


political affairs

NOVEMBER 1960 • 35 CENTS

- 
- [1] Salute to the U.S.S.R.
- [27] Peaceful Co-Existence and Revisionism
- [37] On the Farm Question: A Discussion
- [41] Poland Today
- [50] The Latin-American Revolution of 1810-1826
- [54] On the Party's History
- [62] Labor in the 'Thirties

THE UN AND THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

by Jack Stachel

[5-14]

DISARMAMENT AND PEACE

by Herbert Aptheker

[15-26]

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

A SYMPOSIUM: DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, Edited by Herbert Aptheker	\$-.75
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
JEWS 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

Salute to the U. S. S. R.

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

Forty-three years ago it was Tzarist Russia, one of the most cruel and backward of tyrannies in the world. It enslaved all the surrounding peoples. "A prison of nations," Lenin called it. Now it is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a friendly family of fifteen equal republics. It stretches from the Gulf of Finland to the Pacific Ocean, from the Arctic Ocean to China. In these republics of 212 millions of people nearly all languages are spoken, all colors of skin are seen, all native literature and history, music and dance, are preserved.

Forty-three years ago the people were hungry, illiterate, superstitious. Now all have abundant food, clothing and adequate shelter. Schools and colleges are built in the most remote corners. Young and old have learned to read and write. They are scientists, engineers, specialists and experts in all fields. Young girls study to be research workers, doctors, nurses, teachers, agronomists—whatever their bent.

Forty-three years ago they lived and died in the darkness of their own villages. Today they travel—

to visit, for vacations, schools, conferences—to many far off places. They go by train, car, or jet planes over borders that are legendary and practically non-existent. All are Soviet citizens, enjoying full political rights, sharing responsibilities, participating in all phases of human activity. Their members of the Supreme Soviet come regularly to Moscow, to meet in the Kremlin. They make the laws for the entire country and return to report to their constituency. Strong young Soviet athletes, men and women, were recently enthusiastically welcomed back from the Olympic Games at Rome, where they won many medals and honors in all sports.

Forty-three years ago culture was only for the rich and powerful. The ballet and the opera entertained the Tzar and aristocracy. Today every city has its ballet and opera companies, its theaters and orchestras. A factory may engage a whole house for a performance. Young and old are "fans," of favorite dancers and singers, who travel all over the country. Libraries, museums, houses of culture for the people, occupy

I

\$.75

\$.15

.25

\$.15

.15

.10

\$.10

.15

.10

.10

.35

.05

1.00

.35

.25

N. Y.

York, N. Y.,
New Century
payments and
ashes; foreign

the beautiful palaces of yesterday. Old buildings of architectural interest, including many churches, have been restored. Rich treasures of archaeological value have been unearthed in geological surveys of natural resources, and placed in museums. Whatever is good in the past, as Lenin taught, is not rejected.

Forty-three years ago the women were "slaves of a stove." Drudgery and misery was their lot. Nowhere in the whole wide world have women made such progress as in the U.S.S.R. Long ago in its Far Eastern Republics, on International Woman's Day, they tore the age-old veils from their faces and buried them in front of the statue of Lenin. Today they are free and equal. They run factories, hospitals, schools, are judges and lawmakers. More and more in the new housing centers, the burdens of domestic tasks are being socialized. The women work, study, bring up beautiful children. Special care of mothers, guarantee of their jobs, care of the aged, medical care and vacations for all, remove the insecurity that oppresses women under capitalism.

Never in the history of humanity has so much attention been given to the care of children, as here under Socialism. Nurseries and boarding schools, child-care centers, recreation places for older children, summer camps, give all children a happy life in the Soviet Union. These citizens of the future, who will live in a Communist society, are growing up in an

atmosphere of loving kindness. All their capacities and capabilities will be unfolded; selfishness, envy, greed, will be foreign to them. They will be a new type of human being.

Forty-three years ago the peoples here were in the midst of a terrible war. The soldiers had no ammunition, the people were starving. The dissolute monarchy had pushed them to disaster and death. Despair gripped the country. Some upon whom they had pinned their hopes of freedom, betrayed them and tried to keep them in the war. Then came the great October Revolution, as it is called here. The calendar has since been changed. Now the historic date is November 7th. It marked the beginning of the Epoch of Socialism. It marked the beginning of the end of capitalism—soon to disappear from the stage of history.

The October Socialist Revolution of 1917, led by Lenin, produced three legal proclamations. First was *Peace*; then *National Liberation* of the subject peoples; then *Land* to the peasants. These three first acts of the new-born Socialist government, were greeted with vast enthusiasm by the people everywhere. They were hated and feared by the ruling class in all lands, lest an example be set to their victims. The foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. today, as enunciated by Premier N. S. Khrushchev, consistently carries forward these noble principles. They meet with the same

response—enthusiastic support by the peoples, who have grown stronger, and a more desperate hatred by the ruling class, who are far weaker in the world today.

The past forty-three years have not been easy for the Soviet people. At the outset, Tzarist generals created a civil war. The capitalist countries blockaded the new-born Socialist republic, invaded her territory with joint military action and refused her recognition for many years. But all these attacks were courageously rebuffed by the Soviet people. Alone and unaided, with their bare land and their bare hands, they proceeded to build Socialism. They were strengthened by the realization that now the land and its fruits, the natural resources, the fields, rivers and mountains, all belonged to the people. The long term plan of Lenin for electrification, inspired them to build a new life. His wise words created a faith in themselves, which unleashed the creative power of the people—will, energy, devotion, determination, such as never before were witnessed on such a gigantic scale.

In the past forty-three years, the building of all basic industry and of light industry for consumers' goods—the building of great dams, bridges, railroads, steel plants; the use of machinery in industry and agriculture, proceeded beyond scheduled plans. They would have surpassed capitalist production long

ago, if the horrors of another war had not been let loose, in Hitler's invasion of their country in 1941. More terrible than the interruption was the destruction of all they had built thus far and the frightful toll of human lives. Every Soviet family suffered losses. We who live far away do not fully realize what the peoples of Europe endured during World War II. Their cities were bombed, their industries destroyed, their civilians starved, dragged away to slavery or killed. Even after fifteen years the scars of war are not healed.

By a superhuman effort the heroic Soviet Union hurled the invaders from her soil and drove them all the way to Berlin, liberating Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland and even many of the German people from the nightmare of Nazi occupation. There are graves of anti-fascist heroes of all countries and beautiful statues to the Red Army soldier in these places. They are a constant reminder of what their freedom cost and express their everlasting gratitude to the U.S.S.R. The rubble is now cleared away. In fifteen years a miraculous recovery has been made in all the Socialist countries, with the aid of the Soviet Union. They are engaged today in the peaceful construction of Socialism. No one is more anxious to keep the world at peace than these Socialist people. War is not in their minds and hearts. Building a better

life is their great purpose.

Forty-three years ago the new-born Socialist republic stood alone. Today it has the vast and powerful People's Republic of China, with three other Asian Socialist countries and seven European Socialist countries at its side, representing over one-third of humanity. This is a great camp of *peace* today, fighting against a nuclear war, calling on people everywhere to work for peace. The second great slogan of the October Socialist Revolution—*national liberation of subject peoples*, is a reality today in Asia and Africa, where millions have thrown off the yoke of colonialism. The third great slogan of *land*, which in a larger sense meant bread and life for the people, has been realized by millions and is the fighting slogan of many millions more. The October Socialist Revolution marked the dawn of a new day for the oppressed, the exploited, the enslaved in all lands. They are on the march. They will not turn back. They will not rest until independence of peoples, freedom and peace have been attained.

After forty-three years, Socialism is here to stay. No one is forcing it on those who live under capitalism. But what the imperialist rulers in the world today frantically realize is *the growing attractiveness of socialism* to toilers everywhere. Cancers eat at the heart of capitalism—poverty, insecurity, unemployment, automation, taxes, racial discrimina-

tion, the arms race, the cold war. It cannot guarantee life, liberty or happiness to the plain people. Try as they will, by lies, misrepresentation and suppression of the truth, the ruling class cannot forever keep the facts of Socialist life away from our people. The King Canutes of today cannot hold back the tide of history. Nor will the people of the world, our own included, permit them to destroy humanity and civilization by nuclear warfare, in their mad frenzy of rule or ruin.

The celebration of the 43rd anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution will be devoted in the U.S.S.R. to the world cause of peace; to greeting all who fight for freedom around the globe; and to the fulfillment of the plans to open the way to Communism. The old saw: "You can't change human nature!" is proven false here. Due to their culture, their very way of life, a new kind of superior human being—the Socialist man and woman—are products of the new society. Proud but not boastful; patriotic, yet imbued with deep proletarian internationalism; patient—not given to anger but anxious to understand all people; courteous, calm, unselfish, hard-working, studious, devoted to their families and their co-workers—I salute these wonderful people on their great holiday. May peace, prosperity and happiness crown all their glorious efforts! May we live in peace and friendship with them!

The UN Assembly and the Fight for Peace*

By Jack Stachel

THE 15TH ASSEMBLY of the United Nations is an historic event, a great landmark in the struggle for peace, freedom and socialism. It reflects and registers the enormous changes in the world and in the alignments since the end of World War II and the formation of the UN 15 years ago. It is itself a battleground for the acceleration and advancement of that struggle. It confirms the basic changes in world relations and the correctness of the principles and policies flowing from these changes as first advanced at the 20th Congress of the CPSU and developed in the 1957 Declaration and the 21st Congress. It corroborates the correctness of these principles and policies as recently reaffirmed in the Bucharest Communiqué, in struggle against all deviations and vacillations, whether from the revisionist position or from that of doctrinairism and sectarianism.

In a certain sense, the UN Assembly in the world arena is similar to parliament in each capitalist nation, where the advanced revolutionary class and its allies carry on the struggle for the interests of the working class, the popular masses and the true national interest. But here the place of national interest is replaced by that of all humanity. Communist

parliamentary struggle does not replace but is based upon the mass struggles of the people and is itself a form of the class struggle. This is also equally true as regards the UN.

The 15th Assembly has special significance because of two facts. First, it takes place at a moment of an unprecedented upsurge and maturing of the struggles of the colonial peoples on all continents, as witness especially Iraq and Cuba, but first and foremost in Africa where great struggles and great leaders are rising and having their impact on the entire world. The epic struggle of the people of the Congo, the admission of so many new African states to the UN, and the emergence of such figures as Nkrumah, Touré and Lumumba, vividly reflect these world-shaking changes.

The second significant aspect which marks the 15th Assembly is *the great initiative of the great Soviet Union and its leader Nikita Khrushchev*. This initiative, which brought to this country almost all of the outstanding heads of state, not a few against their will, is itself the most striking confirmation, not only of brilliant leadership but of the correctness and effectiveness of the creative Marxist-Leninist policies developed by the USSR under Khrushchev's leadership and by the world Communist movement.

* Based on a report presented to the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party on September 28, 1960.

A look at the 15th Assembly in contrast to the U.N. of 15 years ago helps us understand the change in the character of the epoch. It helps us to see the development from an epoch which in Lenin's day could be described as one of "*imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions*" to that of today: the epoch of the disintegration of imperialism, of revolutions, of transition from capitalism to socialism, of the rise, consolidation and victory of the socialist world system.

Such a look will not only help us to understand the emergence of the struggle against colonialism as the major question at the 15th Assembly side by side with disarmament, as well as the relation *between* these two questions, but also why Khrushchev has raised the abolition of the secretary-generalship and its replacement by a directorate of three. Whether or not this is achieved at this session, this question arises out of the necessities of today, the experiences in the work of the UN, the new relations of forces and the tasks ahead, among them those in the struggle against colonialism and for disarmament.

Forty years ago, in the time of Lenin, the world's population, then less than 2 billion people, was divided approximately as follows: 250 million in capitalist-imperialist countries; 150 million in the Soviet Union; over 1½ billion in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Today, of a world population of nearly three billion, 1 billion are in socialist countries and another billion are in newly independent states. Only 150 million are in countries which are still colonies, and 350 million are in the capitalist-imperialist states.

In 1945, at the time of the First Assembly, there were six socialist nations: The USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Yugoslavia. Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Albania were not in the UN.

Today there are nine socialist states in the UN (without Yugoslavia): the USSR, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Albania. The following socialist countries are outside the UN: People's China, Mongolia, North Vietnam, North Korea and East Germany. *These socialist states total close to 1 billion people.*

Instead of 52 members, the United Nations now number 97. The socialist bloc has grown from 6 to 9, the African-Asian bloc from 12 to 46. On the other hand, the Western bloc has declined from 23 to 14, while the Latin-American bloc remains at 20.

In 1945, Africa was represented only by Liberia, Ethiopia and Egypt, aside from South Africa, whose government adheres to the Western bloc. By the end of this year, there will be 26 African nations in the UN.

At present 1,803,000,000 people are

repre
billion
which
close
W
the
wou
2½
wor
Chin
Asia
com
of t
Am
can-
cons
men
nine
repr
men
F
tion
conc
know
T
the
Con
resp
forc
1.
a s
mea
tion
Its
tory
peac
tem
2.
stru
But

represented in the UN. Over 1 billion are still unrepresented, of which People's China accounts for close to 700 million.

Were People's China admitted to the UN, the socialist countries would represent one billion out of 2½ billion, or 40 per cent of the world's population. If People's China were included among the Asian-African countries, these would comprise 1.6 billions or 64 per cent of the UN membership. If Latin America is added, the Asian-African-Latin American bloc would constitute 72 per cent of the UN membership. If to this is added the nine socialist nations, *they would represent 85 per cent of the UN membership.*

From these changes in the relationship of forces, two different conclusions have been drawn, as we know.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU, the 12-Party Declaration and the 21st Congress defined the epoch to correspond to this new relationship of forces and concluded that:

1. Co-existence, which was always a socialist policy, now no longer means, as in Lenin's time, "*alternation of periods of war and peace.*" Its content now is: "*Worldwide victory of socialism over capitalism in peaceful competition of the two systems. War is no longer inevitable.*"

2. Co-existence is a form of class struggle in the international arena. *But military means shall not be used*

to decide issues.

3. While the socialist countries can defeat imperialism if the imperialists provoke war, the sufferers would be all of humanity, *not only imperialism*, and the policy of peace, of avoiding war, *is inherent in socialism just as the policy of war is inherent in imperialism.*

* * *

The revisionists base their policy on the false claim that imperialism has changed its character and hence is no longer warlike. This leads to the abandonment of the struggle against imperialism.

The dogmatists, on the other hand, question the thesis of non-inevitability of war because they emphasize only that imperialism has not changed its character. They fail to grasp the essence of the following advice of Lenin:

Only an objective consideration of the sum total of all the classes of a given society without exception and, consequently, a consideration of the *objective stage of development of that society and of the reciprocal relations between it and other societies* can serve as the basis for correct tactics of the advanced class. (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18. Emphasis added.)

And further:

There are and there will be in each epoch separate, partial movements now forward, now backward, there are and there will be various deviations from the average type and average rate of movements. We cannot know how

rapidly and how successfully the separate historical movements of each epoch will develop. But we can know and we do know *which class* is the pivot of a particular epoch, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main peculiarities of the historical scene of this epoch." ("Under a False Flag," *Collected Works*, Vol. 18. Emphasis added.)

Those who fail to see that though imperialism has not changed its nature, *the character of the epoch and that class which is the pivot* have changed, point to the recently increased tensions as final proof that nothing has altered since Lenin's day. They put to question all the main conclusions of the 20th Congress, the 12-Party Declaration and the 21st Congress. The U-2 provocation, the fact that the summit meeting did not take place, the imperialist attacks and maneuvers in the Congo and in Cuba, the war in Algeria—all these are pointed to in opposition to the newly-developed creative policies of the world Communist movement. But first, this distorts the policy of co-existence and non-inevitability of war and secondly, it again fails to grasp that this policy flows not from subjective desire but objective reality.

This policy of the world Communist movement is a policy which fully takes into account the continued provocations of imperialism, the necessity for struggle on the part of the working people in each country against the monopolists, on the part of the oppressed peoples against im-

perialism. The cold war is a weapon of imperialism against the people and against the victory of coexistence. Even a small thaw in the cold war, on the other hand, strengthens the people's struggle for their social and economic welfare and democratic liberty. "*Peaceful coexistence is not a temporary policy depending on circumstances* but a general line of development of international relations, the road to world socialism. It is not merely an official policy but a principle of the Communist movement as a whole."* And the fight for peace is the central, the main, the paramount task of the working class.

Doesn't the 15th Assembly of the UN confirm this? Does it not reflect the new epoch? Is the UN itself not an arena of struggle? And by the way, is the world limited to just two camps—imperialism and socialism? Would not such a class-against-class concept on an international scale be even more dangerous today, when the imperialists are still powerful and possess weapons of such frightful destruction? Is the struggle to win the nations belonging to neither camp unimportant?

The new world, of course, existed before the 15th Assembly. But this meeting dramatizes it not only for us but for the whole world—and this itself will have its impact and become a mighty force.

The magnificent speech of Nkrumah and the admission of the many

* A. Zhikov, "Peace: Key Problem of Today," in *World Marxist Review*, August, 1960.

new African states reflected this new world. Castro and his profound and courageous presentation of the cause not only of Cuba but all the oppressed certainly reflected this new world.

And Nikita Khrushchev, by whose initiative this great world event, with the gathering of so many heads of state, was realized, and whose policies are being brilliantly confirmed in the Assembly debate as in life itself, likewise reflected it. He did so by centering on three major questions: an end to colonialism, disarmament, and the changes needed in the UN to correspond to the new world relations. Thus he dramatized the fact that a new class has become the pivot in this epoch.

Does anyone believe that it will be easier after all this for U.S. imperialism to carry forward with its plans against Cuba, or for world imperialism to use the UN against the people in the Congo? Here is an example of the correctness and the effectiveness of the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence.

President Eisenhower's speech was, as was to be expected, a defense of the imperialist policies of the monopolists of the U.S.A., a defense of the cold war policies, of the policy of building the alliances against the socialist countries, the bases surrounding them and in general the policy of reliance on the strength of armaments. But even the President's speech reflected the new situation. He could no longer make an open and outright defense of such policies.

True, this policy has for a long time been masqueraded as "peace with justice," "defense of human liberty and democracy." But most important is the fact that President Eisenhower put forward the position that the USA in the future will lay major emphasis upon the United Nations, and will bring forward its position through it and in its name. On the one hand, this reflects the growing opposition to imperialism and colonialism on the part of the people of the world generally, but in the first place the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. On the other hand, this is a position which, as we have seen in the Congo, aims to convert the UN into a permanent instrument of imperialist policy.

Colonialism has emerged as a central issue at the Assembly. *But this does not mean that disarmament has thereby receded from being the main issue before the UN.* And certainly the admission of China to the UN and the creation of guarantees that the UN will not be used as an instrument against the peoples winning their freedom are also part of the struggle to have the UN live up to its charter and reflect the new world relations. The threat to arm the revanchists of the German Federal Republic with nuclear weapons is also one of the major questions before the world. The struggle to realize peaceful coexistence, to end the cold war, to promote normal trade and cultural relations between our country and the rest of the world

—these questions which in one way or another will be debated in the UN, are the issues around which we have the task of clarifying the people, developing movements and struggles.

* * *

The UN Assembly has dramatized what has been known to us for some time. First, the weakness of the organized peace movement in our country generally, and especially among the working class. And secondly, the need of the more conscious anti-imperialist forces, aside from our own Party and the immediate Left to become a more effective force in the fight for peace. And thirdly, that the fight for peace does not yet occupy the main attention of our Party; it has not yet become the central task. Our attempts to react in this situation—and *we have done a number of good things together with others*—have also disclosed a certain one-sidedness and confusion as to the character of the peace movement in our country today, the role of the Party, the united front and role of the Left-progressive forces.

This discussion around the UN Assembly gives us the opportunity to examine these questions, to clarify our position and to take political and organizational measures to strengthen our work.

First, it must be established that the struggle for peace is not only for others outside the Party, or even for those Party members active in

one or another peace organization. Peace has to become the chief task of the entire Party, of all of us—the leadership on every level, the clubs and the entire membership. This does not mean, of course, that everybody fights for peace in the same way all the time or that civil rights, social welfare, the working-class struggles on economic questions are of secondary importance.

The more the people who want peace come to associate our Party, our principles, socialism with peace and the struggle for peaceful co-existence, the easier it will be for us to overcome anti-Communist prejudices, and the harder it will be for our class enemies to isolate us.

* * *

But the Party's own activity in its own name—which is essential—should not be made a substitute for the main task. This is the task of setting in motion and winning the mass of the people for peace, on one or another issue, and irrespective of confusion and differences on the causes for the war danger or their unreadiness to see ahead and fight for as advanced a position as we do. Included in this is the need to work in the main peace organizations.

At the same time, it is also possible to unite into ad hoc or permanent committees those forces in addition to ourselves who can fight for more advanced slogans, who will react in a timely way and who do not hesitate to develop struggles. Such forms of organized activity, if not in oppo-

sition
the
sim
strug
Or
never
rect
ways
both
secta
To
Party
ward
or to
in th
one
Bu
cum
Party
work
men
ahead
ing
men
work
be i
peop
N
to to
to e
ple,
relat
mas
W
peac
to b
the
chu
etc.,
org
In

sition to or a substitute for work in the broader peace movement, can stimulate and advance the whole struggle.

On this question also, we must never forget that to fight for the correct line of the Party, we must always struggle on two fronts—against both Right opportunism and Left sectarianism.

To underestimate the role of the Party as such, to fail to bring forward the Party as a fighter for peace or to underestimate the Party's role in the broader peace movement is one danger which must be fought.

But this must not under any circumstances lead to substituting the Party for the mass movement or to working in the broader peace movement in a sectarian way, to running ahead of the masses, and so to isolating ourselves from the broader movement, either by staying out of it or working in such a way that we will be isolated instead of winning the people for our position.

Never limiting the united front to top relations alone, always striving to establish a base among the people, we should not underestimate top relations as a means of winning the masses.

Work for peace is not limited to peace organizations as such. It has to be brought into the trade unions, the Negro people's organizations, churches, women, youth, students, etc., as well as into existing peace organizations.

In the fight for peace, we have to

grasp and bring especially to the labor and Negro people's movements the growing interdependence between the struggle for peace and for the class interests of the people. The cold war strengthens the rule of monopoly capital. A thaw furthers the fight for social and political demands. Examples, such as the abandonment by Reuther and others of the shorter work week in the interests of the cold war can be used to show how the vital immediate interests of the working class are linked to the cause of peace. It is not difficult to see how the struggles of the African peoples and the advances of socialism strengthen the fight of the Negro people. The developments around the UN and the Congo show that it is possible to draw the Negro people into the fight for peace.

Also we should not confuse the possibility and necessity of utilizing differences existing in the camp of the monopolists in the interests of peace with the necessity of basing the peace movement and the peace struggle on the masses of the people—on the overwhelming majority exploited and oppressed by the monopolists. And we must see that the anti-monopoly struggle, the fight for democratic demands, for curbing the monopolists is of immeasurable help in the fight for peace.

* * *

The central issue in the struggle for peace remains disarmament. The monopolists obviously will not accept disarmament voluntarily. The strug-

gle for disarmament is, however, an integral part of the struggle to end the cold war, for peaceful coexistence. The cold war is not an alternative to war. It is accompanied by increased armaments of the most destructive character and the struggle to end it is unthinkable without the struggle for disarmament. The dogmatists who say that disarmament is impossible are actually repeating what the most die-hard imperialists say. If this were true, then ultimately a third world war could not be avoided. But it is also clear that only the people will impose disarmament on the imperialists. Any step they will be compelled to take will be as "voluntary" as their granting of freedom to the colonies.

This is why we must undertake a long-range, systematic and persistent campaign on all levels and through every medium possible to fight for disarmament. Here many agitational and educational tasks have to be undertaken to deal with such misconceptions as these:

That the cold war is an alternative to war;

That cold war and coexistence are not contradictory;

That the U.S. needs more arms before we can negotiate;

That controls must come before disarmament;

That armaments mean jobs and disarmament means unemployment;

That armament is a deterrent to war.

That coexistence is only a tactic, hence we can't disarm;

That if we disarm, the whole world will become Communist.

We have on the other hand to show the immediate benefits from every measure of arms limitation, both as regards easing tensions and lessening the danger of war, and as regards conversion of the benefits into increased economic welfare, aid to underdeveloped countries. And we have to show that lessening of tensions can help to promote world trade, easing unemployment, and to strengthen the struggle for civil rights and civil liberties.

Special attention has to be given to banning nuclear weapons, agreements against their use, destruction of means of delivery of nuclear weapons and the liquidation of all foreign bases. In this respect the establishment of nuclear free zones as proposed by Poland for Central Europe, by Rumania for the Balkans, by China for the Pacific and by Nkrumah for Africa, can be the basis not only for agitation but for movements and actions in selected areas and certain groups. In this connection the scheduled new tests by the French Government in the Sahara should be protested most vigorously and immediately.

But the permanent banning of the bomb tests and the defeat of threats to renew underground tests remain the most important concrete immediate issues around which big movements already exist and actions on an even wider scale can be set in motion. Great pressures to resume the

tests are being exerted by the Pentagon and others in and out of the Administration. World public opinion would be shocked if this happened. Negotiations are now proceeding in Geneva and every possible pressure should be exerted in favor of an agreement to ban the tests permanently. Resumption of tests, aside from the hazards involved, would give great encouragement to the cold war forces and set back the struggle for disarmament. An agreement for a permanent ban would greatly strengthen and encourage the peace forces and advance the struggle for disarmament, for peaceful coexistence and for ending the cold war. Immediate steps are necessary to bring about such a victory.

Meetings, demonstrations, petitions, resolutions in the trade unions and all peoples' organizations should call upon the President to work for an agreement and to declare that our country will not take the initiative in resuming any test on the ground, in the air or underground.

* * *

The struggle to end colonialism everywhere has been raised to an immediate realizable issue by the world upsurge of the colonial and semi-colonial people everywhere, dramatized by the heroic struggle of the people of Cuba, the Congo, Algeria, South Africa and elsewhere. It is necessary for our Party to conduct an ideological campaign to clarify the entire membership on the full meaning of this and to bring this

realization to as many Americans as we can reach. It is necessary to mobilize support for these struggles among the masses and especially to assume greater responsibility in connection with the struggles of the Cuban people and the people of Puerto Rico. *Permanent committees have to be established to deal with Latin America and Africa both within the Party itself as well as of a united front character.* At times a struggle (as for example Cuba or the Congo) demands the full attention of the entire Party and calls for support from all. At other times, certain sections of the country or certain groups of our population may be the special concentration objectives on a given issue.

In connection with China for example, it is necessary to develop broad agitation and movement for recognition of the People's Republic and its admission to the UN. Committees for the promotion of trade with People's China in such areas as the Pacific Coast can be of immense help in furthering the general campaign.

The danger of arming West Germany with nuclear weapons is arousing many people the world over including those in our country. It is worthy of note that in their speeches to the UN Assembly, Novotny and Gomulka devoted considerable attention to this question. It is, of course, a general question for all Americans. But among the Jewish masses, and among Polish- and Czech-Americans especially, it should be possible to

develop very broad united fronts.

Finally, in connection with the fight for peace, most thinking people understand that our people and the people of the Soviet Union must live in peace and friendship if world peace is to be preserved. Normal trade and cultural relations have to be established and expanded. Much progress has been achieved in the cultural exchange involving the arts, the sciences, the professions and lately some trade union delegations, consisting of both rank and file and some leaders, among them Joseph Curran. Hardly a day passes but that some outstanding figure is astounded by the great achievements of the Soviet people. The National Council for Soviet-American Friendship which is reaching many Americans and promoting knowledge about the Soviet Union, and which is working for exchange and promotion of friendship, should receive the support of all who wish this work to continue and expand.

* * *

We in the United States have the task of letting the people of the world know that the shameful, provocative acts of a handful of fascist and pro-fascist emigres do not reflect the masses of peace-loving people of our country. But unfortunately we cannot deny that these elements, organized and financed by the reactionary monopolists and the intelligence agencies, have been inspired and encouraged by officials of our government including the very highest. Un-

fortunately, too, those decent honest Americans desiring peace, and even ashamed of what transpired, have remained silent. Nor can it be denied that many have been confused, influenced or at least intimidated by the official Administration policy.

But it *is* significant that reaction did not succeed in whipping up the kind of hysteria they wanted, and did not succeed in involving any significant group of Americans. Also to be noted is that whatever efforts were undertaken by the Left progressive forces to express support for the UN, for peaceful coexistence and for an end to the cold war met with a good response. And there are signs that many Americans are coming to realize that the treatment of leading statesmen who came here to the United Nations, which is their right under agreements signed when we succeeded in convincing the world organization to establish its headquarters here, has been shameful. They are ashamed of it and are aware of the effect of this the world over. If the UN is to remain in our country, there has to be a repudiation of what has gone on and mass demands upon the Administration to see that the pledge given as regards the UN is honored. From all over the country there should now be expressions for *disarmament, for an end to the tests, for support to the legal government of Lumumba, for hands off Cuba, for seating China in the UN, and against nuclear arms to West Germany.*

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

DISARMAMENT AND PEACE

As the question, peace or war, will be with us so long as there *is* a question, so the related questions of disarmament and which nations want it and which do not, of how to achieve it, and whether or not disarmament would serve the cause of peace or rather lead to enhanced international tensions, persist as matters of heated debate and deep concern.

We posed and tried to answer the question, who wants disarmament, in the August issue of this magazine. We would be so bold as to quote a summarizing paragraph from that effort:

The history of the struggle for disarmament since the end of World War II makes clear, as this article 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 backbreaking armaments race that has plagued the world in the present epoch and which threatens momentarily the destruction of most of mankind.

In addition to the evidence mustered in that essay to support this conclusion, we would like to bring forward other testimony briefly and then move on to a consideration of related problems. The well-known British Labour Party analyst, Barbara Castle, discussing "The Truth About Disarmament" in *The New Statesman* (June 11, 1960), after examining the role of American, French, and British leaders in recent international conferences and the proposals advanced by them, concluded that these "show that the West is not in fact contemplating any disarmament which would cut across the existing dispositions of her forces or make any serious inroads into them."

The central myth in the gigantic effort of the American commercial press to hoodwink our people into believing the opposite of what the evidence shows, is to insist that the Soviet Union really does not want disarmament, for all its grandiose pronouncements, because she consistently rejects any system of control, while the United States demonstrates its real desire for disarmament in that it brings forward realistic proposals

towards that end and accompanies these with necessary control measures. The evidence demonstrating who does and who does not want disarmament is the basic answer to this camouflage system; but even directly on the matter of controls, the testimony is overwhelming—from thoroughly respectable and non-Communist sources—demonstrating that the United States in its proposals is advocating a controlled armaments race, while the Soviet Union's plans—and they are quite specific and full—seek to control a process of actual disarmament.*

Evidence on this crucial point also was advanced in the August issue of this magazine. Again, additional material may be helpful. Thus, Hugh Thomas wrote from the Geneva disarmament conferences in the *New Statesman* (May 7, 1960):

The position of the U.S. has been made perfectly clear: control must be proved 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." (Italics in original.—H.A.)

Mr. Thomas adds that anyone examining the official studies being printed by various U.S. Congressional committees would have to conclude that the most influential people in the United States "have a profound distrust for a disarmed world" and that the "military chiefs" of the United States believe that so long as the Soviet Union exists "it would be mad to make disarmament effective."

Mr. Thomas has in mind especially nearly a score of research reports made for and published by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate during the past two years. These have been the work of such bodies as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Center for International Studies at M.I.T., the Center of Foreign Policy Research at Johns Hopkins, the Stanford Research Institute, the Corporation for Economic and Industrial Research, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, etc. The Foreign Policy Association, through its Headline Series, has just made available a condensation of the findings in all these reports—*U.S. Foreign Policy Goals: What Experts Propose* (N. Y., 35c). From this we quote the germane conclusions:

The consensus seems to be that disarmament or arms control is not

* The details of the Soviet control proposals were summarized briefly in the August issue of this magazine. More elaborate data, particularly valuable since they are of a comparative character, will be found in the table taking up four pages of the October issue of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, distributed by the University of Chicago Press.

a rational objective in itself, since it would not assure political stability, and could, in fact, create greater instability than we now enjoy. The studies also emphasize that arms control is not an alternative to military security, but should rather be viewed as part of a reasonable over-all strategy.

Therefore:

An adequate U.S. defense strategy is viewed by all studies dealing with the subject as a necessary precondition to success in any other area of foreign policy. Without an effective deterrent to war, and, in a showdown, without both the willingness to wage and the capacity to survive war, all other foreign-policy objectives are ephemeral.

This is as blunt a reaffirmation of the commitment to war as an instrument of national policy as it is possible to find in the literature of imperialism; of course it is a policy which must approach real disarmament with keen suspicion and intense hostility.

As a companion publication to this Headline Series pamphlet may be taken a new Doubleday Anchor book, *American Strategy for the Nuclear Age*, edited by Colonel Walter F. Hahn and John O. Neff (N. Y., \$1.45). This book is the outgrowth of a National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers, held at the National War College, Washington, in July, 1959. Over two hundred "carefully selected students" attended, including two Governors and three Congressmen. Since July, 1959, similar seminars—involving "military and business leaders"—have been held in New York, Chicago, New Orleans, in Delaware, California, Massachusetts and Texas. The Washington Seminar was convened under the authority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the active cooperation, we are told, of the FBI, and with much of the money to cover expenses coming from the Richardson Foundation and Frank R. Barnett—the same man who successfully proposed the appropriation by the Congress of \$100,000,000 for the creation of military units made up of "freedom fighters" who have fled the Socialist countries—units now in existence.

This volume contains essays by such individuals as Robert Strausz-Hupé, formerly a Vienna banker and now director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania; John F. Loosbrock, a lecturer at the Air University and Editor of the *Air Force Magazine*; and Herman Kahn, a physicist, consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission and for eleven years with the RAND Corporation, an unofficial intelligence arm of the military services.

This book, resulting from a conference held under the auspices I have indicated and being part of a national program of indoctrination and

propaganda having the official support of the highest governmental bodies, is one of the most open calls for thermonuclear war upon the Soviet Union that has appeared in print since the infamous issue of *Collier's* magazine back in October, 1951. It insists upon the "feasibility" of such war; that it would not—"for at least the next decade or so"—result in the *total annihilation* of all life in our country, but perhaps a mere 20 or 30 or 50 millions dead. It demands that this country make clear "that we would go to war at an appropriate level if we were provoked again." It develops the theme that peaceful coexistence is a snare and a delusion; that the Soviet proposals for disarmament "is the most dramatic concomitant" of his awful trap. It, too, speaks, as does Mr. Herter, of the need for "positive control of weapons of war," but the same individual who writes these words—the editor of the *Air Force Magazine*—makes clear that he has in mind a controlled race for, after detailing his program, including "arms control," he writes: "It becomes obvious that we cannot do all that is to be done in the forthcoming decade (!) within the economic restrictions currently imposed on military budgets" (!!).

With this as a background one sees more clearly, perhaps, that the insistence by both Senator Kennedy and Vice-President Nixon upon the "need" for greatly increased expenditures upon armaments reflected as it intensified the commitment by dominant elements in the U.S. ruling class to a policy of re-freezing the Cold War and, in the first place, sabotaging efforts at disarmament and the elimination of atomic and nuclear weapons.

On Resuming Nuclear-Weapons Testing

Highly instructive as to which Great Power really wants disarmament is the recent history of the events surrounding the banning of nuclear-weapons testing. The initiative for this has come—as is universally admitted—from the USSR. Back in 1956, after the breakthrough in thermonuclear weapons had been achieved by both sides, but when U.S. experimentation was clearly ahead of that of the Soviet Union, the latter Power proposed that all testing cease. Though under the circumstances this would have meant the freezing of technique at a point favorable to the United States, the latter rejected the proposal. Testing intensified; finally in 1958 the USSR unilaterally announced its cessation for one year and stated that it would not resume testing, after that period, if the United States refrained from testing. This action, and the resultant world-wide demand, led the United States belatedly and grudgingly to accept what it called a moratorium on nuclear-weapons testing. Stimulated by this, serious negotiations involving diplomats and scientists from the United

States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union began in Geneva and made notable progress, especially in technical areas, towards agreement on permanent cessation of testing.

The "moratorium" on testing was due to expire on December 31, 1959. Two days prior to that date, the United States Government announced that it would not renew its commitment. On the contrary, it stated that it felt itself free to resume tests after that date, whenever it wished, although it did affirm that it would announce any such tests in advance. After smashing the Summit Conference in Paris early in May, 1960, President Eisenhower stated, on May 7, that the U.S. research program on test evasion and detection—so-called project VELA—would include, "where necessary," nuclear explosions. The United States invited the USSR to examine the devices it would use in this testing—on a reciprocal basis; the Soviet Union replied that it planned no such tests and that, therefore, any notion of reciprocity was erroneous, and that it would not seem to justify the American government's experimentations by participating in any phase of them.

In spite of this, however, the USSR again, in May, 1960, renewed its own commitment not to resume nuclear-weapons testing, conditional only upon abstention by the West; Great Britain also promised not to resume testing, but conditioned this upon what it called "progress" in the Geneva negotiations. Thereafter, in the U.S. press there developed—and still continues—a major campaign to win over public opinion here to the unilateral resumption of nuclear-weapons testing. Vice-President Nixon, in the course of the 1960 campaign, stated that the Geneva negotiations on ending such testing had been "frozen" by the intransigence of the USSR and that the United States could no longer brook delay. By now, all informed people must know that when Mr. Nixon says one thing, the other is true; exactly this was the case in the particular matter at hand.

Indeed, the Geneva correspondent of the *New York Times* itself, A. M. Rosenthal, began a dispatch to that paper (August 12, 1960), with these sentences: "Western nuclear diplomacy is frozen in Geneva. It will remain so until a struggle is resolved in Washington." And Mr. Rosenthal made it clear that the struggle was between people—in the State Department—who would yield to halting tests if iron-clad controls were gained, and people, "strongest in the Atomic Energy Commission," who would not agree to any cessation of testing no matter what the circumstances.

Meanwhile, the propaganda had begun. Thus, on July 25, John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, "called for resumption of underground nuclear testing if Russians continue to stall on

plans for conducting experiments jointly," to quote Marguerite Higgins in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*. The Republican Party platform called for such resumption, and word went out, again quoting Miss Higgins, "that President Eisenhower will order the experiments to begin before fall—with or without Russian agreement."

On August 8, in Washington, was held the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army; its theme was "Weapons Modernization." Secretary of the Army Brucker used the occasion to warn the Soviet Union that the United States would not refrain from war if sufficiently provoked. At the same meeting the new tactical and operational commander of the U.S. Seventh Army—which did fairly well fighting the Nazis in the Ruhr a million years ago—also warned the Soviet Union, and begged for better and more modern weapons as he feared his NATO command was weaker than the Soviet army. This new commander of the U.S. Seventh Army is General Hans Speidel, Hitler's Commandant of occupied Paris; it's possible some of the veterans of the Seventh, in the old-fashioned days when it had only American commanders, will remember Herr Speidel.

Two days later, at his August 10th news conference, President Eisenhower again stated that his patience was wearing thin and that it might soon be necessary for "the United States to resume underground tests of nuclear weapons." On August 13, Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D., Conn.) demanded resumption of testing; on August 14, several newspapers throughout the country began publishing a series of six articles by the fanatical Dr. Edward Teller scientifically explaining why it was "necessary" for the United States to resume weapons testing; on August 15, Chairman McCone of the AEC and Under-Secretary of State Livingston T. Merchant flew to London in order to bring pressure to bear upon the British Government to join the United States in resuming testing. Said the *Herald Tribune* (August 16):

Their trip was ordered, it was learned, after the National Security Council held a full-dress debate last week on the entire test question and decided that the time had come when the Russians must be forced to fish or cut bait.

Simultaneously "hints" began to appear in the press that "maybe" the Russians were already testing on their own—of course, there was no evidence, but it was held that the very absence of evidence made the reality of the secret testing all the more likely! Senator Henry M. Jackson (D., Wash.), for instance, made these points during a nationwide television appearance on August 14.

In October the propaganda campaign was stepped up. On October 4, Chairman McCone said he would "surmise" the Russians were testing "in the absence of any proof that they are not"! He went on to say that U.S. testing would begin "in a matter of weeks, or at the most a few months" and that one of the stations to be used for project VELA was "about finished." Dr. Robert E. Wilson, a member of the AEC, addressed a National Youth Conference on the Atom, in Chicago; he told the young people in attendance that "maybe" the Russians were testing and that in any case, without a fool-proof control system, the United States "should resume underground testing soon to perfect nuclear war-heads" (*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 21). The latest release, coming as these words are written, emanates from the indefatigable Mr. McCone; speaking at a closed meeting of the President's Business Advisory Council—made up of one hundred corporation presidents—he said the United States "might decide within 'the next several weeks' whether to resume underground testing." (*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 23). The language here is conditional—appropriate when a servant addresses his masters—but the intent is plain.

Dr. Hans A. Bethe, of the Cornell Laboratory of Nuclear Studies, and a member of the scientists negotiating—quite fruitfully—in Geneva, has published a very important and persuasive paper, "The Case for Ending Nuclear Tests" in *The Atlantic* (August). He writes: "Having participated in the negotiations with the Russian scientists at Geneva on three occasions, I believe that they are sincere in wanting the test cessation agreement and do not intend to cheat on it." He adds that proposals put forward by the U.S. delegation at times embarrassed him and that the U.S. press grossly distorted some of his own opinions and testimony before official committees into arguments against test cessation, when in fact he believes such cessation is necessary and entirely practical. He warns that an absence of agreement will lead to the expansion of the number of Powers possessing such weapons; he thinks that, in any case, "public opinion in the world will force us to stop nuclear testing," and that if the U.S. puts itself in the position of being forced to do what the world's population demands, it will lose still further what prestige it may have.

A very sharp condemnation of the course of the U.S. Government in this matter has come also from Dr. William Davidon, of the Argonne National Laboratory. In the October number of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (p. 335), Dr. Davidon writes:

. . . the unilateral resumption of tests by the United States is likely to initiate the testing, by several other countries, of large and small

weapons. It will probably delay (perhaps until it is too late) the establishment of the world-wide, international control system which the U.S., the U.K. and the USSR have already largely agreed upon. It will therefore be an overt act contrary to the hopes of most people, and their governments, throughout the world.

These are the facts in one specific area of the decisive problem of effective disarmament. Knowing these facts, can we not take them to the people—as many as we can reach, in time—and thus make Chairman McCone's conditional language, that he chose when speaking to the multimillionaires, more than conditional? With enough popular awareness of the truth about nuclear-weapons testing, Mr. McCone could be made not only to use conditional words, but to eat his words; in fact, he might even find himself in need of different employment.

The Pro-Armaments Ideology

The dominant official rationalization for opposing disarmament—and it is only on the level of the propaganda aimed at confusing the masses (for whom the elite have an ineradicable contempt) that the fiction is maintained that the U.S. Government really wants and is actively seeking disarmament—is fundamentally what Albert Wohlstetter, of RAND, called "The Delicate Balance of Terror."* That is to say, it is held that the massive and awful armaments mutually held by the Great Powers are the guarantee of peace. This is related to, but far from identical with, the widespread idea that since the employment of thermonuclear weapons is "unthinkable," therefore they will not be used. The essayist, E. B. White, for example, in *The New Yorker* magazine (June 17, 1960) wrote: "Today's weapons are too destructive to use, so they stand poised and quiet; this is our strange climate, when arms are safer than no arms." Mr. White draws a logical conclusion: "If modern arms make war unlikely, had we better not keep them until we have found the political means of making war unnecessary?"

War is "unlikely," but under present political conditions, remains "necessary"; hence while war at a particular moment is not likely, its outbreak is certain if it is "necessary." And how shall the political changes that would make war unnecessary be brought about; moreover, how are their progress to manifest themselves if the retention of the present annihilating monstrosities is the guarantee of peace? And what political changes? Is there not implicit in this line, the line of Dulles; that is, does

* The title of his important article in *Foreign Affairs*, January, 1959.

this not posit "liberation" with its corollary of massive retaliation and brinkmanship and is it not clear that this guarantees war and not peace?

Furthermore, the Dulles line, and the official line today, holds to retaliation and deterrence (with growing inclination towards preventive and "pre-emptive" war) and these most certainly do entail the idea of the use of all weapons; indeed, the line has no meaning whatsoever without this commitment at its heart.

In this connection it is at least sobering to recall that major wars in the past have occurred soon after all and sundry were assured that the progress in weaponry had made "unthinkable" their employment. If one wishes a particular example—and there are hundreds—on July 28, 1914, the *New York Times*, surveying the tenseness that pervaded Europe, noted the prospect of war, but, having in mind the fearful "modern" weapons, added: "That [war] is too dreadful for imagining, and because it is too dreadful it cannot happen." On July 29, Austria declared war upon Serbia; on the very day that Germany declared war upon Russia in 1914, the editorial in the *New York Times* said: "War provokes savagery, but a war involving the great powers would be fought with due restraint." Of course, these editorials did not serve to enlighten the *Times'* readers as to why war came; they served at the time not only to obscure this central question but also to dull any resistance to the butchery as it began. And surely this motivated the editorials' content.

Certainly the analogy here is not perfect; of course, the weapons of World War I—or of World War II—are not comparable to those now in existence. Still, in the past, highly significant qualitative leaps in weaponry did not lead to peace, but to war. Furthermore, today, American experts are busy insisting that atomic war and that thermonuclear war can be fought; that "we" could win; and that some kind of viable society would survive here. This was one of the themes of Henry Kissinger's very influential *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* (1957) and his idea of "limited warfare"; it is the thesis of the very recent *Thermonuclear War*, by Herman Kahn (Princeton University Press, 1960); and it is this same Dr. Kahn who stated in the book *American Strategy for the Nuclear Age*, already cited, and published this October, that if the U.S. uses all its capabilities, it can really "deter" the Russians, especially if it makes perfectly clear "that we would go to war at an appropriate level if we were provoked again."

But the main emphasis of the argumentation—for obvious reasons—is to insist that armaments will mean peace; especially if the armaments are awful and plentiful. Indeed, what is required is invulnerability. Everything in the ideological armory of the Cold Warriors requires per-

fection—they insist on absolutely fool-proof detection systems before any kind of agreement on test-cessation or armaments reduction can be reached. They work, however, not on perfecting detection, but “improving” weapons and spinning theories as to how detection could be avoided; meanwhile their theory of a delicate balance of terror requires incessant labors devoted to developing more and more terrible instruments of terror: now “scientists” in this country are working on such problems as bringing the ocean to a boil; changing the climate of the Soviet Union; stopping the earth’s rotation!*

The “balance of terror” theory rationalizing a high level of thermonuclear armaments—and any newer and “more efficient” weapons that may be developed—as vital to the maintenance of peace, as, indeed, the only hope for peace in the world today, is expressed very clearly and fully by Oskar Morgenstern, Henry Kissinger and Walter Lippmann. There are no more influential thinkers in the areas of armaments and foreign policy than these three so far as the ruling class of the United States is concerned; these three are, in fact, among the more sober and more responsible of such thinkers, and not as excessive or fierce as for instance Strausz-Hupé, Herman Kahn, or Edward Teller, not to mention a Henry Luce or a General David Sarnoff.

Morgenstern, a professor at Princeton, consultant to the AEC, to the Congressional subcommittee on atomic energy, and to the Convair Corporation, develops his thesis most fully in his book, *The Question of National Defense* (Random House, N. Y., 1959). A later and more condensed version of his views were published as an article in *Fortune Magazine* (July, 1960), under the title “Goal: An Armed, Inspected, Open World.” Professor Morgenstern believes, as he states in the aforementioned book, that “the probability of a large thermonuclear war occurring appears to be significantly larger than the probability of its not occurring.” He sets himself the worthy task of answering how can “these probabilities be reversed?” The nature of his answer is in this key paragraph (p. 296):

The impossibility of war has to be of a technological character. Moral and religious considerations have failed to stop wars. Indeed, the greatest cruelties have been committed in the name of lofty moral or religious ideas. It will take too long for fresh moral values to develop which would make war impossible. It would take even more time for them to become effective enough to check the new destructive powers.

* Harrison Brown and James Real, *Community of Fear* (Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Cal., 1960), p. 32.

Hence, Morgenstern's conclusion is that the way to peace is to develop mutually invulnerable forces and to make sure that each side knows that the other is invulnerable.

Walter Lippmann, in a very significant column called, "Disarmament Reappraised" (June 30, 1960) adopted the Morgenstern position. He finds that in the missile age any kind of inspection system is absurd because the important weapons, from their nature, are not inspectable. He asks, therefore:

What, then, are we to rely upon. We have to rely upon *what has now become the accepted doctrine of the Pentagon*—that is to say, on developing a deterrent power that cannot be knocked out by a surprise attack. This, and not inspection, is the way to reduce the tensions which are caused by the race in nuclear armaments. (Italics added. —H.A.)

Lippmann then draws the logical diplomatic and negotiating conclusion:

This will lead us to a position where we say to the Russians: "On the critical issue of the big lethal weapons, let us both base our security on developing invulnerable deterrents. Let this understanding that we will do this be our agreement. Then let us negotiate about saving money by reducing other components of military power."

This has been the essential position of the United States—not only the Pentagon, as Lippmann states, but also the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Security Council and, with some vacillation, the State Department. The colossal demagoguery of the Government and its habitual lying in the arena of international confrontation arise out of the knowledge that the American people do not really know that this is the position, would not agree to it if they did, and that the United States, officially—as a member of the U.N.—is supposed to be committed to a policy seeking "general and complete" disarmament, and that it is under the mandate of the U.N. to seek *such agreement* that the various technical and diplomatic conferences on *disarmament* are held.

We offer, finally, the position of Henry A. Kissinger, perhaps the leading figure, in the ideological team developing U.S. foreign policy. In *Foreign Affairs* (July, 1960), the quarterly published by the Council on Foreign Relations—whose advisory board includes Allen W. Dulles, Alfred M. Gruenther, George F. Kennan, Philip E. Mosely, and John J. McCloy—Mr. Kissinger, after detailing certain features of the Great Power

scene that seem to him most cogent, then turns to summation: the first point he makes is: "The primary goal of any arms control scheme must be to increase stability. A precondition is that both sides should strive to develop invulnerable retaliatory forces."

He concludes his analysis by saying that this thesis—essentially, as the reader will see, the thesis of Morgenthorn—is irrefutable, so that on the basis of it, "If the Soviet Union rejects proposals which are designed to increase its security together with ours—and this is the essence of any responsible program—it will have given clear proof that there is no alternative to the arms race." That is, if the USSR—having led in demanding a policy of complete and general disarmament and having finally gotten adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the U.N. a commitment for such disarmament—does not abandon that position and accept one that seeks not disarmament, but arms control, and arms control having the objective of developing such awful weapons system in the possession of East and West that each is invulnerable—if the USSR does not do this, then it, the USSR, shows that it is not serious and shows that what it really wants is an unrestrained arms race!

After throwing down the gauntlet, as above, to the USSR, Kissinger's last words are a nobly phrased call to persevere in this line, as "perhaps our last opportunity to stabilize the arms race."

Considerations of space force us to postpone until next month a further examination of the ideology of the Cold War opponents of disarmament. But the evidence already presented justifies the conclusion, I think, that the American people have been hoodwinked into believing that their Government really desires—however bungling it may have been—disarmament and that it is the obduracy and the deviousness of the Soviet Union which, on one pretext or another, prevent this. The truth is that the United States Government—*i.e.*, the dominant component in the ruling class—has opposed disarmament and that this has been and is the decisive obstacle keeping humanity from achieving a passionately desired and urgently needed goal: a real agreement on general and complete disarmament.

Peaceful Co-Existence and Revisionism*

By A. Arzumanyan and V. Kornionov

Borba [in Yugoslavia] has published chapters from a new book by Edvard Kardelj under the pretentious title of "Socialism and War." A full translation of the book is not yet available, but acquaintance with its opening chapters shows that, far from being a study of socialism and war, it represents an apology of the stand of Yugoslav revisionism on these questions.

This time Kardelj has chosen to expound his revisionist ideas on grounds of controversy with the Chinese Communists. By resorting to excessive quotations from Marxist-Leninist sources, the author seeks to don the cloak of a "defender" of Marxism-Leninism and pose as a guardian of the purity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. But the opening chapters of the book leave no doubt as to the fact that actually the Yugoslav theoretician pursues a diametrically opposed aim. His main purpose is to whitewash the aggressive course of American imperialism and conceal the real source from which war threatens the peoples, and at the same time to cast aspersions on the policy of the socialist countries and the Commu-

nist Parties which play a decisive role in the preservation of peace. It is this that compels us to discuss the book without awaiting the full translation.

The Communist and Workers' Parties are in the van of the mighty popular movement in defense of peace. They consistently unmask the sophisms to which the enemies of peace resort to justify their criminal activities. It is not surprising that the propaganda guns of the proponents of a new war are levelled precisely against Communists. The imperialist aggressors and their newspaper lackeys would like nothing more than to slander the socialist camp, distort its policy, present it as an "aggressor" and undermine the great respect and trust which the broad popular masses of all countries display towards the countries of socialism and Communist Parties.

In his new book Kardelj comes to the aid of the inspirers of the anti-Communist campaign. The book represents a revisionist's attempt to drag into the labor movement, under the guise of combatting "Leftist tendencies," ideas which only the enemies of communism would applaud.

Why has Edvard Kardelj's work

* Translated from *Pravda* (Moscow), September 1, 1960.

appeared precisely at this moment?

The struggle that the socialist countries, the working class and the toiling masses of capitalist countries are waging for peace is now at a very important juncture. The aggressive forces of imperialism are doing everything to throw mankind back to the worst times of the cold war. The breakdown of the Paris conference by the Government of the United States; attempts to cause serious international conflicts with the help of provocations; the sabotaging of disarmament; the acceleration of the regeneration of the West German Bundeswehr and its arming with weapons of mass annihilation; the forcing of a military treaty with the U.S.A. on Japan contrary to the will of her people; the plans of the American military to renew nuclear weapon tests—all this shows that the imperialists have not given up their evil plans.

But barring the road to these man-hating designs are the mighty world socialist system, the young nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the number of which is multiplying daily, the international working class and broad popular masses of capitalist countries with their communist vanguard. To the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp, which are pursuing an active peaceful foreign policy, and to the Communist Parties of the world belongs the main role in the noble struggle for the preservation of the

peace and security of the peoples. As the Bucharest meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out, this struggle for peace remains the primary task of all Communists. Marxist-Leninist theses on questions of war and peace, the new theoretical and political conclusions drawn by the 20th and 21st Congresses of the C.P.S.U. and the Declaration and Peace Manifesto concerning the possibility of preventing war in our time are the mighty ideological weapon in the hands of the working class and all champions of peace. To dull this mighty weapon and to sow doubt among the peoples with regard to the correctness of the policy of socialist countries is what the imperialists would like most of all. And it is to this end that Kardelj, too, directs his efforts.

* * *

In analyzing the problem of war, Kardelj accepts the thesis concerning the possibility of preventing war in our time. But in passing he performs a theoretical somersault which strips the question entirely of its Marxist-Leninist basis.

Kardelj's main theoretical sin is that in analyzing the problems of war he does not establish the connection between wars and class struggle and does not regard war as a continuation of policy by means of force. Was War historically inevitable? "Abstractly speaking," Kardelj replies, "war was never absolutely or fatally inevitable. It has always de-

pended on the balance of forces." This reply already reveals Kardelj's digression from Marxist-Leninist theory in the question of war.

Marxist-Leninists proceed from the consideration that war is a continuation of policy by other methods, namely by force. War is a historical category. It is connected with the antagonistic differences between classes and states. Therefore wars inevitably accompany all social systems based on exploitation.

Lenin stressed that the attitude of Communists towards war differs in principle from the attitude of bourgeois pacifists and anarchists. We Communists, Lenin pointed out, differ from them in that "we realize the inevitable connection between wars and class struggle inside a country, we realize the impossibility of eliminating wars without eliminating classes and creating socialism, and also in that we fully recognize the legitimacy, progressiveness and necessity of civil war, *i.e.*, war of the oppressed class against the oppressor. . . ." (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. 21, p. 271.)

Kardelj views this problem differently. Seeing no inevitable connection between wars and classes and class struggle, Kardelj alleges that the issue of war and peace has always depended on the balance of forces. "War is inevitable," he writes, "if the forces of peace are too weak to prevent it. War can

be excluded if the forces of peace are more powerful than the forces of war."

Kardelj even alleges that Marx and Engels did not link the possibility of preventing war with transition to socialism. He claims that the founders of scientific communism, who foresaw the eventuality and possibility of war ceasing to be inevitable, "did not associate them with any concrete dates of history but only with the maturing of a number of factors of social development, both material and ideological and political, which would condition people's actions."

But Marx, Engels and Lenin have always proceeded from the premise that war was inevitable under the domination of capitalism and previous exploiting formations. In conditions of the domination of capitalism all over the world no changes in the correlation of forces of war and peace can eliminate war. The founders of Marxism-Leninism connected the elimination of war with the abolition of antagonistic classes and the establishment of socialism.

E. Kardelj draws the conclusion of the inevitability of war on the basis of the correlation of forces and carefully conceals what correlation of forces and what epoch are at issue. The correlation of forces in the epoch when capitalism was the only world system is one thing. But the correlation of forces in the epoch when the

world has been divided into two systems, and side by side with the moribund system of imperialism there has appeared a new world system of socialism that is full of strength and is confidently going uphill, is quite another thing.

In conditions of antagonistic formations, the more so in conditions of imperialism, wars broke out not as a result of the subjective desires of individuals but were a continuation of the policy of classes. Changes in the correlation of forces in such an epoch were changes that took place on the basis of capitalism, within the framework of capitalism. These were changes in the correlation of forces between the imperialist powers.

And they only led to one result, the division of the capitalist world into two alignments of imperialist powers. There was only one end: the outbreak of wars between these alignments, which engulfed the whole world.

There were, of course, forces even at that time that fought against wars. Struggle for peace has always been the glorious tradition of the international working class. But these forces were weak at that time. In conditions when imperialism constituted the only world system the working class and the other anti-imperialist forces were unable to eliminate predatory wars. That is why in those conditions Lenin said that an imperialist war could not be ended by sticking the bayonet into the earth.

He taught us that imperialist wars could not be averted by pacifist chatter. Lenin pointed out that an imperialist war could be done away with only by civil war, by revolutionary withdrawal from the war.

The Marxists and Leninists have consequently always connected the possibility of averting war with a definite "date in history," with abolishing the exploiting classes and establishing and developing socialism. The magnificence of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. lies in the fact that, guided by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and having creatively assessed the new correlation of forces in the world characterized by the transformation of socialism into a world system, it drew the bold conclusion of the possibility of averting war in the present epoch. It has become possible to avert war not simply because the correlation of forces have changed, but because a new world social system has been established, the socialist system, to whose nature aggressive policy and predatory wars are alien. The mighty socialist camp possesses ever growing opportunities for curbing the imperialists. In speaking about the changes in the correlation of forces one must not emasculate the class essence of this historic process. But the author of the book "Socialism and War" is doing this very thing.

* * *

Why is Kardelj stubbornly avoiding the question that a real possi-

bility for averting war has only appeared with the emergence and consolidation of the world system of socialism? This is done not without reason. The fact is that according to Kardelj, war is inherent not only in the nature of imperialism but also in the nature of the socialist countries.

Kardelj's break with Marxism-Leninism on this question is becoming particularly clear. Here the mask drops off the revisionist completely and he appears in his true light.

The facts of life are decidedly against Kardelj. That is why he has to mention that "socialism (since the point at issue are genuine socialist social relations and not elements of the old in the new) not only cannot be a source of war but its consolidation in the world must become a factor for lessening the danger of war and for eliminating the inevitability of war." But Kardelj accompanies even this forced admission by all kinds of reservations, big and small; he is trying hard to sow doubts in the "genuineness of the socialist social relations," and speaks vaguely about elements of the old in the new. Kardelj needs these reservations in order to undermine the confidence of the peoples in socialism in which they see a powerful source of peace.

The apostle of Yugoslav revisionism declares unceremoniously that the founders of Marxism did not regard the victory of socialism in any

country as an absolute obstacle to war.

This is monstrous, but it is a fact: Kardelj assumes that a socialist state may be the vehicle of a predatory war! And so the Yugoslav revisionists who have begun with inventions about "socialist hegemonism," with allegations that the striving for supremacy over other countries is inherent in the "socialist bloc" just as it is in the imperialist, have now arrived to the logical end: they put in advance responsibility for the possible unleashing of war upon the socialist states.

The Pentagon and NATO militarists are frantically seeking any confirmation of the fabrications circulated by them that their criminal intrigues allegedly bear a "defensive" nature and are caused by the fact that the socialist countries threaten the security of the "free world." Whether Kardelj wishes it or not, his "conceptions" serve the forces of imperialism.

He makes the preservation of peace dependent upon all kinds of "ifs" characteristic of revisionists. He proclaims that "not a single socialist state automatically becomes immune to egoistical tendencies and actions just because it is socialist." Kardelj alleges that the "classics of Marxism did not preclude the possibility of such a phenomenon when a socialist country also waged an *unjust* war."

Of course, Kardelj does not adduce a single fact in support of his in-

ventions, for the simple reason that no such facts exist. But the revisionist has done his job: he has supplied the reactionary bourgeois propaganda with another "argument" in its anti-Communist slander.

It should be noted that Kardelj has more than a strange attitude to socialism and to the socialist gains the peoples have achieved at the price of great sacrifice and suffering. Running through his writings is the idea that socialism has also its negative features such as hegemonism, a tendency for reactionary wars, etc. This is evidenced by his dilations that the fact of a socialist country waging a certain war is not the sole criterion of the "justice" of such a war. Indeed, even the word "justice" he takes in quotes. And what is more, he says that "such a war can impose backward political forms of socialism on much more developed socio-economic conditions and, thus, objectively play a reactionary role. It is likewise possible that neo-socialistic tendencies may appear in such a war, alongside of hegemonism and other like phenomena."

Why does Kardelj need these arguments? He knows perfectly well that Marxism-Leninism has always most vigorously denied and denies that revolution can be "exported." Is it not in support of the imperialist thesis on exporting revolutions that Kardelj disseminates his "viewpoint"? He is even trying to charge the socialist countries with yet an-

other accusation: the possibility of one socialist country imposing its forms of development by force upon another socialist country. It is not by accident that he speaks of the possibility of "even antagonistic contradictions" between socialist countries.

In his book Kardelj, to all intents and purposes, repeats the slander about People's China and its "aggressiveness," spread by American imperialism. It will be recalled that the American imperialists, with the aid of their voting machine, have pushed through the United Nations a "resolution," declaring China an "aggressor." This, however, has not yielded the U.S. ruling circles any big political dividends, has not helped them to ward off the just wrath of the peoples. Now Kardelj hastens to the aid of these gentry.

An inalienable part of Chinese territory, Taiwan and some other coastal islands, have been seized by the United States. The American military are insolently threatening the security of China, now and again intruding by their planes and ships into the peaceful sky and territorial waters of China. American military bases in the Pacific threaten China and the other socialist countries of the East. But Kardelj makes believe that he does not see all this. He cannot find a single word to condemn the American imperialist provocators, which means that he acts as an advocate of American imperialism.

It is the prime duty of everyone who considers himself to be against war and for peaceful coexistence, to expose the real warmongers, to tear off their masks of peacemakers, and arouse against them the sacred wrath of the peoples. The Communists are tirelessly urging the peoples to be extremely vigilant with regard to the war danger created by imperialism, and American imperialism first and foremost. "So long as capitalism remains in the world," the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. pointed out, "the reactionary forces which represent the interests of the capitalist monopolies will continue to strive for military gambles and aggression, will try to unleash a war." And the Communist and Workers' Parties in their Declaration adopted at the Moscow Conference of 1957, stated: "So long as imperialism exists there will always be soil for aggressive wars."

Kardelj in his book is doing his utmost to distract the attention of the masses from the sources of the war danger and camouflages the aggressive essence of imperialism's policy. He cannot find any words to criticize the aggressive policy of American imperialism and its partners. As any reformist he paints a picture of the utmost blunting of all the contradictions of imperialism. He even tries to prove that the threat to peace on the part of imperialism is lessening. "The entire imperialist system is, as a system,

in a state of decay," Kardelj declares. "By this I do not wish to say that imperialism is no longer a mighty factor or that it no longer represents any danger as an initiator of a new world war. But it is absolutely clear that these possibilities will grow slimmer and slimmer and after a certain period of time may be reduced to a minimum, given an appropriate policy of the socialist forces." And this is written at a time when the internal contradictions of imperialism have become particularly sharp and the most adventurist circles are trying to dominate the foreign policy of the imperialist states!

An author who claims to analyze the problems of socialism and war should have shown from the beginning that imperialism, American imperialism above all, is the only carrier of the war danger, and is alone to blame for the international tension. Does not Kardelj see that the source of tension lies in imperialism's unwillingness to reconcile itself to those revolutionary changes in the world that are being effected by the peoples? Why does not Kardelj direct his ire against American imperialism? Why does he try to hold the socialist countries responsible for a possible unleashing of war?

Kardelj feigns that he is combatting dogmatism. But this will deceive no one. The fact is that Kardelj is falsifying Marxism and acts as

an apologist of imperialism. His inventions that the policy of the socialist countries may become a source of unleashing a world war are an attack upon the entire socialist world, upon the whole international communist and liberation movement. This attack will bring joy only to the enemies of peace.

This shameful role possibly satisfies Kardelj and his friends. But one may well ask: what has all this got to do with Marxism-Leninism? Is there anything in common between Edward Kardelj's efforts and the sacred cause of the Communists: defense of mankind against the lethal danger spelled by the bellicose imperialist atom-mongers?

The revisionists, and the Yugoslav revisionists first and foremost, have already long stopped analyzing from Marxist positions the fundamental differences, the deep contradiction between the world system of socialism and the world system of capitalism. Their refusal to approach fundamental questions of foreign policy from a class standpoint has resulted in that the Belgrade theoreticians are making believe that they do not notice the existence of the socialist camp, which is consistently upholding the cause of peace, freedom and progress of the peoples, and the imperialist camp which is preparing a world thermo-nuclear debacle. To the reformist there is no difference between the socialist international policy of the working class and the

anti-popular policy of the financial-industrial oligarchy.

Behavior of that kind may be considered typical of the revisionists' position. It is usual for them to straddle the fence. The facts, however, show that this notorious policy of "non-alignment" with blocs is more and more plainly assuming the character of an alignment with definite spheres of the aggressive imperialist bloc. The appearance of Kardelj's new book brings to light another highly notable aspect of this political line. Belgrade is today no longer confining itself to isolated calumnies against the socialist countries. Nowadays the Belgrade theoreticians are trying to cast doubts on the peaceful character of the foreign policy of the socialist camp. The Communists of all countries, and millions of people who are fighting selflessly for peace now know that this latest smear against socialism bears the plain trade mark of "made in Yugoslavia."

* * *

The working class and hundreds of millions of working people will always gratefully remember that it was precisely the Communists, and especially the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at its 20th and 21st congresses that placed on the agenda of the day the world historic task of preventing another war and subsequently of completely excluding world wars from the life of society. The great mobilizing and organiz-

ing role of that slogan is becoming more manifest with every passing day. The ardent call of the Communists is gripping the minds of ever wider sections of the working people; it has become a gigantic force which is changing the course of world events in favor of peace.

The stand taken by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and fraternal communist parties to the effect that wars can be prevented and excluded from the life of society in our era has nothing in common with the stand taken on that problem by the revisionists. With the victory of socialism and growth of socialism into a world system, the communists have advanced the slogan of the possibility of preventing war as something that is practically feasible already in our times. If war were intrinsic to the nature of not only imperialism but also of socialism, as Kardelj puts it, then it would truly be impossible to prevent war, inasmuch as any intrinsic feature of a social system must inevitably find expression, and nothing can stop it.

Communists have always proceeded from and still hold to the premise that wars spring from the very nature of imperialism, and that no matter what changes imperialism may undergo its nature remains aggressive. The possibility of preventing war has only arisen today thanks to the existence and consolidation of the great socialist camp, which has become the mainstay of the peoples'

struggle for peace and security. The socialist society has no antagonistic classes and therefore there are no forces in it that would be interested in provoking war. It does not need war as an instrument of its national and international policy. Exporting revolutions, especially by means of force, is contrary to the very nature of socialism. Not the atomic bomb, but the inspiration of its example and its immeasurable superiority to capitalism is the "weapon" with which socialism is winning the sympathy of the peoples.

"A world war is not needed to ensure the victory of socialist ideas on a global scale," said N. S. Khrushchev at the third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party. "These ideas will triumph in the course of peaceful competition between the socialist and capitalist countries." The socialist countries are staunchly adhering to Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems.

In this new history-making era which is highlighted by the existence of a world socialist system, wars have ceased to be inevitable. But to prevent war, the might and unity of the world socialist system must be increasingly strengthened and peace champions all over must tirelessly multiply their efforts. The success of the struggle to prevent another war and consolidate peace depends, above all, on the strength and might of the socialist camp and the mono-

lithic unity of its ranks. It also depends upon the activity of all the peoples in their fight for peace, against imperialist aggression.

Thus, the Marxist-Leninist approach of the communists to the problem of war and peace differs radically from the way either the revisionists or the dogmatists approach this problem.

The revisionists try to prove that the possibility of preventing war is not connected with the victory of socialism. Practically, they abstain from the struggle to strengthen the might and unity of the world socialist system and reject revolutionary struggle against the basic cause of war—imperialism. In the final analysis, they are aligning themselves with the imperialists.

The dogmatists, on the other hand, do not realize that the change in the correlation of forces in the world in favor of socialism is giving rise to a new situation for the solution of the problem of war and peace. They overestimate the forces of imperialism and underestimate the forces of socialism. By continuing to claim that war is still inevitable in our day, the dogmatists are encouraging inactivity among the

masses and depriving the peoples of the opportunity to employ the new conditions which have arisen in the world today to the utmost so as to prevent war.

The strength of the Marxists-Leninists lies in the fact that, guided by the victorious teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, they evaluate the historical situation correctly, are creatively applying and developing revolutionary theory, and are bringing together the working class and all the progressive and peace-loving forces in their great, selfless struggle to preserve and consolidate peace.

* * *

The latest political utterances of the Yugoslav revisionists can only disorientate the masses in their fight for peace. They amount to an attempt to sow discord in the world Communist family and so help the enemies of Communism.

But it is a futile attempt. E. Kardelj may think that his book will achieve its purpose. The world communist movement, armed with Marxism-Leninism theory will however push from its path all those who stand in the way, and fight even more staunchly for the attainment of its great and noble goal.

On the Farm Question: A Discussion

By a Reader and Erik Bert

Kenosha, Wisconsin

Dear Editor:

Being a worker and a trade unionist, I am acquainted with the farm situation only through reading and an occasional acquaintance with some farmer "moonlighting" in the shop. Thus, an article like Erik Bert's "The American Farm Crisis" in July's *Political Affairs* is most informative and most welcome. Bert's statistical breakdown of the farm population does an excellent job of brushing aside the usual fuzzy generalizations about the "farm problem."

As for his six-point program for Party action on the farm crisis, every one of the points seems to follow logically from his delineation of the problem. If I may, however, I would like to suggest what seems to me a highly necessary seventh point.

The Republicans, as Bert observes, are continually harping on the need to eliminate "inefficient" farm units. That their motives are selfish and inhumane, I agree. But to say this is not to refute their contention that many small farms *are* indeed inefficient, in the sense that, given unrestricted competition, they would be (and many of them are being) rapidly driven to the wall.

There are three possible ways to deal with this competitive disadvan-

tage. The Republican way of removing the parity-props and letting them collapse, we reject immediately. Bert's first and fifth points appear to mean that we have adopted the second way, which is essentially the liberal-Democrat solution: retain the price-support system and other aid plans, with the aim of "equalizing" the competition through a subsidy to the small farms.

As an immediate brake on the tendency of small farms to go bust, this is no doubt essential. But as a long-run program to "solve" the farm problem (short of socialism), I suggest that the third way should be explored: the way of voluntary combination into cooperatives. This, I think, has several advantages over Government support.

(1) It places the instrumentality for rendering the "inefficient" farms competitively efficient in the hands of the *farmers*, relieving them of dependence on the whimsies of changing administrations in Washington.

(2) Much as a Union gives the workers equal bargaining power with their employer, the coop allows the farmers to bargain on even terms with the feed magnates, processing monopolies, etc.

(3) The very act of organizing these units produces a new type of

property relationship and renders the farmers involved more receptive to the general concept of collectivization.

It may be that the co-op idea was considered for Bert's article and rejected, on the grounds that (1) where co-ops do exist, they have been subject, under our capitalist economy, to stagnation and a drift into capitalist business-ideology and practice, and that (2) after a wave of co-op organization in the 20's and 30's, the movement seems to have exhausted its potentiality for capturing the support of American farmers. I feel we should examine any such negative thinking with suspicion. These two tendencies will exist at any time under capitalism, and can be overcome, as they were in the aforementioned wave of organization, when current farm conditions reach a state of crisis (as Bert shows they have) and when a vigorous, goal-conscious leadership is available to spark the movement (as it has not been, during this era of McCarthy club and Fair Deal carrot).

On the contrary, it seems to me that such a plank is needed to distinguish our Party's platform from that of liberals and progressives without socialist orientation. In any program of land reform (which is what we are dealing with), *distribution* of the land necessarily gives way either to *collectivization*, or to a drift back into capitalist concentration, with the distribution to be re-effected at some

later date. Distribution is the problem only in certain sections of the country, notably the South; it will become the problem universally, if the present tendency to capitalist concentration is not checked and permanently undercut by means of some program of voluntary collectivization. (That such a program, under any name, will be in contradiction to the surrounding capitalist relations of production and will therefore have revolutionary implications ought scarcely deter us!)

So much for the thoughts of a shop worker on the farm question. I look forward to more such provocative and well-documented articles as Comrade Bert's in forthcoming issues of *Political Affairs*.

Sincerely,

A Trade-Union Comrade.

A REPLY BY ERIK BERT

"Trade-Union Comrade's" letter is a welcome contribution to what has been a sparse discussion during recent years.

The "first and fifth points" to which he refers were these:

1. "We are opposed to driving farmers from the land, under whatever pretext; we support their right to make a decent living on the farms they now occupy; we believe that the main purpose of federal and state legislation should be to achieve this end. We oppose all programs for easing farmers off the land under deceptive devices."

5. "We believe that the main and immediate goal for federal aid should be to assure every farmer at least a minimum decent standard of living." (To this end we suggested, for discussion, across-the-board limitation on benefit payments and across-the-board exemption from production controls.)

One would have to go far and wide among Democrats, liberals or progressive farm leaders, contrary to TUC's belief, to find even a few who do not accept the idea that the "inefficient" farmers will have to be got rid of, or who agree with points 1 and 5.

Now, as to the "voluntary combination into cooperatives" which TUC believes offers a "long-run program to 'solve' the farm problem (short of socialism)." (The quotation marks around "solve" leave me uncertain of just what he intended to convey):

Farm cooperatives are not instruments for rendering the "inefficient" farmers competitively effective. At best they represent the farmers as a whole in their relations with the monopolies and they leave the difference between small, middle and big farmers unaffected. They are usually dominated by the more well-to-do farmers or, at least, not by the poorer farmers. The benefits they bring are usually distributed in direct proportion to the amount of business a farmer does, whether in sales or in purchases. It is not realistic, there-

fore, to expect them to render the "inefficient" farms competitively effective."

Furthermore, the major problem that confronts all cooperatives today is how to survive in the face of the growing tendency to monopolization in trade, industry, transportation, finance.

The final arbiters over the affairs of the co-ops are the agencies from which they get their credit, and these institutions do not look on the co-ops as instruments for salvaging the "inefficient" farmers.

Will the co-op enable the farmer to bargain on "even terms" with the monopolies? The predominant economic power under capitalism is all on the side of monopoly. There is nothing "equal" in that; nor is there any possibility of its becoming equal. (The same holds true for what purports to be the "equal" bargaining power of the trade unions with the capitalists. The workers bargain as the sellers of their labor power; the capitalists as the owners of the means of existence. There is nothing "equal" in that.)

Assuming the best of intentions on the part of a "vigorous, goal-conscious leadership," and increasing support from the farmers—can this movement save the small and middle farmers from the increasing pressure of both the monopolies and of the increased amounts of capital that are today a prerequisite for survival in farming? What is the "goal" of

which such leadership should be conscious? Is it identical with the "first and fifth" points to which TUC refers?

TUC's contention that the farmers can expect very little from the Administration in Washington, whatever its stripe, suggests the necessity for propagating the idea of a farmer-labor party which will have a different outlook on life than either the Republicans or Democrats have. But, it also suggests something more immediate: the necessity for unity around a program which the people will seek to impose on both parties in Congress.

There is no evidence anywhere in the U.S. that any farmers favor "voluntary collectivization" or will in the foreseeable future. Under such circumstances such a proposal would have, not "revolutionary" but, utopian implications. It would constitute a diversion from the main task, which is the utmost, united resistance of workers and farmers now, to prevent the farmers from being cleaned off the land. Today it is even more obvious than a few months ago that the sweeping of farmers into the cities and towns, where unemployment is of growing gravity, can have only the most serious consequences for the workers as well as for the farmers.

Is it possible to "'solve' the farm problem (with or without quotation marks) short of socialism" The "farm problem" is built into

capitalism. It is the contradiction of town and country, of self-employed producers and capitalist production; and, today, of self-employed producers and monopoly; contradictions whose origin coincides with the inception of capitalism. I do not believe that it is possible to solve the "farm problem" under capitalism; but neither do I believe that that is the issue that confronts us. The task is to arouse the working class and the small and middle farmers in a common struggle for the right of the farmers to remain on the land now. While that would succor millions who are now threatened, it would in no wise "solve" the "farm problem."

For those who are interested in further study of the situation in U.S. agriculture, the most useful current source is *Facts for Farmers*, published by Farm Research, Inc., 39 Cortlandt St., New York, N. Y.

* * *

P.S.: I should like to use this occasion to correct an error which occurred in the article in the July issue of *Political Affairs* to which TUC has referred. On page 33 the second paragraph of the section entitled "The South Hardest Hit," should have read: "Between 1945 and 1954, 19.6 per cent of all farms in the South disappeared, compared to 17.2 per cent in the rest of the U.S. . . .", instead of the figures which appeared.—E.B.

Poland Today

By Maxim Lieber*

IN ITS ISSUE OF August, 1960, *The Atlantic* published "Poland Revisited," an article by Martha Gellhorn whom the magazine's editors identified as, among other things, a short-story writer. Because I, too, revisited Poland, I read her piece with a good deal of interest. I came away convinced that, without malice aforethought, the editors had not exaggerated: Miss Gellhorn is a capable short-story writer. Her "Poland Revisited" is indeed a piece of fiction, a figment of her imagination judiciously spiked with concepts that have been skillfully inculcated by such objective sources of information as Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, the U.S. Department of State, the Catholic Church, and, of course, the free American press.

One could not truly blame Miss Gellhorn if she merely had seen what she expected to see and misunderstood what she didn't expect to see. Countless visitors to foreign countries frequently come away after brief visits, with their preconceived opinions fortified. And quite a number of them write fascinating books that only irritate their hosts, as for

example the British on the United States or vice versa. Irritation in the latter case is understandable, even if not always justified, since the British and Americans have a common language, more or less a common heritage, and a common social system. But it is quite another matter when an American visits such a country as Poland. To begin with, the very business of communication becomes an almost insuperable obstacle; and even if this could be managed, one comes up against alien national traditions, strange ways of thought and, most importantly, an entirely different social system.

If, after taking all these factors into consideration, Miss Gellhorn had presented her views, had honestly interpreted her fugitive impression of a short visit, some kind of a picture, however cockeyed or amusing, might have emerged. Unfortunately, Miss Gellhorn had been infected by those sources of so-called information, referred to above, that, except for the brief interval of the World War II period, have been diffusing their misinformation about the socialist sector of the world ever since the great October Revolution.

Miss Gellhorn begins with a meta-

* The author, an American, has been living and working for several years in the new Poland.—*the Editor.*

phor that sets the tone of her article. She fancies herself as Alice stepping through the Looking Glass. "The people are superb, but there's also the Red Queen, dressed up as the State now . . . barking mad and beastly." An excellent opening for a fiction writer who expects her deluded readers to identify themselves with the "superb" people and hiss at the State.

Would her readers glean from such a fable that in 1945 Poland had been left desolate, not alone because of a savage war, but because of the ruthless Nazi occupant who set about deliberately, methodically, fiendishly to wipe out every trace of Polish civilization? Industrial establishments, scientific laboratories, cultural institutions were either looted, wrecked or totally destroyed. Millions of people were killed—countless numbers in concentration camps and gas chambers—especially professionals, such as doctors, teachers, educators, writers, painters, scientists. That was fascism's never-to-be-forgotten bequest. Physical evidence of it is gradually disappearing as cities are rebuilt and cultural monuments restored. Nevertheless, the memory of that nightmare is kept green by such permanent museums as the death camps at Oswiecim (Auschwitz) and Brezinka (Birkenau), and by tablets on houses on almost any street in almost every city, with bouquets of flowers underneath the tablets in memory of

the unfortunate victims caught in a dragnet and shot on the spot.

And what of the legacy the nation inherited from the pre-war rulers of the country? It had little of positive value, for Pilsudski and his clique of colonels were not concerned with developing the material or cultural life of the country that, for almost 150 years, since its partition between Austria, Prussia and Czarist Russia in 1772, had had no independent existence. On the contrary, in 1926 Pilsudski seized power in fascist style and ruled Poland in the interest of the landed gentry and the small group of industrialists largely dominated by foreign capital.

Consequently, when the Committee of National Liberation formed a Provisional Government in December 1944, it faced a gigantic task. It had to begin reviving a prostrate country that suffered not only from the ravages of war but also from the ills of a centuries-old tradition of feudalism. Agricultural production was extremely backward; except for some huge manorial estates that belonged to a handful of princes and assorted nobles, most farms were tiny, planted and cultivated with primitive tools and draft animals. Several million peasants were altogether landless, more often than not unemployed. (This was responsible for the vast migrations to the United States, France, Belgium, and South American countries.) The working class, prior to the Nazi

policy of extermination, had accounted for some 800,000.

Two things happened almost at once: a Land Reform Act divided the land into small farms that began absorbing some of the landless—twelve percent of the entire rural population in 1931; it dwindled to less than two percent by 1950, whereas owners of farms of between five and ten hectares had, in the same period, increased from less than nineteen percent to almost twenty-seven percent. Simultaneously an extensive industrialization program was launched that began to absorb the remaining unemployed of town and country. Such a program, however, involves not only the building of large plants; its realization requires a large labor force which, in turn, is in need of housing. But a large labor force must be trained and literate; so that these two things—land reform and industrialization—presently germinated a multitude of tasks that needed doing simultaneously and quickly.

Let us consider the problem of illiteracy which plagued pre-war Poland. According to the *Concise Statistical Annual*, published in Warsaw in 1937, about twenty-five percent of the total population was illiterate. A vast part of the peasant youth had little opportunity to attend an elementary school for the simple reason that few were available to them; and even those who lived close enough to schools did not

attend beyond the third or fourth grade, for their labor was needed at home.

In 1937 a mere 2,750 students graduated from vocational schools as skilled mechanics or electricians, and 30 from agricultural schools—in a country predominantly agricultural! In the same year 15,165 students out of an attendance of 221,417 graduated from secondary schools (roughly equivalent to our high schools). This out of a population of better than thirty-three million.

World War II caused a further deterioration. Sixty percent of the school buildings were destroyed or seriously damaged. Bent on eradicating every expression of Polish culture, the Nazis shut down secondary and higher schools throughout Poland; destroyed more than fifty percent of the scientific laboratories at higher schools; murdered some 20,000 teachers; burned and destroyed libraries; destroyed or looted printing plants.

Fifteen years after its liberation Poland presents an entirely different picture. The school system has grown tremendously what with the training of teaching staffs, the construction of schools, the printing of text books, the establishment of laboratories and workshops. In 1958, out of the smaller population of about 27.5 million, there were already over 28,000 secondary school graduates out of an at-

tendance of 195,091. Another aspect of this picture was the successful campaign for the elimination of illiteracy, thanks to which many people for whom the printed word was a mystery have learned to read and write. Apropos of reading it is highly illuminating to note that while in 1936 the Polish publishing industry printed fewer than 21 million books and pamphlets for a population of better than 33 million, in 1957 it produced over 92 million for a population of about 27 million. Bearing in mind the recent backwardness and illiteracy, contrast this if you will with book production in the United States.

Such statistical items are, however, quite abstract unless placed in their proper context: the significant rise in the people's purchasing power which flowed from the change in the nation's economic system. And having said this, I realize how difficult it is for mere words to present an image of the prodigious accomplishments in this field. Overnight, as it were, Poland became a vast building site. Somnolent villages became industrial areas; steel mills, hydroelectric plants, chemical plants, cement factories, fertilizer plants, shipyards, tractor and motor vehicle plants, textile mills were constructed and went into operation. And to build all these plants and man them, and to build decent housing for those who manned them required an astronomical increase of a working popula-

tion—from the pre-war figure of 800,000 to almost six million!

This, then, is the transformation that a socialistic state, based on a planned economy, has accomplished in a matter of fifteen years. And it is this state that Miss Gellhorn depicts as the Red Queen. Reading her article you will find no reference to the fact that this inhuman "Red Queen" recognized that children are a nation's most precious treasure by building thousands of nursery schools in which, by 1958, some 351,000 children between the ages of three and seven were being cared for by about 17,000 teachers. The parents, depending upon their financial means, pay from five to twenty-five percent of the cost of maintaining each child. Nor will you find mention of the 3,859,400 children between seven and thirteen years of age in the 24,502 schools, some of them rebuilt after Nazi destruction, most of them new.

Reading her article it would seem that Miss Gellhorn shuns workers almost as much as she would the plague. She did manage to pick up one eighteen-year-old in a cafe in Newa Huta. "He was enrolled in the law faculty of Cracow University; his father was a steel worker. He announced that after he had finished law he would like to study philosophy, and after that he would like to become a journalist." This young man struck me as being a perpetual student; but never mind.

The important thing is that the State, alias the "Red Queen", gives him these opportunities, because, despite Miss Gellhorn's misinformation, tuition is absolutely free and, moreover, depending upon his father's wages, the fellow is entitled to apply and will receive a stipend that will take care of his lodging and meals.

This young would-be journalist "loves sports, jazz, movies . . . reads classical drama for pleasure . . . wanted to know whether people lived very nervous lives" in America. And Miss Gellhorn generously adds in a parenthesis: "Few Americans would deny that life is needlessly nervous in God's Own Country; but few of us could take what Polish nerves do, and have to." Note the conscious and unconscious casuistry in this quotation: life is *needlessly* nervous in America, but in Poland it's just inevitable. Or do I misread Miss Gellhorn in that she really means that it is within the grasp of America's millions to change their social system and thus forever abolish their needlessly nervous lives? Poland has actually done so by means of its economic planning, its free educational system, its assurance of work for everyone, its free medical and dental care, its maternity care, free hospitalization, and countless other social benefits that every citizen receives or is entitled to receive besides his wages which, while admittedly

modest, are subject to increase in relation to the increase in productivity.

Miss Gellhorn is somewhat careless in stating, "There is little or no material advantage, for a Pole, in being educated." The fact is that everyone is urged to continue his education, for his pay is increased in relation to the character and degree of his education, so that her informant at the Howa Hute cafe would have one rating after his degree in law, and a correspondingly higher rating following his degree in philosophy. But, oh shades of Emerson and Thoreau! Cannot Miss Gellhorn conceive of cultural and spiritual values that derive from higher learning? And she an exponent of "God's Own Country" where spiritual values are held in highest esteem—of course.

There is no denying that in a mere fifteen years a backward agricultural country, plagued with illiteracy, ignorance, chaos, can, by virtue of Socialist planning, become a leading industrial country. This, nevertheless, is a far cry from producing, in the same space of time the Socialist man; evolution of the human species is a painfully slower process than the revolution of things. This process, after all, does not occur inside an incubator. The ideology of a former ruling class sank deep roots in the nation, an ideology of and for the sanctification of private property, exploitation, laissez-faire, man's in-

humanity to man, in brief the ideology of the monopoly capitalist system, best typified by the United States. It may take a generation or two to supplant those tenacious survivals of the bourgeois state. Meanwhile the struggle continues.

And there are the inevitable contradictions. In Poland, for example, the Catholic Church remains a powerful force and one to be reckoned with by the State. Throughout history the Church has known how to accommodate itself to the changing political scene; it could live at peace with feudalism and, subsequently, with capitalism, for in a large measure church and state were necessary to each other. But under Socialism, the new stage in history, the Church must, ultimately, disappear. What, then, accounts for its unique position in Polish life?

Due to Poland's partition for 150 years among its more powerful neighbors, the Church had to fight for its existence. **On the West** it faced Prussia's Lutheran Church, **on the East, Russia's Greek Catholic.** The struggle for survival paradoxically placed the Roman Catholic Church in the center of the national liberation movement which, of course, has left its effects on a Poland that only yesterday was a feudal, semi-colonial country, and is now in the process of building Socialism.

Under these circumstances it is scarcely strange to encounter the kind of incident Miss Gellhorn re-

lates, and builds up to fantastic proportions, namely, the church-versus-school episode in Nowa Huta. From her narration, it would appear that Miss Gellhorn prefers churches to schools. I'm inclined to be sceptical, and I venture to say this was written with tongue in cheek.

Miss Gellhorn has much to say about economics. "The State, the overall paymaster, does not pay a living wage . . . Communist economics forces the Poles to be finaglers, cheats, little or big crooks . . . If a charwoman is paid ten dollars a month for full-time work, she must obviously have several jobs or starve. So she checks in at two or more jobs, works a little, and badly, at each, and lives." Now while Miss Gellhorn has this and more to say about economics, it is plain to see that she must have flunked out this subject. What is a living wage? Any ordinary student would know that a living wage is determined by what it can purchase in goods and services. Besides, ten dollars has no significance in this framework, for one cannot equate the dollar with the Polish zloty. This charwoman (who is, of course, paid the lowest wage of any worker, in Poland or elsewhere) pays an infinitesimal sum for her rent, heat and electricity, and a fair amount for her food (no allowance for lobster thermidors or crepe suzette). In this connection it is most interesting to see how the per capita food consumption has changed

in the years between the preceding capitalist system (the demise of which causes such anguish to people like Miss Gellhorn) and the present socialist system. In 1937 the average Pole consumed 136.8 kg. of cereal products; in 1957 it increased to 154.4 kg. In 1937 he consumed 19.6 kg. of meat and animal fats; in 1957 this had increased to 46.6 kg. Average consumption of milk and milk products amounted to 262.3 ltrs. in 1937, whereas in 1957 it had risen to 347.2 ltrs. Sugar in 1937, 9.6 kg., but 26.5 kg. in 1957. The Pole consumed more meat than the Italian, more milk products than the Italian, or Frenchman, or the West German, more sugar than the Italian or Frenchman.

If the charwoman falls ill she goes to her doctor or is hospitalized, gets X-rayed, has laboratory tests without cost, and her wages continue for as long as she must stay away. If she is seriously ill she is sent to a sanatorium, and her wages continue. Besides she gets her two weeks' to a month's vacation with pay plus free transportation one way.

The living wage, then, is irrelevant. The living standard is another matter.

There is almost nothing in People's Poland that brings joy to Miss Gellhorn. She complains that the State "snoops after any signs of well-being, for legally there should be none." This is just plain malicious. She makes the sweeping statement

that people "are not allowed freedom of movement, to leave and to return when they want to," and that proves the "Communist rulers' . . . contempt for human needs." Sheer ignorance or lies, because ORBIS, the State travel agency, organizes countless tours, to Italy, to France, to Greece, Mediterranean tours that stop over at all sorts of ports for sightseeing, not to mention tours to the Socialist countries. And thousands upon thousands of Poles take full advantage of this opportunity. And it is proper to point out that it costs the Polish State a fortune: since the hard currency countries do not accept zlotys, Poland must cover the cost of such tours from her dollar reserves that could be used to such better purpose (with all due respect to Miss Gellhorn) as buying sorely needed machinery.

In one or two exceptional cases Miss Gellhorn managed to find some favorable aspects of Polish life, I dare say to give the impression of objectivity. For example, the professor from the medical school at Cracow, a pre-war professor (doubtless one of those who escaped the Nazi exterminators). He was full of energy who "shouted joyfully that, in his work, it is a thousand times better than before the war. There are now ten medical facilities instead of five . . . all the money you want for research." Or, when she was admitted into a stranger's flat in Nowa Huta: "It was a clean one-

room dwelling for a young man, his wife and baby (plus kitchen and bath; rent \$1.72 a month)." "The young man was a mason; starting here as an unskilled worker at the age of fifteen, he had been employed for ten years in building . . . He was now earning fifty-six dollars a month . . . more than a judge earns in Poland . . . He had medals for good workmanship . . . He reads newspapers . . . He had two books out from the lending library . . . Once a month he goes to the theatre—there is an especially fine one in Nowa Huta . . . to the movies three or four times a week; he watches and plays soccer. He is a contented man and a hard, competent worker." Or, in speaking about cultural matters: "Throughout Poland there is an enormous attentive audience for the best work that can be done in the theatre, in films, in music, in painting, and in writing. Every little provincial town has its theatre and orchestra; companies go on tour regularly to the smaller villages; editions of the classics and of good foreign and Polish writers are sold out in a matter of days."

But in each instance Miss Gellhorn feels obliged to regret her decent impulse. And so her professor of medicine is alleged to say: "What is bad is that the young assistants are not paid enough . . . and they lack foreign exchange to buy equipment in the West." Quite true; but the

country is poor, and its foreign exchange reserves, as has already been stated, are exceedingly limited; and, wisely or not, the State must decide on what to expend them. Or, her young man in Nowa Huta is building "gray cement sardine tins." True, the flats are not sumptuous, but the monthly rentals are \$1.72 or somewhat more for larger quarters for larger families. Moreover, when her young man started working here ten years ago, when Nowa Huta was first laid out, he was doubtless the son of one of the illiterate, landless peasants in the neighborhood who began by clearing ground and helped lay the foundations for the enormous foundry, and, quite likely, lived in hastily constructed barracks, for there was no housing at all.

This State, the very thought of which makes Miss Gellhorn froth at the mouth, gave him a free education, decorated him with medals for good work, provides him with excellent theatre and movies at a ridiculously low cost (from four to twenty cents if we take Miss Gellhorn's peculiar way of calculating the rate of exchange), gives him and his family free medical and hospital service, annual vacations for little or no cost. He never loses a day's pay, and he is completely secure in his job, for the Polish Constitution guarantees every adult citizen the right to a job. It is fair to add that this security still encourages a certain

laxness, for the moral sense has not yet developed to the point where it can act as an individual's own policeman.

Actually, if Miss Gellhorn had chosen to give a true picture of Poland she could have found tens of thousands such young, and middle-aged, and older men, not only in Nowa Huta but around Katowice, which she refers to as a "grisly mining town" (would Scranton or Wilkesbarre or the Monongahela Valley make her shudder?), in Wroclaw, or Poznan, in Szezecin, or Gdansk. But that was not her mission. She "sat in a charming candlelit cellar . . . in Warsaw, and it might have been a glamorous restaurant anywhere." Or, "One night, four of us were having a feast in a room like a stage set: it was an abject-poverty room, a tiny cell in a dark, dirty, overcrowded flat on an ugly street." She writes she almost wrecked the party by her outburst against the State. She felt

everyone was spying on everyone else, there were mikes in your hotel room, mikes everywhere; and you didn't dare to mention anyone's name on the telephone for fear that the person would get in trouble for talking to you; and so on and on *ad nauseam*.

All this would give almost any Pole a big laugh, for she indeed betrays that "deadly, cheap, E. Phillips-Oppenheim spy-story mentality" of which she accuses the Polish State. Her admirable talent as a fiction writer comes through on her junkets to "candlelit cellars" or "abject-poverty" rooms, but reveals mighty little knowledge of people, many of whom, no one will deny, squawk a good deal. But that's not a uniquely Polish national trait.

In this they get a powerful assist from all the mass communication media in imperialist countries, especially those in the United States whose ruling class lives in the vain hope of "liberating" the Poles.

The Latin-American Revolution of 1810-1826

By William Z. Foster

IN A RECENT ISSUE of *Fundamentos*, the theoretical organ of the Popular Socialist Party (Communist) of Cuba, there is the first section of a very important article entitled, "The Freedom Struggles of the Spanish Colonies in 1810-1826." It was written by four Soviet historians—M. S. Alperovich, V. I. Ermolaev, I. P. Lavretzky, and S. I. Semionov. I had to get the second section from the Soviet Union—it could not be had in Cuba. It is a decisive contribution to the study of the great struggle that set free the Spanish, Portuguese (Brazilian), and French (Haitian) colonies 150 years ago. The article, however, confining itself to the Spanish-American struggle, unfortunately does not deal with the closely associated Brazilian and Haitian revolutions; it was originally published in the well-known Soviet journal, *Problems of History*, in November, 1956.

The revolt of the Spanish colonies (and Brazil and Haiti), a century and a half ago, was a vast struggle. It embraced over 19,000,000 people (2,500,000 of whom were in Brazil); it extended over 5,313,000 square miles (besides about 3,288,000 square miles in Brazil); and the revolution-

ary war, bitterly fought, lasted some 16 years. Haiti also played a big part in it. Thus, the movement, whether considered from the standpoint of the population involved, the area covered, or the duration of the armed struggle, was several times as extensive as our revolution of 1775-1783. Of the 16,800,000 population in the Spanish colonies proper, only 3,240,000 were whites, 5,320,000 were mestizos (mixed races), 7,530,000 were Indians, and 775,000 were Negroes—thus, but about 35 per cent of the people involved in the revolution were white.

Despite its great extent, however, this vast movement in the Spanish colonies has been, unfortunately, but inadequately analyzed by the Latin-American Communists. And the bourgeois historians have not helped. There have been only very few general studies made, and these have mostly not been very sound. Wherein these analyses have failed has been chiefly in underestimating the depth and class significance of the movements involved. That is, the tendency has been to pass over the immense struggle as solely a war for independence from Spain, instead of recognizing it for what it was, namely, the beginnings of a bourgeois

revolution, of which the separation or independence feature was only one aspect, although a most important one. Similarly, for many years, the revolution of the thirteen colonies from England was also considered almost solely as a war of independence and was not generally recognized at the time as a social revolution; and it was likewise some 60 years after the event before the "Civil War" of 1861 was given recognition as the second American revolution.

In 1951, I wrote a book, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, in which I summarized the whole Hemispheric Revolution, including that in the Spanish colonies, as follows:

The great American Revolution—in the United States, Haiti, the Spanish colonies, Brazil, and Canada—was fundamentally a bourgeois, i.e., a capitalist revolution. Notwithstanding all its revolutionary shortcomings, it constituted a big step in the establishment of capitalism in this hemisphere. But, as we have already remarked, it was by no means a "pure" capitalist revolution. Many hangovers of feudalism were still attached to it, which prevented it from reaching full capitalist expression in various countries. This was especially the case in the Latin-American countries, where the feudal elements were very strong and where the revolutionary bourgeoisie and working class were relatively weak. This fact has led many writers to conclude, erroneously, that the national liberation struggle in Latin-America

was not a revolution at all, but merely a mechanical breaking off of the allegiance of the colonies from their "mother" countries. (p. 157.)

A number of comrades in Latin-America took sharp issue with the above conception. They were especially influenced in their conclusion by the weakness of the Latin-American bourgeoisie and proletariat in 1810 and afterwards and the decisive strength of the latifundists (big land-owners), who have long remained the basic class power in the Latin-American countries. They failed to see, what I extensively pointed out in my book, that the movement, despite its imperfections and wide diversities in the various countries, was, nevertheless, fundamentally a bourgeois revolution. This was evidenced by the nature of the revolution as follows: the separatist movement of the colonies from Spain; the abolition domestically of the monarchy, despite desperate efforts to maintain it (even in the United States); the establishment of 20 individual Latin-American republics, each with its own government and more or less democracy, despite the rigid literacy tests which heavily disfranchised the Indians and Negroes—these states all had democratic forms of government, with constitutions on the United States model; the bourgeois ideology of most of the main leaders of the revolution—Bolívar, San Martín, Belgrano,

O'Higgins, Hidalgo, Morelos, etc.—many of whom were militant Masons and students of the United States and French revolutions; the partial weakening of the bonds between the Church and state; the initiation of a strong movement for Negro freedom from slavery; the unfettering of the merchant capitalists from the strict Spanish controls, and their entry into the world market; and the strengthening of the weak domestic capitalist class. The developing capitalist influence also deeply affected agriculture, the big land-owning interests. Henceforth, the latifundia tended to develop as big capitalist farms producing rice, coffee, cotton, fruit, etc., for the world market, rather than the narrow latifundia whose production and markets had in pre-revolutionary years been restricted feudally and closely controlled by the "mother country," Spain.

A most important feature of the bourgeois revolution, slavery was abolished in the Spanish colonies (before it was in the United States). The dates when the various Spanish colonies did away with chattel slavery indicate the powerful anti-slavery movement that was initiated during the revolution. The following are the years of major limitation or final abolition of Negro chattel slavery in the erstwhile Spanish-American colonies: Chile, 1811; Argentina, 1813; Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and El Salvador, 1824;

Bolivia, 1825; Mexico, 1828; Uruguay, 1842; Paraguay, 1844; Colombia, 1851; Ecuador, 1852; Peru, 1856; Venezuela, 1858. The freed Negroes generally became peons, as were the Indians.

The foregoing developments, as I stressed time and again, were clear evidence of a social-bourgeois revolution, however weak. For a long time, the situation has remained theoretically confused, which has prevented a clear understanding of what had actually happened in the broad Latin-American revolution, and bedeviled the policies in after years of the Communist Parties. Now comes the article of the four Soviet historians. It clears up many hitherto obscure or confused questions about the revolution. These include the degree to which the proletariat, slaves, Indian peons, handicraftsmen, and merchants supported the 1810 revolution; they combat the illusions about the revolution being merely the work of the separatist creole (native-born) landowners; they give a good review of the growing economic crisis before the revolution; they clarify the whole controversial question around the personality of Bolivar, pointing out certain errors made by Marx and others.*

In dealing with the previous studies of the revolutionary question in Latin-America, the four Soviet writ-

* See Marx, *The Revolution in Spain*, p. 170.

ers examine the Foster book, among others. They say that it "is basically correct," and their Marxian analysis goes to prove this statement. One of the basic weaknesses of the article is that it deals only with the Spanish colonial revolution although the Spanish, Brazilian, Haitian, etc., upheavals are inseparably bound up together in time, location, objectives, etc. It is absolutely necessary to see that these several revolutions be linked up as essentially one great movement, and also, in spite of their very considerable weakness in this respect, that they are essentially part of the bourgeois revolution.

The four Soviet writers make very good progress in this respect. After analyzing the course of the revolution in the score of Spanish colonies, they offer a summary of the general result of the revolution at the end of their article, as follows:

The war exercised an enormous influence upon the final development of Latin-America. It led to the liquidation of the colonial regime and the establishment of political independence for all the hispanoamerican countries with the exception of Cuba and Puerto

Rico. It put a finish to the commercial monopolies, the prohibitions, limitations and regulations—all this was ended to create most favorable conditions for the development of capitalist relations in Latin-America and for its incorporation into the world economic system. The indigenous population was liberated from personal tribute and obligatory labor in favor of particular persons of the Church and the State. In the majority of the countries, slavery was abolished and the rights of the Church were limited. In all the hispanoamerican states that just emerged, a republican regime was established. Also of progressive significance were the suppression of the Inquisition, the abolition of the titles of nobility, the stimulus of immigration, etc. In this manner and as a result of the war for independence, there arose partially in practice, proposals of a bourgeois revolution.

The analysis of the four Soviet writers agrees substantially, as they say, with the analysis that I made some years ago in my book, *Outline Political History of the Americas*. This should go a long way to clearing up one of the most stubborn points of major revolutionary history.

ON THE PARTY'S HISTORY

By Clarence Hathaway

It has long been the practice of anti-Communists to pick up reports of self-critical discussions by Communists of their own differences, shortcomings, or mistakes, in order to paint a horrible picture of demoralization, defeat, and even early death for the Communist movement. Particularly, it has been their practice to present lurid tales by deserters from Communist ranks—Lovestone, Gitlow, Browder or Gates—as the funeral dirge of the movement.

This book by Theodore Draper* is no exception, nor is it peculiar to the United States. Like books have appeared regularly in all countries ever since Karl Marx and Frederick Engels first produced the Communist Manifesto back in 1848. Through the years we Communists have died many deaths, in many lands, by the pens of such wishful anti-Communists. But, with each "burial," we do not die; we are re-born. We regroup our forces, re-examine our position, evaluate our experiences and prepare for new struggles. Capitalism, by its ever ruthless exploitation of the people, soon provides us with fresh opportunities for new recruits, greater strength and greater influence. Capitalism never fails to produce its own grave-diggers.

* *American Communism and Soviet Russia: The Formative Period*, by Theodore Draper (Viking Press, N. Y., 558 pp., \$8.50).

True, our Party in the United States is not now as strong, either in membership or influence, as it was in the nineteen-thirties, nor can it be compared in size and influence with Communist Parties in many other countries. This is not due primarily to weaknesses or shortcomings within our Party, though, of course, we have many—*too many!* It is due, in the main, to two factors: 1) the relatively favored position of American capitalism since World War I, and particularly during and since World War II, and 2), the cold war, anti-Communist policies of both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations, accompanied by the McCarthy-Eastland-McClellan witch-hunts, and the adoption of a wide range of undemocratic, anti-labor, anti-Communist legislation ever since 1919. These measures have hurt the whole labor and progressive movements, and not only the American Communists. In fact the arrest and persecution of Communists have undermined and restricted the rights and liberties of all Americans.

But our capitalists have no cause for joy. At home, a ground swell is gradually, but surely, building up against their policies. Abroad, they find themselves in an ever more critical situation. Their anti-Communism is boomeranging against them. The world-wide sweep of the anti-imperial-

ist and Communist movements are decisively influencing events in all nations, on all continents.

U.S. imperialism, of course, is still very strong, and is fighting back desperately to hold and extend its positions. Anti-Communism, cold war against the Soviet Union and the Socialist world, and a feverish armaments drive are still its policies; they were the policies of both presidential candidates—Kennedy, as well as Nixon! This fierce urge for self-preservation by the capitalists is the setting in which Draper's "American Communism and Soviet Russia," must be evaluated; it is the second volume in a projected three-volume "history" of the Communist Party of the United States.

These volumes are not the brain child of Mr. Draper alone. They are part of "a series of studies of Communist influence in American life," with Clinton Rossiter as General Editor. "The entire survey," we are told, "has been made possible through the foresight and generous support of the Fund for the Republic"—an off-shoot of the Ford Foundation. It is fair to observe that the executors of Ford's millions would hardly finance an objective study of this question.

Mr. Draper makes the usual claims to objectivity—a claim that rapidly fades when one examines his source material and the acknowledgements he offers for services rendered. He has culled the anti-Communist garbage cans, starting with the Subversive Activities Control Board, the House Un-American Activities Committee, the old Dies Committee, the N. Y. State Legislative Committee on Seditious Activities, and the Louisiana State Legislative

Investigation of Subversion in Racial Unrest.

Further, he bases his book mainly on gratuitous gossip, self-justification and slanders by renegades from Communism—people anxious to "explain" their desertion of the revolutionary working-class movement, and their subsequent services to the enemies of that movement. Among the many renegades he lists, the best known are Jay Lovestone, Ben Gitlow, Bertram Wolfe, Earl Browder and the Trotskyites, Max Shachtman and Jim Cannon. With the exception of Lovestone and Gitlow, he also thanks those listed here for help in preparing the final manuscript.

A reviewer in the *New York Herald Tribune* (Cyril E. Black) had this comment on Draper's book: "Those who think of Marxism and Communism as offering alternative solutions to the great problems of policy confronting any society will be disappointed to find little discussion of such basic issues in this volume."

He is inclined to excuse Draper, and blame the Party. The facts are that Draper does not know Communist theory, and had no desire to discuss Marxist-Leninist alternatives, nor any positive aspects of the revolutionary working-class movement. His aim was only to do a hatchet job.

He states that it was his plan, at the outset, to write only a one-volume story of American Communism during the years of the depression, the early nineteen-thirties. Had he wished, he possibly could have done that job reasonably well. He had worked on the staff of the *Daily Worker* and the *New Masses*. Through these associations, he knew first hand of the unemployed

ted States
in mem-
ras in the
be com-
with Com-
countries.
weaknesses
ur Party,
many—too
n, to two
ored posi-
nce World
aring and
, the cold
s of both
Adminis-
McCarthy-
ants, and
ge of un-
ommunist
ese meas-
labor and
not only
In fact
Commun-
restricted
ill Ameri-
cause for
swell is
lding up
oad, they
more criti-
mmunism
em. The
i-imperial-

struggles, the strike movements, the basic industry-organizing drives, the fight against white chauvinism and for Negro rights, the Scottsboro and Herndon cases, the farmers' struggles against foreclosures and evictions, the wide movement against war and fascism, the supporting movement for Republican Spain, and the fight for peace and democracy. Moreover, he could have told of Communist policies during that period, of our all-out efforts to initiate, inspire, build and unite these peoples' movements on the broadest possible basis, and of the friendly, cooperative relations we had in that period with all other progressive, labor, Negro and farmer forces. Such a book really could have been a contribution toward "a series of studies of Communist influence in American life," and of positive alternatives, both in terms of immediate program and socialist aims, to the chaos and anarchy of capitalism in crisis.

However, he soon discarded that excellent idea:

"But the more I studied the Party's actions and policies from 1930 to 1945 . . . the more dissatisfied I became. It gradually became clear to me that . . . the story could not be understood from the actions and policies of the Popular Front and war years. At every crisis and turning point, such as the outbreak of war in 1939 or the downfall of Earl Browder in 1945, the leaders seemed to be responding to *influences and pressures out of the distant past* rather than in the immediate present." (My emphasis—C.A.H.)

One would assume, when he begins to talk of the "*distant past*," that he was about to examine the influences and

pressures generated by the teachings of Marx and Engels, in the first place of the *Communist Manifesto*. There he would have found, clearly spelled out, the relation of Communists to the working class movement as a whole, and of the fight for immediate demands under capitalism to the struggle for socialism. With a little more effort, he could have found in the vast library of books, pamphlets and articles by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Ruthenberg, Foster and many other revolutionary working-class leaders, the answers to whatever questions he had—whether such questions had to do with basic principles, or strategy or tactics. He could have had both the "distant past" and the "immediate present" in his search for an understanding of Party policies—toward war, or Browder's revisionism, or anything else.

But this talk of seeking "influences and pressures" is so much hogwash. American capitalism needs and is willing to pay for a book that could be used to justify the heating up of the cold war against the Soviet Union, and at home, against the Communists and all militants. And Mr. Draper, with the assistance of Lovestone, Browder, *et al.*, was prepared to deliver. All they had to do was concoct a tale of the Russians as villains, and American Communists as "conspiratorial agents" of the Russians. *That is the book*. There was never anything else in Draper's mind.

As for his 558 pages of meanderings through truths, half-truths, distortions, and just plain gossip and slanders, there is nothing concerning the birth and development of our

Party that cannot be understood by rational people. There is no conspiracy, nothing to hide, nothing for which we must apologize. True, we made mistakes. For these mistakes, we can be condemned—*only by those who never made any!* The test is the positive contributions of our Party, through the 41 years of its history, to the struggles of the common people of our country for a better life.

The Communist Party of the United States was born in September, 1919. It cut its baby teeth and formulated its basic policies in the stormy struggles of the early twenties.

Our Party did not come into being because of the revolution in Czarist Russia. Our roots rest firmly in the many decades of bitter class struggles of American workers against American capitalists. From the first days of the International Workingmen's Association (The First International) in 1864, the organizations of American workers were leavened increasingly by Marxist theory and an international outlook. The heavy flow of immigrants—of our own forefathers—as well as the circulation of international literature, kept our advanced workers' and early socialist movements informed. With the outbreak of World War I in 1914, and the betrayal of Socialist internationalism by the leaders of the Second (Socialist) International, the struggles here against leaders such as Gompers, Berger and Hillquit sharpened, and paved the way for the inevitable formation of a new Party, based on revolutionary, rather than on reformist and chauvinist policies. Though each new event in Europe—and above all, the Russian revolu-

tion—accelerated these developments, the need for a Communist Party was maturing here, independently of these events, out of the extremely sharp struggles of the war and immediate post-war period.

In a nutshell, what were the characteristics of that period (1919 to 1924)? Post-war readjustment brought high prices, unemployment, wage cuts, massive strike struggles, nation-wide drives by employers to destroy the trade unions, employer-planted spies in labor unions and factories, blacklists of active unionists, arrests and deportation of foreign-born, arrest and persecution of I.W.W. members and Communists, deep crisis in agriculture, and widespread middle class discontent.

Politically, reactionaries controlled both old parties; farmers in the middle west were forming Non-Partisan Leagues in an effort to capture the Republican Party; the Railroad Brotherhoods and shop craft unions had created an organization (the Plumb Plan) to promote the nationalization of the railroads; local A. F. of L. unions and some city central labor bodies were promoting local and state Labor Parties; a group of middle class liberals was promoting a new political movement; some old-party politicians reflected this mass dissatisfaction.

Everywhere one turned there was discontent and political turmoil; all were trying to move, but in different directions. The trade union bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. opposed the Labor Party movement and remained tied to the old parties—until July of 1924—and then quickly returned to

the old party camps. The Socialist Party virtually disappeared as a factor after the formation of the Communist Party, and the campaign of Eugene V. Debs for the presidency in 1920. The Industrial Workers of the World opposed political action in principle and was largely destroyed during that period. The Socialist Labor Party, then as now, remained aloof from mass developments.

Our Party was born out of this period, reflecting the moods of these people, and, to a degree, their confusion and conflicts. We were a part of them; we could not be otherwise. There was this difference, however. We built our Party on an ideological foundation—on the theories of Marx and Engels. And soon we added—as the writings became more fully available—the most advanced Marxist concepts, those of V. I. Lenin. We set out to master theory ourselves, and to contribute all we could, both in theory and practice, toward uniting and directing these workers and farmers into a powerful political movement.

But, in the process, we had to re-make ourselves; we had to root out the incorrect and ineffective policies and practices—the opportunism and the sectarianism—which we had inherited from our Socialist Party, S.L.P., I.W.W., A. F. of L. or language federation backgrounds; we had to develop new approaches toward other working class and popular movements. It was necessary for us to become a Party of a new type—not one limited to election campaigns or to general agitation and propaganda against capitalism and for socialism; but rather a Party that

could work continuously, day in and day out, combining the promotion of our socialist objectives with direct participation in and leadership of every struggle of working people for their immediate needs and aims.

From the teachings of both Marx and Lenin we were fast learning that a revolutionary workers' Party could only lead the workers, Negro people, farmers and others exploited by capitalism, to the struggle for political power when, from their own experiences, they became convinced that there was no other, no easier solution for their problems. All this required a major re-making job in our new, young Party, and in the thinking of our members.

Is it surprising that we had some sharp differences of opinion, and even the formation of groupings—factions, if you wish—to promote or oppose one set of new proposals as against others? Is it surprising that during this formative period there were variations in attitude toward a Labor Party, a Farmer-Labor Party, or a petty-bourgeois Third Party, such as that headed by Senator Robert LaFollette of Wisconsin? Is it surprising that there were differences on trade-union policies—toward the I.W.W. or the A. F. of L., or on the approach to the Negro problem, or on the inner-organizational problems confronting our Party? Who, but a hopeless cynic, would question our efforts to find solutions to these complex problems by discussing them with more experienced international leaders? Only a cynical, petty-bourgeois dilettante—or one who has sold his soul for 30 pieces of silver—could write

of these discussions and struggles as does Draper.

What about his picture of deep intrigue, of weird conspiracies, of international plots in the process of working out solutions to various controversial issues? When one rips away the deliberate distortions, his own book admits these facts:

1) When discussions took place with other Communist leaders and in the Communist International—and they were with English, French, German, Hungarian, and other leaders, as well as with Russian—representatives of all viewpoints in the American Party participated;

2) Such discussions were always initiated by American leaders of all factions in an effort to get the advice and help of more experienced leaders;

3) All such discussions were preceded and followed by articles in our Party publications, clarifying the issues and explaining the proposed policies;

4) Finally Draper *disproves* what he sets out to prove—that American Communists were somehow serving the interests of Soviet Russia—by admitting that the advice we received and accepted was all directed toward making us *a more American Communist Party*, more responsive to the traditions, desires and needs of our own American people, and more effective in fighting in their behalf.

Specifically, what advice did we receive—when removed from Draper's mystical wrappings?

• That it would be better for us to do away with the foreign-language speaking federations which we inherited from the Socialist Party, and re-

organize our Party on the basis of English-speaking neighborhood and shop clubs.

• That Communists should strive to end the destructive, divisive policy of dual unionism, and work to unite and influence all workers in the A. F. of L.

• That in all our work, and as a basic long-range policy, we should strive to work with the trade unions, farmers, the Negro people and other popular forces to develop political activities independent of the two capitalist parties, with the aim of forming a broad Farmer-Labor Party.

• That it was incorrect to approach the Negro question as simply one of organizing Negro workers. These experienced leaders stressed that this was a problem of a national or racial minority, doubly exploited and oppressed by the ruling class, and that the white working class could never free itself from capitalist exploitation and rule unless the workers waged a determined, uncompromising battle against all manifestations of white chauvinism, and for full equality in all aspects of life for the entire Negro people.

These were the positive, constructive approaches to questions of mass policy hammered out during our formative period—the period of Draper's book.

It is not my intention to follow him through his distortions and factual errors on our purported "mistakes." There were many things we did not do right, and many others that we could have done better—if we had had more knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, greater experience and numerical strength. However, Draper's anti-Communist bias—his search for non-

existent conspiracies—causes him to miss completely the mass role of our small Party, even in this formative period, that prepared us to play a decisive role in the decade that followed.

For him, our mistakes—and they were mainly sectarian mistakes—in the Farmer-Labor campaigns of 1923 and 1924, are the whole story. Actually, they should not be permitted to conceal the positive aspects of these mass campaigns.

We hurt only ourselves then by a certain impatience; by our youthful desire to push the formation of a national Farmer-Labor Party too fast, beyond our strength and influence and the possibilities of the time.

But, consider this question from another viewpoint—not from the view of whether at that moment we made mistakes, but rather from the view of what we did in terms of the movement of workers and farmers. These are the facts: admitted by Draper (though he draws no positive conclusions). We were the driving force in organizing both the Chicago and St. Paul, Farmer-Labor conventions. Through the work of our Party and the Trade Union Educational League, headed by Comrade William Z. Foster, many thousands of local unions, and many central labor bodies, city and state, were won for the Farmer-Labor Party. Farm organizations, cooperatives and fraternal organizations were reached, and brought together with the trade unionists, by our tireless efforts. The LaFollette-Wheeler campaign of 1924, on a Third Party ticket, profited by the intensive work we did. In fact, probably more than any other single factor, it was our drive in the unions

that made it necessary for the A. F. of L. bureaucracy to desert the old parties that year, and endorse the LaFollette ticket.

On the trade-union question, Draper works himself into a lather over the struggles around the question of dual unionism and work in the A. F. of L., in the early 30's, and then over the conduct of certain strike struggles and the carrying through of independent organizing activities at a later period, as a fundamental violation of avowed Party policy, and as a defeat for Comrade Foster's policies. There is no denying that we made some Leftist errors, but it should be apparent, to all but the blind, that one can be opposed to dual unionism as a matter of principle, and yet be confronted with situations where there are, for a time, no alternatives. The facts were that the A. F. of L. leadership refused to undertake the organization of the mass production industries or give leadership to the workers' struggles then developing. That this was so was proven historically by the developing inner-revolt in the A. F. of L. that came to a head in 1935, with the creation of the C.I.O. The trade-union work we did in the early 30's in part paved the way for the C.I.O., and enabled us to be a decisive force in the building of the C.I.O. in a number of the basic industries. Yet, even then, we advocated the earliest possible reunification of the trade-union movement, of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O.

On the Negro question, Draper presents the slogan on the Right of Self-Determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt of the South as a conspiratorial proposal by Stalin imposed on the American Party. Nonsense! The

resolutions on the Negro question adopted in 1929 and 1930, which included that slogan among other basic concepts, were the result of many hours of diligent study of the national and colonial question by American Communists in Moscow. They reflected an effort to raise the Negro question to its proper place in the struggle of the American working class. Until then it was a very secondary issue, receiving very little attention in our Party, and no attention among white workers in trade unions or elsewhere.

What was our error? Simply that we did not anticipate World War II, and the effect that it would have in breaking up the concentrated Negro areas in the rural South, bringing the Negroes into the industrial centers of both North and South. But the significance of these resolutions was not, primarily, the slogan of self-determination. It was rather that they raised the Negro question as a national question—one of a specially oppressed national or racial group—and elevated the whole issue from a secondary to a major issue in our Party and before the masses.

Upon the adoption of those resolutions the battle began against white chauvinism in our Party and to develop the mass struggle for full unrestricted equality for the Negro people. The historic struggles to save the lives of the Scottsboro boys, the Herndon case and others became nationwide and worldwide in their scope. Negro workers were organized in the unemployed movements with the whites; the struggle for Negro rights was

brought into the trade unions; work was started among the Negro sharecroppers in the South. Those resolutions initiated by a handful of Communists and adopted by our Party laid the foundations on a mass scale for the gigantic and victorious struggles that have finally elevated these issues of civil rights and equality to first place in American life. And this cynic, Draper, dares to see only our "mistakes."

All of our inner struggles during these formative years were our ideological growing pains. From them came the understanding and acceptance of basic Marxist-Leninist concepts that enabled our members to reject and defeat recurring waves of revisionism, and also Left-sectarian attacks on our Party's policies. Renegades like Lovestone, Browder, Cannon, Gates, Draper and others—people who for a time played a role in our Party, only to capitulate to capitalist influences and pressures—have all been thrown out. In any struggle as decisive as that between capitalists and workers; between two systems—capitalism and socialism—there are inevitably both deserters and casualties. But after each such flurry of struggle, our Party has regrouped, and prepared for a new advance, never losing sight of its job of fighting for the interests and needs of the people on the road of struggle for socialism.

Our capitalists will continue to fight back, but they are defending a losing cause. Draper's book certainly will not save them.

LABOR IN THE 'THIRTIES

By Carl Winter

Compressing the history of American labor's turbulent pre-World War II struggles between the covers of a single book is, at least, a difficult task. But when it is undertaken without the aid of either practical participation in the labor movement or theoretical illumination of the sources of its major currents, the end product can only be a compilation of assorted, arbitrarily-selected reports. And when the compiler starts out accepting—or refusing to question—red-baiting distortions of the role and motives of Communists in pioneering the very union efforts under study, only a one-sided account can result.

Such is the unfortunate fate of the work undertaken by Prof. Walter Galenson in his recent volume, *The CIO Challenge to the AFL*.*

This is not to deny that there is assembled in this book a considerable amount of useful information on the highlights and some of the details of the growth of America's major unions, connected with the rise of the CIO. Seventeen chapters tell the outline story of as many industries and their labor organizations, mainly from the formation of the Committee for Industrial Organization in 1935 to the entry of the United States into World War II in 1941.

Enveloping these pages, the book

opens with "The Background of the Struggle" as Chapter I and closes with Chapter 19, "Some General Aspects of the Labor Movement." The former traces the change from the original committee within the AFL to the independent Congress of Industrial Organizations. The last chapter, after providing some data on changes in union enrollment, finances and work stoppages, stresses the new role of the labor movement in national politics and legislation dating from the Roosevelt Administration. It also fills some gaps in the preceding chapters on such questions as Negro rights, corruption, agricultural organization and world affiliations.

Yet, all of this hardly warrants the ambitious sub-title carried by this volume—"A History of the American Labor Movement, 1935-1941." For all the diligent research evidently performed by Prof. Galenson, he has missed or set aside the decisive force that shapes history. That is the class struggle waged by masses in defense of their livelihood and for its improvement.

Despite all the evidence which his own accounts reveal, that the great upsurge of union organization in the thirties resulted primarily from the unleashing of the initiative and militancy of large bodies of workers in America's basic industries, the author places major emphasis upon secondary aspects. Thus, he makes a mystery (p. 93), impossible to fathom "with-

* *The CIO Challenge to the AFL—A History of the American Labor Movement, 1935-1941*, by Walter Galenson (Harvard University Press, 732 pages, \$9.75).

out full access to its policy papers and executive minutes," of the unprecedented, sudden and peaceful recognition by the United States Steel Corporation of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee early in 1937. However, the obvious clue is to be found in the very next chapter in which is reported the sensational success of the sit-down strikes which had spread from Cleveland to Flint General Motors plants exactly two months earlier. And not until three chapters farther along is reference made to the strikes of rubber workers in Akron who, as early as January, 1936, demonstrated the potential power of the sit-down in spite of the opposition of their union leaders to this form of struggle.

The oddly inverse order of these chapters to the sequence in which the workers in the rubber, auto and steel plants used or threatened to use the new, militant sit-down weapon reflects an appraisal of what constitutes the decisive factor in the growth of the new unionism in the country. The maneuvering skill of leaders apparently ranks with Galenson above and, somehow, independent of, the readiness of organized workers to throw their full weight into struggle against their exploiters.

The governing criterion by which the heroes of this book become the Philip Murrays, the latter-day Reuthers and the earlier Lewises and other top union officials, instead of the rank and file and those bound to them in daily struggle, is perhaps best revealed in the following passage.

"... Even the recognition of the United Automobile Workers Union by General Motors a week earlier did not have the impact

of the steel settlement, since the GM agreement had been reached after a long and bitter sit-down strike, and with the most severe form of pressure exercised by the federal and state governments. Here, on the contrary, there had been virtually no governmental intervention and no industrial strife. The agreement was worked out by the parties themselves on a voluntary basis." (p. 93.)

How is it possible otherwise to explain that in 66 pages of notes giving the author's sources of information there is not a single reference to even one of the innumerable bulletins, periodicals, shop papers or other publications with which rank and file committees and Left groups flooded industrial centers at the height of the drive to organize mass production workers? Instead, there is an almost complete reliance upon the self-description of dominant officials and their supporters, through official union publications and their own approved biographers.

It cannot be said that Galenson is unfamiliar with the Trade Union Unity League and its affiliated unions which preceded the CIO in training thousands of workers and organizers for industrial unionism and effective militancy. He does note the early presence of the TUUL in several fields including steel, meat packing, metal, radio and others; but he does so chiefly in a slighting manner and echoes the reactionaries' cry of "infiltration" and their charge of "Communist control." Galenson calls upon the testimony of such notorious, professional anti-Communists as Martin Dies, Benjamin Stolberg and Jay Lovestone; yet, such is the low state to which the red-baiters have reduced scholarship in our country that he does not even once cite a reference to the rebuttal arguments. Nor

does this author even note the recognition by other anti-Communist writers of the basic contributions which the TUUL, under the leadership of William Z. Foster, made to paving the way for the new Congress of Industrial Organizations.

In his *Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement* (International Publishers, 1956), Foster briefly summarized (p. 332) but one aspect of the contributions of the TUUL and its Communist supporters when he wrote:

"In March, 1935 . . . the TUUL, with at least 100,000 members, largely militants, merged itself, without getting Green's permission, into the AFL unions. These militants worked with the Lewis-Hillman forces in the CIO and with their experience and fighting spirit they there played a decisive role in the big organizing campaigns and strikes that followed. With thousands of contacts in the key and trustified industries, the Communist Party also threw its entire strength into the huge campaign. The Lewis-Hillman forces, in each struggle with the Green bureaucrats, welcomed this effective Communist support. Everybody knows that the Communists were in the frontline of building the CIO. Lewis' biographer Alin-

sky states, "The fact is that the Communist Party made a major contribution in the organization of the unorganized for the CIO."

It is not simply to keep the record truthful or to preserve the honor of early Left and Communist builders of the CIO that these facts need to be repeated now. A new wave of employer attacks upon organized labor needs to be met again today. Even though Professor Galenson seeks to show that the challenge of the CIO has transformed the AFL, the vastly strengthened AFL-CIO still faces great, unresolved problems. And the chief source of their solution lies where the successful union builders of the thirties tapped it, in the unity and the militant struggle of the working men and women in America's basic industries.

An adequate history still needs to be written of the breakthrough of unionism in the strongholds of monopoly, out of justice to the thousands of labor heroes who pioneered in this task, and as inspiration and guide to the millions who now need to defend and carry forward the gains so nobly won.

A NOTE TO READERS

The Editors wish to announce that "Notes of the Month," which is missing from this issue, is being discontinued in its present form. Since experience has shown that it is impractical to have it written regularly by one individual in the existing circumstances, it will be replaced, starting in the December issue, by a column of unsigned editorial comment written by various individuals. This is one of a number of changes decided upon following discussion in the National Secretariat of a report presented by the Editor. Others will be announced at a later date.

* * *

The results of the questionnaire which appeared some months ago have been tabulated and summarized.

There were 65 replies from readers in 13 states and 3 foreign countries. They range in age from 19 to 87, in occupation from shop workers to scientists and teachers, in length of readership from one month to 25 years. Twenty said they were readers of *Political Affairs* "since its inception."

The answers were highly diverse, and we have space here to present only the following main conclusions:

1. A striking feature is the high age level of the group. Two-thirds are over 40 and one-third over 60. But at the same time the replies include a group of younger readers, students and others, indicating the emergence of a new, youthful readership.
 2. There were a substantial number of criticisms of the length of articles and complexity of language.
 3. A significant number felt that the magazine should deal much more with theoretical questions.
 4. "Notes of the Month" was generally considered a valuable feature, though an appreciable number felt it needed to be more analytical in character.
 5. "Ideas in Our Time" is easily the most popular item in the magazine. It is highly regarded by a considerable body of readers, who consider it extremely useful.
 6. While the Editors consider the lack of treatment of labor questions as the magazine's single most glaring weakness, no more than half a dozen of the replies called attention to this in any way. This indicates that comparatively few of those who replied are closely concerned with trade-union questions.
- A detailed summary of the replies is available in mimeographed form and will be sent to any reader requesting it.

THREE RECENT TITLES

DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

A Symposium, edited by Herbert Aptheker

Paperback \$.75

Studies in the ideology, politics and economics of disarmament in the U.S.A. presented in the form of papers offered at a symposium under the sponsorship of the Faculty of Social Science by such distinguished Marxist economists as James S. Allen, Robert W. Dunn, Hyman Lumer, Victor Perlo and others. A New Century title.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: 1763-1783

By Herbert Aptheker

Price \$3.50

Was the American Revolution really a REVOLUTION? What were its sources? Did class divisions within the colonies determine its nature? How were Tories and traitors treated by the military? 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

Surveys four centuries of music, the great 19th century composers such as Smetana, Dvorak, Tchaikovsky, and Rimsky-Korsakov, the masters who wrote during the period of the rise of modern nations, such as Vivaldi, Handel and Bach, the classic era of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, the romantic composers like Schuman, Chopin, Berlioz, Wagner and Brahms, the moderns, like Debussy, Mahler, Stravinsky and others, American jazz, contemporary Soviet music and other musical developments. An International book.

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York 3

75

ent
m-
by
art
ary

.50

ere
its
y?
le?
ysis

.00

sers
the
ons,
art,
han,
assy,
So-
ook.
k 3