

political affairs

AUGUST 1960 • 35 CENTS

July



WYMAN LUMER
HERBERT APFNER
VICTOR PERLO
S. J. T.
ERIC BERT

- [1] **Notes of the Month**
- [34] **Who Wants Disarmament?**
- [48] **West German and U.S. Imperialism**
- [60] **A Letter from Guinea**
- [62] **Farming and Freedom**

THE SUMMIT AND AFTER
by Gus Hall

[11-23]

AMERICAN YOUTH ON THE MOVE
by Dan Ross

[24-33]

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

| | |
|--|--------|
| THE SUMMIT FAILURE, by Gus Hall | \$.15 |
| JOHN BROWN, AMERICAN MARTYR, by Herbert Aptheker | .25 |
| YOUR STAKE IN THE 1960 ELECTIONS by Gus Hall | \$.15 |
| UPSURGE IN THE SOUTH, by Benjamin J. Davis | .15 |
| JEWES IN THE SOVIET UNION, by Sofia Frey | .10 |
| DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, by Hyman Lumer | \$.10 |
| OUR SIGHTS TO THE FUTURE, by Gus Hall | .15 |
| THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE U.S.A., Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention, C.P.,U.S.A., with the Report of Claude Lightfoot | .10 |
| THE CHALLENGE TO LABOR Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention C.P.,U.S.A. | .10 |
| ON THE NATURE OF FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker | .35 |
| THE SOCIALIST WAY, by N. S. Khrushchev | .05 |
| HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford | 1.00 |
| THE SOVIET UNION TODAY, by George Morris | .35 |
| ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION, by H. Aptheker | .25 |

New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

Notes of the Month

By Hyman Lumer

THE SLUMP IN STEEL

STEEL PRODUCTION is in the doldrums. In the words of some observers, it is in a "private depression." Output has been on the downgrade ever since January, and in recent months the decline has accelerated. In May, production averaged about 70% of capacity; in June, it was down to approximately 62%; in July, it is expected to average not much above 50%. And opinions are divided as to whether or not August will show a pickup.

The decline has been an uneven one, affecting some steel-producing centers much more than others. Especially hard-hit have been the Pittsburgh-Youngstown and Buffalo areas. In Youngstown, production during the week beginning July 3 plummeted to 13% of capacity.

Falling output has brought with it a considerable rise in layoffs and short work weeks. As of July 1, according to United Steelworkers President David J. McDonald, some 480,000 steelworkers—well over one-

third of the union's membership—were either laid off or working part time, a higher proportion than at the depth of the 1957-58 crisis. In some areas, chronic unemployment has been a hard reality for some time. And in the industry generally, seasonal fluctuations in employment, which have been absent for many years, are returning.

WHY THE DROP?

The steel slump takes place in the absence of any corresponding decline in other major areas of the economy. How is this to be explained?

The main immediate factor in the picture is the cutting of inventories by steel users. Behind this lies the fact that the steel industry is today burdened with a considerable excess of capacity and faces a buyer's market. Writes *New York Herald Tribune* analyst, Donald I. Rogers (June 15, 1960):

Inventories which were built up before the strike began—and again after

it ended—lasted far longer than anyone expected. In recent months there has been a fundamental change in attitude by those who buy steel: they no longer stock any more than they absolutely have to.

Since they can now get any kind of steel they want as fast as they want it, buyers find no need to maintain protective inventories and are compelling the steel companies to maintain the inventories instead.

The accumulation of excess capacity is the result of a period of unprecedented expansion, outstripping the growth of the economy as a whole. In the last ten years, ingot capacity has been increased by 50%. From 1953-58 alone it rose 26%, while the real national product grew by only 8%. In 1959 the output of 6½ months, with production at less than 90% of capacity, was enough to fill ten months' requirements, including the entire strike period. And in 1960, with a capacity of 150 million tons, the market is expected to absorb no more than about 108 million tons.

At the same time, important markets for steel have been declining in recent years. With the growing emphasis on missiles, which use little or no steel, the amount absorbed in arms production has gone down, and it is estimated that no more than 5% of steel output is now used for such purposes. Railroad needs are substantially lower than before, and auto production consumes considerably less than in the peak year

of 1955. Auto consumption is further reduced by the trend to compact cars, each of which contains one-third less steel than the conventional low-priced model. In addition, there has been growing competition from new metals, plastics and wood, as well as from foreign steel producers.

THE STEEL STRIKE

Already faced with the need to slow down in 1959, the steel companies looked upon a strike as the preferable way out. This was not new; they had done the same, for example, in 1956 (the union termed the strike in that year an "inventory lockout"). But this time the circumstances and the results were different.

In the first half of the year, inventories were diligently built up to 24 million tons, 10 million tons above the usual level. Paul Jacobs, writing in *The Reporter* (February 4, 1960), describes it as follows:

For months steel-consuming industries had been accumulating reserves of steel, which were widely reported to be equivalent to three months' needs (some observers believed that the steel companies had needed a strike to allow these reserves to be used up), and it was no secret that October 15—three months from the beginning of the strike—was the industry's choice for "I Day," the day on which the President would request the injunction.

The Taft-Hartley injunction was actually granted on October 21. Ap-

parently, the idea was to use up the inventories and to lay the basis for a new upsurge in production after the strike—and presumably after the union had been administered a severe setback on the work rules. But the steel companies were disappointed on both scores.

Not only did inventories last longer than expected (even in mid-October the effects of the strike on steel users were barely beginning to become serious), but the rebuilding of inventories after the strike was faster than anticipated, and it was followed by the reduction noted above. The upsurge the companies expected has failed to materialize, and the industry is faced with very dubious prospects for the months ahead.

POSTWAR TRENDS

Among the major industries in this country, the steel industry has enjoyed an especially favorable situation during the postwar years. The steel monopolists were able to raise prices repeatedly, and to a greater extent than in other basic industries. Since 1947, steel prices have gone up more than four times as much as the general wholesale price level.

There are a number of reasons for this. Among these, in addition to a considerably increased demand for steel, is the exceptionally strong monopoly position of the industry. Not only is it itself highly monopolistic, but it possesses certain additional advantages. The demand for

steel, vitally necessary as a raw material in many areas of manufacturing, is comparatively inelastic; that is, a rise in the price causes relatively little reduction of demand. Further, the chief customers of the steel companies are themselves highly monopolized industries, able to pass on most of the price increase to their customers. Of these conditions the steel companies have taken the fullest advantage.

The exceptional rise in steel prices has been accompanied by a higher-than-average rise in wages in the industry. In the period since 1953, when steel prices increased twice as much as the wholesale average, wages increased $1\frac{1}{2}$ times as much as the average for all of manufacturing. By 1959 the average hourly rate in steel was \$3.10 an hour, as against \$2.23 for manufacturing as a whole. Steel wage rates rose from eleventh place in 1953 to second place in 1959, exceeded only by those of the flat-glass workers in manufacturing, and by those of the coal miners and skilled building-trades workers in other fields of industry.

Much has been made of these facts by spokesmen for big business, who claim that steel wages have risen beyond all reason and that the average steelworker lives in the lap of luxury. But this is far from the truth. In part, the higher average rate is due to the higher proportion of skilled workers in this industry, which serves to obscure the fact that large numbers of unskilled

workers—especially the many Negro and Puerto Rican workers—receive wages far too low to live on.

Moreover, few steelworkers enjoy a full work year. And even if they did, their annual earnings would still fall below their needs. The AFL-CIO publication *Economic Trends and Outlook* (June-July, 1959) states:

Even \$3 an hour for workers fortunate enough to be employed year-round can hardly be viewed as a luxury wage in the face of present-day prices, taxes and the requirements of urban family living. The yearly income it would produce would provide considerably less than the \$6,435 needed in 1958 by a home-owning family headed by a wage earner, according to the respected Heller Budget compiled at the University of California. Last year, *less than one-third* of all steelworkers earned enough to meet the \$6,087 budget required by a home-renting family.

The fact is that a major beneficiary of the price increases has been the profits of the steel corporations. According to Senator Estes Kefauver (*The Progressive*, January, 1960), profit on net worth, after taxes, of the eight leading steel companies rose from 11.3% in 1953 to 16.2% in the first half of 1959 (these are comparable periods in terms of the level of operations). Profit on sales rose from 5.9% to 9%, and this during a period when the average for all manufacturing declined.

The steel corporations used their favorable position, Senator Kefauver

points out, to alter cost-price-profit relationships so as to lower their break-even-point—the level of operations at which the company breaks even. Thus, U.S. Steel reduced its break-even point from 50% of the actual level of output in 1947 to 41% in 1958. If these figures are expressed in terms of capacity rather than output, the 1958 figure means that in that year U.S. Steel could have broken even if it had operated at somewhat less than 30% of capacity—an unbelievably low percentage.

This enables the steel companies to ride out their present difficulties at a substantial rate of profit, even when operating at only 50% of capacity. What happens to the steelworkers under such conditions is quite another matter. Nothing indicates more clearly than this how the steel trusts have succeeded in increasing their profitability at the expense of the steelworkers.

THE PICTURE CHANGES

Today the steel industry finds itself in a new and much less favorable situation. This is manifested not merely in the low level of operation, but particularly in the absence of price increases. During the 1957-58 economic slump, despite a sharp decline in steel production, prices continued to rise. But since the wage increase granted last January, there has been no price hike. This is the first time since the end of the war that a wage increase has not

been followed, immediately or soon after, by a price increase.

Moreover, there is at present no price increase in sight; on the contrary, there have recently been some reductions in prices at the warehouse level by U.S. Steel and Inland Steel, with more expected to follow.

What has happened seems reasonably clear. Having raised its prices over a period of years to the limit of what the market will bear, and having enormously expanded its productive capacity, the steel industry now confronts an economy whose capacity to support these developments is appreciably curtailed. Today's economic picture is a far cry from the boom period of 1955-57, in which steel production jumped to more than 100% of capacity and in which century-old equipment was resurrected to meet the demand. Today, most industries are enjoying at best a moderate prosperity and growth. Industrial production has levelled off; in June the Federal Reserve Board index was 109 (with 1957 as 100), two points lower than in January. And the general outlook is for a new economic decline in the not too distant future. Under these circumstances, it is small wonder that the after-effects of the steel strike are quite different from what its instigators anticipated.

The drive for maximum profits will, of course, go on, and the steel barons will strive to meet the new situation by stepping up their at-

tacks on working conditions and jobs. They will seek to increase the already severe speedup all the more. The introduction of automation will proceed apace, and with it the drive to secure the maximum benefits from it in terms of elimination of workers through destruction of work rules and other such measures.

For the steelworkers, confronted with these attacks and with mounting unemployment, rough times lie ahead. But there is little doubt that the militance and capacity to resist which the steelworkers have already demonstrated will also grow, and that sharper struggles likewise lie ahead.

OUR ECONOMIC GROWTH

Within the past few years, the rate of growth of the American economy has become the subject of extensive concern and debate. It has now been injected as an issue into the election campaign.

The source of the concern is the challenge offered by the phenomenal growth of the Soviet economy, together with a growing awareness of the inadequate growth rate of our own economy in terms of the country's needs.

DEMANDS FOR INCREASED GROWTH

As measured by the gross national product, the long-run rate of economic growth has been about 3% a year. In the postwar period, as

has been widely noted, the rate from 1947-53 was 4.6% a year, then it fell to about 2.5% in the 1953-59 period. The corresponding per capita growth rates are 2.7% and 0.6% respectively. These figures have been widely pointed to as evidence of a falling-off of growth and the setting in of economic stagnation.

It is important to note that the 1947-53 figures include the period of the Korean war; if we omit this abnormal situation and confine ourselves to peacetime growth, the difference is less than it appears to be. Nevertheless, the period since 1953, with its two depressions, its below-average growth rate and its uncertain future, does pose a definite problem. So, too, does the growing lag in provision of vital public and social welfare services.

This situation has given birth to a mounting flood of demands for stepping up growth to a rate of 4-5% a year. These figures appeared originally in the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report, *The Challenge to America: Its Economic and Social Aspects* (Doubleday, 1958). They have been renewed recently by Nelson Rockefeller, who now places a 5% rate growth as a minimum.

The idea of a 5% goal has been picked up by the Conference on Economic Progress, headed by Leon Keyserling, by the AFL-CIO, by Walter Lippmann and by a host of others. It has found expression in the Democratic Party platform.

"GROWTHMANSHIP"

There are others, however, who firmly oppose all such ideas. Vice President Nixon ridicules those who call for higher growth rates as engaging in a political parlor game of "growthmanship." He maintains that Soviet achievements are being grossly overestimated, and that "there is no possibility that the Soviet economy will overtake our own at any time in this century."

Similarly, Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson castigates those who "appear to believe that economic growth at a dramatic and unprecedented rate is of such overriding importance that it must be achieved at any cost." Growth, he insists, cannot be forced in a "free choice economy." Rather, the role of government is merely to "provide an atmosphere conducive to growth," and to leave the rest to private initiative.

These views are shared by others in political and business circles. They are also shared in varying degrees by a substantial group of economists, many of whom doubt that a long-run increase is feasible. And between the two extremes may be found a variety of intermediate positions—advocates of a growth rate of 4%, of 3%, etc.

ARGUMENTS AND PROPOSALS

The proponents of one or another of these conflicting positions offer

a variety of arguments in their support. For the most part, however, these hark back to the long-standing partisan debate over monetary and fiscal policies.

The 5% advocates, as a rule, assign the current lag in growth to the GOP tight-money policy. The slowdown and the last two economic declines, says the AFL-CIO publication *Labor's Economic Review* (December, 1959), "represent the success of the government's restrictive policies—such as tight money, high interest rates and self-defeating attempts to balance the budget at relatively low levels of production, sales and incomes. These policies are specifically designed to curb the expansion of production, sales and jobs." The Democratic Party platform states: "As the first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic president will put an end to the present high-interest, tight-money policy."

The other side harangues for stable prices and the prevention of inflation as the primary consideration. Thus, Treasury Secretary Anderson decries "excessive Government spending and money creation during a period of strong business activity." He adds: "Such practices can readily lead to inflation, which will ultimately dry up the flow of genuine savings and lead to recession—the number one enemy of growth."

The programs offered by the proponents of expanded growth are similarly varied. Rockefeller pre-

sents a typical big-business program, whose core is the stimulation of private investment through such incentives as tax reductions on big incomes and corporation profits, more liberal depreciation allowances and other such steps. He calls also for "elimination of featherbedding and restrictive practices by labor or management," and for aid in removing small farmers from agriculture. He is against increased government spending or controls, but with one notable exception: a major point in the program, on which he places great emphasis, is the increasing of arms expenditures by some \$3 billion a year.

Accordingly, his prescription calls for sacrifices, particularly the abandonment of efforts to shorten the work week. He states: "If there were a sufficiently broad acceptance of . . . the seriousness of the challenge we face, I think the American public might agree on a moratorium on increased leisure for a period." (*New York Times*, June 2, 1960.)

By contrast, the AFL-CIO program is based on elevating the purchasing power of the workers. It calls for higher wages, improvement of the minimum wage law, higher unemployment compensation and social security pensions, tax reductions on workers' incomes, a shorter work week, and similar measures. But in one vital respect, it resembles the Rockefeller program: it, too, places great emphasis on increased spending for arms. Indeed, this is, sig-

nificantly, an ingredient of virtually all programs for increasing the rate of growth.

For a more extended discussion of such programs, the reader is referred to Chapter VII of the recently-published book by Victor Perlo, *USA and USSR: The Economic Race*.^{*} This work provides an excellent analysis of the economic competition between capitalism and socialism.

THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

Behind all the excitement about economic growth lies the challenge of the Soviet Union, which has now set itself the task of overtaking the United States in total industrial output by 1965 and in per capita output by 1970. Though Nixon and others may ridicule such a prospect, the predominant view takes the difference in growth rates and its potential consequences quite seriously.

Harvard economist Seymour E. Harris points out in reply to Nixon (*New York Times*, June 30, 1960) that if the U.S. economy should continue to grow at 2¼% a year (the 1952-59 average), and if that of the Soviet Union grows at 7% a year, starting from a present level of 45% of U.S. output (the figures most widely advanced by "authoritative" observers here), Soviet output would be 2¾ times as great as that of this country by the year 2000.

Allan Dulles, head of the CIA,

credits the Soviet Union with a rise in production of 80% in the next decade. He considers the Soviet Seven-Year Plan "a reasonable blueprint of the attainable future," and adds: "Experience teaches us that Soviet industrial plans should be taken seriously." He concludes that "the gap between our two economies by 1970 will be dangerously narrowed unless our own industrial growth is substantially increased from the present pace." (Statement to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, November 13, 1959.)

But while there is widespread fear that "the gap will be dangerously narrowed," few regard the Soviet goals as a realistic prospect. The Soviet figures are attacked as being grossly inflated, and the idea that the Soviet Union can actually overtake us within the next decade or two is contemptuously dismissed.

The game of "improving" on Soviet statistics is a very popular one in this country, and the "improvements" vary with the ingenuity and the degree of anti-Soviet hostility of the "improver." But the Soviet figures are not concocted, as Perlo effectively demonstrates in his above-mentioned book.

Using industrial production figures, which are more reliable and more nearly comparable than gross national products, he shows the following: a) If we leave out war periods, the U.S. index of industrial

^{*} International Publishers, N. Y., 1960, \$1.25 (paper); \$2.50 (cloth).

production has risen on the average by 2.1% a year since 1919, and 2.4% since 1953. For the coming decade an average of 2.5% may be assumed, provided there is neither a severe depression nor a drastic change in government policies; b) The rate projected in the Soviet plan is 8.6% a year. Experience shows that such projections have generally been exceeded. In fact, in the first year of the plan, 1959, the actual growth was 11%, and completion of the plan in six years is now projected. This would mean an actual growth rate of 10.3% a year; c) At these rates, the Soviet Union will catch up with the United States in total production by 1967-68 and in per capita production by 1970.

Some may question the selection of the 10.3% figure. But this is not the main point; a somewhat lower growth rate would merely postpone the overtaking by a few years. Whatever figures one selects, the important fact is that *the Soviet economy is growing far more rapidly than that of the United States and is bound, in the not too distant future, to surpass it.* This is the great historical fact of our times, and no amount of statistical juggling or fakery can wish it away.

THE LIMITATIONS OF CAPITALISM

Those in our country whose main concern is salvaging capitalism,

have good reason to be disturbed by our comparatively low rate of growth. But the question is: what can be done about it? To this question, no one has provided a real answer. The programs which are being offered are nothing more than proposals designed to advance the interests of one or another class or group, made with the pious hope that their adoption will somehow produce the desired growth rate.

"To date," says *New York Times* writer Edward R. Collins (June 15, 1960), "no one has produced a Law of Economic Growth." Nor is anyone likely to do so. In the anarchistic jungle of capitalist production, the overall control necessary to plan economic growth is impossible of achievement. Moreover, growth rates cannot be arbitrarily set in any case. The maximum rate of growth attainable is determined by the existing level of productive resources available and their maximum utilization and development. What this would be under socialism and under capitalism is not at all the same. Capitalist production, which continually generates overproduction and excess capacity, is inherently incapable of fully utilizing or developing the productive forces.

Basically, the present level of our economic growth rate is not a consequence of either tight or easy money policies, or of the size of budgetary deficits, any more than such policies are the true "cause"

or "preventative" of cyclical economic crises. The current decline in growth rate stems from such factors as the growing underlying instability of the American economy, the accumulation of excess capacity and the declining position of the United States in the world economy. And to alter this picture—to impart a fresh spurt to economic growth—the growth advocates have so far come up with only one serious answer in practice: expansion of arms production.

This is not to say, however, that nothing can be done to improve the situation short of the establishment of socialism. Perlo offers a series of proposals to improve the welfare of the American working people, and writes (p. 110):

Their main focus is to compete with socialism in what matters most, in applying the fantastic power of modern technique to supplying all the needs of the people for a full, rich, secure life. At the same time, they foresee opportunities for a comparatively high growth rate for U.S. capitalism for a fairly long period.

The program he presents is based on a policy of peace and disarmament, with a consequent expansion of public services and social welfare measures. This includes the raising of minimum wages, improvement of social security and unemployment benefits, establishment of a 35-hour week, development of

East-West trade and of genuine aid to underdeveloped countries, and similar measures. The extent to which such a program is realized depends on the success of the working class and other forward-looking forces in our society in fighting for it.

To what extent this would increase the long-term rate of growth is problematic. But it *would* help to improve the lot of the American people, and this is really the point of the competition. At the same time, it would certainly not prevent the Soviet economy from overtaking ours. It is clear that nothing short of a socialist America would produce anything approaching the Soviet rate of growth, which stems from a socialist economy.

The ultimate goal for the American people must, of course, be socialism. For this is a contest between the new and the old. In the words of Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman (*Monthly Review*, January, 1960):

As we enter the decade of the 1960's, we can head the bell tolling clear and loud—and we know for whom it tolls. It tolls for a system which long ago exhausted its creativity and is now being pushed off the historical stage, all too slowly but none the less surely, by another system which has already proved its great superiority in securing the basic needs of harassed and suffering humanity.

July 22, 1960.

The Summit and After*

By Gus Hall

THE WRECK OF THE Summit Conference has had profound repercussions. The shock waves and tremors it produced have already shifted and changed the political landscape in many parts of the world. They have hit with full force on the U.S.A.—the cause of the wreck and therefore, understandably, the main center of the disturbance.

The U-2 provocation and the failure at the Summit have forced a painful re-examination of all developments by all sections of the population. This has brought into the open many deep, smoldering differences on basic questions, especially those around foreign affairs. It is one of the new political factors in the present-day United States, that there was not a united reaction or endorsement of the Eisenhower policies. If anything, the one single outstanding trend in the reactions, is a call for a critical re-evaluation of all policies and a sharp criticism of the Administration. The attitude of large sections of our people was expressed by Senator Fulbright when he presented the Senate Committee's report, in the following words: "It is often more painful for a great nation to admit that its policies have been lacking in wisdom

and foresight. The prestige and influence of our own country on the affairs of nations has reached a new low."

All forces, however, have not drawn the same conclusion from this turn of events. The forces fighting for peace have become encouraged and are more determined than ever to end all policies of imperialism and war. The spokesmen for the monopoly elements have used the "blunders" as the occasion to call for more arms and for full mobilization of all resources behind an even more aggressive imperialist drive. Governor Rockefeller of the oil billions has taken the lead as spokesman for this pack.

These tremors will continue to be felt for some time to come, but the dust has now settled down enough for us to make some assessment of the effects as they appear to us here in the heartland of the imperialist world.

THE SUMMIT SMASH-UP

The basic truth as to who caused the Summit wreck must be restated again and again, because this, above all else, the wreckers want to hide from the people of the world, as well as from the people of the United States. These wreckers must be forced into the spotlight of public

* This article is based on a report made to the National Secretariat of the Communist Party, U.S.A., June 25, 1960.

opinion and exposed as the arch criminals and enemies of mankind.

At their center are the pro-war monopoly forces of U.S. imperialism, deeply entrenched in the state-monopoly-military setup in Washington. These forces did not want any meetings of the heads of state. There is an old conspiracy aimed against every idea of peace and every relaxation of tensions in the world.

It is this pro-war, imperialist mob that succeeded in preventing the Summit meeting. And the Eisenhower Administration, in the fullest sense, became a part and a willing instrument of this clique in the wrecking of the Summit.

The great majority of the American people, including some sections of the capitalist class, are not in agreement with the policies pursued by these elements. This is reflected not only in the remarks of Senator Fulbright, but also in the statement of Senator Mansfield, a Democratic spokesman on foreign policy, who said: "The incident became a factor in the collapse of the Paris Summit Conference; the deterioration of relations with Japan; the embarrassment of allies providing bases on the Soviet periphery; intensification of war danger; a partial resumption of the 'cold war'. . . . The incident raised the question: 'Who runs this Administration in the vital matters of foreign policy and defense?'"

The attitude of the war conspira-

tors was most openly stated by Senator Goldwater. He referred to the U-2 provocation as "one of the greatest victories we have achieved, since the Second World War. The United States has made a mistake in not playing up the success of the U-2 incident and the collapse of the Summit."

STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

This growing entrenchment and control of these aggressive, monopoly imperialist elements is a part of and has proceeded hand in hand with the development of state-monopoly capitalism in the United States. This development is slowly changing the very structure of the government set-up. A system of dictation and control is being built that more and more bypasses the traditional constitutional and democratic institutions. This is being brought about by the establishment of appointed government bodies which increasingly take over functions and authority that have until now rested with elected bodies.

Thus we have the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the F.B.I. and a host of other agencies and committees, set up by the executive branch and Congress and operating secretly, without control or check. These bodies, whose existence is based mainly on the cold war and whose secrecy is justified on grounds of "national security," are steadily creeping into control of ever great-

er spheres of government affairs and public life. They are more and more becoming the instruments through which the monopoly imperialist forces control and dictate the policies of government. The countless billions of dollars involved in war contracts, tax exemptions, etc., are passed on to the monopolies through these special governmental bodies.

This process vastly increases the powers of the executive, and moves in the direction of giving the monopolies ever greater and more direct influence and control over the decisions and policies of the state. This is the structural form of the development of state monopoly capitalism in the U.S.A.

This creeping growth of control by a small but powerful group of monopoly forces comes into ever sharper conflict with the interest of ever wider sections of the people. The reaction to the wrecking of the Summit clearly demonstrates this fact.

The resistance to the reactionary policies pursued by these forces takes on a multitude of forms—of movements, activities, and protests on a variety of issues.

The working class, the Negro people, small businessmen, poor farmers, and to an extent even elements of the non-monopoly section of capital, are increasingly becoming victims of the ruthless policies pursued by these forces.

During the past few months U.S.

imperialism has received a number of rebuffs and setbacks. From this one must not draw the conclusion that these are signs of imminent collapse. There are powerful elements in influential quarters who still hold on to and are guided by the conviction not only that war to destroy the socialist countries is inevitable, but that each day it is postponed the task becomes more difficult. As long as these forces are in positions of influence, there will be the danger of provocation and incidents. The build-up of the armed forces, the size of the arms budget, the ideological preparations, are all on a scale that matches the concept of the inevitability of a world war.

The ability to wreck the Summit is itself evidence of the power and influence of these aggressive war-like powers. One must keep in mind that if they can torpedo the Summit, they can also cause provocations and planned "incidents" capable of provoking world conflict.

The dramatic and rapid unfolding of a series of explosive political, military and diplomatic developments have focused world attention on the policies of U.S. imperialism. These policies have become the main source for concern, of uneasiness, of increase in world tensions and greatly sharpened relations among nations.

We need to give closer and a more critical examination to these policies.

The basic predatory nature of im-

perialism is universal. But each country develops some of its own distinctive characteristics, based on its history and its world position. U.S. imperialism is no exception to this rule.

The exceptional expansion of U.S. imperialism can be attributed to the two world wars. While the two wars were not identical in nature, U.S. imperialism was able to emerge from both in a stronger position. Its growth and "success" rest upon the dead bodies of tens of millions of men, women and children. While it has continued its drive for world conquest between wars, it is a historical fact that the most basic and far-reaching redivision of the capitalist world in favor of U.S. imperialism took place during and immediately following each of the two world wars. In the first stages of both world conflicts, taking advantage of their geographical remoteness, the U.S. imperialists studiously stayed away from the battlefields. This policy was followed not because of peaceful intentions or because of neutrality. This was a studied tactic of conquest—of letting each of the warring nations bleed itself white; and then, when they were both sufficiently weakened, entering the conflict under conditions in which both sides, worn out by war, would lose and U.S. imperialism would garner the spoils from both victor and vanquished.

In both wars, U.S. imperialism went to the assistance of Great Brit-

ain and France. But among the capitalist countries, only U.S. imperialism came out strengthened. It gathered in the markets, the raw materials, the industries, not only of defeated Germany, Italy, and Japan, but of its allies, England and France, as well.

In 1941, Senator Harry Truman, later to become President, most openly expressed his cynicism as follows: "If we see that Germany is winning, we ought to help Russia, and if Russia is winning, we ought to help Germany, and that way let them kill as many as possible."

U.S. imperialism has always followed the tactic of building up points of antagonism in different parts of the globe, to be used in its own interest. The build-up of Germany, in the past and today, has especially served this purpose. This tactic has also been a constant source of conflict between the countries of South America. At the same time, U.S. imperialism has not had the experience of wars on its own soil. Its industries and resources have always been safe, far from the fields of battle.

This historical battleground has left its imprint on the specific characteristics of U.S. imperialism.

Today, the American ruling clique continues to dream of the prospect of a war between West Germany and the Soviet Union; of a war between Japan and People's China; of wars between Cuba and other Latin American countries. Like a vulture,

it looks for the pitting of two creatures in battle until both are exhausted. It dreams of history repeating itself so it can once more devour the riches of victor and vanquished alike.

From its birth, a hallmark of U.S. imperialism has been deception and double dealing. Through these tactics, it has been able to carry out its vast piratical operations behind the mask of neutrality and anti-imperialist mouthings.

After the Second World War, with the setting forth of the Truman Doctrine, it picked up the mantle of the Big Lie from Hitler. Since then it has advanced its imperialist interests under the smoke-screen of a holy crusade against Communism.

SOME NEW FACTORS

Such are some of the distinctive features in the background of U.S. imperialism. But a Marxist analysis cannot be satisfied with a mere repetition of those facts. For we know that history is a product of constantly changing relationships of forces. In making a rounded assessment of a phenomenon, therefore, we must not only take into consideration that which is valid from the old, but must add to it that which is new—the x factors that have since appeared on the scene and are influencing developments. In this sense, we must now add some further elements to our analysis of U.S. imperialism.

Because the U.S. is a dominant capitalist nation, and because it has the biggest share of the world's imperialist holdings and interests, all developments in the area of the general crisis of capitalism, any deterioration in the position of world imperialism, has telescopic and deep-going effects in its home base.

In the first instance, what is new is that the world has changed. So the strategy and tactics that resulted in gains and victories for U.S. imperialism have become obsolete. They do not reflect the new balance in world relationships. This has brought on a crisis and a bankruptcy of policy.

Further, today, all evidence points to the conclusion that U.S. imperialism has reached the height of its influence and power as a world force, and has started on the first stage of its decline.

The law of unequal development among capitalist nations has for decades given a favorable nod to U.S. capitalism. Now there are important signs that the U.S. is losing its position as the favorite son of this law.

After the Second World War, the new wave of anti-imperialist struggles was initially directed against the older but greatly weakened imperialist countries such as England, France, etc. Now it has spread. The present upsurge in the struggles for independence, for democracy, is taking place in areas where U.S. imperialism has been the

dominant force. Its ability to move consequently has been greatly restricted in vast portions of the world. And these struggles will grow.

For almost two decades, Wall Street's main world competitors were lying in ruins and stagnation with little capital for renewal of machinery and therefore at the mercy of the vultures of Wall Street. The already large U.S. corporations not only had the world market for the taking but also the profitable business of rebuilding such industries on a global basis. This was an exceptional set of circumstances. But now the worm is turning. Not since the days before the Second World War has U.S. capitalism met with such stiff competition for the world's markets as it does today.

And in the very center of these world developments there has risen, like a giant, the world system of socialist nations. This world system of socialist states is now emerging as the cornerstone for all future progress of civilization, as the leader in all fields of science, culture, economic advancement, and—yes, the leader in the struggle for freedom, peace, and democratic rights.

Such is the totality of the growing challenge to the position and policies of U.S. imperialism.

The cold war policies of the past fifteen years have become shipwrecked on the reality of this new, developing world. This challenge has forced a painful re-examination

of all policies.

Under the circumstances there is only one path that remains open for U.S. imperialism—that is to retreat, to recede, and withdraw its tentacles from the far corners of the earth. This was expressed by James Reston in the *New York Times* as follows: "It is not so much that we have lost our way forward, but we have lost our way home."

The bungling, the mistakes, the "loss of the golden touch" by the Eisenhower Administration, are only the surface manifestations of a deeper and more general crisis. They are the manifestations of the present level of the general crisis of capitalism as it is affecting developments in the center of the capitalist world, the United States.

THE NEW BALANCE OF FORCES

The realities of the new balance of world forces can be stated and understood in the following manner:

The war-like, predatory factors that stem from the very nature of capitalism, especially during its imperialist stage, have been the dominant elements of the world scene for a long period of history.

But during this period the anti-imperialist forces have been growing and becoming steeled in the struggles against imperialist oppression. These forces draw strength from a number of dynamic sources.

The factors for peace and progress are inherent in the very nature

of socialism and made their appearance with the birth of the Soviet Union. Since then, the socialist world has grown into a powerful world system of socialist states. The colonial peoples are breaking the chains of their slavery. Most of these new states are proud, independent, and neutral. One must understand the dialectics of this historic step. When a nation steps away from the influence and domination of reactionary imperialism into a neutral position, this is a progressive step and needs the support of all. This weakens imperialism. If, however, a nation, like Yugoslavia, breaks its brotherly political ties with its fellow socialist nations and pretends to take up a neutral position, this serves the interests of imperialism and is a step backward. It is in this light of the direction of history that one must evaluate the historic steps the newly liberated countries are taking. And further, in the capitalist countries, the working class and other sections of the working people are more and more moving into the ranks of those opposed to capitalism and its piratical policies.

The totality of these progressive developments has emerged as a counter-force to the forces of war. This counter-force has grown to a point where the balance has tipped in favor of the forces for peace. This new relationship of forces which is now operative, affects the course of events and the actions

of every class, of every country. A proper evaluation of its effects is a necessary prerequisite for establishing a correct policy.

U.S. imperialism is the very center of world imperialism. Hence, in the very center of all our thinking, we in the United States must place the following question: In the light of the present relationship of forces in the world and in the United States, and giving full weight to the predatory nature and to the dreams and plans of monopoly capitalism, is it possible to force U.S. imperialism to retreat while at the same time preventing it from provoking or precipitating an armed conflict?

This is a fundamental question, because the U.S. is the leading imperialist world power, and so if it is possible to force it back from its high-water mark without world war, then it follows that such war is not an inevitability.

If it is possible to force U.S. imperialism to retreat, then the policies of co-existence take on greater meaning and significance.

In very large measure this is the key, and the starting point from which follow the answers to many basic questions. For if the conclusion is reached that U.S. imperialism cannot be made to retreat, then war is an almost inevitable outcome; also because, when thinking of longer historical periods, ideas of maintaining the status quo are not realistic concepts.

The outlook for a retreat by U.S.

imperialism without a major war is a realistic one. Yes, this is a realistic possibility.

This will not happen because U.S. imperialism has basically changed its piratical nature; it will not happen because of U.S. imperialism's good will.

It is possible only because of struggle, because of movements and mass actions that have acquired a *new strength, a qualitatively new and crucial character*, because they are a part of, and have behind them, the new world relationship of forces tipped on the side of anti-imperialism and peace.

To force U.S. imperialism to pull in its tentacles, to preserve world peace—these will not be automatic gifts of some abstract objective phenomenon. The idea of world forces and their relative strengths is not a lifeless abstraction. When we speak about a new balance in the relationships of these forces, we have in mind forces in motion—movements and struggle. To view the new possibilities of halting war as a gift of some abstract objective development or as gifts from an imperialism that has changed its nature, would lead to passivity and inaction. On the other hand, to see the new possibilities arising because of the growing power of the socialist world, combined with the struggles of the anti-imperialist and peace movements—this will lead to confidence, to new enthusiasm and renewed activity.

To say these things, or to say

war is not inevitable, does not rule out other possibilities; they continue to exist as possibilities, but one must see what is new and draw the necessary conclusions.

In this respect the heroic struggle of the Japanese people against U.S. imperialism is a good example to study. Who can now deny that U.S. imperialism has retreated and will be forced to retreat further because of this struggle backed by the anti-imperialist actions the world over? Are not the recent developments in South Korea, Turkey and South Vietnam, Cuba and the Congo, all pointing in the same direction?

There is of course a constant danger. Thus, there are forces that call for U.S. imperialist intervention against the Cuban people and their newly won independence. But is it not plainly a very definite possibility that in the light of the new relationship of forces in the world and through the power of the Cuban people, the support of the other Latin American peoples and the intervention of the people of the United States on the side of anti-imperialism that U.S. imperialism can be halted?

In the old circumstances, when the war-like predatory imperialism dominated the world scene, such a possibility did not exist. In the past, armed marines were sent in without hesitation. If not the marines, then aggression by economic boycott was carried on. In this

U.S. imperialism has not changed, and is again resorting to such measures against Cuba. But is it not a fact that, because of the new factors, it is fully possible to defeat these policies of aggression? And such a defeat would be a retreat and a setback for American ruling circles.

U.S. imperialism has not given up its old policies, that have in the past paid off so well. It is still building up points of antagonism. It is building the war machines of West Germany and Japan. What is new, however, is that now the possibility exists of preventing these policies from bearing their grisly harvest of war.

CRISIS IN U. S. FOREIGN POLICY

It is this new set of factors that is at the bottom of the crisis of U.S. foreign policy. This historic turn of events has brought American capitalism face to face with many very difficult problems and contradictions, in the domestic as well as in the foreign relations field.

U.S. industrial capacity is a bloated capacity that is geared to a policy of ever-expanding imperialist conquest, exploitation and war.

This inflated capacity is now coming into conflict with the realities of a period in which U.S. imperialism is being successfully challenged by the socialist world, by the liberated colonial nations, and by the capitalist countries which have now recovered from the ravages of the wars

and are in a far stronger competitive position.

This turn of events has made a Frankenstein of the bloated industrial capacity. A point is now being approached at which in one basic industry after another, no more than fifty percent of capacity can be used even during a boom phase of the economic cycle.

In the face of this already existing overcapacity, the introduction of automated processes of production takes on a special and very significant meaning, serving the monopolies as a means of displacing workers and destroying their hard-won gains.

The coal mining corporations "solved" their problem by eliminating some 300,000 coal miners, and in West Virginia, Kentucky and Pennsylvania they left desolated areas of mass starvation. The auto and steel monopolies are meeting this problem in the typically capitalist manner of mass layoffs, closing of older mills, and cutting employment to three or four days each week. The corporations are taking full advantage of this situation and are now engaged in the most savage and brutal campaign of speedup, of destroying the hard-won health standards and work rules, that this country has witnessed since the days before the organization of the mass production industries in the 1930's.

As U.S. imperialism is forced to retreat, as its world position becomes weaker, it increases its drive

to shift this burden on to the backs of the people and the working class. This has greatly sharpened class antagonisms and has stepped up the mood of struggle against monopoly domination in all sections of the population.

U.S. imperialism has now some 250 overseas war bases in seventy lands. These bases are tied together and enmeshed in numerous military alliances, many of them with various reactionary puppet governments. This was part of the master plan of U.S. world domination and enslavement launched after World War II. The contradiction between this grandiose scheme and the hard realities of the present-day relationships of world forces is beginning to show up more and more acutely.

Since the dramatic breakthrough in the U.S. monopoly of the A-bomb by the Soviet Union, the handwriting on the wall has been plainly evident.

Developments in South Korea and Turkey give indications that the network of bases is not very effective even as a political deterrent. In fact, because of the rise of the movements for peace, democracy, and independence, these bases and alliances are turning into their very opposite—into points of weakness instead of strength. They are becoming obsolete military outposts which are significant mainly as symbols of U.S. imperialism. The demand for dismantling and scrapping these nests of war has become a cry of the forces

of peace throughout the world.

Life is again giving powerful evidence that what is good for Standard Oil, General Motors, Morgan and Rockefeller is not good for the common people of these United States. The big business policies of imperialism are leading our nation and people into a blind alley. There is a growing concern and recognition of this in ever wider circles. One of the reflections of this is seen in the rash of studies, including a study by a presidential commission, and in others by magazines and newspapers. There are even a number of books devoted to this subject. They are all looking for the "lost national goal," the "lost national purpose," or "long-range perspective."

Most of the studies recognize that something has gone wrong. But because they dare not dig into the real causes, they remain shallow and only skate around the edges. So they turn out to be nothing more than apologies for capitalism and its policies.

David Lilienthal, the first chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, expressed his concern in the following words:

America is face to face with a clear and present danger. . . . The heart of our danger is that we shall be isolated.

This would not be an isolation by our own choice, but an enforced isolation, a gradually tightening suffocation and quarantine that we could not endure and still maintain our place in the

world, our standard of life and even our survival as a free people. And this without a shot being fired.

The danger is clear and present, not remote and vague. For the tempo and technique of world political and economic changes, like those of technology and science, have become fantastically swift.

The starting point of any serious study, one that will point a way out of the dilemma, must be the unavoidable truth that the policies and the interests of the monopolies are not in the interest or to the benefit of the great majority of the people of the United States.

The self-interest of the working class, the Negro people, the youth, the farmers and most other sections of the population lies in a defeat for the monopoly policies of imperialism and war.

In periods when the predatory imperialist holdings of the capitalist class of one's own country are under increasing attack—in periods when such policies face retreats—the working class and people face one of its most serious tests.

The decisive sections of our people are showing a growing understanding of the problems and of their historic responsibilities. This understanding is as yet on a minimum level and therefore marked by weaknesses and serious shortcomings.

Our working class has a glorious tradition and a wealth of experience, mainly in the economic field of

struggle. This militancy of the workers, forces even the conservative trade union leaders to give at least lip service to economic struggles and take part in them. However, this militancy and understanding toward economic questions, this very positive characteristic has not extended to the political or foreign affairs areas. Because of this serious weakness, the bureaucratic trade-union leaders have been able to continue giving their support to the worst of the cold-war imperialist policies. Very often they have spearheaded the anti-Communist crusades.

However, what is new is a growing trend in the ranks of the trade union membership and of important elements in leadership towards breaking away from the positions of support to the cold war and imperialist policies.

The struggle for peace is breaking through the cold war barrier set up by the reactionary trade-union bureaucracy.

The eighteen million Negro Americans have a proud history of struggle. They are a militant and a well-organized people, and are putting up a brilliant fight for equal rights as citizens of the United States. In broad terms, there is an identification of their struggles with the anti-colonial explosions in all corners of the world.

However, here again, this level of understanding and militancy does not extend into the fields of peace, world affairs, and the aggressive role

of U.S. imperialism. Hence, very often militant speeches for equal rights are weakened by expressions of support for policies of the U.S. State Department and the use of the big lie—anti-Communism.

Or who can deny the all-embracing fear of nuclear war that is expressed in the movements and actions against nuclear testing, etc. The sentiment for peace, and of pacifism, is at an all-time high in the U.S. And what is new and growing is that this sentiment is being more and more expressed in actions for peace. There are more actions, meetings, demonstrations and marches for peace than at any time in our history.

This, too, is at an elementary level. Many of these actions are mingled with expressions of support for policies that have nothing in common with the struggle for peace and are confused by the use of the anti-Communist lie.

Broad circles of our citizens know and accept the basic truth that both the Republican and Democratic Parties are parties of big business. This growing recognition is reflected in the now rapid growth of numerous grass-roots independent political organizations.

However, this understanding has not reached the level where they would conclude that a new party—a party based on the working class—is an absolute necessity before the people of the United States can escape from the two-party prison.

Though on an elementary level, the rise of these new movements is of great significance. The stagnant, reactionary McCarthy years are over. We are witnessing a rising curve of activity and struggle by our people.

We Communists welcome all these steps forward. We are an integral part of and fully support these activities. However, we would be remiss if we did not indicate what are the weaknesses.

MONOPOLY CAPITALISM THE ENEMY

We must patiently explain and explain that all evidence from the many different fields of struggle points to one central source, to a single cause. We must be able to show to the masses, on the basis of their own experiences, that the real culprit is right here in our own midst. We must show how U.S. capitalism is the root-source of the problems and how the large monopolies have taken over and dominate all phases of economic and political life, and the state apparatus.

We must clearly show how the policies of world imperialist enslavement are only a continuation of the policies of exploitation at home, by the very same culprits—namely, U.S. monopoly.

All concepts of peaceful co-existence, of disarmament, of cutting taxes and war budgets, of struggling for democracy—all these are tied together and dependent on the outlook of a retreat for U.S. monopolies'

policies of imperialism and war.

This understanding is necessary as a foundation to raise these struggles to new levels. This is necessary to show the potential monolithic character of the various separate movements and struggles. This understanding is necessary as a base for an anti-monopoly coalition of all the forces who are victims of monopolies' ruthless policies. Further, this understanding is necessary to convince the broad masses of the need for a socialist solution to the basic problems.

U.S. imperialism has suffered a number of serious setbacks. These flow from and are the products of the new relationship of world forces. However, in the final analysis, it is the people of the United States who must take these policies of the imperialists of its own country into the historic woodshed.

These policies are in ever sharper contradiction to the interests of the people. As has happened on a world scale, the balance of weight between these forces will tip to the side of the people and against the forces of imperialism and war.

The chart-lines of history for a nation never run uninterruptedly straight up or down. There are always the inevitable ups and downs of shorter periods, the new highs and lows in specific areas, etc. These deviations, however, take place within the context of a definite general direction within longer epochs of history.

This is how we must view the present day developments in the life of our nation. We must see them within the perspective of a declining phase in a historic epoch of capitalism; in the context of the rising phase of the epoch of socialism and communism. We must view them in the context of the ever-changing balance of the world forces and of the forces within the U.S.A.

The world forces of progress draw their growing strength from different areas of movement and struggle—the world system of socialist nations, the newly won independent countries, the colonial peoples, the peoples and working class of the capitalist nations. What is it that gives unity to these movements, a unity that adds a new quality of strength? They are all on the right side of history. They are all elements of the new, healthy progressive direction of history.

What is the new ingredient that has added such confidence to these forces? It is the realization that the scales of history have tipped in their favor; the realization that this new force is now the strongest element in human life.

From this realization flows the new concepts, the new possibilities, that, yes, civilization can move forward without world or nuclear war. So the concept of peaceful co-existence has become a banner for struggle, for movement. It is the unifying ingredient of all these different struggles and movements.

American Youth on the Move

By Dan Ross

RECENTLY THE WORLD has marvelled at the magnificent mass action of youth and students in South Korea, Turkey and Japan. U.S. youth are also on the move, though not as fully as in those countries. In numbers, militancy and self-sacrifice, the present movements in the U.S. can be compared only with the youth activities of the 1930's. What are these movements? Why have they developed at this time? What is their significance? What are their prospects? What contributions can Communists and progressives make to them? This article will make a start at such an examination.

THE SIT-INS

First and foremost, of course, is the sit-in movement begun February 1 in Greensboro, North Carolina. There is no need to repeat here the analysis and reporting of recent *Political Affairs* articles on the sit-ins. A few summary figures and conclusions will suffice. As many as 200,000 Southern Negroes have participated in sit-ins, picketing, mass marches and meetings. Negro students from some 60 colleges and a score of high schools have supplied the manpower and punch for the actions in nearly 100 communities. Qualities of heroism,

determination, selflessness and discipline have marked the youths' efforts. They have had to face school expulsions, 2,000 arrests, bombings, beatings, fire hoses and tear gas. Truly they are participants in a movement that will not stop till full equality is won and the unfinished bourgeois democratic tasks of the Civil War are completed.

There are a number of factors contributing to the scope and depth of the movement. In their own explanations Negro students point to the 1954 Supreme Court decision and growing loss of confidence that this or other forms of Federal intervention alone were going to make a substantial change. Magnificent African freedom struggles inspired them. The Montgomery bus boycott familiarized them with direct action and passive resistance techniques of struggle. Lack of jobs in their chosen fields for growing numbers of college graduates convinced them they had little to lose. The Youth Marches gave Negro youth experience with organization and knowledge that support from the North could be obtained. Finally, Eisenhower's pretensions of democracy and freedom on his world junkets such as to South America stuck in the craw.

Some lunch counters in twenty-eight cities have desegregated but the prospects are for a long hard fight. The monopoly press is giving little coverage today but the sit-ins continue, even gaining in strength in Baltimore and elsewhere despite the summer period. * Throughout the South, seminars and other preparations are taking place for a bigger push in the Fall. There are plans to apply the same techniques to the fight for voting rights.

The main problem of the movement is to gain adequate support from potential allies. Here some suggestions will be made with respect to internal weaknesses; of course, one makes suggestions of this kind with the utmost humility considering the magnificent scope of the movement.

1. At Raleigh, North Carolina on April 15-17 the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee was formed under the leadership of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (S.C.L.C.), led by Rev. King. It represented a high point of unity but still did not fully reflect the scope of the movement. Many states, schools and organizations were not included. Divisive tendencies between SCLC and NAACP came to the fore. On many Southern Negro campuses, NAACP forces played the initiating role despite early tendencies of the na-

* Just before going to press, lunch counters were desegregated in Greensboro, N. C., and in Norfolk, Va.—Ed.

tional organization to stand aloof. A much more inclusive movement united by a coordinating organization is needed to realize the full potential. Struggle against those who resist mass action should be within the framework of keeping unity with them.

2. There is need for a declaration of principles capable of embracing all sections of the movement and ideologically winning new adherents. The statement of principles of the Raleigh Conference organization is acceptable only to thorough-going philosophical pacifists. More appropriate are the general principles of the Atlanta Appeal for Human Rights.

3. Lacking experience with Communists, Negro students still accept propaganda that Communists are a hindrance.

4. Lastly, concrete political action on a mass scale is weak. It is needed so that massive Federal intervention will prevent violence and compel the enforcement of the Constitution.

In the Fall, the situation will sharpen up greatly with renewed public school integration fights, lunch counter sit-ins and voter registration actions.

SOUTHERN WHITE SUPPORT

Many commentators have noted the rise of Southern white supporting actions, especially by white college students. In every city in

which there is a white college as well as a Negro one, at least a small number of white youth have come forward in public support. About sixty of them have been arrested for participation. They have suffered all sorts of pressure. But still they help picket, sit-in, join marches, circulate petitions, etc. Many do it from religious motives, others because of their political concepts of democracy. The large number of Northern students on Southern white campuses have had an impact.

One young woman said she could not be a hypocrite, believing in democracy and not acting for it. She underwent severe personal pressure. A growing number believe there is only one way to end the strife that is upsetting their lives. It will end when the Negro people have full equality. The sooner that occurs the sooner passions will cool and tensions reduce. A sociology student speaks of the economic insanity of segregation in Virginia, trying to support three school systems, etc. But as yet no important forms of South-wide white youth support have developed.

NORTHERN SUPPORT

Large-scale Northern supporting actions in the form of picketing of Woolworth's, mass marches, meetings, circulation of SCLC petitions and Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) post cards, organization

resolutions, fund raising have gone on for months. Trade union locals, the NAACP and church groups have been active. But the greatest mass support has come from college students. Perhaps 50,000 students at 130 schools have actively participated. On May 17 the Governor of Wisconsin addressed the second University rally. Mass marches and meetings involving thousands each have taken place in Detroit, Cleveland, Columbus, New York, Boston, and elsewhere. Mass picketing has been notable in Chicago, Philadelphia, New York and Boston. In Chicago, Philadelphia and Detroit picketing centers around NAACP and church teen-age groups the NAACP reaches. Elsewhere picketing has been based on college students and white teen-agers from liberal and progressive middle-class backgrounds.

While engaging in supporting actions, students on many campuses are giving their own campuses a long look. Resulting actions have knocked out discrimination in a number of fraternities, in campus housing and in other areas.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

Throughout this period the National Student Christian Federation (NSCF) and the National Student Association (NSA), the official organization of student governments, have played a spurring and unifying role. The NSA Washington Confer-

ence represented a high point of unity and mobilization. But its 180 delegates fell far short of the expected number and of the potential. What is required is for all major campus organizations North and South and all major youth organizations that have endorsed the struggle to call jointly a nationwide conference on this question. Such a conference could bring together experiences and plan a massive assault on Jim Crow by young people. NSA alone can not be successful with such a project.

Another need of the movement is political action. Except for White House actions by Howard and Amherst students and a few other examples, the attitude has been that little can be gotten out of the Federal Government that will really help. A new Youth March on a much higher and even more mass level following the sit-ins and just prior to election day is needed as are other forms of political action.

Mass picketing has not reached its fullest possible extent in most areas. Many church and civic groups have not been involved. For Northern picketing to continue and expand, participants must be convinced it is in their self-interest, it is their highest moral duty and it is economic pressure that can win against outfits like Woolworth's who are not just innocents in the middle. Picketing must be backed up by other mass forms like petitions, post cards

and rallies, student stoppages and by action on local questions of jim crow.

PEACE ACTIVITY

Peace activities by youth increased considerably. Young people have circulated petitions to promote Summit success, had various educational meetings on campus focusing on the Summit issues, etc. In Los Angeles and Minnesota peace marches of several hundred youth were held. Student Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) and similar campus groups have shown some growth. At Temple University, Philadelphia, the campus paper reported an exchange of letters with Tashkent, USSR on what youth can do for peace. After much resistance, NSA has organized tours of socialist lands and student exchanges with Poland and the USSR. The American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) and Soviet Committee of Youth Organizations have arranged peace seminars in both countries. NSA has even broken with its strict State Department position by endorsing an end to testing nuclear weapons. Nearly 500 college and high school students in New York refused to obey Civil Defense regulations to take cover. A peace forum organized by Advance, New York socialist youth group, drew 300 youth. A number of foreign students as well as an Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) and AFSC student

spoke.

A form of student peace sentiment has arisen in wide support of Congressional bills for a Point Four Youth Corp. This plan provides that instead of going into the armed forces, students would go to newly independent countries as technical aides. The argument is that we do not need so many soldiers and this would be more valuable to our foreign policy.

There was major youth attendance at the Madison Square Garden SANE rally, the San Francisco Little Summit and Chicago University Peace Forum.

Despite the increase in activity, peace activity is still limited to Left, pacifist and a few liberal and religious youth on the campus and in some high schools. Peace organizations are still unstable and weak. But new sections of youth are beginning to feel something may be wrong with a U.S. foreign policy that is isolating our country.

The Cold War continues with respect to contacts by major U.S. youth organizations and their international federations, Coordinating Secretariat (CO-SEC) on the student level and World Assembly of Youth (WAY) for all youth. Aside from the AFSC, organizations like NSA, the Y's and the Young Adult Council of the National Social Welfare Assembly (YAC) have not responded positively to the World Youth Forum proposal of the Committee of So-

viet Youth Organizations. The Forum is to encourage an exchange of views by all youth organizations of the world on peace and other problems of youth.

CIVIL LIBERTIES STRUGGLES

A number of very significant struggles for democratic liberties has taken place. Most dramatic are the San Francisco mass protests against the House un-Americans, the police attacks and the response of the college youth involved.

Well over a hundred schools protested the loyalty-oath requirements of the National Defense Education Act. Many schools refused to take money under the Act. Student lobbies have been effective. A number of political figures, as a result, have called for repeal. The danger exists, as indicated in the Prouty Amendment to the National Defense Education Act, already passed by the Senate, that legislation will be enacted making provisions worse, while appearing to meet the objections.

Another broad movement has developed on nearly sixty campuses in opposition to compulsory ROTC. Mass actions such as the rally of 600 students at Lafayette College in Pennsylvania occurred. At Rutgers, compulsory ROTC was dropped. The army tried to meet objections by reducing time spent on strictly military subjects, but the movement goes on.

In New York a sizeable protest against the high school graduation loyalty oath has developed.

Out of movements by youth on other issues have grown several academic freedom struggles. Such struggles arose out of the sit-in movements and the expulsion of students such as Rev. Lawson at Vanderbilt. Out of the World Youth Festival activities grew the House Committee attacks and resulting protests. Out of the civil defense protest grew academic freedom fights at Brooklyn College and elsewhere. As the movements of youth for their needs grow, attacks that try to keep the lid on can be expected to increase. These youth actions also run into repressive measures remaining from the McCarthy period. What is new is that young people are acting anyway and are even beginning to remove some long standing obstacles to democratic action.

These have been the most important areas of youth action. Some others bear mention—notably the support of Portland college students to the newspaper strikers and of Philadelphia youth in collecting food and circulating post cards to support the steel strikers.

SEARCH FOR BASIC ANSWERS

Along with these actions on youth's needs, an increased searching for radical solutions to our coun-

try's ills is developing. The Challenge Collegiate Forum in New England is one example. Social problem discussion groups, Marxist study groups and classes have grown. In a few places Left student campus political parties have emerged. Speakers from the Communist Party are being invited to campuses more frequently and are getting a better response.

In the absence of alternatives, a number of youth with a positive orientation to the lands of socialism, to Marxism and who are friendly or not anti-Communist have drifted into the Young People's Socialist League (YPSL). YPSL is the youth organization of the Socialist Party Social-Democratic Federation.

A smaller number have joined the Young Socialist Alliance or supported their newspaper, *The Young Socialist*. The line of this organization is Trotskyite, publicly supporting the political position and candidates of the Socialist Workers Party. They continue their main function in life of trying to win or split the genuine Marxist Left. Due to their opposition to peaceful co-existence and their denial that the socialist lands are socialist and splitting tactics in the mass movement they do not hold many youth for long. But they do disorient some and drive them from all progressive activity.

As part of the revitalization of Left youth, a number of essentially

positive publications are developing. These include the academically oriented *Studies on the Left* from the University of Wisconsin, a new academic journal of radical thought from the University of Chicago and the significant new general youth newspaper, *New Horizons for Youth*.

WHY THE UPSURGE?

What explains this upsurge among youth at this time? Following World War II, stimulated by the return of the vets, American youth engaged in a number of significant struggles for peace, over academic conditions and in the political arena. With hindsight we can now say that these were rearguard actions aimed at limiting the advance of reaction and its policies and at preserving the democratic and progressive forces in good order for future offensive action. The significant youth fights against McCarthyism and for academic freedom in the early 1950's, though a new high point, were essentially defensive. Then followed in the late 1950's a period of groping for new directions and ripples of new offensive action for youth's needs.

On February 1, 1960 with the Greensboro sit-ins, the offensive of American youth for their needs began in earnest and is now developing. The factors contributing to the turn are several. Problems confronting certain sections of the youth have been accumulating and sharp-

ening. The problem of jobs for Negro college graduates has been mentioned. Job training and job prospect problems have sharpened, with widespread youth unemployment among the growing permanent army of unemployed. Negro teen-agers, due to discrimination, have faced that problem even more severely. Getting a decent college education that enables a student to compete in a tougher job market has been a problem that compulsory ROTC, NDEA loyalty oaths, etc., have not made easier. Continuing war tensions and interference in a young person's life by military service has been another problem. Young people have not been able to escape the growing feeling that something is wrong in our country. Continual revelations of corruption and double standards have undermined their confidence in the life of their society. Our international stature has been declining. The large number of youth afflicted with emotional disturbances and demoralization have been signs of the problems and uneasiness.

College students especially, living more among those who spend time analyzing the society we live in and more in contact with foreign students and international views of our country, have begun searching for some answers and means to put deeds into line with pretensions. Being young and not so hardened to the hypocrisy of our public life,

they
which
The
for f
ple
mora
of th
to w
lip
arou
deme
dent
and
the
norm
dent
stud
repu
the
fears
TI
now
othe
ence
give
W
not
fore
of p
it is
onst
poli
mor
SOC
S
hav
den
The
tion

they were in search of a cause in which they could have confidence. The struggle for human dignity, for full equality for the Negro people became that cause for many. Its morality was certain since it is one of the great world-wide moral issues to which even our government gives lip service. Actions by students around the world for freedom and democracy prepared American students to take social responsibility and break with the recent tradition of the isolated ivory tower. In economic terms, Southern Negro students had little to lose. Northern students, McCarthyism being in ill repute, began to follow the lead of the Southern students and lose their fears of acting.

The struggle for Negro rights has now become a lever for struggle on other fronts. It has given experience in struggle, reduced fears and given hope for success.

While the number of youth who not only are dissatisfied with our foreign policy but also are convinced of positive alternatives is still limited, it is growing. Recent events demonstrating the bankruptcy of those policies undoubtedly will prepare more youth for peace action.

SOCIAL COMPOSITION

So far the movements of youth have centered around college students, especially Negro students. There has been considerable motion also by high school students.

Negro teen-agers have been active in some places on the sit-ins. White liberal and progressive middle class teen-agers have acted on the sit-ins, the peace question and in defense of democratic liberties.

Among working youth there has been localized activity for job training and for recreation. Too often young workers have shown backwardness on the need and role of unions, but in a number of local strike situations in electrical, hospital, and in the big steel strike younger workers have been among the staunchest.

Youth struggles are weak among working youth, among teen-agers who are not going to college and, in many places, among Negro teen-agers. Until that situation changes youth actions will be inconsistent, somewhat unclear in direction and limited in their mass struggle character. But that does not mean we should give up major attention to that which is moving in order to concentrate on basic sections of the youth. It will not be easy to set these sections of youth in motion. Most organizations, including the churches, report a lack of working youth membership and an absence of special forms of organization of these youth. A growing and powerful movement among college students and some teen-agers can be a big lever in moving other sections of the youth who will be influenced by their example. In those places where large-

scale Negro teen-age and working youth participation in the sit-ins has occurred, it usually resulted from college students and their organizations approaching church youth groups and others and asking them to join in.

YOUTH AND THE ANTI-MONOPOLY COALITION

Youth activities can be a lever in increasing forward-looking motion among adults. This can come from youth groups approaching adults and asking for help on given problems. It can also come from adult community organizations and trade unions focusing on conditions facing youth such as the condition of our schools, lack of job training and job opportunities, what to do positively about juvenile delinquency, etc. Parents are often ready to move on their children's behalf before they will move for themselves.

All in all, mass movements of youth for their needs are already an important factor in the developing anti-monopoly people's coalition and can become even more important. More and more youth are becoming aware that it is Woolworth's monopoly in the sit-in field and other big monopolies in the jobs and peace fields that are the obstacles. The support of union locals for the Youth Marches and sit-in picketing and the few examples of union concern for job training and education begin to teach youth that labor can be their

best ally. More activity by unions and special youth forms of organization like sons and daughters clubs, apprentice clubs, are needed to strengthen the labor-youth alliance and positively influence the direction of youth's rebellion. While building strong alliances, youth must also have their own independent organizations if they are to develop most rapidly as a part of the anti-monopoly coalition.

CHIEF WEAKNESS

Probably the greatest weakness in the entire youth field is the small size of the Communist youth and organized progressive youth. While they are growing in number they grow not nearly as fast as the mass movement. As a result many possibilities for democratic developments are not taken hold of. At a certain point this weakness can become crucial to the mass movement. Weaknesses appearing along the line of development may become crucial to any further advance. Communist youth especially and other Left youth have special contributions to make based on their class and world outlook. These include: (1) the possibility and need for the widest unity; (2) the need for struggle within that unity for an orientation toward labor and basic sections of youth, for a policy of consistent mass struggle, for political action and against divisive tendencies; (3) showing who are the enemies and who are the friends of youth's

needs; (4) more radical immediate solutions when the situation requires; (5) propaganda and agitation for socialism which offers the only lasting full solution for youth's problems.

It is easier to split a movement with red-baiting when there is no substantial Communist force to show in life what Communists really stand for. For all these reasons a strong and growing Left current is required.

Communist and progressive youth have been giving a good account of themselves in all the youth struggles mentioned. But they exist in too few places. What they have achieved only serves to point up the tragedy and error of repeated dissolutions of Marxist oriented youth organizations. Dissolution is easy, but it does not provide correction or improvement. Building anew is most difficult.

What are some of the obstacles to increasing rapidly the number of Communist and organized progressive youth?

1. Adults, swamped with their own problems, are leaving nearly all of the job to the few youth and even fewer experienced youth. Adults give insufficient attention to issues of concern to youth, to developing youth contacts, etc.

2. Adults, feeling the lack of younger, more vigorous people, tend to draw youth away from the key focuses of youth activity. This is done by taking most of youth's time

with meetings and activities that grow out of the focus of adult developments. In the special instances when such involvement of youth is correct, youth aspects and forms of organization around general issues are overlooked.

3. Sometimes in fear of having more work dumped on them, adults dampen the initiative of youth and then cover that up with big political theories.

4. Weaknesses exist in the education of Communist and progressive youth. Not enough energy is devoted to this work. Such education must include character building—the combatting of the destructive influences of our capitalist environment that produce competitive, opportunist and individualist traits, and building in their place working-class standards of conduct.

All progressive adults and youth must make it their responsibility to act boldly to increase rapidly the number of Communist and organized progressive youth. It is possible to do that today. Every adult must think over all the youth he or she knows and put them in contact with the organized youth. Where that is not possible, adults should aid in formation of new study groups, classes, action groups, etc. Financial and all other kinds of support by adults is needed for the many progressive youth activities now in existence. This is a crucial matter for the future of our movement and of our country.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

WHO WANTS DISARMAMENT?

In these pages, in June and July, examination was made of the responsibility for the smash-up of the May Summit Conference. It is not usual to find the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate in substantial agreement with the analysis offered in this magazine; the rarity, however, in no way decreases the pleasure derived from this experience.

Senator Fulbright (D., Ark.), Chairman of the Committee, in submitting its majority report, said on June 28, 1960:

Historically, the deliberate and intentional assertion by a head of state of the right to violate the territorial sovereignty of another nation has been considered an unfriendly act of the utmost seriousness.

It is quite unacceptable to any state to be put in the position in which this Government put the Soviet Union last month . . . it is difficult to see how anyone could have been expected to act substantially different from the way Chairman Khrushchev acted under the circumstances which confronted him in Paris.

In adjudging responsibility for aborting the Summit, then, the Committee and this magazine were in general accord. But in seeking the cause for such conduct, disagreement appeared. Senator Fulbright emphasized the need, in acknowledging the fault of the U.S. Government, to "examine the causes thereof"; in seeking these, however, the Senator could discover nothing more fundamental than a lack of co-ordination in various levels and agencies of government and an absence of close and effective leadership in that government.

But, we think that matters of technique and personnel cannot explain satisfactorily the roots of behavior that results—in the course of a protracted period—in the disruption of a Summit Conference that was months and even years in the creating and planning. No, as we stated and tried to demonstrate in the June and July issues of this magazine, U.S. governmental responsibility for smashing the Summit resulted from the triumph of Cold-War forces in that Government; the Summit was smashed before it got under way because its promised convening represented a victory for the peace forces of the world and its successful—even moderately successful—conduct would have been a resounding triumph for those forces.

* * *

One of the main items on the agenda of that projected Summit Meeting was to begin the "complete and general" disarmament so dramatically pro-

posed by Premier Khrushchev before the United Nations General Assembly last summer — a proposal subsequently endorsed, unanimously, by the UN. The Paris Meeting was to represent the culmination of two international conferences already under way in Geneva, in which the major capitalist and socialist states (with the great exception of the Chinese People's Republic) were considering means toward such disarmament and towards guaranteeing the cessation of nuclear-weapons testing.

Since the smash-up of the Summit, the Geneva disarmament conference has terminated, quite abruptly, and the meeting on test cessation is experiencing stormy weather. Nothing is more consequential than the cause of peace, and for the enhancement of that cause nothing is more important—we shall argue—than that a real program of general and complete disarmament get under way. In that connection, immediate priority must be given to the stopping of nuclear-weapons testing forever, and to the banning of the continued manufacture of such weapons, and the destruction of the existing enormous stockpiles of those instruments of catastrophe.

It may, then, be worthwhile to examine the disarmament question; the value of such examination may be enhanced since developments in connection with it have appeared so quickly and in such numerous forms, and the reportage concerning it has been so one-sided, that the whole matter is befogged in confusion. With the collapse, late in June, of the latest disarmament conference, and with debates on the matter scheduled soon before the United Nations, an immediate topicality also attaches to the subject and thus, further, suggests investigation.

* * *

Stated summarily, study leads to the conclusion, I think, that the United States Government, since 1945, has resisted all efforts and proposals looking towards effective disarmament and has been opposed especially to limiting or prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons. Study also demonstrates that the leadership in disarmament efforts and proposals since World War II belongs—as it did during the period between the two World Wars—to the USSR. Such study also shows that the Soviet Union has led in our era—as she did in the 1920's and 1930's—in urging general and complete disarmament.

This leadership has borne fruit, for the first time in history, in the unanimously affirmed commitment to this policy by the United Nations, but the U.S. Government has persisted in opposing that aim; it has never, itself, proposed its implementation and, in fact, stands today severely opposed to it. This—plus the Truman-Eisenhower opposition specifically to nuclear-weapon prohibition—has been the major cause for the failure of disarmament efforts in the past fifteen years and was the immediate cause for the breaking off of disarmament negotiations this summer at Geneva. True it is that the opposition to disarmament mirrors a deeper policy of imperialist expansion, hostility to national liberation movements, and fierce antagonism to Socialism. There is, however, a dialectical interplay between cause and result, and when the result

is the colossal proportions and fearful potential of modern arms, it takes on, within itself, a monstrous dimension.

All struggles must be waged in specifics, and this applies to the struggle against imperialism. Hence, while tremendous armaments flow from imperialism, a central tactic of the anti-imperialist battle is the fight for disarmament. And, in this nuclear-energy era, the character of weapons and of war has so altered that the struggle against those weapons takes on a breadth and an urgency which enormously enhance the power of the anti-imperialist forces. The more consciousness in these forces, the more effective their efforts; however, no matter how elementary such consciousness is, or even if it is altogether absent, the unprecedented burden armaments today represent and the quite new dangers they entail, offer opportunities for mass involvement which, in the last analysis, will make possible a world without war and free of monstrous devices for mass murder.

WHO HAS SABOTAGED DISARMAMENT?

We have placed the blame for the failure of disarmament efforts since World War II upon the United States Government. Many people—certainly most Americans—would find that an extraordinary position. Americans, in particular, would think of the immediate post-war years when, as they recall, swift and massive demobilization of the Army occurred (spurred on, it is worth remembering, by tremendous demonstrations of thousands of GIs). It is to this image that President Eisenhower was appealing, on February 21, 1960, when he said that “for the first five years after World War II, we in the United States . . . pursued a policy of virtual disarmament.”

But, for the United States, army demobilization has little in common with “virtual disarmament.” As the Quakers stated, in 1951, in their *Steps to Peace*:

Another inaccuracy widely believed is that the United States disarmed unilaterally after World War II, thereby weakening itself and opening the way for Soviet expansion. The fallacy in this is in its frame of reference, for while it is true that we demobilized our army to a much larger extent than did the Russians, the military strength of the United States has never been measured by the size of its standing army. For geographic reasons we rely primarily on sea and air power, while the Soviet Union is primarily a land power. *If all categories of weapons are included, as they must be in any fair analysis of military strength, the theory of America's unilateral disarmament collapses.* In the years since the war, our production of Atomic weapons has proceeded at an increasing tempo, accompanied by the maintenance of a far-flung network of air bases and the bombing planes necessary for their delivery. Our navy, by far the largest in the world, has been maintained on a standby basis.*

* Quoted in *Dollars and Sense of Disarmament*, by Carl Marzani and Victor Perlo (N. Y., 1960 Marzani & Munsell, \$1.95). This book is a very valuable study of the economics and politics of the disarmament struggle.

Far from disarming after the War, with our monopoly (until 1949) of the A-Bomb and our feverish production of that weapon, and then our monopoly (until 1953) of the H-Bomb, plus the establishment of hundreds of naval and air bases around the USSR, the United States greatly intensified its military might. Coincident was the Truman Doctrine pledging the United States as the guarantor of capitalist relations in the "Free World"—like Metetrnich's guarantee of monarchical legitimacy a century earlier—and the first implementation of that policy when the United States replaced Great Britain as the annihilator of the Greek people's bid for an advanced democratic state. With this, the U.S. Government, graced by Churchill's rhetoric, launched the Cold War and multiplied its military might.

With the fervor of wartime US-USSR friendship still warm, and with the reality of 17,000,000 Soviet dead and one-third of the Soviet Union devastated, it required considerable effort to drum up any kind of public acceptance of the myth of Soviet "aggression" and the Communist "menace." But, with years of diligent effort, this was accomplished and McCarthyism at home reflected and bulwarked "emergency" abroad.

The cold-blooded deliberation with which this "emergency" propaganda was disseminated is not well understood even by many on the Left. Thus, Colonel William H. Neblett wrote of the 1947 Pentagon-inspired campaign to secure Universal Military Training, that this aimed at persuading the people "that we were living in a state of undeclared emergency; that war with Russia was just around the corner; and that the safety of the nation was dependent upon the speedy" up-building of the country's armed might. Colonel Neblett added: "I know from my own knowledge of the men who worked up the fear campaign that they do not believe what they say." (*Pentagon Politics*, N.Y., 1949, Pageant Press, p. 101).

Early in 1948, Army Intelligence informed President Truman, quite falsely, that Soviet troops were being mobilized and that war was only a few weeks off. President Truman called Congress into Special Session and, on March 17, 1948, asked for the immediate enactment of the draft and of the Marshall Plan. Although it is now known that the CIA informed the President that the Army Intelligence report was false, Mr. Truman chose not to announce this fact and as late as June, 1948, the Army's Chief of Staff told Congress that war with the USSR was then a matter of "plausible possibility."*

It is following this Special Session of 1948 that Congress began to pass truly colossal arms appropriations that continued thereafter to mount year after year. In fact, the appropriations soon became so large as to embarrass even the Pentagon. Said *U.S. News and World Report* (May 14, 1949):

War scares, encouraged by high officials only a few weeks ago, so alarmed the U.S. public that top planners now are having to struggle hard to keep Congress from pouring more money into national defense than

* John Swomley, Jr., of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, gives these facts in *The Progressive*, April, 1960, p. 37.

the Joint Chiefs of Staff regard as wise or necessary. It is proving more difficult to turn off than to turn on a war psychology.

THE PAST FIVE YEARS

For the past five years, with the Soviet Union showing the way and most of world public opinion backing her in this, disarmament efforts have reached the stage of highest level international negotiation. Participation by the U.S. Government has been halting and marked by ill-concealed hostility to the whole matter; specifically, time after time, the USSR has exercised initiative, world public opinion has responded, neutral governments have shown keen interest, certain of America's allies—especially Great Britain—have pressed for some show, at least, of U.S. concern, and then, most belatedly and with reiterated words of cautious pessimism, the U.S. Government has responded. Then, typically, has followed a prolonged period of preparation, then confrontation. The confrontation always has been accompanied by a risingly hostile U.S. press and damaging "leaks" from the Pentagon and/or the Atomic Energy Commission. Then, again typically, have come acts of accommodation and concession from the USSR, shifts in the U.S. position, and more hostility from Madison Avenue and more worried voices from the AEC and the Pentagon. This process then is terminated—until the next round—with American withdrawal, so far as substance is concerned, announcements lamenting Soviet "intransigence"—and we are ready for the New Year's Battle of the Budget, with the momentous question being: Shall Defense get 39 billions this time, or 43 billions?

Let us recall to the reader some of the details of this process. In the Spring of 1955, the Western powers refused serious consideration of disarmament touching nuclear weapons. Instead, the United States proposed drastic reductions in conventional arms and armies, firm in the belief that these would be rejected since they aimed at the area then of the Soviet's greatest relative strength. But—to the open chagrin of the U.S. delegation—the Soviet Union informed the U.N. disarmament subcommittee, on May 10, 1955, that it was prepared to accept the Western proposals, in substance. Indeed, a British delegate announced, **with somewhat premature joy**, that the Western ideas "have now been largely, and in some cases entirely, adopted by the Soviet Union." Weeks of stalling followed: on September 15, 1955, the Western powers, led by the United States, withdrew the proposals accepted by the USSR.*

The same tragic farce was repeated at the London arms-control talks in 1957 when Harold Stassen headed the American delegation. Governor Meyner recalled this in a speech he delivered March 18, 1960; "At London," Meyner said, "Governor Stassen made considerable progress . . . But as soon as he was on the point of concluding what could have been an historic agreement, he was pulled out . . . and given a new set of instructions . . . to attach other conditions which it was certain the Russians would not accept." Soon thereafter Stassen

* Details and documentation of this may be found in: Philip Noel-Baker, *Arms Race: Progress for World Disarmament* (N. Y., 1958, Oceana Pub.).

was recalled; the press turned against him; Dulles excoriated him; and Eisenhower dismissed him.

In 1958 and 1959, the Soviet Union pressed hard for a suspension of nuclear-weapons testing as one step in the direction of disarmament and as important in itself in view of the dangerous radiation resulting from such testing. World-wide pressure for this became irresistible. Early in 1959 Prime Minister Macmillan visited the United States for talks with the President; it was an open secret at the time that his purpose was to press for an agreement on a suspension of such tests.

Coincident with his arrival there was an AEC-sponsored "leak" to the *N.Y. Times* of the so-called "Project Argus," the 300-mile-high explosion of three small atomic bombs, which allegedly made impossible the detection of other tests of more powerful nuclear weapons. As Marquis Childs reported (*N.Y. Post*, March 24, 1959): "The news of Project Argus was leaked in such a way as to make it seem that tests would have to continue and the British compromise, therefore, would have to be rejected."

What was "leaked" to the *Times* and published by it was—at the time of publication—"top secret"; nobody, however, was punished for this real security break. U.S. testing continued until it was forced to desist by a storm of public opinion after the USSR—agreement or no agreement—announced unilaterally its decision to stop such testing for a year and thereafter not to resume if no other nation meanwhile resumed testing.

After the Khrushchev "general and complete" disarmament proposal was endorsed by the UN in the Fall of 1959, a Ten-Power disarmament conference was scheduled to begin in Geneva in March, 1960, charged with the responsibility of considering *how to implement that endorsement*. Simultaneously, in the same city, and at the same time, experts from both East and West were to meet to consider suspension of nuclear-weapons testing.

The Khrushchev proposal—for a phased and internationally controlled four-year program of general and complete disarmament—constituted the Soviet delegation's contribution, in March, to the Geneva Disarmament Conference. The American proposals, cleared with Adenauer when he visited Eisenhower earlier in 1960, were summarized, correctly, by *The Nation* (March 26, 1960) in these words; "They do not contain a single new item, and the very fact that the West Germans approve them indicates that the possibility of a rapprochement by the route the West has chosen is remote." In essence, these proposals did not even envisage general disarmament—the purpose and mandate of the Conference, remember—but rather suggested forms for *controlling the process of arming*, including the re-introduction of President Eisenhower's "open-skies" espionage proposal.*

Meanwhile, at the sister Geneva meeting on atomic testing, experts were

* Something of the makeshift character of this proposal, as originally brought forward in 1955, was described in the June, 1960 issue of this magazine. It now appears that the original genius who concocted it was Col. Richard S. Leghorn of the Air Force Reserve, who promoted it as part of his selling job in the employ of Eastman Kodak!—see *The New Republic*, June 20, 1960, p. 9.

approaching agreement, and the AEC-Pentagon clique became worried, especially since agreement in this area would make difficult the sabotaging of the Disarmament Conference and would be an auspicious launching for the then-pending Summit Meeting. These considerations illuminate two paragraphs in the *N.Y. Times'* military analyst's dispatch, dated March 30, 1960. Hanson Baldwin then wrote:

Most observers, however, are less worried about the possibilities of undetectable violations of the projected test ban and the technical slowdown it may cause in nuclear arms development than they are about the psychological and political consequences of such an agreement.

An agreement to halt nuclear testing, signed with a flourish at the Summit Conference, could lead to the same sort of psychological relaxation in the West as occurred after the summit conference in Geneva in 1955. Western military defenses might suffer. It might be difficult to maintain the strength and unity of the West if another era of "sweetness and light" were initiated by the agreement.

In this area of nuclear-test banning, where joint experts have moved so close to agreement and where one stands only at the threshold of the infinitely more complex problem of disarmament in general—not to speak of a real and lasting *detente*—American opposition has been persistent and potent. Dr. Hugh C. Wolfe, a distinguished physicist, declared, on the NBC television program, "The Open Mind", on February 7, 1960, that these objections would continue even if a detection system ten times more exact than the remarkable one already in existence should be developed. This was because, said Dr. Wolfe:

there are people in the AEC and in the Pentagon who are awfully anxious to continue the American program of nuclear weapons development involving the setting off of small nuclear weapons. And these people have always been opposed to any kind of agreement with the Soviet Union which would stop their program. They will continue to be opposed to it no matter how good the inspection system is . . .

Six weeks after Dr. Wolfe's remarks, the Soviet representatives at the Geneva weapons-testing conference "enormously narrowed" remaining areas of disagreement—to use the words of a *New Republic* editorial (March 28, 1960), by agreeing to a ban on high-yield explosions, to be monitored by a multinational inspection team, and by deferring to the U.S. view that techniques for detecting smaller, underground blasts need study, pending which, however, tests of all sizes were to be suspended.

How was this momentous advance received by the United States? A day after its announcement, James A. Douglas, Deputy Secretary of Defense, told a nationwide television audience that "from a defense point of view there are many good reasons for wanting to continue testing." Following this came Hanson Baldwin's "trial balloon" in the *Times* of March 30, already quoted.

Then, in April, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy held four days of public hearings in which witnesses such as the notorious and fanatical Dr. Edward Teller were given the center of the stage and the newspaper headlines to explain that no detection system could ever work, that no test ban should be approved and that salvation lay only in more and more devastating weapons dispersed widely in reliable hands—like those of the West German government. William H. Stringer, chief of the Washington Bureau of *The Christian Science Monitor*, reported in that paper (April 26, 1960) that the Committee members "were remiss in their questioning and never asked the scientists why the 'art of detection' of underground explosions should not move forward as fast as the 'art of concealment.'"

Mr. Stringer might have added, what Walter Lippmann noted at the time, that the Committee failed to ask the Pentagon scientists why they felt that renewed testing would place the United States at an advantage. Mr. Lippmann went on to point out that during the period since World War II and up to the moratorium on testing, while the United States had started out with a monopoly on atomic weapons, it had ended up only on a par with the Soviet Union in nuclear weapons, and behind the USSR in means of delivering such weapons to their targets.

At any rate, Mr. Stringer, having the May Summit in mind, thought that "the test ban is a first step, an index of intentions, an exercise in Soviet-West cooperation"; hence, he was distressed that the attitude of the Joint Committee and of the AEC was "to build more bombs, don't take the risk of test banning, negative, negative, negative."

In May, after murdering the Summit Conference, the United States Government intensified its sabotage tactics against the test-cessation conference in Geneva. On May 7, 1960 the President announced—without giving his own representatives in Geneva any forewarning, not to speak of the British and Soviet delegates there—that the United States would begin a series of eleven underground nuclear blasts, during the next two years. This, coming after U-2 and the President's unprecedented justification of U-2 procedure and after the Defense Secretary's world-wide air alert, seemed a further indication of American desire to re-freeze the Cold War at its lowest possible temperature. Little improvement resulted when the President, belatedly and after world-wide expressions of astonishment, announced that the tests would be entirely peaceful in character and invited the Soviet Union to send representatives, reciprocally, to the American tests; the latter invitation was rejected and the USSR announced that since it did not plan such tests, it could hardly accept a reciprocal invitation.

This series of acts by the U.S. Government led Marquis Childs to write two scorching columns from his post in Geneva (*N.Y. Post*, May 10 and May 12, 1960). Childs noted that the Soviet Union had made concession after concession to the American objections in the course of eighteen months of tortuous negotiations; but, added Childs, throughout these negotiations, Mr. Wadsworth, the chief of the U.S. delegation, "has constantly been fighting a rear-guard action

with those in Washington who have been determined to block any treaty." Childs reported that "opinion" in Great Britain, the Scandinavian countries and even in West Germany unanimously held "that it would have been possible to get a treaty with adequate guarantees any time during the past nine months if it had not been for America's delaying tactics." It seemed clear to that world-wide opinion, Childs continued, that the United States does not want a treaty and wishes "to continue nuclear testing." "The question," he concluded, "written large across the sky would be: Why, if you did not believe in a treaty, did you go so far in the negotiations and, having had your way in instance after instance, why do you now pull back?"

Two days later, Childs noted that as the Conference approached agreement, the propaganda campaign against Wadsworth as being "soft" and an "appeaser" reached a crescendo; and that now he found himself "perched precariously at the end of a forgotten limb." "What is most damaging," wrote Childs, "to America's prestige is the wriggle and wobble of American policy from one side of the road to the other."

Wadsworth was Stassenized.

The U.S. Government does not want disarmament and it does not want an end to nuclear-weapons testing and production. But the humanity of the world wants both, and so do mighty Socialist states; pressure from both induce the United States grudgingly to yield to the point—if it must—where it agrees to meet and discuss—enveloping the agreement in the most pessimistic appraisals of the meeting's possibilities. Strong positions are assumed, and impossible demands are raised. As concession follows concession from the USSR and as world opinion becomes more and more hopeful of success, the U.S. Government becomes more and more uncomfortable, tries increasingly shifty tactics, then produces a demand or an objection of a clearly impossible or wholly provocative nature, assassinates the meeting, and turns loose Madison Avenue to "explain" how everything was a resounding victory for the "Free World" and that Soviet deceptiveness once again showed that the only recourse of God-fearing Washington is to keep its powder dry, pass the ammunition and build up greater stockpiles for slaughter—all this in the name of the Prince of Peace!

The experiences at the test-cessation conference in Geneva were being duplicated, simultaneously, at the 10-Nation disarmament conference in the same city. Said Hugh Thomas, the Geneva correspondent of the *New Statesman* (May 7, 1960): "Even the experts up in the Foreign Office think that the Russians are 'interested' in disarmament." But:

The position of the U.S. has been made perfectly clear: control must be provided to be working well in certain limitations of arms (e. g. in outer space) before any actual disarmament *can even be negotiated*. Mr. Herter has declared that he wants above all not disarmament but 'a more stable military environment' . . . U.S. military chiefs insist that while the Iron Curtain stays, it would be mad to make disarmament effective (*italics in original*).

This, the reader is reminded, was the U.S. position at a Conference called as the result of a United Nations unanimous resolution endorsing a policy of complete and general disarmament. In accordance with that purpose, the Soviet delegation first introduced, as we have mentioned, the proposal made in the Fall of 1959 by Premier Khrushchev for such disarmament. After this was considered and debated at the Conference, and after the killing of the Summit Meeting and the "wriggling and wobbling" by the U.S. delegation at the nuclear-testing conference, the Soviet delegation still, on June 2, 1960, introduced another careful and very full plan for general and complete disarmament, which plan took into consideration several of the proposals made by the West, and particularly by the French delegation.

THE LATEST SOVIET PROPOSALS

This June 2 Soviet plan called for complete and general disarmament within four years, or some other agreed upon span of time. It proposed that, "All disarmament measures from beginning to end shall be carried out under strict and effective international control." It then proceeded to detail a six-point system of international control appropriate to each of the three different major stages of disarming.

In the first stage, the following were to be scrapped: all rocket and missile weapons; all war planes capable of carrying nuclear weapons; all submarines; all surface vessels capable of carrying nuclear weapons; all artillery capable of firing such weapons. All foreign bases were to be abolished; all foreign troops wherever stationed were to go home; all space devices capable of military use were to be banned; nuclear know-how was not to be dispersed to any other countries; rockets for peaceful and scientific purposes were to be launched only under international control, with inspection conducted at the launching sites; arms expenditures of all countries were to be cut in accordance with implementation of these proposals.

In the second stage, all nuclear weapons were to be banned; their production was to stop, and stockpiles of them were to be destroyed. Chemical, biological and all other mass-destruction means were to be banned, production was to cease, stockpiles were to be destroyed. Armed personnel were to be reduced; those of the USSR and the USA not to exceed 1,700,000 each. Conventional weapons made surplus by such cuts were to be destroyed; arms budgets to be reduced in accordance with these policies.

In the third stage, all armed forces were to be scrapped; limited police forces to remain purely for internal purposes; all remaining conventional weapons, except small firearms to be scrapped; military production of all such arms to be discontinued; war ministries, general staffs to be abolished, conscription to be banned; military training to stop; military education to be banned by law in each country; budgets for military purposes to be abolished; funds released through disarmament were to be used to cut or abolish taxation, to provide assistance to poorer or under-developed countries, and to help support vast public assistance and welfare programs throughout the world.

As we have stated, the plan called for detailed systems of international control appropriate to each of the stages, not excluding aerial inspection and photography in the third stage, where this might help to check on actual disarmament, and not as a source of information about existing armaments. The control plan called for an international board of control under UN auspices, on-the-spot inspection teams, with factories, docks, platforms, etc., open to the scrutiny of such teams.

The plan introduced the West's idea of *simultaneous* disarmament and control thereof; it accepted the West's idea that the plan *start* with the scrapping of means of delivering nuclear weapons, including rockets and missiles, because it is well known that in this the USSR leads the world; and it accepted the West's insistence that on-the-spot inspection teams be present throughout the implementation of the program. These were the three main stumbling blocks so far as the Anglo-French delegations were concerned; and when these had been raised the United States in all cases expressed "grave" concern lest they not be taken care of; in the Soviet proposal of June 2 all of them are provided for almost exactly in the way proposed in discussion.

The reaction to this Soviet proposal in the press of the world was not made available to the American people at all—most of whom to this day have no idea themselves of the actual content of that proposal. It is important to note that there have been very few occasions in the history of the world when a nation's proposals in a critical area of policy have evoked such unanimous approval. Indian, Japanese, Latin-American newspapers hailed the June 2 document; the Scandinavian press dealt with it as irresistible and marking the beginning of a new era for mankind. The French, Italian, Belgium and English press—with rare exceptions, made up of the neo-fascist and extreme Right—expressed pleasure at least, and some could ill restrain their enthusiasm. This included the London *Sunday Times*, *Reynolds News*, *News Chronicle*, *Manchester Guardian*, *Daily Herald*, the Brussels *La Libre Belgique*, and the Catholic *La Cie*, the Paris *Combat*; even Fritz Erler, Secretary of the Social Democrat Bundestag Group in West Germany hailed the proposal as making possible real headway in the area of disarmament.

RESPONSE OF U.S. GOVERNMENT

What was the response of the U.S. delegation? Nothing; literally nothing, absolute silence for days and then for weeks. The matter became an international scandal and absolutely impermissible. French and English pressure on Washington grew, as the *N.Y. Times* discreetly reported; the head of the U.S. delegation in Geneva flew back to Washington, begging for some word, any word. Nothing came until June 26; and then the U.S. proposal reiterated all the old American positions seeking not disarmament but the control of armament programs.

As a matter of fact, this position is reiterated in the letter of resignation as head of the U.S. delegation submitted by Mr. F.M. Eaton to the President, where he expressed his regret that he could not get the Conference to move

"in the direction of halting the *build-up of armaments*"; it is repeated in the President's letter to Mr. Eaton accepting his resignation, dated July 22, 1960, where the President thanked him for his efforts "to find an agreement which would halt *the building up of armaments.*" But this was not supposed to be a conference, like the Conferences of the 1920's, where imperialist powers mutually agreed upon relative levels of permissible armaments; it was called for the purpose of *disarming*, and specifically in response to the United Nations Resolution favoring complete and general disarmament.

The matter may be summed up in the words of the *New Statesman*, in an editorial entitled "Why Zorin [Chief of the Soviet delegation] Walked Out" (July 2, 1960): "What is known is that the Communist delegations agreed to the Western insistence on an elaborate inspection system, provided it was accompanied by radical disarmament; the western powers, on the other hand, were determined to see an inspection system working properly before they were willing to consider detailed disarmament. The Russians made several concessions to the West since the conference resumed after the Summit. The West was very slow in responding."

The essence of the record of the United States Government, relative to disarmament efforts, was stated correctly by Senator John F. Kennedy in a speech at the University of New Hampshire on March 7, 1960:

We pour our talent and funds into a feverish race for arms supremacy, by-passing almost entirely the quest for arms control. This gap has been apparent, to our enemy [sic] and to the world, at every arms control or related conference since the close of the Korean war. Our conferees have lacked both the technical backing and the high-level policy support and guidance necessary to make their mission a success.

Mr. Kennedy's current proposal that we spend three billion dollars *more* for armaments seems a strange way to repair this glaring deficiency; this does not negate, however, the correctness of his analysis of U.S. participation in disarmament conferences during the past five years.

Somewhat more forcefully than Senator Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson also put the onus where it belonged, in terms of answering the question: who wants disarmament? At the University of Chicago, on May 12, 1960, Mr. Stevenson said:

It seems to be both sad and ironic that the Communists have so largely succeeded in pre-empting and exploiting the cry for peace—which is surely the loudest and dearest sound in this war-weary, frightened world . . . We have emphasized military containment, and for years it appeared that we didn't want to negotiate with the Russians, either to test their intentions or to call their bluff.

Meanwhile they stopped nuclear testing unilaterally; they reduced their army unilaterally; they proposed summit talks about reducing tensions and the dangers of war; they proposed total disarmament. Whatever the motives, cynical or sincere, they have constantly taken the initia-

tive. They have answered the cry for peace, while we have quibbled and hesitated and then finally given in.

The record proves Mr. Stevenson to be correct except that "we" have not—yet—"given in." The history of the struggle for disarmament since the end of World War II makes clear, as this article has sought to show, that the Soviet Union has striven persistently for the adoption of a program of significant disarmament, and that the U.S. Government has been the chief stumbling block against its realization. The fact is that both in words and more decisively in action, the U.S. Government has thwarted disarmament and has made impossible the elimination of nuclear weapons; it has been, in fact, the main source for the back-breaking armaments race that has plagued the world in the present epoch and which threatens momentarily the destruction of most of mankind.

This role of the U.S. Government reflects its dominant ideology which, in turn, reflects its class character. In a subsequent article, we intend to examine at some length that ideology as it relates to war-making and to armaments; at the same time we shall inquire into whether or not effective disarmament really is obtainable and enforceable; and we shall examine whether or not such disarmament is a necessary step toward world peace.

Here we conclude our present effort, and somewhat anticipate the future one, by calling to the attention of our readers one of the most naked manifestations of dominant imperialist ideology as it manifests itself in the areas of war and disarmament. This is an article entitled, "Victory without War?", by Dr. Hans Karl Gunther, one of Adenauer's "experts"; it appeared originally, in German, in the *Wehrwissenschaftliche Rundschau* (Military Science Review), for June, 1958. It was published in the *Military Review*, June, 1959, which is the organ of the Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas (itself issued also in Spanish and Portuguese so that, no doubt, the freedom-fighters of Franco and Salazar can keep up with developments).

Dr. Gunther writes of war and preparations for war in terms directly reminiscent of Mussolini and Hitler. We summarize, using in most cases direct quotation:

After establishing to his own satisfaction, that no system of disarmament could really be established, Dr. Gunther says:

The armament race must continue, therefore, until one of the systems [socialism or capitalism] collapses or—perhaps in order to avoid a collapse—has recourse to war as the only way out. A continuation of armament does not exclude the possibilities of future war, as some high officials maintain, but it clearly points to the possibility of a preventive war. Furthermore, the West is given a chance at victory by continued arming, whereas a general disarmament would take this chance away.

War has stimulated the noblest creative efforts of man, and been responsible for his greatest scientific advances, Dr. Gunther insists. Furthermore:

From the viewpoint of the classic school of national economy, armament is equal to senseless squandering and all things related to

warfare 100 percent unproductive . . . But during the last century in all those countries where governments spent large sums for armed readiness the national economy prospered accordingly.

This, continues Dr. Gunther, was directly proved by "national socialism"—here it was seen "that expenditures made by the state for armed readiness raise the living standard of a people by revitalizing industry and facilitating the credit system"—whatever that last phrase may mean.

Only "dreamers" think of using the money spent on arms upon public welfare needs; moreover, it is doubtful if the latter expenditures really help anyone:

On the contrary, it probably would create . . . a constantly increasing class of parasites, ending the old willingness to sacrifice for the common good and thereby causing the end of the Republic.

The secret of Prussia's "greatness," the Doctor holds, was that its main business was that of war and war-preparation. This is because, "The armed forces are the most productive industry of any national economy." He concludes, "there exist almost insurmountable obstacles to a general disarmament and honest outlawry of war;" therefore, "the safety" of the world "lies in the hands of the soldier."

Only in the brutality of the language and the directness of its barbarism does this differ, as we shall see in a subsequent article, from what is being asserted with more and more frequency in the most powerful circles of the American ruling class.

This adds intense urgency to the sober words uttered by Premier Khrushchev on July 12, after announcing the shooting down of the latest U.S. reconnaissance plane infringing Soviet sovereignty:

On behalf of the Soviet government and all the Soviet people, I wish to call with all seriousness the attention of all the countries of the world to the fact that the ruling quarters of the United States with the connivance of their allies in aggressive blocs, are obviously provoking a serious military conflict. Their actions cannot be assessed otherwise.

The Soviet leader went on to promise continued dedication to the struggle for peaceful co-existence, but he concluded by warning those who quite literally are playing with fire that the Socialist nations "will be able to rebuff any aggressor."

The leadership of the "aggressive blocs" resides right here in the United States. It is for us, the American people, in the first place, to understand that, and to make up our minds to change it. We can—certainly no one else can. And we can by getting the facts, taking them to our shopmates, friends and neighbors, and measuring all political considerations and actions on this greatest test of all: Is the cause of peace and of disarmament served or harmed? If peace is preserved, all things become possible; if not . . .

West German and U.S. Imperialism

By Victor Perlo

WEST GERMAN IMPERIALISM is emerging as the principal ally of American imperialism in world affairs.

This development was immanent in the sabotage of Potsdam, the maneuvers of Clay and McCloy, the Wall-Street sponsored rehabilitation of the Ruhr magnates and restoration and expansion of their properties, in the "United Europe" policies of Dulles, in the structure of NATO.

The powerful surge in West German economy along with the relative weakening of the United States in world markets and of the dollar, the initiation of the Common Market with West Germany in the driver's seat, the wide-open militarization of the FRG, have ripened the eruption of this alliance from potentiality to reality, from inner sickness to active infection on the body of the planet.

Britain, the junior partner of American imperialism, has been displaced in economic matters, and the political shift is not lagging far behind.

However, German imperialism is *not* a junior partner of American imperialism, like Britain. It is on a more equal plane, there is more of mutual dependence and collaboration in plunder. The Americans

are the leading partner, they retain the upper hand, but it is not a whip hand. The domineering American tycoons have their counterpart in the arrogant lords of the Rhine. The Americans seem almost in awe of the German capitalists, show none of the public contempt for them they heap onto the British, French and other weaker capitalists.

The German capitalists ask no favors; they demand, limiting their groveling and wheedling to private correspondence with the officials of the still more powerful American corporations.

The major economic objective of the U.S.-German imperialist alliance is joint and parallel expansion of investment and trade through most of the capitalist world, particularly Western Europe, Asia and Africa, including British and French colonies and spheres of influence. Its decisive political characteristics are militarism, provocations against the lands of socialism, repression of the national liberation movement, undermining the sovereignty of weaker capitalist states.

Major contradictions affect the German-American imperialist alliance, hindering its full development and foreshadowing its ultimate destruction.

1. German imperialism is already the main rival of American imperialism for world markets. Despite cartelized divisions of markets, this rivalry will become more severe.

2. Collaboration in foreign investments will sooner or later be replaced by competition, as more intensive exploitation of remaining capitalist areas with new industries and techniques approaches its limits.

3. The West German policy of vigorously expanding trade with the socialist world is in sharp opposition to the still dominant U.S. policy of restricting such trade to the utmost.

4. Today the German imperialists "help" Washington redress its balance of payments through joint investments, advance loan repayments, etc. Tomorrow they may seek more decisive gains through a hardboiled ditching of cooperation at a moment of American financial crisis.

5. The growth of the peace movement in both countries tends to undermine the political foundation of the alliance.

THE ECONOMIC RISE OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM

Industrial production in the West surpassed the prewar level in 1950 and by 1959 reached 246 per cent of the 1936 level. Even since 1953, when all rebuilding was completed, industrial production has grown at the annual rate of 8 per cent, which

is unusually high for a capitalist country.

While the United States share of capitalist world industrial output fell from 53.9% in 1950 to 45.6% in 1958, and the British share from 9.4% to 8.%, the West German share rose from 6.8% to 10.1%. On the smaller territory of West Germany, industrial production now holds the same share within capitalist Europe that all pre-war Germany held during the 1930's. West Germany is now decisively the second capitalist industrial power, after the United States. The investment of capital comprises a higher proportion of the national income in the FRG than in any other leading capitalist country, suggesting further future gains.

In exports West Germany rose from 20% of the American level in 1950 to over 50% of the United States level in 1958. In 1959, West Germany surpassed Britain in exports for the first peacetime year in history.

The FRG's gold and dollar holdings of \$4 billion, plus another \$1.3 billion of essentially solid foreign assets, are a far cry from Hitler's chronic bankruptcy.

Indicative of West Germany's financial strength is the sharp acceleration of capital exports. Long-term capital exports, private and state, reached 1,852 million DM in 1958 and 2,649 million in the first nine months of 1959. The third

quarter annual rate of such capital movements reached 4.5 billion DM, or over a billion dollars. This approximates, and with the short-term capital exports exceeds substantially, British capital exports. In this characteristic phase of imperialist economics, also, West Germany is now second only to the United States. Meanwhile foreign investments in West Germany are being liquidated by the repayment of official debts, which exceeds the continuation of some private foreign investment in West Germany.

In less than a decade, the pre-war German empires of finance capital controlling this economic machine have been re-established—the Big Three banks, the multiple enterprises of Krupp, Flick, Thyssen and Siemens are reconstituted with sundry additions. And the “separate” parts of what were IG Farben are beginning to openly collaborate. Surviving war criminal tycoons are in direct control of the industrial empires. The cartel system is back in full force, under the “regulation” of the sympathetic Federal Cartel Authority. Scarcely a month goes by without a major merger increasing the concentration of capital and tightening its administrative structure.

The reasons for the renewed German predominance in European capitalism are well known: (1) retention of a very advanced technical staff and highly skilled working class;

(2) the aid of former enemy imperialisms, especially American, which helped financially and materially in the conscious attempt to re-establish German imperialism as the main capitalist power of Europe; (3) the power of a most aggressive group of monopolies aided by a very well developed state monopoly capitalist structure; (4) a vast pool of added labor from the millions of expelled and refugee Hitlerites, capitalists and kulaks from the socialist lands; (5) a low wage scale and intense labor, permitted by the unusually subservient Social Democratic trade union leadership, “too proud of having workers named ‘Herr Direktors’ to worry about” the acceptance of responsibility without authority under the so-called codetermination law. (*Business Week*, 12/6/58)

GERMAN IMPERIALISM AS MAIN BASE OF U.S. EUROPEAN POLICY

Militarily, West Germany serves as the principal overseas base of American armed forces. With its outpost in West Berlin, it is the center of the most critical provocations of the cold war, and would be the staging area for attack should the American imperialists launch a new world war. The Pentagon counts on the German militarists as their main ally, and is attempting through NATO to place them in charge of the armed forces of more dubious European allies, as in the Speidel

appointment.

Politically, the Adenauer regime has been the most trusted supporter of the belligerent line of the most aggressive circles of U.S. imperialism. The revanchist aims of the German imperialists coincide perfectly with the "liberation" policies of the late unlamented Dulles. As under Hitler, German imperialism is looked on as the potential gendarme of Europe, to repress the working class of other European countries as well as West Germany.

Throughout the post-war period the concept of a United Europe, embracing the military, political and economic spheres, has been in the forefront of American imperialist policy. This half-century old reactionary concept reached its first logical climax with Hitler's continental conquests. Its most significant post-war development has been in the economic sphere.

U.S. capitalists aim to establish a continental market as large in population as their home country, in which mass production on the domestic scale would be profitable. The Coal and Steel Community and Euratom were preliminaries which established the identity of the six-nation unit. Experiments toward a larger entity, as in the European Payments Union, broke down because of the conflicts between the British and continental imperialists.

The Common Market represents the most general development to

date of economic integration of West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. Of course, it is as yet far from a real "Common Market," without interior tariffs or quotas, with a free flow of capital and labor. In view of the known antagonisms of the participants, the general law of uneven development of capitalism, and the history of previous international cooperative ventures of capitalist countries, it is more likely than not that the whole common market structure will collapse long before it approaches its "perfect" state.

But for the present, it has a degree of significant existence, within which German imperialism is clearly dominant.

The international flow of labor within the common market area has begun with the import of Italian and other workers into the FRG, a repetition of the unhappy experience of the Hitler era. The freer flow of capital is also apparent, but in the opposite direction. German private purchases of foreign securities took a big leap, rising from a quarterly average of 69 million DM in 1958 to 250 million DM in the 1st, 220 million DM in the 2nd, and 410 million DM in the 3rd quarter of 1959. Most significant is the buying out of French interests. Shares of the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas are now traded on the Frankfurt stock exchange, and the German Bank Franco-Sarroise SA,

with headquarters in the Saarland, has opened a Paris branch. The Adenauer government made a substantial payment to France to buy out certain French investments in the Saar.

Prior to World War II the French imperialists jealously excluded their German rivals from their African holdings. Now Hitler's screaming demands have been granted, with German combines being given access to ores of French-controlled African colonies.

Parallel to encouraging this Common Market trend, American imperialism collaborates in the attempted ousting of British power and influence from the continent. Jointly with the Germans, they tell the British to give up their sterling bloc advantages, or be excluded from the "inner circle" of continental trade and investments. But of course the British will not give up their shrinking imperial loot, the only remaining source of power and influence as well as superprofits at their disposal. So they are maneuvered out of the continental picture.

As the friction between the Common Market and the British-dominated Outer Seven became more pronounced late in 1959, U.S. Under-Secretary of State Dillon went through the West European capitals and made his position known—all-out support for the Common Market but coolness to the Outer Seven.

Dillon said he favored the Common Market because it had the ob-

jective of political unification of its members, and because "it was a means of knitting West Germany into the European community." (*Journal of Commerce*, Dec. 11, 1959)

So the United States retains the policy, publicly developed by Dulles, of the ultimate merging of the West European states under German imperialist direct leadership, and American general domination and strategic guidance.

STAKE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN WEST GERMANY

The FRG, as all Germany before the war, is the principal locus of American investments in continental Europe. During the 1920's American investments in Germany were mainly in bonds. Now the largest investments are in industrial enterprises controlled by U.S. monopolies. The following table shows the trend of U.S. direct investments in Britain and in the Common Market countries. (Direct investments mean investments of corporations in controlled enterprises.)

American Direct Investments in
Europe, 1936-58 and
Profits, 1958 (millions of dollars)

| Country | 1936 | 1950 | 1958 | Profit, |
|----------------|------|------|------|---------|
| | | | | 1958 |
| United Kingdom | 474 | 847 | 2058 | 315 |
| Germany | 228 | 204 | 574 | 85 |
| France | 146 | 217 | 527 | 52 |
| Italy | 70 | 63 | 264 | 20 |
| Netherlands | 19 | 84 | 233 | 10 |
| Belgium | 35 | 65 | 163 | 17 |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce

These figures show Britain as still the main European center of American investments, with a larger total than the entire Common Market area combined. But American investments in West Germany are growing more rapidly, and for some years have been larger than in any other continental country. Moreover, statistical factors lead to understatement of investments in West Germany, relative to those in other countries shown.

A recent compilation—released by the New York Stock Exchange in July, 1959—shows how West Germany has been favored as a site for new American investments. In 1958, of the companies listed on that Stock Exchange, 176 had plants or retail outlets in Great Britain, 88 in West Germany, 71 in France. But in the six years ending in 1958, the increase in that number was 51 in West Germany, 24 in Great Britain, 18 in France. More U.S. companies erected or purchased plants in West Germany during this period than in any other country in the Eastern Hemisphere. A sign of the times is the shifting by numerous U.S. corporations of their continental headquarters from France to West Germany.

The establishment of the Common Market has spurred U.S. investment in this area, with some estimates indicating the volume has tripled in 1959.

The basic attraction of West Ger-

many to American investors, of course, is the lure of super-profits. Rockwell Manufacturing Co., close to the Mellon interests of Pittsburgh, has opened plants at Pinneberg and Munich to make valves and small engines. Chairman Willard F. Rockwell "says he pays less than a quarter as much for labor there—and in Germany you get a man 'who works harder, is more interested in his work and does a better job.'"*

A supplementary attraction to the American monopolists is political, their confidence that things in West Germany are firmly under control of their own kind of hard-fisted, ruthless exploiters.

While American investments in West Germany are still growing, the trend is not toward the general control of West German economy by Wall Street. The pace of the dollar flow is insufficient, nor has it penetrated significantly into the basic heavy industries of the Rhine-Ruhr, nor into the financial institutions of German imperialism.

In this connection one point is of special significance for the present period of the scientific-technical revolution. During World War II and the subsequent reconstruction period, American imperialism gained a tremendous lead over its capitalist rivals in scientific-technical progress. The sale of know-how, patents, etc., is not only a great source

* Osborn Elliott, *Men at the Top* (New York, Harper, 1959), p. 230.

on of its
t was a
Germany
community."
Dec. 11,
tains the
by Dulles,
the West
erman im-
nd Ameri-
l strategic
ny before
locus of
ontinental
s Ameri-
any were
he largest
erial enter-
monopo-
shows the
tments in
on Market
ents mean
as in con-
ments in
nd
dollars)

| | Profits, 1958 | 1958 |
|-----|------------------|------|
| 958 | 315 | 85 |
| 058 | 527 | 52 |
| 574 | 264 | 20 |
| | 233 | 10 |
| | 163 | 17 |

of profits, but a lever for gaining control of industry in other capitalist countries.

West Germany appears to be an exception. The capitalists of this area have maintained sufficient research activity to keep abreast of the Americans in many aspects of the key metallurgical, machinery, and chemical industries, and ahead in some. In these areas agreements for sharing or exchanging processes are appearing between the American and West German companies. American companies buy up sales rights for West German processes, as well as the reverse.

ROCKEFELLER AND WEST GERMANY

There are different degrees of emphasis on the German alliance among leading groups of finance capital in America. Perhaps most committed is the Rockefeller group, recently defeated in its bid for the presidency, with an apparent perspective of restoring the all-out cold war atmosphere achieved under the one-time Standard Oil lawyer, Dulles.

True, Standard Oil investments in West Germany are much smaller than in England, and no larger than in France. But the lower relative use of oil in West Germany, in comparison with England and France, shows that opportunities for expansion of petroleum investments there are really outstanding. Re-

cently, a huge Standard Oil bond issue in West Germany for new construction was oversubscribed. Great pipelines are being built through France for increasing the flow of oil into West Germany.

The Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank is the only Wall Street bank with a branch in West Germany—the Bank of America, from California, also has one. The two Americans who had most to do with the reconstruction of West German imperialist power, Clay and McCloy, are now both on the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and McCloy is its chairman.

MILITARY AND MUNITIONS COLLABORATION

West Germany is a major "beneficiary" of American military bases. The receipts of dollars in payment for services and commodities rendered to American occupation troops doubled between 1956 and 1958, reaching 3.1 billion DM. Part of these funds contribute to the surplus available to the German capitalists for the making of private and state foreign investments.

At least as large a part are sent back to the United States for the purchase of munitions for the remilitarization of West Germany. West Germany spent in advance payments on munitions, net, 1.7 billion DM in the first nine months of 1959, and 4 billion DM in the past three years. Most of this went

to U.S. companies.

Now the trend is increasingly toward the production of munitions, rather than their importation. Superficially, we witness a step-by-step removal of Allied restrictions on West German weapon making privileges. Realistically, there may be occurring a series of deals whereby American munitions trusts obtain a share in ownership of this production and the profits to be derived, in exchange for the easing of restrictions.

According to *New York Times* correspondent Arthur Olsen, during the past year "United States armament manufacturers have begun to pour massive amounts of capital and technical experience into the reviving West German arms industry." Electrical, aircraft, and machine building companies are getting into Germany in the "widespread conviction that the Bonn Republic is destined to become a major weapons producer." Such investments are expected to total a billion dollars within the next six or seven years, or more than the total nominal value of present U.S. investments in West Germany. (*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 14, 1959).

Ostensibly the German corporations welcome U.S. participation because they are short of capital and backward in technique, owing to their long exclusion from military production advances. There are some grains of truth in this, but

perhaps not too many. One cannot disregard the concentration of German scientific talent in American munitions development throughout the post-war period, along with the recent return of some of them, like Oberth.

In this writer's opinion, the *main* factor is the political desirability, if not necessity, of admitting American participation in order to open wide the opportunities for munitions profits. At any rate, here are examples of this munitions penetration:

Lockheed is buying shares of Heinkel Messerschmidt—a merger of traditional German aircraft firms—to acquire a substantial minority interest. First Lockheed made plenty selling 94 F-104's to West Germany. Now, besides its investment profits, it received a \$1 million licensing fee plus \$15,000 for each F-104 built in West Germany (500 are scheduled). General Electric obtained a \$3 million fee for the right to manufacture its J-79 engine, used in the F-104, and appears to have won a three-way struggle for control of Bayerische Motorenwerke (BMW) which makes the engine.

Rockefeller's Vertol Aircraft Co. has joined with Dornier in helicopter development. United Aircraft, largest of the aircraft motor companies in the United States, has bought up 43 per cent of AG Weser, which is controlled by Krupp.

Who ever believed the protesta-

tions of Krupp—as spokesman for the Ruhr magnates generally—that he never again would produce munitions? These promises have been added to the long list of lies of which these sinister magnates are guilty.

The West German and American munitions kings, in close unity, are straining every effort to prevent a disarmament agreement, to end the thawing tendencies in international relations, and to build to the utmost their business in West Germany.

Now maneuvers are underway to extend this collaboration to the lethal nuclear weapons field.

West Germany is more than a satellite of the American imperialists in this munitions collaboration. For example, the Americans foist on their puppet regimes obsolete models of equipment, and even on their more advanced allies somewhat older models. But the Germans are getting the F-104, the same basic fighter model currently being supplied to the U.S. Air Force.

It is a shame and a menace to the American people that our soldiers engage in joint maneuvers with the Nazi-led Wehrmacht, that the West German imperialists are seeking to add their bases to the American bases resting on the bleeding bodies of the Spanish people, that this year's West German military budget has jumped another \$1.1 billion, with all encouragement and aid from Washington.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

West Germany is increasingly becoming associated with the United States in international financial relations. The German imperialists welcome the opportunity. They need a powerful United States imperialism not only for political and military support, but to provide an opening wedge into many areas for foreign economic expansion.

And now the American imperialists need the Germans economically. The dollar is weakening, because of the multi-billion dollar annual deficit in the balance of payments and the corresponding drain on gold reserves.

The American imperialists appeal to their allies for help. Share the costs of our foreign military bases, of our aid to puppet regimes, of state investments in underdeveloped areas, they plead, lest the position of international capitalism be fatally weakened. The West German capitalists are best able and most willing to help.

The British and French imperialists, who have had their noses rubbed in the dirt by Wall Street dictated currency devaluations, may take secret pleasure in the weakening of the dollar. Not so the German imperialists. Says Erhard: "The dollar is the sun of the western economic planetary system in which other currencies are satellites." (*Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 5, 1959).

Readily the West Germans agree

to liberalize importation of American goods. They paid \$150 million in advance on debt redemption, and offer to pay another \$200 million next year. Dillon, the American Undersecretary, found the West Germans "sympathetic," and "eager to do whatever they could to help." (*N. Y. Times*, Dec. 12, 1959).

Most significantly, the West Germans are increasingly joining the Americans in investments in underdeveloped countries, especially the state investments needed to set the conditions for profitable private deals. The West Germans have increased their quotas in the International Bank and the International Fund more than proportionately to the general increases which went into effect this year. West German currency and loans are now second to the dollar in the activities of the Bank and Fund.

German bankers are starting to participate in international syndicates with American and other European bankers. The new billion-dollar European Investment Bank of the Common Market area made its first loan in conjunction with the World Bank and the American Morgan interests to the Italian Cassa per il Mezzogiorno, for Southern Italy development. The money is parceled out to private corporations operating in southern Italy, including the American Union Carbide Corp. The \$580 million Common Market Overseas Development Fund has made loans to Turkey and Spain, helping

to bail out countries in financial trouble after receiving the dubious blessings of huge American-directed militarization programs—and at the same time to re-establish pre-war German economic domination in the two countries.

CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN WEST GERMAN AND AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

To a degree, history is repeating itself. After World War I also, American imperialism played a leading role in the revival of German imperialism, and in the process acquired important economic positions within Germany, the core of its expanded role today.

But in the last analysis the contradictions between American and German imperialism became most prominent, the Anglo-American alliance came to the fore and was forced to fight against German imperialism.

Will the two powers again break apart in conflict, or will the West German-American alliance deepen at the expense of the traditional "Atlantic" relationships? Of course, no certain answer can be given. But the contradictions emerging can be defined, and tentatively assessed in terms of their direction of development.

The most obvious contradiction is in international trade. Using extremely aggressive forms of state aid, German imperialism under Hitler made major penetrations of the

depression-gripped capitalist world markets of the 1930's.

Wiped out in World War II, the trading position of West Germany is already stronger, in relation to its European capitalist rivals, than in 1938. In that year, the U.S. and Germany were tied for first place in exports to Western Europe, with Britain somewhat behind. In 1958 West Germany held a broad lead, with the United States second and Britain far behind.

West Germany has long since regained its 1938 status of being second to the United States in exports to Latin America, although it is still much further behind the United States than in 1938. Britain's one-time trading dominance in the Middle East has been reduced to a narrow lead. West Germany is registering the largest gains, and is within striking distance of catching up to the U.S. and the U.K. in Middle Eastern exports. In the United States market also, West German competition is felt more keenly by many sections of industry, most significantly recently by the iron and steel and machinery industries, which carry more weight politically than the light industries which have long fought foreign competition.

Further West German export gains are to be expected, so long as a major capitalist world economic crisis is avoided. American investors participate to some degree in these German export gains. But on

the whole, one must expect the competition and rivalry for this trade to become fiercer, especially because of the newly recognized need on the part of American imperialism to defend its positions on world markets.

William A. Williams, in his recent book *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Cleveland, 1959, World Publishers), stresses the importance of this foreign trade rivalry in turning American policy toward opposition to German imperialism during the 1930's. Then, the threat to American domination over Latin America was the main thing. Now West Germany is also encroaching on newly won U.S.-dominated areas in Asia and Africa.

American finance capital looks favorably on the Common Market, on the assumption that profitable investment positions it can establish will more than counterbalance losses of export opportunities from the United States. But the further development of the Common Market may increasingly exclude U.S.-manufactured goods and farm surpluses from continental Europe, further upsetting the balance of payments against the United States.

CONCLUSION

Today, the German and American imperialists show an almost unbroken front of political, military, and economic alliance. But there is a vital conflict in the long-term aims of the two partners. To the Americans, German imperialism is

the instrument for maintaining and deriving the most profits from strategic domination over capitalist Europe. To the Germans, American imperialism is the instrument for achieving dominance first over capitalist Europe and later—who knows where else?

As the West German strength grows, the Rhine-Ruhr trusts will increasingly maneuver to reduce the influence of Wall Street in their affairs, and the Wall Street share in their profits. Who can doubt that corresponding political conflicts will also arise? These conflicts tend to undermine the alliance, as against other circumstances tending to tighten the mutual embrace of these partners in exploitation and militarism.

One cannot predict with certainty which will prove most important. However, one must consider political circumstances and trends which essentially doom the German-American imperialist alliance, although the timing and circumstances of its demise cannot be foretold.

The German-American imperialist alliance is evil. Both partners are responsible, before all humanity, for the sinister epidemic of Nazi anti-Semitic demonstrations, spreading from West Germany throughout the "advanced" capitalist countries, including the United States. These shocking events coincided with a particularly venal campaign in some American publications, notably *Life* and the *New York Times*, slanderously alleging anti-Semitism in the

U.S.S.R.

These anti-Soviet propagandists claim to be against racism, but they have supported and continue to support the U.S. policy in relation to West Germany which has set the stage for this new upsurge of fascist racism in the capitalist world. Meanwhile, the basically racist nature of American imperialism is notorious.

Certainly the people of the world, so much stronger and better organized than 30 years ago, will never again permit fascist imperialists to develop anti-Semitism to the tragic climax of Hitler's times. In halting this, they will also smash the aggressive designs of the German-American imperialist alliance.

The aim of progressive forces everywhere must be to replace this alliance not with German-American hostility, but with friendly relations between the United States and both Germanies, based on peaceful coexistence, disarmament, and the full development of economic relations between the socialist and capitalist worlds.

The United States and West Germany, above all other capitalist countries, can find a real basis for high and growing economic activity for a considerable period of time through such a course. This would improve the circumstances of the peoples of the two countries in struggling for improvement in living conditions and relief from the hardships and oppressions of capitalism.

A Letter from Guinea

By S. J. T.

Conakry, July 9.

A Guinean whose comment I requested described the June 6 *Time* article [dealing with Guinea] as a malodorous hash of slanderous falsifications culled from the French press of the extreme Right. Repeatedly these falsifications have been exposed by the Press Agency of Guinea, and by others as well. For example, *Afrique Nouvelle*, a Catholic-oriented weekly paper in Dakar, noted in its June 1 issue, the "bo-bard" committed by the French Press Agency in announcing that a Frenchman, M. Rossignol, one of those sentenced for complicity in the anti-Guinea conspiracy early in May, had died in jail of a heart-attack. This story, served up again as part of the *Time* hash, was answered by an official report from Paris that the man in question was not dead at all. After reviewing these facts, the Dakar paper commented on "the regrettable irresponsibility" of the above-mentioned news agencies evidenced by this kind of reporting which, it said, "can only serve to make even more difficult the relations between France and Guinea (and by the same token the situation of the French living in Guinea) without profit to anyone."

The *Time* article fails to mention that with all the alleged police surveillance in Guinea (of which I have

seen no evidence whatever), one yet finds the French Press Agency, source of most of the misinformation about the country, maintaining a functioning office right in the center of Conakry—with a sign on the building announcing its presence.

Time is expressing only a wish in suggesting that there is a group of "young intellectuals" in Guinea who seek to form an opposition party to the P.D.G. (Democratic Party of Guinea) headed by Sekou Touré. Intellectuals as well as other sections of the population are united in support of the aims of the PDG to achieve and defend the full independence of Guinea and the whole continent of Africa. An opposition party, were it to exist, would differ only on the question of *how* to achieve all these goals. But that is in no sense comparable to a conspiracy to undermine and overthrow the present regime in order to open up Guinea once again to French imperialist domination.

It was for this that the People's Court last month meted out sentences to Africans and non-Africans involved in counter-revolutionary activity. The danger of such activity is real—Senegal as well as Guinea has recently uncovered secret stores of arms and munitions in substantial quantities—and necessitates continued vigilance on the part of Guineans and other inde-

pendent African nations until Africa has been completely liberated from imperialist domination. This theme is constantly stressed by Sekou Touré and others in Guinea.

It is noteworthy that the other French-speaking African countries are now following the example of Guinea and demanding immediate independence without prior negotiations or conditions, and are simultaneously re-establishing close ties with their Guinean brothers. This, of course, adds to the dismay and anger in French imperialist circles.

Meanwhile, Guinea goes forward with its three-year plan for rebuilding the economy of the country on solid foundations. But just as the unreconstructed Bourbons of the southern United States mourn the passing of the

"good old days" when the "happy slaves" danced at night under the magnolia trees, so *Time* laments that Conakry is no longer "a cheerful little city where the Africans . . . danced into the night under the mango trees." Perhaps this is some disillusioned emigre's observation reported at second or third hand, or perhaps *Time's* correspondent—if he was actually in Conakry—simply sat sulking in a bar over his whiskey and soda and didn't bother to look around the city. The truth is that although many difficult problems beset the country, there is already growing a sense of accomplishment and progress, the basis of genuine satisfaction and cheerfulness among the people—and they are working *and* dancing.

S. J. T.

The attention of readers is called to the June, 1960 issue of *The Atlantic*. Practically the entire issue was devoted to "The Arts in the Soviet Union." It contains generous samplings of current Soviet poetry and short stories; a fascinating letter from Simonov to the Editor; excellent essays on publishing, the theatre, and the ballet in the USSR; and several illustrations of sculpture and painting. It has been at least fifteen years since a major, nationally-circulating American magazine has provided its readers with so objective a view of cultural developments in the Soviet Union—The Editor.

FARMING AND FREEDOM

By Eric Bert

The only value in Ezra Taft Benson's *Freedom to Farm* (Doubleday, \$3.95), is that it presents the full propaganda arsenal of Big Business on the agricultural front. The starting point of Benson's exposition is that, unlike the "ancient civilizations of Sumer and Babylon and Ninevah and China and Egypt," whose "farm problem" was recurring food shortages, our farm problem occurs in the course of unremitting advances in productivity, and in the midst of bounteous harvests. This change in the level of agricultural productivity, Benson says, means that the "farm problem . . . now lends itself to solution."

That conclusion is based on the contention that the cause of today's "farm problem" is the bad (Democratic) legislation of the past 25 years. The fault, however, lies not in the Democrats nor, for that matter, in the Republicans, but in capitalism; in the ever-increasing pressure of monopoly capital on the five million individual, "independent," for the most part non-capitalist, producers. That is the situation which Benson implies can be solved.

The first step is to deny the domination of monopoly capital. Thus the charge that the "big corporations are overrunning the country" is a fabrication of the "prophets of doom," according to Benson. Similarly he rejects the charge that the "middleman is taking too much."

The evil ways into which bad legislation has got us, he argues, can be overcome by scuttling price supports

and production restrictions; these have been the main bases of farm legislation during the past quarter-century. In defense of this torpedo proposal Benson states, time and again, the undeniable fact that when farm benefits are based on volume of production for the market, as has been the case in our main farm legislation, they benefit the big operators much more than they do the middle or small farmers. However, this does not induce Benson to propose a program which would protect the farm livelihood of the smallest producers. On the contrary, he is the foremost public spokesman for the Big Business program for the elimination of several million farmers.

This verdict is not stated explicitly—for Benson intends the volume as a Republican campaign document. The proposal is presented adroitly. We are a nation of "family farmers": over 99 per cent of our farmers are "unincorporated small businessmen"; 96 percent of our farms are "family-operated"; the "family farm is holding its own very well"; it "will not disappear." However, "the trend toward larger family farm enterprises will continue, as far as anybody can foresee," because of the "technological revolution in agriculture."

Benson says many nice things about "family farmers," but when the chips are down he separates the sheep from the goats, the "progressive," "highly skilled, and usually highly educated commercial farmers" from the "ma-

majority of people living on farms," the "rural dwellers." They are not "truly farmers in the commercial (capitalist—E.B.) sense." They are the inhabitants of the "small scale, part-time and residential farms" which raise only about 10 percent of farm products sold. In contrast, the "commercial farmers" though they "represent only about 40 percent of the people who live on farms . . . sell 90 per cent of our farm products." (Benson mentions croppers only twice, once as the subjects of "committees of idealists worrying over the backwardness of our sharecroppers and subsistence farmers" in the '30's. Negro tillers are never mentioned as such.)

Benson's field of view is, however, much narrower than even the 40 percent who are "commercial farmers." Benson thinks of the "typical farmer" ("the man we choose to show to a visiting dignitary who can only see one farm on a flying tour through our country") as the operator of a "low average . . . adequate commercial farm in the Midwest, which at central Illinois farm land prices, would represent an investment of over \$150,000."

In 1950 the U.S. average value of land and buildings in Class I commercial farms—the topmost class—was \$120,000. Of more than 5.4 million total farms in the U.S. in 1950, only 103,231, or 1.9 percent of all farms, were in Class I. "Typical" for Benson, therefore, is a farm that is *larger* than the average for the *topmost* class of farms, that is, within the *top two percent* of all farms.

For Benson the "farm problem . . . is two problems": of "business farmers," on the one hand, and of the

"people who live in the countryside," on the other. He has, however, one solution: to clean as many millions off the land as possible. The majority of farmers, the "rural dwellers" are to be wiped out of agriculture through the "Rural Development Program" initiated in 1955. His outlook does not imply, however, that the other 40 percent, the "commercial farmers," will all remain. Far from it! The continuing technological revolution, the vastly increased amounts of capital needed to farm "efficiently," lead inevitably to more and more farmers becoming "inefficient" "rural dwellers," fit only to be eliminated in "orderly fashion" through the "Rural Development Program." The implication of Benson's outlook is to encourage the most savage competitive struggle among the "commercial farmers" that our agriculture has ever witnessed, with the victims, in increasing numbers, falling by the wayside. The "majority of farmers who receive substandard incomes" are to be "adjusted" out of agriculture.

The 1959 census of agriculture data which are now becoming available will disclose the tremendous pressures that press down the small and middle size farmers. The preliminary data sheet for Wilkin county, Minnesota, a predominantly cash-grain area discloses, for example, that 73 of the 1183 farms existing in 1954 had been absorbed or abandoned by 1959. It appears that the farmers who vanished were in the main those who had worked off their farms to sustain their families.

The farms of Wilkin county became fewer and larger, and their in-

vestment in machinery greater, during the five years. ("For all practical purposes," Benson says in *Freedom to Farm*, "we can measure the progress of farm mechanization primarily by tractor numbers.") While the number of farms reporting tractors declined by 57 between 1954 and 1959 (there were 77 fewer total farms), the number of tractors reported by these farms rose from 2,413 in 1954 to 2,604 in 1959, that is, by 191. The prerequisites for survival in Wilkin county are suggested in the fact that in 1959, 196 farms reported one tractor, while 849 reported operating two or more tractors.

* * *

A basic question in respect to the Benson-Eisenhower program is: what is its class base or intent? Does it represent the "commercial" farmers against the non-commercial?; the big farmers against the small farmers?; Big Business against farmers in general? The answer lies in the intention of Big Business to get rid of the "surplus" farmers; those who are unnecessary for an "efficient" agriculture. The number of farmers who were considered "necessary" was slashed from 3,000,000 a decade or so ago, to 2,500,000; and then, this past spring, to the 1,000,000 estimate made public by the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. Simultaneously it has been disclosed that the secret goal of high circles in Washington is 500,000, or only half of the publicly announced minimum. (See *Political Affairs*, July 1960.) The secret goal of 500,000 farmers seeks the elimination of five of every six present "commercial farmers"—quite apart from those whom Benson disdains as "rural

dwellers." Regardless of the precise figure, whether the public 1,000,000 or the secret 500,000, the intent of Big Business is to slash the number of farmers to a minimum, and to encourage the transformation of our agriculture to a thoroughly capitalist basis. That is Benson's purpose. He furthers the goals of Big Business and of that small fraction of the farmers who can hope to survive the virulent competitive struggle and take over the operations of the small and middle size farmers.

It is not surprising that this program is accompanied by a typical McCarthyite smear against those liberals in the Department of Agriculture in the '30's who attempted to make the New Deal operate on behalf of the impoverished farmers. Another victim of Benson's character assassination is the late Hal Ware, son of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor, one of the foremost fighters in behalf of the farmers prior to his untimely death in the late thirties. Obviously, the ordinary laws of libel are still unenforceable against such slanderers as the sanctimonious Benson.

* * *

From what Benson says, under "Acknowledgements," *Freedom to Farm* was written by one Asher Brynes. Brynes "carried through the basic research . . . was responsible for the arrangement of the facts . . . gave detailed assistance, line by line . . . except for a few pages . . . in the style of presentation." Benson forgets only to disclose who is going to collect the royalties. The ideas in the book, though they appear under Benson's by-line, are the ideas of Big Business.

TWO NEW TITLES

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: 1763-1783

By Herbert Aptheker

Price \$3.50

This second book in Dr. Aptheker's History of the American People answers such questions as: Was the American Revolution really a REVOLUTION? What were its sources? Did class divisions within the colonies determine its nature? Did the majority of American people support it? How did the Committees of Correspondence and the Continental Congress come into being? How were Tories and traitors treated by the military? What was the role of the Negro people, free and slave? What was the relation of slavery to the independence struggle? These and many other questions are answered in a Marxist analysis that makes this book indispensable. An International title.

COMPOSER AND NATION: THE FOLK HERITAGE IN MUSIC

By Sidney Finkelstein

Price \$4.00

This study surveys four centuries of music, focusing not only on the great 19th century composers who consciously allied their art with national tradition, such as Smetana, Dvorak, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, but throws light on the masters who wrote during the period of the rise of modern nations, such as Vivaldi, Handel and Bach. The author treats in a new and fresh way with the classic era of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, and uncovers the social and psychological issues that affected the work of the romantic composers like Schuman, Chopin, Berlioz, Wagner and Brahms. He also discusses the moderns, like Debussy, Mahler, Stravinsky and others, and appraises American jazz, contemporary Soviet music and other musical developments. An International book.

New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.

Important New Book—

A SYMPOSIUM

DISARMAMENT and the AMERICAN ECONOMY

Edited by HERBERT APTHEKER

Papers presented at a Special Conference of the Faculty
of Social Science in New York including contributions by

HERBERT APTHEKER: The Ideology of Disarmament

JAMES S. ALLEN: The Politics of Disarmament

ROBERT W. DUNN: The Colossal Cost of War Preparations

JOHN EATON: Economics of the Fight for Peace

JURGEN KUCZYNSKI: Peace and the Economist

HYMAN LUMER: The Economic Role of Armament Expenditures

VICTOR PERLO: Economics of Disarmament

GEORGE S. WHEELER: War Production and Employment

Paperback: \$.75

Cloth \$1.50

AT MOST BOOKSTORES

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Y

ty
py

ures

V
C
A
C