-deputations were welcomed by the Union's parliamentary group; these exercised potent influence upon the Government. Furthermore, the Union's parliamentary group organized its own expeditions to the workers' homes and to the factories which stood idle; the workers said these idle plants reminded them of concentration camps. The People's Democratic Union has mounted a

major campaign for unemployment insurance.

These examples show how close was the cooperation between the People's Democrats and the widest groups of masses. That is why the economic and social promises made by other parties in this recent election did not have the same effect as in earlier times. The working people and the poor people generally have seen in practice who are those that talk and who are those that fight for them. Therefore, the parties who had had government responsibility lost the most in the 1958 elections—the Agrarian Union, the Social-Democrats and the so-called People's Party.

The Social-Democrats lost about 80,000 votes, and now have 48 deputies as compared with 54. The fact that a so-called Independent Social-Democratic Party, newly-launched, gained 33,000 votes and three seats does not really make up very much for this loss. Moreover, in the old group, led by the Right-wing, there is an opposition consisting of fifteen deputies, reflecting the great split in the Social-Democratic Party, following its open tie with the bourgeois Right for several years.

The Agrarian Union, too, went down from 53 deputies to 48; and this also is due to their having allied themselves with Big Business. They joined in attacks on wage levels and on welfare provisions. Important in this connection is the fact that most of the smaller farmers must seek a

wage income—especially in timber work—in order to make ends meet.

The bourgeois Rightist group had the smallest loss. The Coalition party has not participated officially, since the end of the war, in the government; it gained back five seats which it had earlier lost to the People's Party and now has 29 deputies. The People's Party, whose largest appeal is to government officials and elements in the middle class, fell from 15 to 8 deputies. The Swedish People's Party, which concentrates its appeal among the Swedish-speaking minority, lost a small number of popular votes, but, because of electoral peculiarities, picked up one more deputy seat; it now makes up a rather heterogeneous group of fourteen deputies.

It is worth noting that a total of 29 women were elected to the Finnish Parliament; of these nine belong to the People's Democratic group.

The situation now is extraordinary in that Parliament contains a majority of deputies who belong to labor parties—101 to 99. If the Social-Democrats want, together with the People's Democrats, to start on the fulfillment of the promises made during the elections, it could be done. The working people are watching very closely to see if efforts will be made to live up to these promises; especially are they anxious about an unemployment insurance law, and other measures to improve living standards. The People's Democrats stand ready and eager, of course, for

the closest Parliamentary cooperation to implement the promises; regretably, however, the Rightist leadership of the Social-Democrats, acting under the orders of the old War politician, Mr. Tanner, are busy explaining in their press that such cooperation is "impossible."

On the other hand, fully two-thirds of Parliament consists of members to whom workers, small farmers and others of comparable economic status, have given their votes. Consequently, there could be the widest basis for real democratic cooperation within Parliament in the interests of the people; this is wide enough to function even if a part of the extreme Right elements in the Social-Democratic and Agrarian Union groups oppose such cooperation.

This possibility alarms, of course, the reactionaries in general. Already, before the meeting of the new Parliament, the Coalition party is plotting with the Right leadership of the Social-Democratic party. First, the idea is to deny the post of Speaker to the People's Democrats, although since that is the largest group it is entitled to the Speakership ac-

ording to all rules and precedents. Secondly, the plan is to achieve a Government "on a wide basis," but without the participation of the largest single group—the People's Democrats. The aim is to have the Government made up of the extreme Rightist elements of all Parties except, of course, the biggest Party. The full aim is the "French" solution—i.e., to have the Parliament destroy itself by empowering a personal dictatorship.

The peace-loving and democratic majority in Finland is faced with a severe struggle to defend national interests and the rights of the people against reactionary aspirants who wish, despite law and election results, to capture power. The Finnish People's Democratic Union, and the Communist Party of Finland, are urging the utmost vigilance in this situation. And they are urging the supporters of the Social-Democrats and Agrarians to influence their Deputies so that democratic cooperation can be brought about, and so that the promises made in the elections may now be fulfilled.

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH . . .

"What we are struggling against in the Middle East is a rising tide of a people's deep emotions. . . . If this is what we are fighting against, what are we fighting for? The most direct answer is that we are fighting for the oil fields of the Middle East. . . . If this is the reason we are ready to fight, then it is not a crusade against Communism and aggression upon which we ride, but a frank power drive of precisely the kind we have so long deplored in others. Our only policy toward Middle Eastern oil is to hold on to it by force."

Editorial, Wall Street Journal, July 16, 1958.

NEW BOOKS

THE GATES OF IVORY, THE GATES OF HORN

by **Thomas McGrath**

"Those who enjoyed *The Space Merchants* and such of Ray Broadbury's books as *Farenheit 451* will find *The Gates of Ivory, the Gates of Horn* even more pointed in its satire and even more grisly in its implications."—JONATHAN FORREST in *People's World*.

MAINSTREAM, Cloth \$2.75; Paper \$1.00

HISTORY AND CONSCIENCE:

The Case of Howard Fast

by **Hershel D. Meyer**

The first full-length study of the social and personal dynamics which lie behind the political reversal announced by the formerly progressive writer. Dr. Meyer probes to the heart of Fast's not-so-special case, buttressing his analysis with historic, philosophic and psychological data in a study which goes beyond the Fast case, into major issues facing intellectuals in our time.

ANVIL-ATLAS, Cloth \$1.75; Paper \$1.00

HERE I STAND

by **Paul Robeson**

"Robeson weaves his background with overtones of moving beauty. Pain and struggle, poverty and heartbreak, humiliation and disappointment are there; but there is too so much love, so much devotion, so much of unselfish giving. . . . *Here I Stand* is a blueprint for action. It is a book to read and to pass on and on."

—SHIRLEY GRAHAM in *Mainstream*

OTHELLO, Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.00

TOWARD A SOCIALIST AMERICA

by **15 Contemporary American Socialists**

Edited by Helen Alfred, this volume contains essays by Herbert Aptheker, Homer Ayres, Reuben Borough, Carl Dreher, W.E.B. Du Bois, Philip Foner, Stephen Fritchman, John Howard Lawson, John T. McManus, Broadus Mitchell, Scott Nearing, George Olshausen, Victor Perlo, Bertha Reynolds, and Paul M. Swezey, setting forth their views on the political and economic shape of socialism in the U.S.A.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS, Cloth \$3.50; Paper \$1.50

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

.....

N

Ray
ory,
ore
rld.
.00

ics
erly
-so-
hic
Fast
1.00

ty.
dis-
uch
ue-
n."
am
1.00

bert
.B.
on,
rge
ey,
of
1.50

.....

3