

political affairs

JULY 1954 • 25 CENTS

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
C.P.U.S.A.

ELIZABETH GURLEY
FLYNN

HERBERT APTHEKER

RICHARD WALKER

DOXEY A. WILKERSON

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

DAVID GOLDWAY

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
C.P. OF BRAZIL

[1] Hands Off Guatemala!

[4] Freedom for Eugene Dennis and
the Battle for Democracy

[10] The Declaration of Independence

[23] The Geneva Conference

[29] The Fight to Abolish Segregated
Schools

[44] On Spontaneity in Labor's Fight
for Peace

[50] Can An Economic Crisis Be
Prevented?

[54] Draft Program of the Communist
Party of Brazil

GREETINGS, COMRADE GENE, ON YOUR 50th BIRTHDAY!
(August 10, 1954)



EUGENE DENNIS
General Secretary
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

Vol. XXXIII, No. 7

JULY, 1954

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Hands Off Guatemala!

By National Committee, CPUSA

On June 23, 1954, the National Committee of the Communist Party issued the following statement, signed by William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Pettis Perry:

THE BRUTAL INVASION of democratic Guatemala by hirelings of the United Fruit Company is a crime not alone against the Guatemalan people, but against the American people and all mankind. This unprovoked attack against Guatemala brings war directly into the Western hemisphere, threatening to create a new Korea or Indo-China right at our very doorstep.

Millions in every Latin-American country condemn this invasion as instigated by the Eisenhower-Dulles State Department. They see it as an immediate threat to their own national sovereignty and struggle for freedom. The Chambers of Deputies of Uruguay and Chile have denounced this aggression. Great protest demonstrations are sweeping Mexico, Cuba, Panama, Chile, Ar-

gentina and other Latin-American countries. Throughout the world, public opinion is outraged. Opposition to the war-inciting policy of U.S. imperialism is growing everywhere.

Let there be no mistake about it; this is no "revolt of Guatemalans" against their government, as our State Department pretends. On the contrary because the plotters could not turn the Guatemalan people against their democratic government they organized their attack from foreign territory, from Honduras and Nicaragua, with arms only recently shipped to those countries by our own government.

Why this fascist attack on a peaceful nation of 3,000,000? It has the same purpose that Hitler and Mussolini had when they set off the Franco rebellion in Spain in 1936.

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: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Acting in the interests of the United Fruit Company, the Eisenhower-Dulles Administration wants to overthrow by force and violence a legal, democratically elected government. It wants to replace it with a stooge dictatorship of the kind that has been imposed on the peoples of Nicaragua, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela and other Latin-American countries.

This is part of the Eisenhower-Dulles "liberation" policy of fomenting war or rebellions against every government that refuses to take orders from the State Department. Under the pretense of "liberation," and in the interest of the powerful Wall Street corporations, Eisenhower and Dulles tried to send American G.I.'s to die in Indo-China. Only the tremendous protests of our people and the peoples of other lands have so far blocked this interventionist plot.

Now they have concocted an invasion to "liberate" Guatemala from the Guatemalans. Will it end by their trying to send American G.I.'s to die for United Fruit?

The overthrow of the constitutional government of Guatemala would lead to a United Fruit dictatorship—a dictatorship which the Guatemalans threw out in their democratic revolution of October 1944. To restore United Fruit domination would mean:

1. Wiping out free trade unions, the right to bargain collectively and strike, and the social security system—gains won by the Guatemalan workers under their democratic

government.

2. Destroying the great agrarian reform program of President Jacobo Arbenz, which is giving land to hundreds of thousands of farmers and agricultural workers.

3. Blotting out Guatemala's democratic regime and civil liberties and McCarthyizing the country under a terrorist Franco-type dictatorship.

4. Crushing the Guatemalan people's movement for liberation from the Wall Street trusts—a movement that is inspiring other Latin-American peoples struggling to free themselves from the imperialist robber barons who pay starvation wages and plunder their countries.

Behind the assault on Guatemala lies the basic aim of making Latin America safe for Wall Street domination and geared to Wall Street's war program. This is why the State Department has for months organized threats and provocations against Guatemala in preparation for the present armed invasion. This is why the State Department, defying international law, imposed a unilateral arms embargo on Guatemala, signed military pacts with Nicaragua and Honduras, and rushed large arms shipments to those countries.

All this is being done under the pretext of combatting "international Communism." The Big Lie of the "Communist menace" is used to justify this criminal assault on a democratic neighbor.

"Communism" is a fake issue in Guatemala, as it was in Spain in the thirties, as it is today in Indo-China,

and everywhere else. The Guatemalan Communists are part of a four-party coalition actively supporting Guatemala's New Deal-reforms that are raising living standards, developing industry, curtailing foreign control, and seeking to lift the country out of semi-feudal backwardness and grinding poverty.

The fact is that Eisenhower and Dulles have thrown overboard the last vestiges of the Roosevelt "good-neighbor" policy. At the behest of the Big Money, they have again taken up the Big Stick which Wall Street imperialism used against the Latin-American peoples in the first third of the century.

Millions of Americans can recall that shameful period when U.S. troops were sent to fight and suppress the peoples of Mexico, Nicaragua, Cuba, Honduras, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Panama and other countries. The American people are traditionally opposed to the flag following the dollar. Shall we today permit the name of America to be dishonored by an act that violates every principle of morality and threatens the peace of the Americas?

Emil Mazey, Secretary-Treasurer of the C.I.O. United Automobile Workers, expressed the best interests of our country, when, in a speech to the Michigan C.I.O. Convention, he warned we were "supporting the wrong people" in Guatemala. In their own interest the people of the United States and especially the organized workers, the Negro people and the farming masses, must speak

up before the war against Guatemala becomes another Spain or Korea. The would-be union-busters and hate-mongers in Guatemala are aiming at us too.

The time to act is NOW. The policies of the big trusts and their Washington government are reaping a whirlwind of hatred and resistance throughout the world. Will the American people stand aside and permit the Hessian bands of our ruling class to drown in blood the young democratic republic of Guatemala?

We appeal to all patriotic Americans to urge the United Nations Security Council to follow up its resolution calling for an end of "any action likely to cause bloodshed" with concrete measures to halt this unprovoked gangster assault on a member nation. Let trade unions and other organizations send protests and resolutions to the White House and the U.N.! Organize delegations to members of Congress and candidates of all parties. Hold meetings and demonstrations. Flood the White House with demands that the U.N. resolution be implemented by banning all arms shipments to the aggressors. Demand that Eisenhower lift the embargo against Guatemala and end the attempt to browbeat that nation into submission.

Let the entire country, from New York to San Francisco, from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, ring with the cry: *Stop the United Fruit War Against Guatemala! Keep War Out of the Americas; Hands Off Guatemala!*

Freedom for Eugene Dennis and the Battle for Democracy

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

THE READERS of this magazine do not need to be told *who* Eugene Dennis is. But sometimes all of us need to remind ourselves *where* Eugene Dennis is. The General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., is in a prison cell and he has been there for a long time. Eight other members of the National Committee are also in prison—John Gates, Robert Thompson, Jack Stachel, John Williamson, Carl Winter, Benjamin J. Davis, Gus Hall and Irving Potash. The political significance of this goes far beyond the fate of nine individuals. It marks the time of day politically in our country, the swift advance of reaction. Eugene Dennis well described it in his opening address at the Foley Square trial as *"the consequences of an American Reichstag Fire Trial and an American version of the Japanese system of punishing those who are alleged to hold 'dangerous thoughts'."*

A frightful wave of repression has been unleashed in our country in the wake of this first onslaught on the Bill of Rights—the imprisonment of the leaders of an American working-class party of Socialism.

Negroes, teachers, labor leaders, scientists, government employees, have all felt the lash of reaction. The imprisonment of Dennis is comparable to the imprisonment of Thaelmann, Dimitroff, Rakosi, Togliatti—in fascist countries; and of the persecution of Thorez, Peri, Fuchik, and other heroic figures in the formerly occupied countries. In time, in those places, even the most backward in the population, if they loved their country and their freedom, rejected the Axis-inspired "Big Lie" against the Communists and came to realize that they were among the foremost and bravest defenders of their countries and people.

August 10, 1954, will mark the fiftieth birthday of Eugene Dennis, son of the American working class, born in Seattle, Washington, of Irish-Norwegian parentage. It will be the fourth birthday he has spent locked up in a crowded cell with seven other men (one of them insane), within the grim walls of the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta, Georgia. Eugene Dennis correctly described himself in a farewell address as *"a prisoner of war, a prisoner of Wall Street's cold war."*

He is a political prisoner, as are his comrades, his voice silenced, his pen stilled, his reading matter censored, his letters limited to his family, with punishment threatened if any portion of them is published or read at a public gathering.

The prison is old and overcrowded. Over thirty years ago it held the immortal Socialist leader, Eugene V. Debs, also a prisoner for his devotion to the principles of peace and international working class solidarity during World War I. The status of political prisoner is not recognized in this country. In fact, writing, reading and visiting privileges even with lawyers, the attaining of good time and dormitory privileges accorded to the ordinary prisoner are denied to the political prisoners. Eugene Dennis has twice undergone major operations within prison walls, denied consultation with his own doctor, forced to recuperate in a prison hospital where there are no trained nurses to render post-operative care. But our Comrade Eugene Dennis stands erect and fearless inside of prison walls, where he has fought valiantly to maintain the rights and privileges accorded to others and due to him and all political prisoners. Benjamin J. Davis, great Negro and Communist leader, twice elected to the N.Y. City Council, is confined in a Federal Penitentiary at Terre Haute, Indiana, where he has likewise fearlessly and valiantly challenged the legality of the Jim Crow system of segregation

and discrimination practised against Negroes in Federal prisons.

Before Eugene Dennis was taken handcuffed in a prison van to Atlanta, he had spent yet another birthday in the Federal House of Detention in New York City for "challenging the Un-Americans," in refusing to appear in April, 1947, before the witchhunt being conducted by the so-called Committee on Un-American Activity then chaired by Parnell Thomas, since jailed for his crookedness. He characterized the Committee's action as *"a wanton disregard of the Constitution"* and its existence as illegal. In particular he disputed the lawfulness of a seat in Congress and therefore of membership in this committee by John E. Rankin of Mississippi, as a violation of the 14th Amendment. He pointed out that the 550,000 eligible Negro citizens of Mississippi were kept from voting by pre-election threats of murder and by other illegal devices. In his statement to Judge Pine before sentence on July 8, 1947, he branded this committee as "in contempt." He denounced it as having "arrogated to itself repressive powers specially forbidden by the Bill of Rights." It was at this time, too, that he made his truly historic declaration: *"My liberty as an individual is, of course, dear to me. But more dear to me is the liberty of the whole American people."* As an American and a Communist, Eugene Dennis has fought fascism in this spirit, at all

times and in all places.

Birthdays, especially a fiftieth, are usually social and personal events, important to families and friends, who surround the loved one and rejoice on the festive occasion. But with Eugene Dennis it will be only another somber milestone marking the passing of over four years—sterile and frustrating years, cut off from family, friends and normal activities. It will mark over four years taken out of a fruitful and useful political life. These years are not only a loss to Eugene Dennis, to his wife and son, and to all of us who love him and cherish his comradeship. They are a loss to the whole American people, who are of course not yet aware of it, but who are increasingly fearful of their own loss of liberty. In the many wise and warning words spoken and written by Eugene Dennis from the end of the war in 1945, to the day the prison gates closed behind him (published in the volume *Ideas They Cannot Jail*) is the essence of what the Government calls “the conspiracy.” The real crime of Eugene Dennis and his comrades is loyalty to the American working class and to the ideals of peace and democracy. All else is a subterfuge, a camouflage, a fraud, a fake, a frame-up. The Bill of Rights was the prisoner in the dock at Foley Square.

In November, 1945, before the ashes of World War II were cold, Comrade Dennis spoke prophetic words, at a meeting of the National

Committee of the Communist Party, on the dangers inherent in American imperialism’s drive for world domination. He spoke of “*America at the Cross Roads*,” and said:

To carry out its program of “power politics” and imperialist aggrandizement, as well as its general anti-Soviet orientation, the American government is building a colossal military machine. It is delaying mobilization, pressing for universal military conscription, and building up an enormous air power and a three-ocean Navy. As if to emphasize its aggressive intentions, the government seeks to intimidate the world by brandishing a so-called secret weapon, a weapon for offense and aggression—the destructive power of the atomic bomb. And, more and more, the intimidation and brandishing are taking on an anti-Soviet tone and direction.

This—the Administration’s program—is an imperialist program which, if unchecked, can only have the most dangerous consequences for America and its people and for the peace of the world. For this is a program leading to the growth of reaction in the United States, to imperialist adventures, to anti-Soviet incitements, and toward the outbreak of a new world war.

The “conspiracy” continued in his report to the National Committee in February, 1946, on “What America Faces—The New War Danger and the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Economic Security.” Again in December, 1946, he reported on “The People Against the Trusts,” and in February, 1948, his report

dealt with “The Third Party and the 1948 Elections,” which spelled out the increased danger of fascism, of war and the need for a growing people’s resistance. Immediately after the arrest of the twelve members of the National Committee on July 20, 1948, Eugene Dennis made a speech to a capacity audience in Madison Square Garden, which was published and distributed in a million copies as *Eugene Dennis Indicts the Wall Street Conspirators*. This was followed by his report to the 1948 convention of the Communist Party on *The Fascist Danger and How to Combat It*.

In September, 1948, he spoke again at Madison Square Garden on the 29th anniversary of the Communist Party, on “Dangerous Thoughts,” which he defined as a belief that world peace is possible, war is not inevitable, fascism can be defeated and a people’s political coalition can end the two-party system and curb the trusts. He said then:

We will spare no sacrifice to save the American workers and people from the horrors of fascism and imperialist war. We will work with all who are willing to work to stop the fascists and the warmongers, regardless of differences in views on the shape of the future. . . . No matter what trials and tribulations may lie ahead, the people are going to come out first! They—we—are going to win!

In acting as his own counsel during the Foley Square trial in 1949, Eugene Dennis did not attempt to

be a lawyer. Rather he adopted a militant tradition established by Debs, Ruthenberg, Larkin, Dimitroff, and others, in order to present the real political issues of the trial and to refute what he called “the Goebbels-like charge contained in the indictment,” namely, that the teaching of Marxism-Leninism constitutes a criminal conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. In both his opening and summation statements, in spite of jeering and scornful interruptions by Judge Medina, he did a magnificent job of defending the Communist Party against the lies, slanders and distortions of stool-pigeons, renegades, and F.B.I. planted agents. The present timeliness of all that Eugene Dennis wrote or spoke cannot be exaggerated. We should bring his messages to the American workers and people, who can far better understand them today, in the light of everything that has happened in the last few years. There has been the rise of a brutal and obscene McCarthyism, menacingly reminiscent of the rise of Hitlerism. There have been attacks on the rights of labor, through the Taft-Hartley and McCarran-Walter acts, new witchhunts on a national and state scale, and the spreading dragnet of the Smith Act which has now extended over eleven cities, involving over a hundred men and women. The Vinson decision in 1951 gave the sanction of the Supreme Court to this onslaught on political

and labor rights in our country. Recently six Boston people, including Otis Hood and Ann Burlak, were arrested under an old-time Sedition Act. A picture in a Boston paper showed the chairman of the Communist Party in Massachusetts, in a jail cell, with his confiscated books stacked up around him. *Books in prison*—in the cultural city of Boston, sometimes called the “Athens of America,” is a significant indication of how far our country has travelled down the road of fascism, since the end of World War II. But on the other hand, there is a rising resistance everywhere among honest people in our country to the threat of war, to the economic crisis that threatens them, to anti-democratic practices, to repressive legislation, to the hand of American imperialism raised against the peace and well-being of the whole world. Now is the appropriate time to build a movement for Amnesty in our country for men like Eugene Dennis who saw so clearly these dangers ahead.

There is one further aspect of the situation of these imprisoned Communist leaders that should cause grave concern. There is no guarantee that when next March comes around and Eugene Dennis and six of his comrades who will have served their sentences are due to be released, that the prison doors will open. There are deportation orders hanging over Stachel, Potash and Williamson. There are always dangers of frame-up inside of prisons.

There is a so-called “short indictment,” charging individual membership in the Communist Party—under the Smith Act, still pending against the first eleven Smith Act defendants. A recent persistent attempt of the Government to force Comrade Foster to stand trial under this indictment failed only when the Government-appointed doctors reported again that he was too ill to face it. By next March the decision in the Court of Appeals of the Communist Party against the ruling of the Subversive Activities Control Board, under the police-state McCarran Act, is likely to come down.

The future liberty of Eugene Dennis and his comrades and of all others to follow them, depends upon the building of a mighty movement of protest against and resistance to all forms of reaction and repression and in defense of the Bill of Rights. All else is either wishful thinking or shirking our responsibility to free these imprisoned leaders. No Communist Party in the world would accept without a tremendous effort to reach the people the incarceration of its leadership, nor should we, American Communists. We have been painfully slow, but it is not too late. In fact, if we do not move to help build a real amnesty movement, the consequences to our comrades may be a prolonged and indefinite stay behind prison bars.

The National Committee of the

Communist Party, for all these reasons, has issued a call (published in the June issue of *Political Affairs*) to all Communists and other fighters for peace and democracy “to begin now—today—preparations that will make the forthcoming birthday anniversary of Eugene Dennis meaningful for our country and the world,” “to raise in a new way the slogan of Amnesty.” The country should and can ring with the slogan, “Free Eugene Dennis and All Political Prisoners.” Inherent in this is the demand that the Supreme Court take a second look at the Smith Act and at its train of evil consequences, that its members examine the frame-up system of stacked juries, informer witnesses (some already exposed as perjurers), the insufficiency of any real evidence, the lack of any criminal intent, the conduct of trial judges, the poisoning of the atmosphere by F.B.I. releases, etc. Inherent in this call for Amnesty is the demand for the end of thought-control and the restoration of the Bill of Rights—by the release of all those in prison and the

cessation of further prosecutions. The “calmer times, when present pressures, passions and fears subside,” spoken of by Justice Black, can be now.

This movement, as suggested by the National Committee, should be one to reach those millions of Americans who have recently “gained new insight into the sinister threat of McCarthyism” and are beginning “to sense that the Communist conspiracy is a hoax, and that Gene Dennis and the Smith Act defendants were framed.” In one of his last public speeches Eugene Dennis warned against a “go it alone” attitude and stressed the imperative urgency of a mass movement. Let us work to make his 50th birthday a memorable occasion, end all moods of pessimism and fatalism, and with the strong and serene confidence in the people which animates Eugene Dennis, go forth to reach these millions of honest Americans—who love their country and their liberty, a liberty which is bound up with the liberty of Eugene Dennis.

The Declaration of Independence

By Herbert Aptheker

THE LEGISLATURE of Virginia discovered this year that the business of the State was interfered with excessively because of a large number of official holidays. It was noted that the birthdays of two sons of Virginia were state holidays—those of Thomas Jefferson and Robert E. Lee—and it was agreed that only one should be so honored. Which was to be retained? There was perfunctory debate; the honorable members quickly agreed to drop Jefferson.

The class which seeks to murder freedom at home and wage war abroad, the class whose morality and perspectives are summed up in the word, McCarthyism, is embarrassed by the memory of our Republic's founder, and charmed by the memory of him who, to perpetuate slavery, led a nearly successful effort to overthrow our Republic by force and violence.

This class, ruling a nation whose sovereignty was won in vindicating the right to self-determination, is now the main bulwark of colonialism and seeks, through corruption and fire, to prevent other peoples from consummating their 1776. In this connection, at the moment, American imperialism's effort to crush the lib-

eration movement in Indo-China immediately comes to mind. It is universally acknowledged that there, as Mark Gayn writes (*The Nation*, June 5, 1954), "in any free election Ho Chi Minh would win by a landslide." So beloved is the man and his cause that even an official of the Bao Dai puppet regime confessed to a *New York Times* reporter (May 9, 1954): "Ho Chi Minh is so greatly revered even on this side that we don't dare attack him in our propaganda."

Admitting of only one answer is the question of this revered leader:*

What would the ancestors of present-day America think, men like Franklin or Jefferson, if they saw American bombers being used to hold back a small nation like ours from gaining our independence?

It is a fact that of 275 descendants of those forefathers, asked (by the *N. Y. Post* and the *Madison Capital Times* back in 1951) to sign their names, as did Franklin and Jefferson, to the opening paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence, not one would do so. They knew the docu-

* Quoted by Joseph Starobin, *Eye-Witness in Indo-China* (Cameron & Kahn, N. Y., 1954), p. 116.

ment's freedom-loving character, and they knew that the Red-baiters, in seeking to suppress the ideas of Marx and Lenin, also aimed at the ideas of Franklin and Jefferson.

Life magazine, editorializing some time ago on the Declaration of Independence, posed as being distressed at the tendency, among high government officials and policy makers, to play it down. Said *Life* (July 7, 1952):

There may be a simple explanation for our soft-pedaling of the Declaration in these years of American leadership: for us to advocate it now entails a new and grave political responsibility for the real consequences, and those are hard to foresee.

Mr. Luce's penman was disingenuous. It is not leadership which induces the soft-pedaling; it is the aims of the leadership, conflicting with the aims of the Declaration, which induce the soft-pedaling. It is because, as the same pen wrote in opening the editorial: "Jefferson's picture still vies with Lenin's in 'backward' young countries like Indonesia. . . ." "Vies"? No; the pictures hang side-by-side for they complement each other—one the incarnation of 18th century anti-feudalism and anti-colonialism, the other the incarnation of 20th century anti-capitalism and anti-imperialism. One is the exemplar of bourgeois democracy; the other, of proletarian democracy. And these are ideologically and historically related—dialectically, not for-

mally—the latter carrying forward and transforming the former, realizing on the basis of the historically higher economic foundation the higher, Socialist, level of democracy. Wrote Lenin:*

. . . just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy.

As the imperialists would prevent new declarations of independence by suppressing present-day liberation efforts, so increasingly their historians would emasculate our Declaration of Independence by denying—somewhat retroactively—the existence of the American Revolution.

This is a theme, for example, of Professor Russell Kirk's widely-heralded *The Conservative Mind* (Chicago, 1953) and it is expressed at greater length in Professor Daniel J. Boorstin's *The Genius of American Politics* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953). The latter finds "the most obvious peculiarity of our Revolution" to have been that "it was hardly a revolution at all." The events mistakenly thought of by George Washington and George III as a revolution were really only a "conservative colonial rebellion." Actually, it was "Parliament that had been revolutionary, by exercising a power for

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, XIX, p. 48 (International Publishers, 1942). This was written in March, 1916.

which there was no warrant in English constitutional precedent." The colonists "were fighting not so much to establish new rights as to preserve old ones." No one, then, need be surprised to learn that Professor Boorstin finds the Declaration of Independence to have had a "conservative character."

In the course of our analysis we shall deal with these interesting views.

* * *

What is the meaning of the Declaration of Independence? What are its lessons for today?

Well known is Lenin's characterization of the American Revolution, in his *Letter to American Workers*, written in 1918 in an effort to explain to our working class the nature of the October Socialist Revolution: "The history of modern civilized America opens with one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars of which there have been so few. . . ."

The Declaration of Independence expressed the soul of that Revolution and was itself a mighty weapon for its consummation. There are three main streams whose convergence produces that revolution. They sparkle through the lines of Jefferson's "passionate chant of human freedom."*

These three streams—interrelated and interpenetrating—are: First, the development of a new nationality,

the American, as the result of the colonists' far-flung separation from the imperial power, their life in a new land with different climate, fauna, flora, their representing a new people derived from the blending of a score of peoples, their developing their own history, their own economy, their own common language, the beginnings of their own cultural expressions and their own mode of responding to their environment—their own psychology.

Second, with the planting of the colonies were planted the seeds of the revolution, for the interests of the rulers of the colonizing power and of the colonists were contradictory and antagonistic. The relationship was that of exploiter and exploited, of dominant and subordinate. There remained only the necessity for the growth in the numbers and strength of the subordinate, the repressed, and the development of a revolutionary consciousness, for the subordination and repression to become more and more onerous and more and more intolerable.

This manifested itself especially in the development of a colonial bourgeoisie—becoming ever more articulate, organized and politically mature—which found increasingly insufferable and therefore unjust the British ruling class' insistence on crippling their development, hampering their trade, taxing their industry, and keeping them from controlling their own immediate market, not to speak of expanding that market or moving out into other areas of trade and

profit. This bourgeoisie, young and vigorous, still having before it a century of growth and creativity, had requirements and developed a program consonant with resistance to tyranny, and with the needs of the developing nation. Therefore it could and did offer leadership in the struggle to realize that nation's independence.

Third, the colonies were class societies and, hence, *within* them, class struggle was characteristic. There was, then, not only the trans-Atlantic conflict but also the internal conflict: artisan, mechanic, worker against merchant and boss; slave against slave-owner; yeoman against large planter; debtor farmers against wealthy landowners and creditors. These class struggles permeate all of colonial history and always—from Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia in 1676 to the Massachusetts Land War led by Samuel Adams' father in the 1740's—the forces of the King were arrayed on the side of "law and order" (*i.e.*, exploitation and plunder) and served as bulwarks against the urgent demands of the colonial masses. In this sense the civil war aspect of the revolution—the struggle against the home-grown Tories—represented a continuation and a development of earlier internal colonial struggles, just as the trans-Atlantic aspect of the revolution—the struggle against the King and Lord North—represented a continuation and a development of earlier, external colonial struggles. And just as before the Revolution these struggles had been

related, so during the Revolution they were related—indeed, merged.

In this sense, too, one finds not only Patriot and Tory divided, but the revolutionary coalition itself divided. Within that coalition there was a Left, Center and Right, and basic to their differences was exactly the question of independence, of breaking completely from British domination. In the eyes of the Right of the revolutionary coalition such a break meant the loss of a great bulwark of conservatism, of mass exploitation; an impediment of all leveling and democratic aspirations. Hence, there was found resistance and opposition to independence; while, for the contrary reasons, among the Left—speaking as this Left did for the vast majority of the American masses—the urge was for independence. Our history thus demonstrates that from the beginning, from the days of the Revolution, the most devoted patriotism has come from the Left, for it was this Left which was most influential in raising the demand for and in achieving American independence.

Gouverneur Morris of New York put the matter succinctly in a letter of May 20, 1774:

I see, and I see it with fear and trembling, that if the disputes with Britain continue, we shall be under the worst of all possible dominions. We shall be under the domination of a riotous mob [read: the People]. It is to the interest of all men, therefore, to seek for reunion with the parent state.*

* Jared Sparks, *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, I, p. 25.

* Moses Coit Taylor, *The Literary History of the American Revolution* (N. Y., 1897, 2 vols.), I, p. 520.

Morris, in seeking reunion was not, however, seeking subordination, which was the end and the policy of the British government, as it was the purpose of colonization. The same year, surely unbeknown to Morris, the King was writing to his Prime Minister: "The New England governments are in a state of rebellion. Blows must decide whether they are to be subject to this country or independent."**

The King sees no middle way; exploitation is exploitation, and subjection is just that. Reunion on those terms, yes; anything else is rebellion, not reunion. It is this fact and the King's acting on that fact, which defeats the Morris policy, which makes independence indispensable to the American cause and which holds to that cause the Revolutionary coalition.

The colonizing power inhibiting the colonial bourgeoisie and oppressing the colonial masses faces the broadest kind of revolutionary movement. For this bourgeoisie, young and progressive, subordinate and oppressed, leads in the effort to throw off the *common* oppressor and gives voice to ideas and to demands not only special to themselves but also meaningful to all components of the revolutionary coalition. Thus the three streams converge, and, under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, crystallize in revolutionary resistance to imperial domination.

This is the meaning of the colo-

** Letter dated November 18, 1774, quoted by C. P. Nettels in *George Washington and American Independence* (Boston, 1951), p. 24.

nists' repeated demands for the "rights of Englishmen," for the removal of the "new shackles" as Jefferson put it. Explaining the colonists' position, in a letter written in 1786, Jefferson said their demand amounted to this:

Place us in the condition we were when the King came to the throne, let us rest so, and we will be satisfied. This was the ground on which all the states soon found themselves rallied, and that there was no other which could be defended.***

In this sense there is some truth in Professor Boorstin's remark, already cited, that the colonists "were fighting not so much to establish new rights as to preserve old ones." But preserving old rights under new conditions may itself be "subversive," the more so as the preservation of old rights under new conditions requires the creation of new rights.

How patently wrong, then, is Prof. Boorstin when he refers to the British government's exercise of "power for which there was no warrant in English constitutional precedent," as "revolutionary." It was the opposite; it was counter-revolutionary. It was another example of a ruling class grossly violating its own constitutional precedents when those precedents impede the achievement of reactionary ends.

Thus, here, the colonists fight for the "rights of Englishmen," for "no taxation without representation"; and nothing could be a broader de-

*** Jefferson's *Works*, V, 189.

mand or one more embarrassing for the Tory propagandists. What, are we not Englishmen? And are we not, then, entitled to the rights of Englishmen and the protection of the splendid English Constitution?

No, this demand is treason, and you are not to have such rights and it is not for this the Empire exists; it is to enrich the rulers of Britain, not to equalize the condition of his Majesty's subjects. "If their Treason be suffered to take root," read the King's Speech to the House of Peers, Oct. 31, 1776, "much mischief must grow from it, to the safety of my loyal colonies, to the commerce of my Kingdoms, and indeed to the present System of all Europe."*

And the King's Chief Justice, Lord Mansfield, pointed out, further, that these "rights of Englishmen" claimed by these upstart Americans, this "no taxation without representation," might revolutionize British society itself, for there were millions of Englishmen without such rights, who were taxed but not themselves represented. The demand cut not only at the heart of the colonial system but also at the heart of the home oligarchy which fed on and maintained that system. Shall the King take his law from the rabble of Boston and, if so, how restrain the rabble of London?***

The fact is that to obtain "the rights of Englishmen" the colonists

* Quoted by J. H. Hazelton, *The Declaration of Independence* (N. Y., 1906), p. 234.

** See, C. P. Nettels, cited work, pp. 16, 26.

had to cease being Englishmen. Moreover, fighting to secure those rights under the new conditions required fashioning new rights altogether: sever church and state; eliminate punishment for "heretical" opinions; provide for full religious freedom; undo the aristocratic system of education; eliminate entail, primogeniture, and quit rent as feudal anachronisms and favorable devices for the building up of a landholding oligarchy; confiscate the King's estates and forests (and those of his Tory adherents); remove all fetters and restrictions on commerce and industry; smash the King's colonial governmental structure and replace it with revolutionary organs; advance the movement against slavery; repudiate His Majesty's divine authority; derive sovereignty from the people's will and, overall, establish, therefore, a *res publica*, a republic.

Such was the "conservative" American Revolution, helping to uproot, as King George III saw, if modern American bourgeois scholars will not, "the present system of all Europe."

Yet, observe, it is the King who hurls down the gauntlet. The colonists confess and possess no disloyalty to their Monarch, as they understand him and their position with respect to him. In requesting the rights of Englishmen, they act with the greatest respect, with full legality, and with due deference. They threaten no violence. They see justice on their side and appear to assume that the King and his Ministers will see it, too. They are slow to

become disillusioned; they are loath to believe the worst:—the British government will not redress their grievances, will not remove the yoke, will not place all subjects of the Crown upon an equal status. No, the British government will add to the grievances, tighten the yoke, reduce the Americans to subordination. As we have seen, the King has told his Prime Minister, already in 1774, that “blows must decide whether they [the colonists] are to be subject to this country or independent.” Blows in reply to peaceable and respectful petitions follow and those blows help cast the die for independence. It is the British government, the forces of repression and reaction, which first resort to a policy of force and violence. That government, through its navy and its army, seeks forcibly to reduce the Americans to subordination and they, then and only then, resort to arms to defend themselves against this force and violence.

And even yet they do not move for independence. The British government outlaws them, blockades their ports, condemns their ships to instant seizure, promises death to their leaders, burns their towns—first all these things are done before history moves from Lexington in April 1775 to the Declaration of Independence in July, 1776. Truly, as the Declaration says, “all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable” and that governments are not “changed for light and transient causes.” No, indeed, wrote Lenin, in the cited

Letter to American Workers, “we know that revolutions are made neither to order nor by agreement.” Yes, revolutionists from Jefferson to Lenin have known well the idiocy of that police-made fantasy—a conspiratorially-concocted, minority-manuevered “revolution.”

* * *

Americans declare their independence and stake their lives and sacred honors behind the Declaration, but in the larger and truer sense, the peoples of the world stood behind the Declaration as they have been and continue to be influenced and inspired by it. What are the international ramifications of our great Declaration?

First, the document itself is written because, as its first paragraph says, “a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires” that this be done. If the people’s will is to be supreme, then their good will is omnipotent. So, the Declaration is a broadside to humanity appealing for their support.

Now the Congress (that new-fangled, starkly simple word that terrified the monarchs) which adopted this Declaration had all along been sensitive to world public opinion. One of the first acts of the Continental Congress had been to appoint a Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose main task was to send agents everywhere explaining the justice of the American cause. (This Committee is the direct ancestor of the Department of State, an embarrassingly seditious background for

Mr. Dulles’ bailiwick!) And these agents had had notable success in Canada, in the West Indies, in Ireland, in Europe, in England itself. Indeed the British Navy was hard put to it to keep Jamaica, Bermuda, Barbados and the Bahamas from joining the Thirteen, and the cream of the British army was needed during the American Revolution to maintain benign domination in Ireland,* while in England itself there were repeated mass demonstrations on behalf of the Americans—and British freedom.

In France, as is well known, popular support for the American cause merged nicely with the French King’s joy at the tribulations of his English enemy. And it is French willingness actively to support the colonial cause—if that cause encompassed independence, *i.e.*, separation from England—which in turn helped induce Congressional approval of independence.

Without international support the Revolution would not have succeeded—certainly not when it did—and those signing the Declaration of Independence might well have signed themselves onto the gallows rather than into immortality. It is only fitting then that this Revolution had colossal impact, in its success, upon the world, and the men from a dozen countries who participated in it—from Haitians to Hessians, from Poles to Frenchmen—helped carry with them the seeds of

* By 1783, Britain, in the Renunciation Act, admitted the claim of the Irish people to be bound only by their own courts and laws.

liberty, equality and the pursuit of happiness. International solidarity is basic to the conduct, success and impact of our Revolution.

Internationalism is central also to the origins of the Declaration’s ideas. The 33-year-old Virginian, creating his exquisite and electric sentences (in a room rented from a bricklayer whose father had come from Germany) was distilling and shaping humanist and libertarian arguments from ancient Greece and Rome, from the Irish revolutionist, Charles Lucas, from the Italian economist, Beccaria, from the Swiss philosopher, Vattel, and his compatriot, Burlamaqui, from the German jurist, Pufendorf, from the Frenchmen, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, from the Englishmen, Milton, Sidney, Harrington, Locke, Priestley and from Americans, too, like Jonathan Mayhew and John Wise. He was, indeed, moved and shaped, by the whole magnificent Age of Reason with its titans who struggled against dogma and authoritarianism—Bacon, Vesalius, Copernicus, Spinoza. . . . And all of these were products, as they were voices, of the central fact in human history—the struggle against oppression and the dynamic, ever-advancing nature of that struggle. The international sources of the Declaration in no way contradict the national essence of that Declaration. It remains American or, better, therefore, it is American.

With the struggle for the right of self-determination central to the founding of our nation, and with

international solidarity fundamental to the achievement of our independence, how violative of these splendid traditions are the present policies of the American ruling class! How incongruous it is to have the government of the United States as the main bulwark of present-day colonialism and national suppression; to have that government as the center of the war danger, seeking to destroy the independence of the peoples of Indo-China, of Korea, of Guatemala—and of all countries that have taken the path to Socialism! The ruling class pursuing such policies, besmirches the noble heritage of our country, and threatens its best interests, as it threatens the very lives of all of us. The whole tradition of our Revolution and the whole spirit of our Declaration of Independence cry out against this and call for sympathy and encouragement for all liberation efforts and a policy of peace and friendship with all peoples everywhere.

* * *

The three main streams of the American Revolution are merged within its finest expression, the Declaration of Independence. That declaration is expressive of the fact of a new nationality—the American—and of its right to determine its own fate. Thus, when General St. Clair read the Declaration to his troops, on July 28, 1776, he reported that they “manifested their joy with three cheers” and he added:*

* Christopher Ward, *The War of the Revolution* (2 vols., Macmillan, N. Y., 1952), I, p. 389, italics added.

It was remarkably pleasing to see the spirits of the soldiers so raised after all their calamities; the language of every man’s countenance was: *Now we are a people: we have a name among the States of the world.*

The inter-Atlantic aspect of the Revolution and the internal, civil war character of it appear throughout the “facts submitted to a candid world” which make up the major portion of the Declaration’s text. And the development of an equalitarian, democratic public opinion, with powerful organizations mobilizing that opinion, also finds expression in those “facts.”** But they find particular expression in the great second paragraph of that Declaration wherein “self-evident truths” are stated, the true purpose of government affirmed and the right of revolution asserted.

The political theory of the Declaration is intensely democratic and profoundly revolutionary. As Copernicus’ discarding the medieval concept of the qualitative inferiority of the earth’s movements as compared with those of heavenly bodies helped revolutionize astronomy, so Jefferson’s Declaration revolutionized political science by discarding the medieval—feudal—concept of the qualitative inferiority of earthly life as compared with eter-

** It is not possible, within the limits of an article, to examine each of these “facts.” Usually historians have dismissed them as grossly exaggerated and “pure propaganda.” Actually they were, indeed, as the Declaration says, facts. A carefully documented examination of their accuracy forms the main content of Edward Dum-bauld’s *The Declaration of Independence*, Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1950.

nal heavenly bliss. This life on earth, Jefferson held, was not supposed to be a vale of tears and suffering. The meaning of life was not unending pain to be endured meekly in order to get into heaven; and man’s pain was not his cross because of original sin—because man was evil. And governments were not the secular arm of the Lord, as priests were not his ecclesiastical arms.

No; this entire elaborate machine for the justification and perpetuity of the rigidly hierarchical, non-dynamic, severely burdensome feudal order is denied. Men are good, not evil; men are capable of governing themselves well; governments are man-made; the purpose of life is its ennoblement here on earth. The “freedom and happiness of man,” Jefferson wrote to Kosciusko in 1810, are the objects of political organization and indeed “the end of all science, of all human endeavor” (*Works*, XII, 369-70).

Hierarchy is, then, rejected and with it aristocracy and monarchy and the divine right of ruler or rulers. Equality of man replaces it and therefore sovereignty lies with these equals, and it is their will which is divine, if anything is; at any rate it is their will which will be decisive where government seeks their welfare. And this is dynamic, not static. The idea of progress permeates the whole argument, for with man good, with government well provided, surely then, as Jefferson said, his “mind is perfectible to a degree of which we cannot form any concep-

tion,” and they speak falsely who insist “that it is not probable that anything better will be discovered than what was known to our fathers.”*

Hence, too, the right of revolution. For given the above, and the most advanced democratic idea of the time that governments must rest on the consent of the governed, it is clear that where governments oppress, where they do not serve to further happiness, where they stifle and are engines of exploitation, they are unjust; they have then become tyrannical, and acquiescence to tyranny is treason to man. Thus, Jefferson taught, the right of revolution is axiomatic where the will of the people is supreme.

We come, then, to the people’s “unalienable rights,” to that magnificent phrase, crashing through the corridors of history, “arousing men to burst the chains”—as Jefferson himself said**—“Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” And, as we have suggested, it is that “pursuit of happiness” as man’s right, as the just end of government which is the heart of the revolutionary enunciation and one which, by its magnificent, timeless generalization makes the document meaningful and stirring for all time.

That Jefferson chose this expression, rather than the usual Whig, bourgeois-revolutionary one of “Life, Liberty and Property” was deliber-

* Quoted by Julian P. Boyd in his outstanding paper, “Thomas Jefferson and the Police State,” published in *The North Carolina Historical Review*, April, 1948, XXV, p. 247.

** In his last letter, dated June 24, 1826, in Ford ed., *Works*, XII, p. 477.

ate and reflects the advanced position of Jefferson personally and of the revolutionary coalition which adopted it. True it is, as Ralph B. Perry has stated, that:***

Property as an inalienable right is not to be identified with any particular institution of property, such as the private ownership of capital, or the unlimited accumulation of wealth, or the right of inheritance, or the law of contract.

True it is, too, that Jefferson conceived of liberty, in the sense of freedom of speech and press and person, and of the pursuit of happiness, as more elemental, more profound than property rights and this explains the phrase he chose. It is true, too, that Jefferson—while, of course, being historically limited, and in no way favoring, or conceiving of Socialism, but on the contrary assuming private ownership of means of production—was very sensitive to the concentration of property-holding and felt it to be the central threat to democratic rights. He saw “enormous inequality” of property ownership—especially in land—as the cause of “so much misery to the bulk of mankind” that he insisted, “legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property.”*

Yet, Jefferson, representative of the rising bourgeoisie, cannot countenance or see, and the Declaration of Independence does not enunciate, of course, the class concept of the State. In this sense it is philosophically

*** Perry, *Puritanism and Democracy* (N.Y., 1944), p. 448.

idealist, limited—bourgeois. It sees man as such; not men in class society and the state as the political superstructure and the instrument of class domination in the given society.

No, the revolutionary bourgeoisie sees the state, which it is capturing and remolding, as an object in itself, standing above classes. And while its insistence that men create it for their purposes is a qualitative leap beyond the feudal concept, there is still an even greater distance from the bourgeois concept to the scientific, Marxist-Leninist concept of the state.

This supra-class view limits, too, the Declaration's theory of equality, for while this is revolutionary *vis-a-vis* feudal hierarchical notions, it is largely illusory in terms of the material base of bourgeois society, in terms of property and class relationship, in terms of power, all of which considerations are vital to a scientific, real understanding of equality. Stalin's criticism of this bourgeois, idealist conception of equality is exactly to the point. Contrasting the Soviet constitution with bourgeois-democratic instruments, Stalin says of the latter:**

They speak about equality of citizens, but forget that real equality between master and workman, between land-

* Letter dated Oct. 28, 1785, in Ford, ed. *Writings*, XIX, 17-18. In this Jefferson is far advanced over Locke or Adam Smith. See on this, Charles M. Wiltse, *The Jeffersonian Tradition in American Democracy* (Chapel Hill, 1935), pp. 136-39.

** *Stalin on the New Soviet Constitution* (International, 1936), p. 15.

lord and peasant, is impossible if the former enjoy wealth and political weight in society, while the latter are deprived of both; if the former are exploiters and the latter are exploited.

This particular limitation—a limitation of the bourgeoisie even at its finest moment—is strikingly illustrated by the fact that while the Declaration spoke of equality and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, 600,000 American slaves were held to labor under the lash. And, as is well known, a passage in Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration, excoriating the King for encouraging that abomination, the slave trade, was cut out because of the objections of Southern slave-owners and Northern slave-traders. This central failing of the Declaration—and of the American Revolution—reflects the organic connection between the rise of capitalism and the enslavement of the Negro people, as it does the system of capitalism and the ideology and practice of racism. For it is most certainly the presence of racism which helps account for the revolutionists going into battle with the slogan “Liberty or Death” on their banners and over half a million slaves on their fields. That which Engels wrote of the Constitution is pertinent to the Declaration: “It is significant of the specifically bourgeois character of these human rights that the American Constitution, the first to recognize the rights of man, in the same breath confirmed the slavery of the colored races in America. . . .”*

It is further to be noted, as also reflective of the bourgeois limitations of the movement inspiring the Declaration, that when it said “All men are created equal” it did not mean all men and women, and had this been offered for ratification the Document would not have been signed.**

The achievement of full equality and complete liberty is the task of the working class and its allies; it will represent the realization of freedom—not partial, not potential, but full and actual. But this achievement comes as the culmination of the long and painful and magnificent human record of resistance to oppression and the seeking of liberation.

In this great record, a place of honor is held by the American Declaration of Independence. Butt of cynics, yet scourge of tyrants, that Declaration, written in blood, will live so long as humanity survives.

This birth-certificate of our Republic stands in absolute opposition to that travesty upon Americanism which usurps its name, that American brand of fascism—McCarthyism. McCarthyism's contempt for man, its hatred of culture and science, its irrationalism, its cruelty and anti-humanism, its chauvinism, its jingoism, its assault upon elemental democratic rights, all these features of the abomination are directly and exactly

* F. Engels, *Anti-Duebring* (International, 1939), p. 117.

** Abigail Adams wrote to her husband, John—one of the committee of five entrusted with drafting the Declaration: “I cannot say, that I think you are very generous to the ladies; for, whilst you are proclaiming peace and good-will to men, emancipating all nations, you insist upon retaining an absolute power over wives.”

contrary to the whole spirit and content of the great Declaration of Independence. In this sense, McCarthyism is profoundly un-American.

The Declaration stands today, as Lincoln said in 1859 — when a rabid slaveowning class jeered at it as pernicious and false — “a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.” Jefferson spoke truly when he said “that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred.” Today his admonition arms us: “To preserve freedom of the human mind then, and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready to devote itself to martyrdom.”

We Communists will defend the Declaration of Independence even unto the limits set by Thomas Jefferson, and we will continue to call upon the working class and the people as a whole, to rally for this defense. We are confident that such dedication, helping to arouse the

American people to safeguard their most beloved vital document, threatened as it is today by an imperialist ruling class bent on destroying it, will secure our Bill of Rights and make possible further advances in the struggle for democracy, peace, and freedom.

Our Party, standing in the front ranks of fighters against fascism and war, is, as its Draft Program declares, “the inheritor and continuer of the best in American democratic, radical and labor thought and traditions.” It is this which “is the source of its deep and abiding patriotism.” It is this, too, which moves our Party “to proclaim our fraternity with all peoples who have pioneered the new frontiers of human history toward Socialism, with all peoples struggling to achieve their independence and national development.”

In this patriotism and internationalism our Party draws inspiration from, and pays its best tribute to, the American Declaration of Independence.

The Geneva Conference

By Richard Walker

THE FOREIGN MINISTERS' Conference on Far Eastern Questions which began at Geneva on April 26, in accordance with a February 18 decision of the Berlin Conference, is still in progress. Obviously, therefore, a rounded evaluation of this event cannot be given at this time.

However, the conference has already focused attention on new developments as regards salient features of the international situation. It has subjected the foreign policy of the Eisenhower Administration to rigorous exposure. It has underscored the urgency of vigorous new struggles to seize the growing opportunities for achieving peace.

At Berlin, the foreign ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union agreed to convene the Geneva conference to discuss the questions of the unification and establishment of a stable peace in Korea, and, at the instance of France, to seek a peaceable settlement of the eight-year war in Indo-China. The U.S.S.R. proposed at Berlin that the Geneva conference deal also with the general question of measures to relax world tension, and that such interested Asian states as India, Pakistan, Indonesia and Burma be invited. These proposals

were rejected, however, and participation was limited to the Chinese People's Republic and belligerents in the Korean war.

Despite this limited composition, the Geneva conference was welcomed throughout the world. Especially noteworthy was the worldwide interpretation given to the participation of the Chinese People's Republic. Although the United States, joined reluctantly by Britain and France, tried to minimize China's participation for the first time among the Great Powers, it was hailed amongst other peoples as a recognition of China's influence in international affairs.

At the end of seven weeks of discussion on the Korean question, during which the Syngman Rhee and U.S. representatives rejected all proposals for establishing the unity and peace of Korea, the 16 governments which had fought under the United Nations flag broke off the Korean phase of the negotiations. A similar deadlock developed in the negotiations on Indo-China, and the U.S. joined later by Britain, moved to rupture these talks also. But the Laniel Government of France was defeated on the Indo-China issue in the French National Assembly, and a

new government committed to end the war in Indo-China within 30 days won authority on June 18. The new French Premier and Foreign Minister, Radical Socialist Party leader Pierre Mendes-France, forthwith resumed negotiations on an Indo-China settlement.

Up to this point, enough data on the clash of views at Geneva and of other developments bearing on the issues at Geneva had accumulated to permit a number of generalizations.

ANOTHER SET-BACK FOR POLICY OF FORCE

A major feature of the Geneva Conference has been the rebuffs dealt to the Eisenhower Administration's basic foreign policy. The fact that this policy throughout the period preceding and during the conference was based on the approach of negotiating from "positions of strength," and consequently was actually opposed to the achievement of negotiated settlements—this was disclosed by the conference.

Less than two weeks after the Berlin Conference, where this same approach had blocked agreement on the German and Austrian questions, Secretary of State Dulles began efforts to create a situation that would make agreement at Geneva impossible. While repeating the Administration's "new look" threat of "instant, massive retaliation" against non-existent "aggression," Dulles announced on April 5 a plan to organize "united action" as a cover for U.S. intervention in Indo-China. At

the same time, the U.S. sent massive supplies of arms and equipment to the Syngman Rhee regime, and staged military maneuvers with the Rhee troops on the eve of the conference.

The plans of Dulles and the reaction to these plans were set forth in the *New York Times* review of the week of April 11:

Mr. Dulles' proposal for "united action" on Indo-China came in the face of a growing hope in Europe that peace can be negotiated with the Communists in the Geneva Conference on the Far East. . . . The first French and British response to the Dulles proposal was cool. . . . But in London, as in Paris, there was talk of "bad timing" which might prejudice Geneva, and specific criticism of Mr. Dulles on the ground that he was trying to force the Allied hand by announcing in advance a policy not yet agreed upon.

The initial coolness of the French and British response to his proposal for "united action" appeared not to have discouraged Dulles. The U.S. Secretary of State flew to London and Paris to put pressure on his allies. And at a three-power meeting in Paris on April 24, two days before the conference, Dulles indicated U.S. aerial participation in the Indo-China war might be authorized if the British would go along with his "united action" scheme. But the British refused. Subsequently, it has been revealed that this commitment was made in accordance with long-range plans to intervene with atomic weapons in Indo-China. The fact is that

the Eisenhower Administration came close to dragging the United States not only into "another Korea," but, because of the planned use of atomic weapons and their implications, also into war with China and a possible third world war.

Speaking in the French National Assembly on June 9, Mendes-France charged that the Laniel-Bidault Cabinet actually had planned a massive intervention in Indo-China by the United States "at the risk of bringing Communist China in and starting a general war."

"United States intervention," said Mendes-France, "was to have taken place on the request of France April 28. The warships carrying atomic aviation materiel were loaded and en route. President Eisenhower was to have asked Congress April 26 for authorization. Luckily the project for United States intervention was set aside by Britain and by public opinion in the United States."

EXPOSURE OF U.S. POLICY OF INTERVENTION

The principal disputed question in regard to proposals for the unification and peace of Korea concerned the right of the Korean people to settle these problems themselves. Nam Il, Foreign Minister of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, on April 27 proposed a settlement through: (1) election of a national assembly in all-Korean free elections, prepared and supervised by an all-Korean commission to ensure genuine democratic elections free from foreign interference or local terrorism, said commission also to take

immediate steps to develop economic and cultural ties between North and South Korea; (2) withdrawal of all foreign armed forces within six months; (3) a guarantee of peace by the appropriate states most interested in preserving peace in the Far East.

These proposals won support from the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and China. But they were bitterly opposed by the Syngman Rhee spokesman and the U.S. representative.

General Smith advanced the demand for United Nations supervision of elections, which the Rhee representative insisted should be held only in North Korea. This position, as U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister Molotov later pointed out, was an attempt to impose "on the Korean people the unlawful resolution of the United Nations General Assembly adopted on October 7, 1950, when the Korean war was in full swing." This resolution was "an attempt to support the aggressive plans aimed at putting not only South Korea but North Korea as well under the actual control of the armed forces of the United States."

The Administration's cynical effort to manipulate the UN as a tool for carrying through its aims in Korea was also, as Molotov said, "motivated by a desire to defend in Asia the outworn privileges of non-Asian states with which the peoples of Asia do not now want to reconcile themselves."

The Administration's policy of in-

tervention was further exposed in the debates on the Indo-China question. Pham Van Dong, Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, proposed on May 10 an eight-point program for the restoration of peace in Indo-China: (1) French recognition of the sovereignty and independence of the three associated states, Viet Nam, Pathet Lao (Laos) and Khmer (Cambodia); (2) withdrawal of all foreign troops; (3) free general elections prepared and supervised by representatives of both sides (people's forces and French puppet forces) in each of the states separately and under conditions of democratic elections; (4) a commitment of Viet Nam to consider entry into the French Union on its own free will, and similar statements by the governments of Pathet Lao and Khmer; (5) recognition by the three states of the economic and cultural interests of France existing in those states; (6) no prosecution of collaborators; (7) mutual war prisoner exchange; (8) a cease-fire, and an end to foreign military aid and personnel.

In respect to Indo-China also, the Eisenhower Administration's representative flatly rejected these proposals and developed the positions that only part of the area of Viet Nam was under consideration; that the questions of Pathet Lao and Khmer should be severed from the Indo-China question; and that an "impartial" truce supervisory commission should be set up. By "impartial" General Smith indicated

what he meant: he denounced the commission which had supervised the truce in Korea and developed the argument that "Communist nations" cannot be neutral.

These arguments were answered by Chou En-lai, Premier and Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China, speaking at the June 9 session of the conference. Attacking the move to separate the three states of Indo-China, Chou said: "If hostilities were to terminate only in one part of Indo-China, with fighting still going on in other parts, not only an early restoration of peace in Indo-China would be impossible, but there would be the constant danger of again spreading the war over the entire territory of Indo-China." He noted that no claim had been made that "capitalist countries" could not be neutral, and defended the composition of the Korean truce supervisory commission.

"It should be pointed out," he said, "that so far there is still no basic change in the policy of the U.S. Government, which is designed to extend the war in Indo-China and to prevent the Geneva Conference from reaching agreement. At the Geneva Conference, the U.S. delegation has adopted an attitude of intransigence and showed distrust of this conference. . . . This policy of the United States is seriously blocking the way to progress of the Geneva Conference."

Subsequently, Chou's position was confirmed by the 16-state declaration breaking off the Korean negotiations, and by the pressure of the U.S. delegation to terminate the Indo-

China talks. At the same time, the State Department had convened military talks of representatives of New Zealand, Australia, Britain and France, excluding the satellite regimes of the Philippines and Thailand. In addition, the State Department maneuvered, through the Thailand representative at the United Nations, to discredit the Geneva conference by bringing the UN into the picture. This move was vetoed by the Soviet Union in the Security Council.

Thus, the Eisenhower Administration persisted in its policy of intervention against the peoples of Asia throughout the conference. The representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the People's Republic of China and the U.S.S.R. offered concession after concession in an effort to reach agreement. But no concession was satisfactory to General Smith.

The rupture of the Korean phase of the negotiations must be seen, therefore, as a certain success for the State Department policy of force and intervention. But this success was far overshadowed by the setback to U.S. imperialist plans for atomic intervention in Indo-China, and by the merciless exposure of the basic policy of the Eisenhower Administration.

FACTORS IN THE DEFEAT OF U.S. IMPERIALIST AIMS

Along with this setback to the war aims of Wall Street imperialism,

the Geneva conference reflected in a dramatic way certain new aspects in the development of a number of powerful world forces.

First, the conference focused attention on the unity of the Asian peoples in resisting imperialist intervention and the war peril to Asia. Significantly, Dulles' efforts to develop "united action" to cover up U.S. intervention in Indo-China was rebuffed by the principal Asian powers. In individual consultations, and in the Colombo meeting of prime ministers, the governments of India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma rejected Dulles' program, demanded a cease-fire in Indo-China, independence for the Indo-China peoples and the withdrawal of foreign troops. Even the satellite government of the Philippines stalled in replying to Dulles' proposal. In addition, India increasingly took the initiative to bolster the prestige of the Geneva conference and facilitate its success in achieving agreement. And it can be said that India's initiative in the struggle for peace, thanks to the national independence movement of the Indian people, will become more influential in the coming period.

Second, the conference reflected the sharp division in the imperialist camp, a division expressing itself in differences over tactics, but stemming basically from the growth of contradictions in the economic and political positions of the three allied partners. It has been noted that British refusal to be drawn into Dulles'

“united action” scheme, that would have scuttled the Geneva conference before it began, was the result of a combination of opposition of the British peace movement, anxiety over the danger of splitting the Commonwealth through the alienation of India, and fear of U.S. imperialist aims against British interests in Burma, Pakistan, Ceylon, Australia and New Zealand. The ouster of the French pro-war Washington-oriented government of Laniel and Bidault, and the installation of a government committed to peace was also the result of a combination of forces: a victory for the French peace movement, and growing anxiety of the French ruling class over the consequences of “internationalizing” the Indo-China war, and over the growing threat of the U.S.-West German menace to French interests in Europe. Laniel’s ouster was also a defeat for the European Army Treaty (E.D.C.)

Finally, the conference, by exposing the policies of the Eisenhower Administration and helping crystallize opposition among the people of the United States to the policy of intervention, has opened more opportunities for the struggle of the American people for peace. The latest setbacks to the Eisenhower program have deepened the confusion and uncertainty in Administration circles. The demand for a re-appraisal of foreign policy is rapidly growing throughout the country.

As Pierre Mendes-France and several U.S. commentators noted, U.S. public opinion played no small part

in defeating Dulles’ scheme for intervention in Indo-China. Such an outpouring of protests and letters against intervention as occurred in April and May was unprecedented. A change from simple protest to open criticism of the Administration’s policies was manifest. The upsurge, moreover, embraced trade-union organizations and leaders, in addition to religious and other people’s groupings. This development has laid solid ground for the further development of the peace movement in the United States.

The task remains one of fighting for abandonment of the policy of force and intervention, and the adoption of a policy of negotiation as *the* means for settling internationally disputed questions. It would be a serious mistake to assume now that the setbacks suffered at Geneva will be accepted by Wall Street imperialism without attempts to reverse them. Already the press reports have indicated new financial pressures are being brought to bear on the French, while the June 25 Eisenhower-Churchill conference was scheduled in order to achieve agreement on tactics so as to overcome this source of Anglo-American disunity, which hampers imperialist designs on Southeast Asia. The keenest vigilance of the American people, and ever-increasing exertions of the peace forces, are required to meet and defeat new attempts to carry out the policy of intervention and force, and to compel the Administration to carry on negotiations.

The Fight to Abolish Segregated Schools

By Doxey A. Wilkerson

WHEN THE Supreme Court of the United States declared unanimously on May 17th that “separate educational facilities are inherently unequal” and that public school segregation “is a denial of the equal protection of the laws,” it struck a mighty blow at the entire system of racial segregation in our country. In destroying the legal validity of segregated schools, it also undermined the “white superiority” rationale for all other forms of anti-Negro discrimination, whether imposed by the state or by custom. Thus, this decision lays the basis for—and will surely help to stimulate—a concerted and powerful assault by the Negro people against the whole rotten structure of Jim Crow oppression.

How does it happen that this momentous democratic victory is won from the High Court of U.S. imperialism precisely when the monopoly ruling class is stepping-up its reactionary drive to fascism and war? Does this decision mean that segregated schools will really be abolished, in fact? Will this decision strengthen the role of the Negro people in the developing coalition for democracy and peace; or will it make them more susceptible to influence

by the demagoguery of the Eisenhower Administration?

The answer to the first question lies in the new high level of development of the Negro people’s movement and its relations to other democratic forces in our country and throughout the world. The answers to the other two questions will be forged in the crucible of struggle which lies ahead; and the role of the Communist Party and of the Left forces it directly influences can do much to guarantee a progressive outcome.

FAR-REACHING IMPLICATIONS OF THE COURT DECISION

The brief filed with the Supreme Court last winter by attorneys for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People declared that “the plain purpose and effect of segregated education is to perpetuate an inferior status for Negroes which is America’s sorry heritage from slavery.”* Thus did these spokesmen for the Negro people correctly pose the segregated schools issue squarely within the framework

* *Brief for Appellants in Nos. 1, 2 and 4 and for Respondents in No. 10 on Reargument, in the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1953, page 17.*

of the broader struggle for full Negro democratic rights. They pointed out that "the primary purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment was to deprive the states of *all* power to perpetuate such a caste system"; and the clear implication of the Court decision upholding their argument is that the Constitution forbids *all legal sanctions* for segregation or other forms of racial discrimination.

This principle, of course, is yet to be translated into practice; and its implementation will require even more powerful struggles than those which led to victory in the courts. But let none underestimate the far-reaching significance of the Supreme Court's ruling in the segregated schools cases; for it is a powerful blow at the main super-structural buttress of the Jim Crow system as a whole.

Historically, it was not as a result of chauvinist attitudes among the Southern white masses, but rather in order to spread and perpetuate white chauvinism, that the post-Reconstruction legislatures made it mandatory for white and Negro children to attend separate schools. They well understood that the impact of school segregation on generation after generation of Southern youth would be to dissipate the Negro-white unity developing during Reconstruction, to drive a powerful ideological wedge between the white and Negro masses, and thus to secure Bourbon dominance as the political guarantee of imperialist super-profits from the South.

Of course, the restored Bourbon lieutenants of monopoly capital did not rely on segregated schools alone to keep the white and Negro masses divided. They erected an imposing edifice of Jim Crow laws—regarding employment, the vote, the courts, housing, transportation, restaurants, theatres, parks, public buildings, etc., as well as schools—and supplemented that with a concerted campaign of white chauvinist propaganda and a prolonged orgy of lynch-terror. Such is the elaborate Jim Crow super-structure maintained in the South to protect Wall Street's multi-billion dollar stake in the oppression of the Negro people. But nothing in this whole set-up has done more to corrupt the Southern white masses with chauvinist poison and to breed hostility between Negro and white than the system of segregated schools.

Consider, concretely, what *full* implementation of the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregated schools would mean in the South. Some 9,000,000 white children and 2,600,000 Negro children now attending segregated elementary and secondary schools would be brought together in the classroom and on the playground. The social content of their courses of study would have to be revised progressively in the light of the new situation. Several hundred thousand white and Negro teachers would be brought into direct association; and their now separate professional organizations would merge for a common approach to their common problems. White and Negro

parents in thousands of communities would begin to work together in the P.T.A.'s. And this process of building Negro-white unity would extend to scores of thousands of youth and their teachers in hundreds of Southern colleges and universities.

The impact of any such development as this would help shatter the whole structure of Jim Crow laws and practices in all fields. White chauvinism is not a "natural" phenomenon; it is learned only if it is taught—and probably no single force is more effective in teaching it than segregation in the schools.

That is why the Dixiecrats are plotting in every possible way to nullify the decision in practice. That is why the Eisenhower Administration may be expected to exploit the Court's ruling to the full in the quest of allies in war and of votes in the '54 elections, while quietly helping to sabotage the principle it proclaims. And that is why the labor-progressive forces of our country must support the Negro people to the hilt in their fight to abolish segregated schools in fact.

Marxists understand, of course, that the full abolition of school segregation in the South will not come through struggles in the social super-structure alone. There will have to be powerful and winning assaults against the material foundations of Jim Crow schools, especially job discrimination in industry, semi-feudal survivals on the land, and ghetto housing. But Marxists also under-

stand that struggles on both these levels interpenetrate, and that the recent Court decision enhances the effectiveness of both.

THE NEW HIGH LEVEL OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE'S DEVELOPMENT

Fifty-eight years ago one Homer Adolphe Plessy appealed to the Supreme Court to reverse on constitutional grounds his conviction for deliberate violation of "The Separate Cars Law" of Louisiana. He was backed by the New Orleans Citizens Committee for Annulment of Act III of the Louisiana Legislature of 1890. The case was argued on April 13, 1896; and on the following May 18th, the Court affirmed Plessy's conviction by a vote of 7 to 1—the only dissent coming from Southern-born Justice John Marshall Harlan. Here was established the legal fraud of "separate but equal," designed to nullify the Fourteenth Amendment and to reconcile the oppression of the Negro people with the Constitution of the United States.

The white chauvinist arrogance of the then ascendant U.S. imperialism—just two years before its colonizing ventures in the Caribbean and the Pacific—is reflected in the Supreme Court's pronouncement that:

Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts or to abolish distinctions based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation. If the civil and

political rights of both races be equal, one cannot be inferior to the other civilly or politically. If one race be inferior to the other socially, the Constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane. . . .

This reactionary decision, clearly reflecting the political climate of the 1890's, remained to thwart all legal assaults against intra-state segregation until only a few weeks ago. In 1927, for example, when the validity of statutes making segregated schools compulsory was brought before the Supreme Court for the first time, Chief Justice Taft, speaking for the Court, refused even to consider the matter.

With how much more deliberation—and with what a changed point of view—did the Court find it necessary to examine the constitutionality of anti-Negro segregation in 1954!

The five segregated schools cases recently decided by the Supreme Court—arising in South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, Kansas and District of Columbia—were first argued in the Court in December 1952. They were restored to the docket for legal briefs and further argument in June 1953. The re-argument took place in December 1953. The unanimous decision was handed down in May 1954. And still more argument, on decrees to implement the decision, is scheduled for the next term of the Court, which begins in October 1954.

Moreover, the Court no longer dares hurl chauvinist insults at the

Negro people. Rather, it declares that "we cannot turn the clock back to 1868, when the [Fourteenth] Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896, when *Plessy v. Ferguson* was written"; and that:

In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

We come then to the question presented: Does segregation in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We think it does.

The explanation of this complete reversal is found in the new high level of development attained by the Negro people's movement and its relations to the forces of democracy and peace in our country and throughout the world.

The Negro people constitute a far more powerful force today than they did in the mid-nineties. By then Reconstruction Democracy had been thoroughly defeated; and Bourbon reaction, newly wedded to the rising U.S. imperialism, was the unquestioned master of the South. Overwhelmingly concentrated on the countryside in the Southern states, the Negro masses were disfranchised, lynched by the thousands, and vir-

tually reenslaved by new versions of the "Black Codes." Moreover, they stood practically alone in the midst of white chauvinist reaction, without any effective allies. *Plessy v. Ferguson* came at the lowest point reached by the Negro liberation movement since the Civil War.

Today the picture is markedly different. There are many great mass organizations of the Negro people, all dedicated to the fight for full democratic rights. Increasingly entrenched in the economic and political life of the country, predominantly urban, the Negro people's movement has been further strengthened by the emergence of a mass industrial proletariat—first established in northern cities during World War I, greatly enlarged and brought into the labor movement during the "New Deal" and World War II, extended increasingly in the South during the post-war years, and now bringing millions of Negro workers into new relations with white workers in the trade-union movement.

Moreover, the tremendous impetus which the anti-Axis war gave to the Negro liberation movement has persisted to the present day. It is reflected in the growing unity of the whole Negro people around increasingly advanced demands—most notably for F.E.P.C. legislation, for the abolition of Jim Crow in the armed services, for the vote and election to public office, and now for the elimination of segregated schools.

In this latter connection, it is important to note that practically the

whole Negro people was mobilized in the fight to outlaw segregated schools. Many thousands of churches, mass fraternal organizations, college fraternities and sororities, business and professional associations of all kinds, social clubs, many other groups and the entire Negro press—all gave political and financial support to the campaign. Every Negro community in the country was involved. Not for many decades has there been such an all-embracing mobilization of the Negro people as in this struggle to eliminate segregated schools.

Another big difference between the mid-nineties and the mid-fifties is that the Negro people no longer stand alone; they have and are developing important allies. The fight to outlaw segregated schools, for example, had the formal backing of A. F. of L. and C.I.O., many national and local unions, the American Jewish Congress, other mass organizations of the Jewish people, and scores of predominantly white professional and community organizations throughout the nation. Such allies are also evident in the universality with which the Court decision is being hailed in the North and West, and by the widespread—perhaps even majority—support it is receiving from labor, church, professional, political and student groups in the South.

Still further, the Negro people's most recent challenge to *Plessy v. Ferguson* came before the Supreme Court at a time when U.S. impe-

rialism was no longer on the way up, as it was 58 years ago. Today, despite its bellicose posture, American imperialism is desperately trying to hold on in the face of formidable opposition and growing challenge from the democratic peace forces throughout the world; and the Negro question is probably the most vulnerable flaw in the ideological armor of the State Department.

The Jim Crow oppression of the Negro people in our country is well known and strongly denounced throughout Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America. It provides dramatic refutation of the "democratic" slogans behind which our war-bound Government tries to mobilize allies for another imperialist war to crush the powerful and growing liberation struggles of colonial and semi-colonial peoples. The peoples of the world distrust and hate the American ruling class more because of its oppression of the Negro people than for any other one reason.

Confronted with the democratic demands of the powerful Negro people's movement and its allies on the home front, and by almost universal condemnation abroad of the white chauvinist oppression of the Negro people in this country, American imperialism was forced to make a big concession in the field of Negro democratic rights—to discard the cherished "separate but equal" doctrine established in *Plessy v. Ferguson*.

The legal issues before the Court were the same in 1954 as in 1896;

but the *political* situation was entirely different. Thus, what the earlier Court could do with arrogance in thirty-six days, the present Court could not do at all. It had to bow to the increased power of the Negro people and their democratic, peace-loving allies in our country and throughout the world. And within the complex of progressive developments responsible for the outlawing of segregated schools, the major cause was the unity and militancy in struggle of the Negro masses and their leaders in the N.A.A.C.P.

THEORETICAL INSIGHTS INTO THE NEGRO LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Analysis of the broad campaign which led to the outlawing of segregated schools offers important theoretical insights into the nature and present stage of development of the Negro people's movement.

First, the fight to abolish segregated schools high-lights the fact that educational inequalities are viewed as a major issue among the Negro people.

The Negro's fight for education began during slavery, in the stealthy efforts of the slaves to learn to read and write despite prohibitive laws carrying stiff penalties. It has grown in breadth and power ever since; and, in both the North and the South, the issue of segregated schools has loomed large in the struggle for equality of educational opportunity.

More than a century ago, for ex-

ample, Negroes in many Northern cities were developing big campaigns to abolish segregated schools. The fight was won in Boston in 1855; and at a dinner celebrating the victory, William C. Nell—leader of the movement—paid special tribute to the role of women in the militant struggle. And, said Nell:

On the morning preceding their advent to the public schools, I saw from my window a boy passing the exclusive [Jim Crow] Smith School (where he had been a pupil) and, raising his hands, he exultingly exclaimed to his companions, "*Good bye forever, colored school! Tomorrow we are like other Boston boys!*"*

The struggle reached a high point in the Southern states right after the Civil War. As Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois points out in *Black Reconstruction in America* (p. 641), there was an "extraordinary mass demand on the part of the black laboring class for education," and this demand "was the effective force for the establishment of the public school in the South on a permanent basis, for all peoples and classes." Many of those early public schools in the Reconstruction South were "mixed schools," where white and Negro children studied together; and Negro leaders held important administrative and supervisory positions in these newly established state systems of public schools.

But this progressive development

* Herbert Aptheker, *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States* (N. Y., 1951), pp. 377-78. Many other documents in this work reflect similar struggles elsewhere.

in the South was destroyed with the restoration of Bourbon dominance in the period of rising imperialism. Racial segregation was decreed as the law of the land; and Negro children were relegated to disgracefully inferior schools which have handicapped several generations of Negro youth. Many hundreds of thousands have had no schools whatever.

A decade-and-a-half-ago I had occasion to make a survey of these Negro separate schools in all of the Southern states. My findings—published in a book recently blacklisted by McCarthyism as "Communistic"—were summarized in these words:*

In general, and especially in rural areas, Negro elementary pupils attend extremely impoverished, small, short-term schools, lacking in transportation service, void of practically every kind of instructional equipment, and staffed by relatively unprepared, overloaded teachers whose compensation does not approximate a subsistence wage. The vast majority of pupils progress through only the primary grades of these schools. . . .

Schools for white children in these states, although far below national standards, were greatly superior to Negro schools in the same communities—and gross disparities between the two exist to this day.

This continuing state of affairs has always been a major issue among the Negro people of the South. As during slavery and Reconstruction, so

* *Special Problems of Negro Education* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939), pp. 151-152.

today, they look upon education as a necessary instrument in the struggle against Jim Crow oppression.

Negroes have fought in all kinds of ways to win decent schools for their children—through petitions, delegations, protest meetings, legislative lobbies, and enormous fund-raising campaigns. During recent decades their emphasis has been on legal action under the leadership of N.A.A.C.P., for “equality of educational opportunity” in the Negro separate school. Moreover, they have won some important victories—in increasing teachers’ salaries, lengthening school terms, extending school plant and equipment, and in winning the right to attend graduate and professional schools in the South.

Thus, the recent and continuing fight to abolish segregated schools climaxes many generations of struggles for educational opportunity. It underscores the fact that the right to education is approached as a basic economic and political question by the Negro people.

Second, the fight to abolish segregated schools emphasizes the key role of the Negro nation in the struggle for Negro liberation.

It is significant that this new high level in the fight for equality of educational opportunity was initiated by Negro working-class and agrarian masses in the Black Belt. It began about four years ago in local struggles for improvement of the woefully inadequate Negro schools in Prince Edward County, Virginia, where Negroes constitute more than half

the population, and in Clarendon County, South Carolina, where Negroes are nearly four-fifths of the total. Frustrated in their efforts to gain substantial improvements in the Negro separate schools, the Negro community raised the demand that their children be allowed to attend the far superior white schools.

In Prince Edward County, for example, the struggle gave rise to a dramatic strike of Negro high school students in Farmville, the county seat. Strike headquarters were established in the basement of the local church. Effectively organized picket-lines closed down the ancient and over-crowded Robert Moton High School. Delegations of students went to the County Superintendent of Schools, demanding immediate guarantees that long-unkept promises to build a new high school be fulfilled. And the adult Negro community expressed full support for the strike at a series of mass meetings in the church.

Whereas Prince Edward County provided only one dilapidated high school for the Negro majority population, there were three fine high schools for the white minority; and this striking contrast intensified the determination of the Negro people to make this a winning fight. In time, getting nowhere with public school authorities, the Negro students and their parents raised the demand that all schools in the County be opened to all students. The strikers refused to return to their classrooms until State officials of the N.A.A.C.P.

were called in and agreed to start legal action to abolish school segregation in the County. The sequel to this and similar struggles elsewhere is the historic victory of May 17th in the Supreme Court.

There is nothing accidental in the fact that the advanced—even “radical”—movement to abolish segregated schools arose within the Negro nation. It is in the Black Belt counties that the most glaring inequalities exist between white and Negro schools—due largely to the general practice of diverting to schools for the white minority most of the per capita money which county authorities get from “state equalization funds” on the basis of the Negro majority population. It is precisely in these areas that the Negro masses feel the deepest resentment over educational discriminations. It is here that they wage the sharpest and most consistent struggles for equality of educational opportunity. And it is but natural that these struggles of the most oppressed, in the territorial area of the Negro nation, should give rise to the most advanced position the Negro people in the South have taken in the fight for educational opportunity since the days of Reconstruction.

Incidentally, this development illustrates a process which future struggles for Negro freedom will repeat over and over again. Fights for limited reforms, initiated among working people in local communities of the Black Belt, will develop into widespread struggles for much more

radical demands, and will win the active support of the entire Negro people. In time, the Negro movement as a whole, its partial and immediate demands thwarted by U.S. imperialism and its Bourbon lackeys in the South, will enter upon the far more fundamental struggles which inhere in its national liberation goals.

Third, the successful struggle to outlaw segregated schools demonstrates both the leading role of Negro workers and the all-class, national character of the Negro liberation movement.

As illustrated in the case of Prince Edward County, Virginia—and as was also true in Clarendon County, South Carolina—the driving force behind this movement was the Negro working class and agrarian masses. It was their pressure, from below, that moved the middle-class leaders of N.A.A.C.P. into struggle for the advanced demands of integrated schools. But it was the able leadership of the N.A.A.C.P. that mobilized the best professional talent in the land for effective argument in the courts, and rallied the whole Negro people, together with their allies, in powerful support.

This relationship of class forces in the Negro movement is at the present time dominant. The Negro workers are now the main dynamic force, ever pressing for new gains in the fight for democratic rights. But we have not reached the stage of working class hegemony over the Negro liberation movement; proletarian leaders are not yet the

chief spokesmen of the Negro people. The Negro middle class, itself a victim of national oppression, is overwhelmingly committed to the fight for Negro democratic rights, despite its vacillations and reformist illusions; and its representatives are the most influential leaders of the Negro working-class masses.

Marxists understand, of course, that the full unity and power of the Negro liberation movement can be achieved only with the leadership of Negro workers. We will do everything we can to strengthen the leading role of Negro workers as the most militant and stable force for progress among the Negro people. At the same time our basic approach to the Negro liberation movement today must proceed from the understanding that all-class, national unity is absolutely essential for success.

Fourth, the struggle to abolish segregated schools illustrates the stake which white workers have in the fight for Negro rights, and the fact that they can be won as allies of the Negro people.

The generally low level of efficiency which characterizes schools for white children in the South—as compared with national standards—is a direct result of segregation in Negro schools. The budgets of southern states are simply incapable of financing two separate systems of schools. Both departments of their “dual school system” necessarily suffer—the Negro, of course, worse than the white.

Thus it is that the Southern white masses seem to be rejecting the Byrnes-Talmadge proposal to circumvent the Court ruling by turning the public schools over to private agencies. Thus it is also that the Georgia Federation of Labor, a number of local trade unions, the Southern Baptist Church Convention, some newspapers, and many professional, student and other groups of Southern whites have spoken up in support of the Court decision. It is quite unlikely that the South will permit the Dixiecrats to dismantle the public school system which the people are eager to have improved; and it is evident that many white Southerners understand that one integrated system of schools can, in time, provide much improved education for white as well as Negro children.

More than this, Jim Crow schools and other forms of racial segregation are a great obstacle to the building of a strong trade-union movement; and it appears that even conservative leaders of labor are beginning to understand this fact. The C.I.O., for example, filed an *amicus* brief with the Supreme Court calling for the outlawing of segregated schools; and more recently it gave \$75,000 from the Philip Murray Memorial Fund to the Educational Equality Fund of the N.A.A.C.P., and another \$25,000 to Howard University. The A. F. of L. formally supported the campaign to outlaw segregated schools; and the Executive Council reacted to the Court de-

cision with a call for the Federal Government to appropriate \$1,000,000,000 to help the Southern states “modernize and democratize their school systems” through “tremendous expansion of inadequate school facilities.” In addition to their specific concern for public education, it is probable that these labor leaders are coming to see how the whole Jim-Crow system weakens the trade-union movement, and also to appreciate the need for developing closer ties with the powerful liberation movement of the Negro people.

Fifth, the struggle to abolish segregated schools demonstrates the importance of the Negro liberation movement as a force for over-all democracy and peace.

McCarthy-fascism and preparations for imperialist war stand in direct conflict with the freedom goals of the Negro people. The recent Court decision was more than a triumph for Negro rights; it was a major victory in the whole broad fight for democracy and peace, in the fight against McCarthyism. This emphasizes the indispensable role of the Negro people's struggle in the whole effort to block war and fascism.

ROLE OF THE LEFT IN THE STRUGGLES WHICH LIE AHEAD

It is a long-standing tactic of the U.S. ruling class to adopt progressive measures in response to democratic pressures of the people, and then to nullify them in practice. The Sherman Anti-Trust Act, for ex-

ample, was not passed to curb the trusts, but to curb the anti-trust movement. The Fourteenth Amendment's suffrage guarantees to the Negro people have long been ignored by our Government; and Comrade Eugene Dennis' effort to invoke them before the un-American Committee landed him in prison for “contempt.” It would be illusory not to expect that the federal courts, Congress and the executive will collaborate with the Dixiecrats in attempting to stymie any genuine implementation of the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregated schools.

The “legal” rationale for such sabotage has already been outlined by a member of the law faculty of the University of Michigan, one Paul G. Kauper. He is said by *The Michigan Journalist* to argue that:

Nothing in the Constitution requires the states or the Federal Government to furnish public education. . . . Hence a state ostensibly could legally quit the field of education by allotting annual subsidies to parents, on condition they see to it that their children are educated, and sell its school properties to private educators who would operate their institutions on a racially segregated basis.

Further, in apparent recognition of the “danger” that the Southern masses will not permit abandonment of public education, the good professor points out:

A state might try to avoid the segregation problem by districting in such a way that Negroes will go to one

school, whites to another. "In the end," he said, "we will have a lot of that anyway," because many children living in Negro districts will continue to go to Negro schools by preference or because of convenience. . . .

The Court did not hold that white and black children must go to school together. . . . If such districting is done (so) it is a normal pattern based on proximity of the children to the schools it will probably be allowed (by the courts).*

The efficacy of Kauper's latter suggestion has been amply demonstrated in many urban communities of Northern states which "prohibit" school segregation by law. In New York City, for example, the Negro population is concentrated in the Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Morrisania and Jamaica areas as a direct result of Jim Crow housing restrictions; and many of the elementary and junior high schools in these areas are quite or almost entirely Negro in composition. Incidentally, much the same is true of schools for Puerto Rican children in the East Harlem ghetto. And so it is with Negro children in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Los Angeles and many other communities with large Negro populations, and with Mexican-American children in the Southwest.

Moreover, these Jim-Crow schools in the North are not solely the result of what New York City Superintendent of Schools William Jansen

seeks to justify as "natural segregation" (*Amsterdam News*, June 5, 1954). Rather, the effects of ghetto housing are aggravated by the deliberate practices of gerrymandering school districts and granting transfers-out to white children living in predominantly Negro districts. We may be sure that the Dixiecrats will seek to avail themselves of these effective techniques by which Northern cities have maintained Jim-Crow schools in spite of legal prohibitions and continual struggle by the Negro people.

Even if the Southern Bourbons are forced to enroll Negro and white children in common schools, they may be expected to resist to the last the integration of Negro and white teachers. For them to concede, in practice, the equality of white and Negro children would, in itself, seriously undermine the premises of white chauvinism; but for them to go farther and concede that *any* Negro could be a *teacher* of a white person—even of white pupils—would be a major blow to their theory of white superiority. Thus, whatever develops regarding children in the schools, we may expect strenuous efforts to keep Negro teachers from instructing white pupils. There is grave danger that in many areas of the South—as in Jeffersonville, Indiana, following the abolition of segregated schools several years ago—the Negro teachers will find themselves without jobs (*The New York Times Magazine*, May 30, 1954).

It is clear that the fight to abolish

segregated schools has only begun. Powerful and sustained people's struggles will be necessary to win progressive implementing decrees from the Supreme Court and actually to eliminate school segregation in the North as well as in the South.

It is also clear that the Negro people are girding for precisely such struggles; they are in no mood for temporizing. In response to the "Atlanta Declaration" issued by Southern Negro leaders at the May 22-23 conference sponsored by the N.A.A.C.P., for example, local delegations throughout the South are calling upon school authorities to take immediate steps to abolish school segregation, without waiting for the Supreme Court's directives some time next year. The slogan, "Integrate Now!", is emblazoned on the front pages of the Negro press; and it correctly reflects the dominant sentiments of the Negro masses and their leaders.

More than this, spokesmen of the Negro people are raising the demand for abolition of all other kinds of racial discrimination. The *Afro-American's* lead editorial on June 5th, for example, hailed the May 24th follow-up decision of the Supreme Court, proscribing segregation in low-rent public housing, city golf courses, municipal parks, public junior colleges and state universities; and then called for a concerted drive to eliminate segregation in public swimming pools, bath houses, drinking fountains, rest room facilities, transportation, voting facilities, ten-

nis courts, baseball and football fields, employment, jails, prisons and houses of correction. "The Supreme Court has assuredly made the job easier," it declared, "but the hard pull still lies ahead. Let's get on with the business."

The Negro people understand the Court decision in the segregated schools cases as a major breakthrough in the whole Jim-Crow system; and they are pressing for new and greater gains. As Comrade Hugh Bradley predicted last fall in *Next Steps in the Struggle for Negro Freedom*: "The next period ahead will witness momentous struggles of the Negro people for the abolition of the Jim-Crow system in the United States."

Victory in the next stages of the fight to abolish segregated schools will require massive support of the Negro people by the progressive white workers of our country, first of all in the trade unions, and especially in the South. Indeed, the whole labor-progressive movement will have to be mobilized in this struggle—including, in addition to the Negro people and the unions, the democratic organizations of tenants, P.T.A.'s and other community groups, churches, professional associations, writers and other artists, peace organizations, fraternal societies, Jewish people's organizations, other national groups, civil rights organizations, the progressive press, and all other sections of the population that can be won in the fight for democracy and peace.

* Reported by Arthur Krock in *The New York Times*, June 18, 1954.

This coalition of democratic forces should demand prompt and full integration of white and Negro schools in the South, and immediate measures to eliminate Jim Crow schools in the North. It should back up the A. F. of L.'s call for a billion-dollar program of federal aid to education to improve school facilities in the Southern states. It should also raise demands for other Negro-rights measures which can be won in the political climate created by the recent Court decisions—notably for an end to segregated housing, for F.E.P.C. legislation on all governmental levels, for fair employment practice clauses in government and trade union contracts, for the freedom of Mrs. Rosa Ingram, for new advances in Negro representation in the fall elections—indeed, all along the line. Candidates for election to public office in 1954 and 1956 should be pressed to declare their stand on these issues. Substantial financial contributions should be made to the Educational Equality Fund of the N.A.A.C.P.

Full and vigorous support of the Negro people's demands by the labor-progressive movement in the period ahead can guarantee the abolition of segregated schools as well as other big gains in the fight for Negro rights. It can also consolidate the Negro-Labor Alliance, and thus greatly strengthen the role of the Negro people as a major force in the over-all struggle for jobs, peace and democracy.

Any such mobilization of the labor-

progressive movement is impossible, however, without the active intervention of the Communist Party and the Left forces it directly influences. Hence, the tremendous opportunities opened up by the recent Supreme Court decisions pose a serious challenge to the vanguard role of the Communists. At the same time they call for self-critical analysis of the reasons our Party remained so largely on the sidelines during the initial stage of the fight to abolish segregated schools.

It is true, of course, that the vanguard role of the Communist Party in many past struggles for Negro rights has contributed markedly to the unity and militancy of the Negro liberation movement, and has helped to win important allies for the Negro people. Further, the struggles of our Party against fascism and war have done much to strengthen the broad people's movement for democracy and peace, and thus to help wrest Negro-rights concessions from our war-bound imperialist government. Even so, the fact remains that, aside from the activities of individual Communists here and there, our Party played no direct role in the fight to outlaw segregated schools. Moreover, if the Communist Party is to play its essential vanguard role in the Negro-rights struggles which lie ahead, we will have to uncover and root out the influences which kept us apart from this most important mass movement of the Negro people in recent decades.

I think we shall find the basic explanation in that general sectarian isolation of our Party from the working class and Negro masses which the Draft Program now under discussion seeks to correct. I think we shall also discover that certain deep-seated ideological weaknesses contributed especially to our isolation from the Jim Crow schools fight. Chief among them are: (1) strong and widespread negative attitudes toward struggles led by the Negro petty bourgeoisie coupled with over-estimation of the present stage in the development of the leading role of Negro workers; (2) underestimation of the political significance of the fight against segregated schools, probably stemming in part from our general tendency to neglect issues in the field of public education; and (3) failure to appreciate the important stakes of the Southern white masses and the labor movement as a whole in the fight to abolish segregated schools, with resultant underestimation of the extent to which they could be won as allies in the struggle.

There are, of course, other factors

—both subjective and objective—and it is extremely important that we examine and correct them all. Full discussion of the fight to abolish segregated schools should be undertaken throughout the Communist Party. Organizational steps should be taken to end the isolation of our Negro cadres from the mass organizations of the Negro people. Concrete programs of action around Jim Crow schools and related issues should be planned and launched in local communities. And our Party should greatly intensify its struggle against white chauvinism—for this remains the chief ideological barrier to full participation of the white working class masses in the fight for Negro democratic rights.

The Draft Program of our Party—*The American Way to Jobs, Peace and Democracy*—declares that “the fight for the liberation of the Negro nation, for the rights of all the Negro people, is an integral part of the fight for democracy, for peace, for the rights and living standards of labor and all the people.” And so it truly is. In the words of the *Afro-Americans*: “Let's get on with the business!”

On Spontaneity in Labor's Fight for Peace

(Draft-Program Discussion)

By William Weinstone

A discussion article on the Draft Program of the Communist Party in the *Daily Worker* of June 8, signed Jim, takes issue with the criticism by Alexander Bittelman, in an earlier discussion article, of the weaknesses of the "anti-depression" programs of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. Bittelman, among other things, wrote that it is a serious defect of the trade-union programs that they do not protest against the war budgets.

Jim finds fault with this, on the grounds that "an active struggle in behalf of the welfare programs put up by the unions objectively undermines the ability of the administration to put across a war budget." He adds:

I share Bittleman's view that there are omissions in the anti-depression programs of the unions. I do not, however, share his tactical approach to these differences. I feel that to adopt his line would place us deep in left field. Life is going to expose and explode some of these contradictions. But only on the basis of honest, militant struggles to achieve those demands which are accurate and meet the needs of the workers.

Jim does not indicate what these

demands should be, but he evidently regards the demand for a fight against the war budget and criticism of the unions for failing to do so as sectarian. He thinks that the welfare program is in reality a better way of fighting against the war program of the government.

In my opinion, Jim is wrong in thinking that this criticism is sectarian. Sectarianism, which is a great danger in our mass work and against which we must ever be on the alert, would in this instance be present if there was a rejection of these programs or a proposal not to fight for them or an insistence that they be fought for only on our own terms. This is not the case here.

Here, it seems to me, we have an example indicating that some of the progressive mass workers—either out of weaknesses in Marxist theory, due to insufficient guidance, or for other reasons—take the line of least resistance and tend to give way to a policy of reliance on spontaneity in their work, as experience in mass work amply testifies. They are evading the issue of peace and hurting the development of a peace movement, which must draw in all peace forces, and particularly

the workers, if it is to be strong, numerous and militant.

Here I must add that the serious backwardness of the organized peace movement in our country stems not from weaknesses of the mass workers alone but stems to a large degree, I think, from the insufficient leadership and struggle of the whole Party and of leadership on all levels—top to bottom—to this central task, a matter deserving the most careful self-examination.

Let us consider Jim's argument. It is simply that large-scale spending for welfare and for warfare do not go together. That is true, but it does not follow that therefore the fight for welfare spending "objectively leads to undermining the ability of the Administration to put across the war budget." The war budget already has been put across. What follows from this truth is that to have the funds for welfare spending it is necessary to cut down spending for war. For this, the workers must be prepared to fight for a reduction in the war budget. But this is not a simple matter. For the workers to fight for this demand they must be convinced that the tremendous war budget is not necessary—that it is harmful. And there's the problem.

The issues of war and peace, it must be remembered, are very complicated, and are not always clear to the average worker because of the bag of lies. The imperialists prepare for war and justify their huge war

budget under the guise of defending the peace and preventing "Soviet aggression." How will the mere fight for a welfare program answer such lies? This must be done consciously by the advanced forces within the unions, by the Party and peace forces outside, who, depending upon the groups they speak to and their level of consciousness, and, of course, in connection with the welfare program and other economic and political needs, must show that the war budget is consuming the wages of the workers, lowering their living standards, enriching the monopolists, helping to speed the economic crisis and, moreover, really threatens war. It must be explained that war is not necessary and is not inevitable and that the Soviet Union advocates peaceful co-existence and does not threaten the security of the United States.

How can the fight for the welfare budget by itself do that? Although addressed to the government and thus having political implications, it is still essentially an economic demand for improvement of the workers' conditions, for increasing employment, etc. Hence, if the welfare budget is to have the effect which Jim desires, he cannot rely on spontaneity, but must tie up this demand with other demands, the fight against the war budget and other war policies of the government.

The "anti-depression" programs of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., which of course must be supported despite

their shortcomings, exclude other peace demands which have a direct bearing on the issue of jobs, such as East-West trade, because of the abject subservience of the Right-wing trade union leaders to the Cold War and the State Department. Shall the failure to include this demand, which is of direct material aid to the workers, also be passed over on the grounds that the existing programs are in reality anti-war programs "objectively"?

Another remark of Jim's which expresses his absorption with "objective" results, which means only one thing — spontaneity — must be mentioned. Acknowledging a criticism of Bittelman's that the anti-depression programs of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. do not demand the curbing of the profits of the monopolists, he contents himself with saying, "if it is a weakness that it is not stated by Meany and Reuther that their objective is to curb monopoly profits, then so much is true. But regardless of their subjective desires, the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. anti-depression programs OBJECTIVELY MOVE THEM IN THAT DIRECTION" (emphasis mine, W. W.).

Aside from overlooking the fact that armaments and the war drive is one of the main sources today of the fabulous profits of the trusts, this statement ignores or plays down the pro-monopoly views, policies and practices of the top trade-union leaders, their role as labor imperialists and their tie-in with Wall Street's

war plans. Their "subjective desires" must not be so lightly dismissed as is done here.

The adoption of the "anti-depression" programs, first advocated by the progressives, despite their limitations, represent not only significant union progress in taking up action for jobs and improved living conditions. They also express on an elementary level the class feelings of the workers to the whole war program of the monopolists. They thus create more favorable possibilities for the fight to curb the monopolists' profits. All that is true.

But it must be remembered that the Meany and Reuthers are old hands at adopting good labor programs and then doing virtually nothing or carrying on only a sham battle for their enactment. In addition, they can be counted on to oppose vigorously any substantial reduction in armaments, as indicated by Reuther's statement to the C.I.O. Job Conference that "it would be a mistake to cut down defense spending" because "Communist tyranny" was "still expanding."

It is clear that if there is to be any effective curbing of the monopolists' profits—if the possibilities are to be turned into realities—it can only occur despite and against the will of the Meany and Reuthers. They will have to be fought every inch of the way not only by pushing for a follow-up on the programs, but also by exposing the harmfulness of the government's war policies, by advo-

cating direct peace demands and by combatting the ideas, maneuvers and policies by which these "labor lieutenants of capital" dilute or demobilize the workers' opposition to the war program. Any other line will avail nothing.

Jim states that he is basically in accord with Bittelman, but thinks that his difference involves only tactics. The tactical execution of policies is a problem of first-rate importance and correct policies can achieve nothing if their tactical execution is faulty. This is deserving of separate discussion. However, here the point is that Jim's article reflects an underestimation of the struggle for peace.

This was dealt with effectively by Comrade Andrew Stevens in his report on *New Opportunities in the fight for Peace and Democracy*. He stated that it is true, "the economic struggle is at the present moment a very direct and important aspect of the fight for peace since it is a struggle against the economic impact of the war economy on the living standards of the workers."

He continued:

"We are opposed to an abstract fight for peace which is projected without a living relationship to the economic needs of the workers. On the other hand the struggle against the economic impact of the war economy will not develop AUTOMATICALLY no matter how militantly it is developed unless such struggles are related, depending on the concrete situation, to the war

policies of the government."

Stevens then added these pertinent remarks:

This does not mean that we should mechanically inject the fight for peace into any and every economic struggle as for example in formulating a set of demands in a given shop or in conducting a specific struggle in a department against the retiming of a certain job. BUT IT DOES MEAN THAT WE SHOULD PUT AN END TO THE TENDENCY TO COUNTERPOSE THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE TO THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AS AN EXCUSE FOR NOT TAKING THE FIGHT FOR PEACE INTO THE SHOPS AND UNIONS. [All emphasis mine, W. W.]

It seems to me that the full significance of Lenin's teachings on the theory of reliance on spontaneity has not been sufficiently grasped by the Party, not only by mass workers but also by political workers. This, in my opinion, has been a long standing weakness of the Party, which accounts to this day in very large measure for underestimating the importance of the Party as vanguard of the working class, of the building of the Party, its press, the spread of Party literature, agitation and propaganda and above all, of defending the Party and working to achieve its leading role in the struggles of the masses. The theory of spontaneity, Stalin said, is the ideological basis of all opportunism—"Left" and Right.

Stalin writes:

The theory of spontaneity is a the-

ory of opportunism, a theory of worshipping the spontaneity of the labor movement, a theory which actually repudiates the leading role of the vanguard of the working class, of the party of the working class.

The theory of worshipping spontaneity is decidedly opposed to the revolutionary character of the working-class movement; it is opposed to the movement taking the line of struggle against the foundations of capitalism; it stands for the idea of the movement proceeding exclusively along the line of "realizable" demands "acceptable" to capitalism; it stands entirely "for the line of least resistance." The theory of spontaneity is the ideology of trade unionism.

Marxism-Leninism, over the period of a hundred years from the days of the Communist Manifesto to the present time has always been the foremost fighter for the organization and building of the unions and for the improvement of the conditions of the working class. Marxism-Leninism has regarded the unions as the most important mass organizations of the workers and has aimed to have them play a role commensurate with their strength and importance not only in the interests of the working class but of all oppressed—the oppressed national groups, the farmers and intellectuals, the youth and women, etc.

It has pointed out, however, that the unions limit their struggles merely to the day-to-day economic questions, and do not use their great power to lift the working class to

higher levels, by developing independent political action in the electoral field and by acting as an independent political force for their own needs and in behalf of all oppressed, fighting for democratic advance and social progress.

But Marxism-Leninism conceived that this development of the working class, of the unions, will not come of itself. It requires the introduction of *class* consciousness which does not arise spontaneously from the day-to-day economic struggles—but is imparted to the working-class movement by the forces that represent the conscious elements in it.

Lenin in his famous work, *What Is To Be Done?* pointed out that the fundamental mistake of the economists, *i.e.*, the reformists, consisted in thinking that class consciousness developed "from within the economic struggles so to speak." This was impossible, he stated, because the economic struggles by themselves are too narrow in that in essence they seek only a higher price for the labor power. They represent, in themselves, no break with the bourgeois system. To develop class political consciousness of the workers, said Lenin, it is necessary, along with giving the greatest attention to the economic struggles, to bring understanding to the workers of the nature of the capitalist system and class forces at work. It is necessary to develop the struggles on the basis of the workers' needs into real united, mili-

tant struggles, economic and political, for their own interests, and in support of the struggles of all the oppressed, for the fight for democracy and freedom. "Working class consciousness," wrote Lenin, "cannot be genuinely political class consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to *all cases* of tyranny, oppression, violence and abuse no matter *what class* is affected."

This means that the working class must become the leading force in the struggles of the people. As Lenin explained it, "As the only consistent revolutionary class of contemporary society it must be the leader—the hegemon in the struggle of the whole people for a complete democratic revolution, in the struggle of all the toilers and exploited against the oppressors and exploited." This idea that the working class must lead in the fight for democracy, peace, etc., that it must act as an independent force, is a basic idea of the Draft Program. For democracy and peace, while of the greatest importance for labor, involves not only the working class but other classes. It is indispensable for its present and future welfare and for the well-being

of the nation that it play this role.

Of course, the working class will not develop its full independent class strength all at once. For this not only education but above all struggles, time and experience are necessary. But at all stages of working-class advance, the activity of the conscious elements, the Communists, the vanguard of the working class, is decisive. Only the vanguard can bring consciousness, clarity and militancy to the working class. To bring this about it is necessary that the Party establish the closest bonds with the working class and its allies as a *first condition* for any effective work. Effective work means the greatest participation in the life and struggles of the masses, aiming to make them play a more independent role in the political life of the nation.

And the struggles that are a key for the development of the strength and consciousness of the working class are those given in the Draft Program. They are the demands for jobs, for democracy, for the rights of the Negro people, linked up with the central task of the day—the fight for peace.

Can An Economic Crisis Be Prevented?

(Draft-Program Discussion)

By David Goldway

THE ANTI-DEPRESSION PROPOSALS in the Draft Program of the Communist Party constitute a signal contribution to the people's fight for jobs, peace and democracy in our country.

The first thing that must be noted about these proposals is that there is an inseparable connection between the five major demands put forward. The first demand (to raise the purchasing power of the people and to curb the power and profits of the trusts) cannot be won unless we carry out the second (spending for human welfare, not warfare). The achievement of these objectives in turn calls for the third demand (to end the "cold war" and promote friendship and trade). And these goals are unthinkable unless we win the fourth demand (to defend and strengthen democracy). Finally, all these have the closest relation to the struggle for the fifth demand (to win equal rights for the Negro people).

The following are a few comments on the anti-depression proposals contained in the Draft Program.

Among many students of political economy there has been considerable discussion of the question of the pos-

sibility of preventing the developing economic crisis. Two tendencies have been expressed. One is to emphasize the *inevitability* of capitalist crisis to the point of throwing cold water on the ameliorative and delaying possibilities which exist. The other is to develop exaggerated notions of what can be done short of Socialism, thereby giving grist to the Keynesian mill of anti-depression panaceas. Both these tendencies are one-sided and therefore not Marxist.

The Draft Program clearly states that only Socialism can eliminate crisis. The proposals it puts forward "cannot do away with the planlessness and recurring economic crises of capitalism." This is so because crisis is inherent in the basic contradiction of capitalism—socialized production and private appropriation.

Yet the fact remains that crisis is not a perpetual feature of capitalism. Crises are periodic; they break out only every so often. Capitalist economic activity has a cyclical pattern, with successive periods of crisis, depression, recovery and boom. The question posed by the Draft Program is not: Can we eliminate crisis? It is: Can we delay its outbreak; can we cushion its blow on the people? In

other words, can we influence the timing and intensity of the cyclical development of capitalism?

The answer the Draft Program gives to these latter questions is: Yes. Certain measures, such as increasing the purchasing power of the people and curbing the profits of the trusts; spending large sums for homes, schools and social welfare; greatly increasing foreign trade and thereby expanding the market for our production—such measures can, in a limited way, influence the pattern of the economic cycle of capitalism. Such measures, while not going to the root of capitalist crisis, can have the effect of staving off capitalism's inevitable plunge into its regular cyclical nose-dive.

How can this be accomplished? First, by increasing mass purchasing power and curbing profits it will be possible to *slow up* (but not eliminate) the growing disparity between the demand for consumer goods and the system's productive capacity. At the same time, such steps could help to eat into the massive inventories that constitute one of the big crisis danger signals.

Even more important in relation to inventories—and the whole question of markets—are the proposals of the Draft Program on East-West trade. Carried out on a large scale, such trade could appreciably influence the "inventory" and "sales" features of the developing crisis.

By themselves, however, such steps can have only very limited effect on the pattern of cyclical crisis. The

heart of the question of crisis is not in the realm of consumption, but in the realm of production. Measures dealing with expanding the *sale* of goods in themselves cannot help. Therefore steps to increase purchasing power and to expand foreign trade must be accompanied by steps in the area of *production*, and more especially in the area of *reproduction* (that is, the replacement and expansion of capital).

The section of the Draft Program dealing with spending for human welfare, not warfare, addresses itself to this problem. It places responsibility on the government for guaranteeing jobs and living standards. It calls for large-scale reconversion of war plants to peace-time uses, suggesting specifically how aircraft factories can be made to produce pre-fab homes on an assembly line basis. It calls for huge spending for schools, hospitals, roads and other public works.

The significance of such proposals is not alone that they provide desperately needed social services on a very considerable scale, but that they also supply the basis for keeping factories running, for building new ones, for employing large numbers of workers, for absorbing substantial sums of investment capital. This kind of capital investment, by the way, will not be made willingly by the monopoly capitalists. It will no doubt be necessary for the government to tax huge chunks of it away from them and then itself invest it in public works.

Several things, however, need to

be pointed out in connection with the struggle to delay the crisis. One is that the steps required for even such temporary influencing of the operation of the capitalist economy, must be of very great magnitude. The capitalist system of the United States today, it must be remembered, is a gigantic economic structure. Moreover, it exists in a capitalist world that is in an advanced stage of general crisis. Petty tinkering, therefore, will have little or no effect. Programs on the level of the Roosevelt New Deal will not be enough. (There is serious question, incidentally, about how much impact the economic measures of the New Deal actually had on the pattern of the economic cycle of the 1930's. Certainly it can be said that the New Deal props were only a secondary feature. The major thing was the movement of the cycle itself.)

Thus what is required if we want to delay crisis is not a few little crumbs for the workers, but *substantial* wage increases, *substantial* tax reductions, *substantial* rises in unemployment and social security benefits. And these must be coupled with *substantial* inroads into the profits of the giant corporations.

Similarly, when we talk about government spending on human welfare, we have to discuss this subject in terms of *billions* of dollars. The housing program, for example, must be projected as the Draft puts it, on the level of 1,500,000 private dwellings a year, not as the Eisenhower Senate does, on the level of 140,000

public units in four years. The same approach is essential for all other proposals for government spending. Only if we have this kind of orientation can we speak of converting "the giant plants which have been erected for the production of planes, tanks, atom and hydrogen bombs for war" to peace-time uses.

Likewise when we talk about East-West trade that "can provide millions of jobs for American workmen for years to come," we must recognize that what is implied is not just releasing a few shiploads of butter, but the development of economic relations such as Molotov discussed in 1945, when he called for credits of 10 to 20 billion dollars. In other words, the kind of East-West trade we need if we are to influence the pattern of the economic cycle is a trade that will increase many times over our present level of over-seas commerce.

Clearly the projection of proposals on such a scale implies far-reaching political changes. To force through the necessary wage and tax revisions, to launch and carry out the mammoth public works program required, to establish the political relations which will have to underlie extensive East-West trade—all this calls for major transformations in the political complexion of our country.

When all is said and done, however, it must be admitted that our capacity to delay the cyclical crisis is limited. This is all the more true because of the grotesquely distorted character which years of war econ-

omy have given the cycle. Therefore, it is necessary to understand that as important as is the *delaying* effect of the Party's anti-depression program, its *cushioning* effect is more important still. Basically what the Party is proposing is not so much an "anti-depression" program as an "anti-depression-on-the-backs-of-the-people" program.

The fact is that under the conditions of advanced decay of modern capitalism, the weight of oppression which the people must bear is enormous. The drive for maximum profits has brought unprecedented exploitation, impoverishment, plunder and enslavement of peoples in our own country and throughout the world. The terrible danger inherent in the coming economic crisis is even greater misery and suffering. Therefore, the struggle for "cushions" against both present and future hardships is of paramount significance for the working class.

It is the great virtue of the Party's anti-depression program that it gives concrete form to this crucial struggle. Thus the very first of the Draft Program's list of demands is the call for a militant fight for wage increases, a shorter work week, the curbing of speed-up, lowered prices, the shifting of the tax burden to the rich, etc. These demands are of prime importance because they answer the workers' needs irrespective of the phase of the economic cycle. In the crisis phase they take on special sig-

nificance.

It also must be understood that the fight for a genuine anti-depression program must of necessity be a difficult, prolonged and severe struggle. Every tiny concession will have to be wrenched from a ruling class desperately determined to hold on to its profits at all costs. The struggle on the economic front will have to merge with the struggle on the various political fronts, and will have to proceed in a very complex and intricate way.

The Draft Program, in my opinion, could be strengthened by giving greater emphasis to the *struggles* that will have to be waged for its realization. Also the economic elements of the program should be better integrated into the discussion of electoral perspectives, and *vice versa*. As the Program now reads, one might get the impression that the anti-depression fight is one thing and the unfolding campaigns of 1954 and 1956 are another. This clearly is not the intent of the drafters of the Program; nevertheless, the inter-relation of the two sides of the struggle is not made fully clear.

One little technical point. In Section II the Draft speaks of a \$27 billion installment debt. The \$27 billion is total consumer credit, not just installment indebtedness. (The latter runs about 75-80% of the former.) Of course, when the final Program is printed, the most up-to-date figures should be substituted.

Draft Program of the Communist Party of Brazil*

Central Committee, C.P. of Brazil

Brazil is a vast country with rich natural resources. It is rich in iron ore, oil, coal, manganese, gold and other minerals. Brazil has fertile soil, favorable climatic conditions for all branches of agriculture, and her extensive plains and plateaus favor all forms of animal husbandry. Our country is rich in forests and water resources which could be utilized for the benefit of our people, for building irrigation systems, combating drought and electrifying the country.

However, notwithstanding these tremendous possibilities, the conditions of the people of Brazil are deteriorating daily, becoming increasingly unbearable. People die from starvation on the roadsides in north-eastern Brazil and in the main industrial cities; tuberculosis and other diseases kill and incapacitate millions of people. The people have neither schools nor hospitals, they live in ignorance and die in poverty.

The poverty of the people in a country so rich as ours is the result of the predatory policy of the American monopolies, the result of the rule of the owners of the latifundia and big Brazilian capitalists.

The American monopolies have already seized our main mineral re-

sources. United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel have a grip on the mining of manganese. Standard Oil is battling to grab our oil deposits, U.S. bankers control the extraction of iron ore and the Volta Redonda iron and steel works. The Light and the Bond and Share companies control nearly 90% of the generation of electric energy. U.S. capital already controls a great part of Brazil's industry.

Foreign trade is dominated by the U.S. imperialists who fix prices according to their interests and act as middlemen in selling some of our products, hindering trade between Brazil and other countries. American monopolies compel us to export our goods at exceedingly low prices and charge us excessive prices for imports. U.S. monopoly firms control the greater part of our coffee exports and have in their hands the buying, cleaning and export of our cotton.

American capital holds the key positions in our air transport, controls our railways and threatens to destroy our merchant fleet. Rockefeller is building big agricultural enterprises all over the country with the aim of seizing control of our big centers of agriculture; American meat companies buy up land and form huge plantations and ranches.

Contrary to the laws of the country, the U.S. monopolies strive for a specially advantageous rate of exchange

in order to transfer their profits abroad. At the same time capital investments of the U.S. monopolies in Brazil are growing rapidly from the accumulated profits with the result that more and more profits are transferred abroad. American investments in Brazil act as a powerful pump, extracting from the country a considerable part of our national income and a large part of the gold earned by our exports.

Thus, the entire national economy of Brazil is being turned into a mere appendage to the U.S. war economy. The American imperialists directly interfere in the entire administrative life of the country; they have taken over the state apparatus of Brazil in order ruthlessly to exploit and oppress our people, to plunder the country's natural resources and to extract maximum profit.

Our country is rapidly losing the attributes of a sovereign nation and is flooded with agents of the U.S. monopolies. The representatives of Brazil abroad become obedient tools in the hands of the U.S. State Department; our armed forces are under the command of American officers and sergeants, and the rulers of the country openly play the role of mere servants of the U.S. Government. By means of the press, radio, cinema, literature and arts, which have become instruments for colonization, U.S. agents are trying to do away with the cherished traditions of our people and our national culture.

Thus, the U.S. imperialists are penetrating to all corners of economic, political, social and cultural life in Brazil, humiliating our people and destroying the independence and sovereignty of our nation which they want to reduce to the status of a U.S. colony.

This situation threatens the people of

Brazil with complete enslavement and imperils the future of our nation.

* * *

The domination of U.S. imperialism becomes more onerous owing to the intensified militarization of Brazil. State expenditure is rising, inflation is growing and taxes and prices on the home market are soaring. All this is a heavy burden on the shoulders of all sections of the population.

Millions of workers in Brazil suffer from severe privation as a result of the fall in real wages, the new forms of exploitation and the steady growth of unemployment. On the pretext of regulating the time of arrival for work, a system of fines is being introduced. The social rights and gains won by the workers are being abolished. Strikes are brutally suppressed. The present government interferes with the work of the trade unions, in trade-union elections, and plants police agents and agents of the U.S. imperialists in the leading bodies of the trade unions. Workers suffer from malnutrition, live in miserable slums, become ill and die, lacking the necessary medical aid; they suffer from occupational diseases and tuberculosis. Their children are denied vocational training and practically deprived of the opportunity to attend elementary schools.

The peasantry, who constitute 70% of the population and who make up the millions of sharecroppers and metayers, tenants, smallholders, agricultural laborers, farmhands, etc., are, in their majority, landless and brutally exploited; they are deprived of all rights and are at the complete mercy of the big landowners on the plantations, on the ranches, in the sugar mills and on sugar plantations. Doomed to illiteracy, victims of local diseases, bare-footed and

* Draft Program of the CP of Brazil, approved by the Party's Central Committee, December, 1953. Reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, Feb. 26, 1954; condensed text.

ragged, millions of peasants live a life of misery in huts, with the mattock as their sole agricultural implement. This situation is becoming worse owing to the constant rise in prices paid for agricultural implements, fertilizers and means for combating pests, owing to the growing profiteering of middlemen who are protected by the Government and enjoy favorable credits from the State Bank. The situation is worsening because of rising taxation, increased railway tariffs and because of unilateral and arbitrary fixing of prices for the products of agriculture and animal husbandry. Agricultural laborers are paid a starvation wage. The small and medium farmers are robbed by landlords and usurers, have no rights to their holdings and are constantly threatened by the big landowners and the authorities. The small and medium tenants are strangled with enslaving agreements, they cannot dispose of their own products which are actually confiscated by the owners of the land they rent. They are often evicted from their holdings. Drought in the northeast and flooding in other parts of the country are a veritable calamity for the poor who, living in terrible poverty and receiving no aid from the Government, are forced to seek refuge in other parts of the country. Thousands perish by the roadsides or fall, in the long run, into the clutches of new exploiters.

The peasant fight for land and against the arbitrary action and exploitation by the landlords is brutally suppressed and drowned in blood by the Government.

The middle sections of the urban population experience great difficulties. Salaries and wages paid to Government, trade and bank employees and clerks as well as to those called to the

colors are, in ever-increasing measure, trailing behind the rising cost of living. The intelligentsia, people of the free professions, scientists, specialists, writers, artists, film workers and teachers who refuse to serve as American lackeys and who take action in defense of the national culture are persecuted, suffer more and more from privation and come up against the greatest obstacles in their creative and professional activity.

No better off are the handicraftsmen, small industrialists and small tradesmen suffering from the consequences of inflation, high interest charges, decline in business activity, lack of credits and unbearable taxation. In carrying on production and their business they are forced to fight against growing difficulties and live in fear of the morrow.

Industrialists and traders are unable to expand their business because of the low purchasing power of the working masses and the competition from American goods. American monopolies control entire branches of Brazilian industry and use all the means at their disposal to strangle and retard development of home industry, to prevent the founding of the basic branches of industry needed to free Brazil from the economic dependence in which it now finds itself. . . .

* * *

The American imperialists do not confine themselves to plundering our national wealth and unbridled exploitation of our people. They also want to involve Brazil in the aggressive war for which they are getting ready. They do not conceal their intention of using the people of Brazil as cannon fodder.

The aim of the propaganda of the American imperialists and their Brazilian hirelings is to convince our peo-

ple that in a future war Brazil must side with the U.S. But the war now being prepared by the U.S. imperialists is an aggressive predatory war aimed at establishing world domination and at enslaving other peoples for the sake of maximum profits. Incapable of realizing these sinister plans by means of their own forces alone, the U.S. imperialists want this war to be waged by others, at the cost of the blood of other peoples. Since Brazil is a big country with a numerous population and enormous resources the U.S. imperialists want to involve our people in war as a supplier of soldiers and strategic materials, to utilize our soil as a bridgehead for the complete colonial subjugation of Brazil and all Latin America.

Were the people of Brazil to take this road they would be reduced to the role of mercenaries of the imperialist armies and together with these armies would suffer the most shameful defeat. History teaches that the war now being prepared by the U.S. against the Soviet Union, China and the countries of people's democracy is a gamble, doomed beforehand to complete fiasco. . . .

Participation in any aggressive war on the side of the U.S. would signify for Brazil not only an adventure devoid of any justification from the standpoint of morals and politics, but also complete destruction of the country, extermination of its youth and still greater poverty for the entire population. No, Brazil must not take this road.

* * *

The supreme interests of the people of Brazil call for a complete break with the aggressive militarist and colonizing policy of the U.S. Brazil

can achieve progress only by taking another road, the road of peaceful cooperation with the peace-loving countries, the road of equal relations with all peoples, of irreconcilable struggle in defense of its sovereignty and national independence. In order to step out along this road Brazil must put an end to the hateful American domination and establish closer economic and cultural contact with all countries which recognize and respect our independence, above all with the Soviet Union and China.

Peace and peaceful cooperation with all countries can ensure Brazil a vast market for exporting surplus goods produced by its agriculture and industry, open boundless opportunities for buying the machinery and raw materials needed for the large-scale development of its national industry.

The road of peace and peaceful cooperation with all peoples is the road to progress for Brazil, the road to rapid development of its national economy, the road to freedom and independence that will enable it to raise the cultural level of the people and create the prerequisites needed for a free and happy life for our people. By taking this road Brazil can occupy a worthy place as a free and independent country in the world commonwealth of nations.

BRAZIL'S GOVERNMENT IS INSTRUMENT OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS

The present Government of Brazil is a docile instrument in the hands of the American imperialists. It helps the American monopolies in plundering the country and exploiting our people.

The Vargas Government is doing its

utmost to facilitate the penetration of American capital into our country, to facilitate the growing domination of the American imperialists and the complete colonization of Brazil by the U.S. The laws of the country are interpreted in the interests of the American magnates or are changed in accordance with the wishes and instructions of the U.S. Embassy

The foreign policy of the Vargas Government is openly dictated by the U.S. State Department and the Brazil delegation in the United Nations has become notorious throughout the world for its servility to the U.S. Government. . . .

Pursuing a policy of complete abnegation of national sovereignty, the Vargas Government seeks to inculcate in the student youth and in literary, art and science circles an attitude of scorn for the national traditions and worship of the cosmopolitan ideas and racial obscurantism of the U.S. imperialists.

* * *

The reason for this policy of national betrayal is rooted in the actual political system of the landlords and big capitalists, represented by the Vargas Government and linked with U.S. imperialism. It is impossible to liberate Brazil from the imperialist yoke without destroying this system.

The owners of the latifundia and the big capitalists submit to the U.S. imperialists because they too want another world war and are interested in exploiting and enslaving the Brazilian people. Consequently, they turn to the U.S. warmongers in the hope of waxing rich on new wars, of getting huge profits by selling raw material and food at sky-high prices, of

making billions out of this bloody business.

The owners of the latifundia and the big capitalists turn to the U.S. imperialists because they fear the Brazilian people more and more. By means of the Vargas Government and supported by American dollars and arms they want to retain their privileges and hold up the progress of Brazil. Relying on the U.S. imperialists they doom the majority of the nation to poverty and slavery and the country to stagnation, increasing backwardness and disintegration.

To involve Brazil in war, to barter it to the U.S. imperialists in order to save the latifundia, the feudal survivals and the survivals of slavery in agriculture—such is the aim of the entire policy of the Vargas Government. This policy of upholding the interests of the reactionary minority clashes irreconcilably with the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population, with the supreme interests of the nation.

Violence against the people is the main weapon of the Vargas Government. At the same time it resorts to unrestrained demagoguery, to out-and-out hypocritical promises of "reforms" and "radical" changes, including promises to change the economic and social structure of Brazil. . . .

These maneuvers of Vargas are designed to safeguard the privileges of the reactionary minority, to guarantee the land monopoly and maintain the semi-feudal relations in agriculture.

Thus, the Vargas Government is a government of war preparation and of national betrayal, a government of enemies of the people. The Vargas Government is a useful and necessary weapon in the hands of the U.S. imperial-

ists since it facilitates the complete colonization of Brazil by the U.S.A.

* * *

Brazil needs another, a genuine people's government capable of safeguarding the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people. Such a government, as the lawful representative of the broad progressive and anti-imperialist sections of the population, would do away with the hated domination of the U.S. imperialists, confiscate the capital and enterprises belonging to the U.S. monopolies and carry out a policy of peace and cooperation with all other nations on an equal footing, in keeping with the supreme interests of the nation. The people's government would be in a position to abolish the feudal survivals and the ownership of land by big landlords and would ensure free distribution of the land among the peasants and all those who want to live by agricultural labor. . . .

This people's government would establish a system of complete freedom and democracy for the people, would guarantee industrial workers and other working people their gains, their rights and ensure for the entire population of Brazil a blossoming, free and happy life.

If we want to live and to prosper, if we want our country to have the happy future to which it is fully entitled, if we want liberation from the hated U.S. enslavement and to take our people out of the backwardness, poverty and ignorance, we must put an end to the domination of the owners of the latifundia and the big capitalists in the service of the U.S. imperialists and overthrow the Vargas Government.

* * *

The Communist Party of Brazil is

convinced that the democratic transformations needed by our people can be achieved only by a democratic government of national liberation, by a government in which along with the working class there would participate the peasantry and intelligentsia, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party is fighting for Socialism, but it is convinced that in the present economic, social and political conditions, in Brazil socialist transformations are impossible. But it is quite possible to fulfill the task of replacing the present anti-national and anti-people's government by a people's government which would free Brazil from the domination of the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys—the owners of the latifundia and the big capitalists.

The democratic government of national liberation will be a genuinely democratic, people's government; it will be a patriotic government, a government of peace, of defense of sovereignty and national independence; it will be a government of salvation for Brazil and of happiness for its people.

The democratic revolution of national liberation and the replacement of the Vargas Government are inevitable. The people of Brazil are rising against the present regime and will not let the Vargas Government turn Brazil into a U.S. colony. The present regime of exploitation and oppression which is in the service of the U.S. imperialists must be abolished and substituted by a new people's-democratic system. Thus, the supreme interests of the nation demand profound economic and social transformations.

The Communist Party of Brazil will

insist that the democratic government of national liberation, coming into existence as a result of the liberation struggle of our people, shall carry out and give the force of law to the following democratic and progressive changes in the economic and social structure of Brazil:

FOREIGN POLICY AND DEFENSE OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Annulment of all agreements and treaties with the U.S.A. that encroach on the interests of the nation.

Confiscation of all capital and enterprises belonging to the American monopolies and annulment of the foreign debt owned by Brazil to the U.S. Government and U.S. banks.

Clearing out of all military, cultural, economic and technical U.S. missions from Brazil.

Friendly relations and peaceful cooperation with all countries, especially with countries capable of co-operating with Brazil without discrimination, on the basis of complete equality and mutual advantage.

Adoption of measures contributing to the preservation of peace. Prohibition of war propaganda and punishment for those guilty of war propaganda.

PEOPLE'S-DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL SYSTEM

Sovereignty of the people, that is the concentration of all power in the country in the hands of the people. Abolition of the Federal Senate. Supreme state power shall be vested in a National Congress composed of representatives elected by the people. All

organs of the new system from top to bottom shall be elected by the people. Electors shall have the right to annul at any time the mandates of their representatives.

The President of the Republic shall be elected by the people for a term of four years. The President shall exercise his functions in the country through the Council of Ministers which shall be responsible to the National Congress.

All citizens who have reached the age of 18, irrespective of sex, property, nationality, place of residence and education, shall have the right to vote and be eligible for election. The same rights shall be enjoyed by illiterates and men serving with the colors, irrespective of rank, including soldiers and sailors. Proportional representation of all political parties in all elections shall be guaranteed.

States, municipalities, federal territories and the federal area shall enjoy political and administrative autonomy. All organs of power shall be elected by the people.

Inviolability of the citizen and domicile shall be guaranteed. Wide freedom of conscience, speech, assembly and association, the right to strike, freedom of the press, freedom to teach, freedom of religion and worship, the right to move freely from place to place and free choice of trade and occupation shall be guaranteed.

Abolition of all forms of racial, religious and national discrimination. Punishment for those guilty of discrimination. The right to education for children of immigrants in their own language.

Separation of all religious bodies from the state. The state shall be secular.

Democratization of the armed forces and building of a national, people's army, navy and air force closely linked with the people and upholding the cause of peace, national independence and the democratic gains of the people. Soldiers, sailors, corporals, sergeants and officers shall enjoy full civil rights and freedom of political activity. They shall be ensured normal and human conditions of life. Free access for privates and n.c.o.'s to officer rank.

Complete abolition of police organs of repression. Democratization of military police and their inclusion in the national, people's armed forces. Substitution of all other police bodies by the people's militia.

Justice shall be free of charge and effected in the shortest possible term. Court and judges shall be elected by the people.

Abolition of all forms of economic, social and juridical inequality of women. Women shall enjoy equal rights with men in relation to inheritance, marriage, divorce, profession, civil service, etc. The state shall undertake all expenditure for protection of mother and child.

Literary, art, technical and scientific peaceful work shall be encouraged with full support and aid on the part of the state.

Protection and promotion of sports and physical training. State construction of public sports grounds, gymnasiums, stadiums, etc.

State aid for housing construction to ensure the working population comfortable and cheap apartments in the shortest possible time.

Medical aid shall be ensured for the entire population and a network of health centers established throughout the country. Systematic measures to

combat local diseases shall be guaranteed.

Free and compulsory elementary education shall be guaranteed by building a network of schools throughout the country with a view to abolishing illiteracy. The state shall provide textbooks and educational material at low prices for those attending educational establishments. Gradual reduction of educational charges. Guaranteed work for young specialists graduating from the middle, technical and higher educational establishments.

Special help and protection for the Indian population and protection of their land. Indians shall enjoy the right to free organization of self-government.

Effective and immediate aid from the state to the population stricken by drought, flooding and other calamities, chiefly by means of providing fertile land, agricultural machines and implements and long-term credit free of interest. People forced to leave their native places will be given aid to restore their households.

Extensive reform of the tax system, abolition of all unjust taxes, introduction of a progressive income tax and simplification of the entire tax system. Establishment of effective control over prices and practical measures against inflation. Currency reform to stabilize the national currency.

INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL ECONOMY

Guaranteed freedom of private initiative for manufacturers and freedom of internal trade. The democratic government of national liberation will not confiscate the enterprises and capital of the national bourgeoisie. It will, how-

ever, confiscate and nationalize the capital and enterprises belonging to big capitalists who have betrayed the interests of the nation and who have aligned themselves with the U.S. imperialists.

Protection of the national industry. To ensure that import of foreign goods, mainly American goods, shall not injure home industry or hinder the founding of new industrial branches and enterprises. Free development of industry producing for civilian goods shall be guaranteed.

Independent development of the national economy and the creation of conditions for intensified industrialization of the country utilizing for this purpose the confiscated capital and enterprises of the American imperialists. For this it will be necessary to invite private capital which must be guaranteed profits and protection in accordance with a special law.

Reorganization of foreign trade with a view to protecting home production. Abolition of all kinds of unjust restrictions preventing imports of equipment and raw materials needed for developing the national economy.

State aid to handicraftsmen and all small and medium-sized producers by means of granting credit and favorable terms for buying raw materials and by means of supplying them with necessary machines and implements.

Cooperation with foreign governments and private capitalists whose capital would further the independent development of the national economy and serve the national interests and the industrialization of Brazil, on the basis of observance of the laws of the country.

RADICAL IMPROVEMENT IN CONDITIONS OF WORKERS

Fixing of minimum wage rates which would ensure decent living conditions for the workers and their families throughout the country. Equal pay for equal work irrespective of sex, age or nationality.

Effective implementation of the eight-hour working day and 44-hour week for all working people, a six-hour working day for those working underground, those engaged in work detrimental to health, and for juveniles.

Democratization of social legislation, its extension to cover also the workers employed in state enterprises and agricultural workers. The trade unions shall exercise control over the proper implementation of social legislation.

Guarantee of freedom of organization and free activity for the trade unions. The trade unions shall be granted the right freely to conclude collective labor agreements with private and state enterprises and control over their implementation.

All forms of social insurance, including unemployment benefit, shall be paid at state expense and at the expense of the capitalists. Pensions and benefits for victims of industrial accidents in accordance with the needs of the working people and their families. Transfer to the trade unions of management functions and control over the activity of the social security bodies and pension boards.

Abolition of all types of forced labor, of the laws authorizing the militarization of labor and of all fines, including fines for absenteeism.

AGRARIAN REFORMS AND AID TO PEASANTS

Confiscation of all land belonging to big landlords and its transfer, free of charge, to landless and land-hungry peasants, and to all who care to till it. Distribution of the land shall be recognized by law and each peasant given title deeds. The possession and seizure of the lands, belonging to both landlords and the state, already effected by the peasants shall also be recognized by law and the peasants will receive necessary title deeds.

Abolition of all types of semi-feudal exploitation of the peasants: metayage, payment in kind and all forms of payment by means of labor; abolition of the coupon system and introduction of a system of obligatory remuneration in money for all categories of agricultural laborers.

Agricultural laborers shall be guaranteed an adequate wage rate not lower than the level of unskilled workers in industry and allotments of land for those desirous of receiving it.

The property of wealthy peasants shall be protected by law. Both the land cultivated by them or by hired laborers and other forms of their property shall be protected by law against any infringement.

Abolition of all arrears owed by peasants to big landowners, money-lenders, banks, the Government and to American imperialist companies.

Granting of low-interest long-term credit to peasants for the purpose of buying agricultural machines and implements, seeds, fertilizers and chemicals for combatting pests, building materials, etc. Technical aid shall be provided for the peasants. The cooperative movement shall be encouraged.

Construction of irrigation systems in accordance with the needs of the peasants and the development of agriculture, particularly in the northeastern regions affected by drought.

Abolition of all restrictions on the fishermen's right to work. State aid to the fishermen through granting credits for construction of dwellings, storage facilities, etc., and placing at their disposal equipment and vessels for fishing.

The state shall guarantee minimum prices for the products of agriculture and animal husbandry essential for the needs of the population with a view to enabling the peasants to develop their farming and raise its productivity, simultaneously protecting the interests of the broad consumer masses.

FORGE BROADEST POSSIBLE UNITED FRONT

The Vargas Government will not relinquish its position without struggle. The latifundia-owners and the big capitalists—henchmen of American imperialism—will try might and main to retain their privileges. At the moment the interests of these classes are represented by Vargas; they can, of course, be represented by another tool of this oppressing minority, but conditions in Brazil will not be changed one iota. It would likewise be a mistake to think that Brazil can be saved from the impending catastrophe and that the country can be freed from the yoke of the U.S. imperialists by means of state or military coups, partial reforms or elections which leave untouched the base of the present reactionary system.

Had it not been for violence against the people and the support by the foreign oppressors, the rule of the lati-

fundia-owners and big capitalists connected with the American imperialists would long ago have ceased to exist in Brazil. This explains why the prisons are overcrowded and strikes suppressed by force of arms, why the police interfere in the affairs of the trade unions and why the genuinely democratic political parties are banned and constitutional rights systematically violated. The regime of reaction and terror has been forced on the people by the reactionary forces.

In these conditions resolute revolutionary struggle by all patriots of Brazil is necessary in order to overthrow the Vargas Government and replace it by a democratic government of national liberation. There is no other way to liberate Brazil from the imperialist yoke; there is no other way to wrest power from the hands of the reactionary minority and carry out the social-economic transformations which are essential for the progress of our homeland.

The patriotic and democratic forces now moving into action throughout the country against the present government of national betrayal are numberless, and they already realize the urgent need to save Brazil from its present catastrophic plight. Marching in the van of these forces is the working class which by its glorious struggle is striking blow after blow at reaction showing to the broad popular masses and to the broadest social forces the path of struggle as the sole way out of the situation of growing poverty and slavery which oppresses all of them.

But the victory of the patriotic forces is possible only if they unite and in the crucible of the liberation struggle against the Vargas Government's policy of war, hunger

and reaction forge the broadest anti-imperialist and anti-feudal united front, the democratic front of national liberation.

The workers and peasants constitute the main and indestructible force of this liberation struggle. The alliance of the workers and peasants is possible and essential. The workers, as allies, will help the peasants in the struggle for land. The peasants, as allies, will help the workers in the struggle for a radical improvement in the conditions of the working class. This alliance of the main forces of the Brazilian people will decide the fate of the Vargas Government and the reactionary regime symbolized by it.

In order to replace the Vargas Government by a democratic government of national liberation it is essential that the worker-peasant alliance be joined by the patriotic intelligentsia, workers in the realm of science, writers, art workers, technical personnel, teachers and people of free professions, who likewise suffer from the present situation of the country and who have no desire to be slaves of the American colonizers. For the same reason trade, office, bank and state employees, people working independently, clergy linked with the people, soldiers, sailors, n.c.o.'s and officers of the armed forces will align themselves with the workers and peasants. The worker-peasant alliance will also be joined by the handicraftsmen, small and medium manufacturers and traders suffering from the disastrous consequences of the American domination and the Vargas policy of national betrayal. This alliance will also be joined by a section of the big manufacturers and traders who also suffer from the U.S. imperialist competition and the Vargas economic and financial policy.

And so all the progressive forces in Brazil irrespective of social status, party affiliation, religious or philosophical convictions, all democrats and patriots anxious to see their homeland free and powerful will rally around the great worker-peasant alliance.

This democratic front of national liberation, the broad and powerful united front of all the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal forces, will guarantee the salvation of Brazil, will be the sole force capable of establishing the people's-democratic system in the country and of wresting Brazil from American domination and its present humiliating position, the sole force capable of leading our homeland to a bright and happy future.

The Communist Party of Brazil holds that the struggle for the creation, extension and reinforcing of the democratic front of national liberation is an urgent and pressing task, a matter of honor for all Brazilian patriots.

The Communist Party of Brazil deems it necessary immediately to unite throughout the country the broad popular masses, people of all classes and social strata ready to fight for democracy and peace, against the policy of war, hunger and reaction pursued by the Vargas Government, to fight for the overthrow of the present government

and its replacement by a democratic government of national liberation.

* * *

The Communist Party of Brazil places this program before the people of Brazil whose glorious traditions of struggle for freedom and independence are the best guarantee of the realization of this program. The people of Brazil, led by their working class, which is closely linked with the peasantry, will successfully realize this program, take into their hands the destiny of the homeland and transform Brazil into a great, free, independent and flowering nation.

The U.S. imperialists want to turn Brazil into a main base for effecting the complete colonization of all the countries of Latin America, but the Communist Party of Brazil believes that the people of Brazil have all the necessary conditions for victory in the patriotic struggle against the enslaving yoke of the United States of America, in the struggle for people's democracy.

The Communist Party of Brazil calls on all Brazilian patriots to rally in the struggle for translating this program into life, the program that will bring happiness to our people and glory to our homeland.

NEW BOOKS

- The Income "Revolution"
by VICTOR PERLO 35c
- Billionaire Corporations
Prepared by Labor Research Association 35c
- War Economy and Crisis
by HYMAN LUMER Cloth \$2.75; Paper \$1.75
- Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung
VOL. I \$2.50
- Historical Materialism
by MAURICE CORNFORTH Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.50
- The Rosenberg Story
by VIRGINIA GARDNER Cloth \$2.00; Paper \$1.00
- Pragmatism: Philosophy of Imperialism
by HARRY K. WELLS Cloth \$2.75; Paper \$1.50
- Laureates of Imperialism
by HERBERT APTHEKER Cloth \$1.25; Paper 60c
- The Last Illusion
by HERSHEL D. MEYER \$3.00
- The Mike Gold Reader
by MICHAEL GOLD Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.50

Pamphlets

- The American Way to Jobs, Peace, Democracy
DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE C.P.U.S.A. 5c
- The Truth About Guatemala
by A. B. MAGIL and HELEN TRAVIS 10c
- Indo-China and World Peace
by RICHARD WALKER 10c
- The Rights You Save May Be Your Own
by SIMON W. GERSON 5c

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.