

DAMAGED

political affairs

DECEMBER 1957 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|-------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|
| JAMES E. JACKSON | [1] | The South's New Challenge |
| JAMES S. ALLEN | [19] | Problems of Foreign Policy |
| CARL WINTER | [32] | On the Eve of the UAW Convention |
| MARTIN CHANCEY | [39] | The Housing Question: Cleveland |
| WILLIAM Z. FOSTER | [47] | The Party Crisis and the Way Out |
| LESLIE MORRIS | [68] | American Imperialism and Canada |
| WLADYSLAW GOMULKA | [76] | On the Situation in the Polish Party |
| | [96] | Index for 1957 |

DECLARATION OF COMMUNIST AND
WORKERS' PARTIES OF SOCIALIST
COUNTRIES

[82-94]

(complete text)

THE EDITOR [62] "Ideas in Our Time"

These books belong in your

PERMANENT LIBRARY

THE ORDEAL OF MANSART, by W.E.B. Du Bois	\$3.50
PHILOSOPHY IN REVOLUTION, by Howard Selsam	\$2.00
LABOR FACT BOOK 13, prepared by Labor Research Association	\$2.00
LIKE ONE OF THE FAMILY, by Alice Childress	\$1.00
THE STALIN ERA, by Anna Louise Strong. Paper \$1.00; cloth	\$2.25
AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, by Samuel Lilly.	\$3.75
PROCEEDINGS OF THE 16th NATIONAL CONVENTION, C.P.U.S.A.	\$2.75
TOWARD NEGRO FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker Paper \$2.00; cloth	\$2.75

Pamphlets

WHAT IS MARXISM? by Emile Burns	.90
THE INDIVIDUAL IN SOVIET LAW, by Leon Josephson	.15
ON THE CORRECT HANDLING OF CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE, by Mao Tse-tung	.25
TO LIVE OR TO DIE, by Albert Schweitzer & Others	.10

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Problems of Foreign Policy*

By JAMES S. ALLEN

THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN foreign policy has been maturing for some time. It has now been placed in sharp relief by two dramatic developments. The opening of outer space frontiers by the sputniks has revealed to the man in the street in a single illuminating flash the remarkable scientific and technological progress of the Soviet Union. Perhaps not as generally understood, but nonetheless of great significance, is the repudiation of the Eisenhower Doctrine by the Arab countries of the Middle East and the consequent defeat of the State Department's effort to overthrow the neutralist and imperialist government of Syria.

SPUTNIK AND THE DULLES POLICY

The first development overshadows all else because it embodies the long-range challenge of socialism to capitalism, in terms of fundamental social and scientific achievements. There would not have been an admixture of such amazement and shock if it were the United States instead of the Soviet Union

that had placed the first earth satellite in orbit. Everyone is accustomed to think of the United States as the classic land of technique and know-how, as the unrivaled leader of the world in industry and skill. This has been true enough. But we now learn that the Soviet Union is on a plane with us in these matters. Considering other recent achievements as well—in nuclear energy, jet propulsion, automation and other fields—as regards science and its application, the Soviet Union can match anything we can do, and in some cases surpass us. As a nation, we are now experiencing something akin to what the British felt, at the turn of the century, when they awoke to the fact that “backward” and “uncultured” America, barely out of its teens, was outstripping them industrially. But besides this, as is now almost universally recognized, the Soviet Union is also far ahead in the entire field of education.

The impact of the sputniks is all the greater because of the rather widespread expectations in the West that economic and political troubles were leading to an inner Soviet collapse. The crash of this illusion,

* This article is based upon a Report, given October 24, 1957, for the Foreign Affairs Committee to the National Executive Committee, CPUSA; it was approved unanimously.—Ed.

which was nurtured by the Dulles policy of "liberation," was well expressed by Drew Middleton, writing from London on the eve of the Macmillan - Eisenhower meeting, when he said:

The central fact before the President and the Prime Minister is that the Soviet Union, far from crumbling within for political or economic reasons, has broken across the frontiers of mankind's scientific and technical knowledge into a new field. (*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 20).

However, the political implications of Sputnik go much further, placing very sharply in question the entire Dulles line of foreign policy, especially its strategic core, the "positions of strength" thesis. The latest version of this is given by Dulles in an article in the October *Foreign Affairs*. In it, he reiterates the essentials of his "anti-Communist" doctrine and with his usual Colonel Blimpish blindness insists that as regards the Soviet Union "basic doctrines preclude its changing of its own accord. Self-advertised changes must be considered as mere stratagems." With the obvious implications that changes in the Soviet Union can be imposed only from the outside, Dulles proceeds to amend his well-known big power policy—reliance upon "positions of strength," secured by "anti-Communist" alliances.

His strategic formula, as now amended, is to prepare for "limited

war backed by the arsenal of retaliation." The change, if such it is, consists in the emphasis upon "limited war." Such a war, as he explains it, would employ atomic artillery and other "tactical" nuclear weapons from bases around the entire periphery of the Socialist world. These arms are supposed to contain any attack by conventional arms. (I do not know why he assumes that the Soviet Union does not have "tactical" nuclear weapons as good as ours.) Being thus repulsed, the Soviet Union would face certain defeat, unless it were to initiate an "unlimited" nuclear war, to which the "West" would reply in kind. Then, according to him, the burden of starting the unlimited nuclear war would rest on the Soviet Union.

This is his theory in a nutshell—schematic, narrowly military, and oblivious to both the political and technical realities. It is more concerned with resting the blame for nuclear war upon the Soviet Union than with preventing such a war. It is nothing less than war doctrine, and it has shocked the world.

The immediate impact of sputnik on this thesis derives from its military implications. Only an intercontinental rocket, capable of carrying a huge war head, could have launched the earth satellite. Sputnik emphasizes the fact that the Soviet Union may be approaching the area of long-range "push-button" war technique.

Does this mean that the Soviet

ARMS PARITY AND THE WAR BLOCS

If this is true, the Dulles strategy is futile in terms of foreign policy or national defense, and its bankruptcy must become increasingly apparent. His exhortation to prepare for "limited war backed by an arsenal of retaliation" can prove disastrous in a nuclear age for the country and for the world.

As for "limited war," this strategic concept depends upon bases in the periphery of the Socialist countries, secured by military alliances. But the value of these bases and of the alliances depreciates with every new development.

Politically, the rise of the national independence movement in Asia, the Middle East and Africa, and the consequent rise of "positive neutralism" in the Asia-Africa bloc render the military bases of the United States in these vast areas of very doubtful value, to say the least. From the military-strategic viewpoint, the position of arms parity makes it possible for the Soviet Union to knock out these bases—be it in Europe, Asia or Africa—from its own home territory, should it come to hostilities.

As concerns Dulles' "arsenal of retaliation," the Soviet Union has shown that it can match any weapon the arsenal can conceivably contain, offsetting the so-called "deterrent" force with which Dulles hopes

Union has a decisive lead in precisely those weapons which the Dulles policy counts upon so heavily to assure success? And does it mean that the Soviet Union, in its turn, can count upon such a lead to assure success for its policy?

First, let us turn to the Soviet estimate of the relative positions. In his interview with James Reston of the *Times*, a few days after sputnik was launched on October 4, Khrushchev gave a restrained and sensible estimate of the arms race. His balanced view is in sharp contrast to the rather lurid picture being presented here of the dire consequences of the Soviet arms lead. Khrushchev held that the scientific and technical resources of both countries were such that what the Soviet Union had one day in the way of weapons the United States would have the next, and vice versa. In other words, what he was stressing is the general position of parity on arms between the two countries. He said further that what the Soviet Union wants is not a competition between the two in storing arsenals of weapons, but an end to the arms race, and the establishment of peaceful conditions in the world.

On our part, it would be wise to come to the conclusion that no decided long-range advantage in arms can be won by one side or the other. The position of arms parity and military stalemate is not likely to be altered for long by either side.

to impose his policies on the world. The new weapons make it as clear as day that there can be no buffer zone in modern war. "Limited wars" in other people's lands may very well bring "unlimited war" to our own country. This is the most important immediate lesson to be drawn by the American people from the implications of sputnik, ICBM, etc. It may take some time for this realization to produce positive political results, but that it will we can be certain, as can be seen already by growing pressures within the country for starting negotiations with the Soviet Union.

What has been the impact of sputnik upon the system of U.S. military alliances?

Among the chief allied powers of NATO, especially in Britain, sputnik has spurred the tug-of-war between the two principal trends. On the one hand, there is a desperate attempt to pull NATO together again. This is exemplified by the emergency Macmillan - Eisenhower meeting in October, in an effort to rebuild the Anglo-American alliance, which had been severely strained by the Suez crisis and by the continuing expansionist drive of American imperialism in the Middle East. As a result of this meeting, a supreme effort is to be made at the December session of NATO to strengthen the war bloc on the principle of "interdependence," which in this context can mean only the further subordination of the al-

lies to the United States in the pursuance of the same policies of war brinkmanship.

On the other hand, there is a renewed and widespread examination of the advantages of negotiations with the Soviet Union at this time or of neutrality, in view of the new rebuff to the American "positions of strength" policy and the new deterioration of United States prestige. The most significant expression of this trend was at the Labor Party Conference, held in Brighton at the end of September and the beginning of October. This had been preceded by the Trade Union Congress, where under pressure of a militant membership a surprising break from past policies took place, on foreign as well as domestic issues. Under this impact, the Labor Party Conference took an advanced position on foreign policy—favoring the security pact for Europe based on a demilitarized and neutralized zone, abolition of nuclear tests and other first steps on disarmament, and the inclusion of the Soviet Union in a Middle East settlement. This position is weakened by adherence to the NATO concept, but the emphasis has been shifted most emphatically to efforts at summit agreements. The forthright statements of Aneurin Bevan during his recent trip to this country on the need for immediate top-level negotiations with the Soviet Union were no longer merely an expression of his own position, but re-

flected the official policy of the Labor Party. Similar trends among the Socialists of Western Europe were expressed in re-establishment of common action between the Nenni Socialists and Communists in Italy and the growing strength of the Left Wing in the Socialist Party of France.

We might say in general that the sputnik development is having the effect of sharpening the domestic political struggle within the Allied powers between the war-bloc course and all peace and neutralist tendencies, even within conservative national circles. Thus, at the Annual Conservative Party Conference, which followed the Labor Party meeting, a highly vocal minority of MP's called for a shift to neutrality for the entire British Commonwealth, as the only way to re-establish British prestige and influence. At the other end of the world, one might cite the highly uncomplimentary remarks widely printed in Japan with respect to the U.S. scientific and military lag, and the increased pull in Japan for an independent policy toward China and India. The latest events are widening the breach within the U.S.-dominated alliances, a breach which was created in the first place by the massive drive of American big business to take over the resources and markets of the world.

THE CRASH ARMS PROGRAM

Is it possible for us to emerge

from the present crisis of foreign policy with something different than Dulles brinkmanship? How is the fight over foreign policy shaping up in this country? How can the popular forces affect the outcome?

Dominant political forces of both major parties are trying to exploit the impact of sputnik on the American people to stampede the country into an expanded crash program on armaments. Initially, and on the surface, practically all major political trends—from Knowland to the ADA and Reuther—seem united behind this. But the big-arms-race unity is far from being as monolithic as it looks. For one thing, there are partisan considerations. The need of the Republican Administration to defend itself against charges of impeding national security and the efforts of the Democrats to exploit the situation politically may lead to no more than a very thin bipartisan facade, if that.

For another thing, the scientists and educators, as well as all those concerned with the intellectual and cultural health of the country, are in open revolt against weapons programs that distort scientific research, starve education, and encourage McCarthyite tendencies. Furthermore, as President Eisenhower has made clear, the new arms crusade will mean an increase in the military budget at the expense of social services and with prospects of increasing the tax burden rather than reducing it. And this will not be taken

lightly by the American people who are already carrying a heavy tax load, in addition to suffering from substantial declines in the standard of living caused by price inflation which may well be extended by further military spending.

Above all, the deep anxiety of the American people over the nuclear arms race will increasingly come to the surface of political life. This is already reflected in some sectors of the labor movement, although as yet only dimly. It finds its most affirmative expression among the Negro people as reflected in their press, where the negative attitude to the arms race is similar in many respects to the sentiments to be found among the Asia-Africa nations. A common theme is to equate the sputnik success with national and racial equality in the Soviet Union, while equating the setback here with segregation and Jim Crow practices.

The central concern of the American people is to assure national security in the nuclear age. But the question is how this concern is to express itself in terms of ending the suicidal arms race and the turn toward a policy of world peace. We turn first to a consideration of world forces.

THE INCREASE OF WORLD TENSION

World tension has increased during the past year. A critical war danger emerged in the Middle East,

marked by the ill-fated Suez invasion and the crisis over Syria, while the prolonged Algerian war continued. Whatever the immediate outcome of the Syrian-Turkish crisis, and the re-emerging crisis in Jordan, the danger of war will fester in the Middle East as long as our American policy concentrates upon checking the Arab national movement, overthrowing governments not to its liking, and remains adamant against four-power negotiations.

These developments should put an end to any illusions, if indeed such still exist, that peaceful coexistence is a foregone conclusion, that peace is inevitable. This is merely the reverse of the old war fatalism, the idea that war is inevitable, an approach just as erroneous. For events have shown that the forces for peace, operating within the new global relations arising from World War II, have gained new advantages in the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

This has been shown most dramatically during the recent period by the decisive role of the Soviet Union in halting the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt and later in scotching the threatened U.S.-Turkish attack on Syria. There is no question but that with every crisis, the outcome of which is a setback for imperialism, the power of the forces making for peace has grown.

First, we should note that a year after the Polish crisis and the at-

tempt at counter-revolution in Hungary, cooperation among the Socialist countries, including more friendly relations with Yugoslavia, have been given a firmer and healthier basis. Furthermore, as symbolized by sputnik and spelled out in great detail by all production and social statistics, the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries are continuing their phenomenal progress. This in itself has strengthened the peace factor, since it has dampened imperialist speculations on the inner crumbling of socialism and rebuffed foreign policies based on such expectations.

Next, we note the high prestige of the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries among the Asian-African peoples as a result of their support to the national independence movements. As a consequence, "positive neutrality" among these nations has grown, accompanied by the further improvement of relations between them and the Socialist bloc.

Finally, we see that as the massive drive of American imperialism to take over the economic and colonial positions of its allies proceeds, and as the Dulles policy suffers serious rebuffs, the advantages of neutrality and of negotiations with the Soviet Union and China become more attractive to the other capitalist powers. More fundamentally, within these countries, including our own, the growing anxiety of the people over the danger of nuclear war is creat-

ing great popular pressures for a change in policy.

However, we should not permit appreciation of the new advantages gained by the world peace forces to dim our awareness of the very real war dangers and counter-trends that exist. It is obvious that the cold war is far from over, that the war danger is far from being eliminated. Obviously, peace has not been won, nor is it even nearly won. There is a hard and long struggle ahead to assure peaceful coexistence in the world, and it is in the course of this struggle that the shape and conditions of peace will emerge.

THE QUESTION OF U.S.-SOVIET NEGOTIATIONS

Events since the Geneva summit meeting in 1955 again demonstrate that as long as serious U.S.-Soviet negotiations are delayed tension becomes greater and new war dangers arise. To start such negotiations for ending the arms race, abolishing nuclear weapons, for a Middle East settlement, for security in Europe and for recognition of China's rightful role in the UN remains the basic problem of world peace. The main problem is how to defeat the Dulles policy of brinkmanship, which is the obstacle on our side to positive negotiations.

Yet, official policy is negative toward the problem of negotiations with the Soviet Union. Every new

Soviet offer to explore such possibilities between the two countries has been rejected, on the ground that bilateral negotiations would amount to by-passing our allies. But the Administration does not hesitate to hold bilateral negotiations with Britain at the summit, as in the Eisenhower-Macmillan meeting, in preparations for a NATO summit meeting. If, for example, there had been a meeting of the minds between the United States and the Soviet Union the recent London Disarmament Conference could have been successful. But an Anglo-American agreement on the approach to disarmament, without a simultaneous understanding with the Soviet Union, assured the failure of the conference. So it is with every other question. It is not a matter of by-passing anybody or settling anything bilaterally against the interests of other nations. For the paramount interest of all nations is peace, and the fact is that only the United States and the Soviet Union are in a position to prevent nuclear war.

Nor is it a matter of the Soviet Union and the United States dividing the world between them as in the old-fashioned imperialist game of power politics. In his extensive interview with Reston, Khrushchev put the matter this way:

One thing is needed for this [successful U.S.-Soviet negotiations]: To recognize what has historically taken place, *i.e.*, to recognize that the USSR

exists as a Socialist state, to recognize that China exists as a Socialist state, to recognize the existence of other Socialist states. It must be recognized that these states are developing in accordance with the will and wishes of their peoples and there must be no interference in their affairs. We, for our part, proceed from the realistic conditions of the existence of such capitalist states as the U.S.A., Britain, France and others and the social structure of these countries is the domestic affair of their peoples.

We believe that all controversial problems must be settled by negotiation without war. . . . We think that if the United States displays a readiness, there are no questions upon which agreement could not be reached. To live without war on a basis of peaceful competition—such is the foundation of coexistence. If you recognize this and base your policy on this instead of relying on some internal forces of the Socialist states supposedly capable of liquidating the Socialist system, it will be easy to reach agreement on all disputed questions.

This is not a proposal for dividing the world. What is urged here is mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, coupled with a recognition on our part that the socialist states are a permanent historical achievement, and on the Soviet side that the peoples of the capitalist states will decide their own future. It is just this that Dulles is organically incapable of recognizing, like all the Tories down the ages. And because of his desperate

hanging on to ancient imperialist privileges, he is leading the country from one fiasco to the next.

Despite the constant outcry in this country and abroad against the stupidity of Dulles' tactics, one can find no sign of basic disagreement between the two major parties on the substance of the policy. The Democratic Party Policy statement of October does make mention of the possibility of negotiations, but only *after* the rebuilding of the NATO and other war alliances and the restoration of the weapons lead. In other words, they stand for the continuation of essentially the same foreign policies which have led us to the present impasse.

Judging from results up to now, this policy will continue to meet serious setbacks in the world and will fail to allay the anxiety of the American people for peace. Lacking steps to improve U.S.-Soviet relations, world relations will be changed further to our disadvantage. We face the prospect of isolation in world affairs, as the NATO and other pact allies individually turn more and more toward an alternate policy of neutrality under pressure from their peoples and also in self defense against the economic and political inroads of American Big Business. That is why the question of U.S.-Soviet negotiations can be evaded or postponed only at the risk of finding ourselves in a much worse situation internationally as time goes on. The world position

of the United States has deteriorated significantly since the Geneva summit conference. It will continue to do so unless the turn toward negotiations is made quickly.

CAN THE UNITED STATES CHANGE ITS POLICY?

It is not enough to say that the United States can be forced into a position of negotiations by a combination of pressures and necessities, internal and world-wide. It is the United States with its present system of capitalism that we are talking about, and not our country in some future stage of transition to socialism. Is it possible for the leading world capitalist power to put aside the Dulles approach and instead adopt a policy which will recognize the new world realities, that is, the permanence of the Socialist world, the advance of the national independence movements, and social changes in the capitalist world as these occur?

It would be futile, indeed, to speak of forcing a power to take a position it is intrinsically incapable of taking. The answer to the question just posed would be a decisive "no" if we conceived of a policy of serious negotiations with the Soviet Union as equivalent to a surrender of imperialist objectives. We get closer to the heart of the thing if we view the matter within the imperialist framework, the way the question actually arises in the inner struggle over policy.

In this sense, we must recognize that variants of imperialist policy are possible in the present situation, just as they proved possible in the past. Such variants are produced by the pressures and interactions of many internal and world forces. At the same time, they can emerge as real and operative policies only if they satisfy the needs of capitalism under given circumstances, since, I repeat again, we are speaking of coexistence in the present and not at some indefinite future. In other words, under certain conditions a "Guatemala policy" may prove both possible and most satisfactory to imperialist needs. At other times, when forces outside the control of imperialism render a "Guatemala policy" impossible, then perforce a "Good Neighbor" policy may prove more satisfactory as a means of obtaining capitalist objectives within a world where imperialism no longer enjoys freedom of action. That is the nature of the fight over foreign policy in the United States today, the outcome of which may mean the difference between war and peace.

Believers in socialism and progressives generally cannot remain indifferent to this inner struggle. The struggle becomes sharper as the foreign policy crisis grows more acute with each new setback for the Dulles line. To ignore this struggle and concentrate instead upon perfecting some "non-imperialist" policy, which the people would recognize as Utopian and inapplicable at the present

stage, is the sure road to complete isolation from the real struggles of the people.

Certainly, Marxists must aim at constantly enlightening the workers on the basic historical development to socialism, on the role of the class struggle and of independent working-class political action. But these objectives cannot be pursued apart from the central struggle for peace. It is in the process of this struggle, in all its aspects, that people will be able to appreciate more fundamentally the role of monopoly capital, the functioning of capitalism as a system, and the need for socialism. Nor should Marxists give a clean bill of health to any variant of imperialist policy. They should make it clear that they support a given alternative because it contributes to world peace, and not because it is a panacea for all our ills. The main thing is to help set into motion a mass peace movement among labor and all sectors of the people of such proportions that it will become one of the leading world pressures upon American imperialism, forcing it to take the peaceful rather than the warlike variant of foreign policy.

In accordance with this perspective, we should study constantly the different currents and variants of policy as they appear, particularly their expression in labor and popular circles.

VARIANT POLICIES TODAY

Are such alternate or variant poli-

cies apparent on the American scene today, or at least elements of them? We do not mean completely elaborated programs in opposition to the present Dulles policy, for unfortunately no single major political force in the country today arises in opposition. However, elements of such opposition are to be found in various forms and gradations, cutting across political parties and trends.

How shall we assess, for example, the clash of currents that came to the surface from within the government around the London Disarmament Conference? Without being dogmatic or rigid about it, we can for the present and tentatively distinguish between conflicting Dulles and Stassen tendencies, which have bipartisan expression. True, both these tendencies revolve around the "positions of strength" policy. While starting from the same general premise, however, they diverge.

The dominant Dulles line is dead set against positive negotiations with the Soviet Union, using the "positions of strength" of the United States to contain and weaken the Socialist world. The Stassen line may be defined as wanting to use these same "positions of strength" to negotiate most advantageously on disarmament and other questions. While Dulles, in the face of a weakening NATO, wants to rely upon a remilitarized and reactionary Germany to "hold" Europe (even at the expense of the British alliance, perhaps), Stassen leans toward the idea

of a demilitarized and neutralized European zone (and strengthening the British alliance). Dulles is working towards a U.S.-German-British "Big Three" vehicle for realizing world imperialist objectives; Stassen may prefer an exclusive Anglo-American alliance for this purpose. While the Dulles line seeks to exploit every difficulty in the Socialist world to pursue his "liberation" policy, the Stassen variant would exploit these weaknesses to obtain better terms for American imperialism in a settlement. It should also be noted that the Stassen line interlinks with the position of various Administration and business circles pushing for defense economies and tax relief for the corporations.

What we have termed the Stassen variant is carried further by other elements. People like Cyrus Eaton, the Cleveland industrialist, James Warburg of the banking family, Senators Kefauver, Morse and Ellender, Mrs. Roosevelt and others urge, in various degrees and forms, some accommodation to the new world realities, in terms of adjustment and peaceful competition. Considerations of trade with the Socialist world as a whole is also an important factor. A great deal of the pressure for changing the China policy, for example, comes from business circles concerned with the world market and worried by British, Japanese and German competition for the China trade.

Another area where important

conflicting tendencies arise is on the question of aid to the underdeveloped countries. This is becoming a focus of world politics in the present period. It is one of the most sharply debated questions at home and abroad. Foreign economic aid is the particular and most pointed form in which the question of policy towards national liberation is presented to the United States.

The rebuffs suffered by the Dulles policy in the field of weapons strategy and in the Middle East are matched by the vigorous opposition in Latin America, Asia and Africa to the economic policies of the United States, which are seen as another and more aggressive version of the old Dollar Diplomacy.

Space does not permit at this time the more detailed consideration this question deserves. Suffice it to point out, in connection with the problem of variant policies we are discussing, that in general more emphasis is placed on this problem in Democratic Party and labor circles than among the Republicans, although Nixon has been making some special efforts to cover up for the Administration.

What is of interest here is not so much the economic content of the proposals (they do not vary too much from the private investment emphasis of the Administration program), but their political emphasis. In so far as this differs from the predominant Dulles position, it turns toward the idea of doing business with

the national bourgeoisies of the newly independent and emerging countries. A tendency of a similar direction is the emphasis upon economic rather than upon military aid as a means of overcoming the crisis of U.S. policy in the Middle East. Obviously, approaches of this kind retain the imperialist objectives, but within approximates the "Good Neighbor" policy (at the expense of the leading allies), rather than the aggressive gun-and-dollar policy which now prevails.

Furthermore, we should keep in mind that if the present let-down in the American economy continues and raises the danger of depression, the conflict over economic policy will become even sharper.

It seems to me that these alternate policies will come more strongly forward, as the futility and bankruptcy of the Dulles line becomes more apparent with every effort to extend and refurbish it.

SOME POINTS OF EMPHASIS

At the moment, our problem is not so much to perfect a detailed program on all these questions—we already have one, or at least its essentials, which is shared by many forces in the peace movement. We need to work out our approach toward the various tendencies and variants of policy as they appear on the American scene, paying particular attention to how they are expressed in the labor and popular movement. The Communists and

the Left generally should join with all others in directing the main fire against the Dulles policy, as a war-provoking line which endangers our national security in the nuclear age.

Particularly in view of the economic let-down and growing unemployment, a major problem is to reach the widest circles of the labor movement with constant arguments exposing the national folly of the arms race as a guarantee either of national security or economic security, and to encourage alternate economic and political programs. Labor cannot ignore the new dangers to trade unionism that would emerge from another jingoistic arms race with its encouragement of another McCarthy-type wave. In view of the new weapons and the attempt to heat up the arms crusade, the campaign to stop nuclear tests, abolish nuclear weapons and end the cold war should be greatly extended.

The major contribution of the Left to the mass peace movement, in

whatever form it expresses itself, is to bring forward cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union as indispensable to world peace. The Communists especially need to overcome a certain timidity and self-imposed "embarrassment" in this respect, and again appear on the American political scene as leading advocates of American-Soviet friendship, which is a requirement of our national safety and welfare. Subjective attitudes which have arisen as a result of inner-party controversy should be set aside. We must appreciate fully the fact that there is a growing realization among the American people that they can and must be friends with the Russians, no matter what they may think of their system or their way of doing things. Many may be surprised to discover that this emphasis will contribute a great deal toward the participation of the Left in the mainstream of American political struggles.

In our January issue, Evelyn Wiener evaluates the Elizabeth Gurley Flynn campaign in New York City; Hyman Lumer analyzes the question of inflation and its relationship to the present economic situation; Max Weiss writes on "Strachey and the Marxist Labor Theory of Value."

On the Eve of the UAW Convention

By CARL WINTER

AS THE MAJOR CONTRACTS in the automotive industry approach their expiration dates, preparations are being made by the employers, as well as by the union, for what is expected to be a sharp and prolonged struggle over new agreements. In the spring of 1958, Ford, General Motors and Chrysler corporations will each meet with the United Automobile Workers of the AFL-CIO to negotiate terms governing wages, hours, working conditions and other desired or established benefits.

Covering an industry that extends from coast to coast and embraces a variety of manufacturing activities, the UAW finds itself confronted with a diversity of prevailing conditions and problems among the more than one million workers under its jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the domination of the automotive industry by the Big 3—GM, Chrysler and Ford, who account for more than 90 per cent of its output—serves constantly to remind the auto workers of the need to develop a common approach to their problems and to face their employers unitedly. As a consequence, all eyes are now upon the preparations for the special con-

vention of the UAW which will meet in Detroit, January 22-24, to map out the union's collective bargaining policies and program for 1958.

This convention will consist of the 3,000 delegates who were elected to represent the auto locals at their last regular International convention, held in Atlantic City in April of this year. It will meet under the mandate of the last convention which decided that the key demand in coming contract negotiations shall be "the shorter work week with increased take-home pay."

As was to be expected, the auto corporations lost no time in launching their propaganda campaign to discredit the union's expected new contract proposals. Their chief weapon was the cry that the auto workers, by their demands, would drive prices upward and contribute to runaway inflation.

PROFITS AND PRICES

It was in this framework that Walter P. Reuther, as president of UAW, proceeded early last September to unmask the pretended concern of the Big 3 for protecting the

public from excessive prices. He challenged the auto monopolists to submit to public examination any evidence that they would be unable to grant a substantial increase in pay in the event that car prices were reduced by as much as \$100. In this manner, the union deprived the company spokesmen of the initiative they sought to gain on the issue of inflation. The spotlight was placed, instead, upon the corporations themselves as the chief source and beneficiaries of rising prices.

A basic flaw in the economic thinking of Reuther and most union leaders in our country today, however, deprived this tactical move of its full force. Since Reuther accepts the prevailing bourgeois economic theories which link wage levels to productivity and prices, he left his followers unarmed against the companies' counter-attack. Henry Ford II and Chrysler president, L. I. Colbert, each quickly replied to the UAW challenge with the taunt that auto workers should accept a wage-cut if they were concerned with the possibility of reducing the price of cars. This contributed to considerable confusion in the union ranks, including fear in many quarters that preparations were being made to bargain away the workers' economic demands in a mere battle for publicity.

Actually, Reuther's challenge was far better grounded than he may have recognized or was willing to admit. Neither the wages of auto

workers nor those in any other industry are tied to the price of the products they turn out.

Ample facts are available to demonstrate the falsity of the companies' claims. Shortly after Chrysler and Ford suggested that the workers, rather than the corporations, should take cuts in the interests of curbing inflation, both firms boasted to their stockholders about their exceptionally high profits. The *N. Y. Times* on October 25th reported that Chrysler announced a 33% increase in dividends over those of last year, and declared that "net earnings of \$103,757,486 were the second largest for any similar nine months." This represented \$11.87 on each share, compared to the average of 72 cents cleared in the same period for 1956! Only in 1950 did Chrysler ever earn more. And this 15-fold increase in returns was amassed in spite of more than a 33% drop this year in so-called defense business. In similar fashion, the *Detroit Free Press* on October 28th blazoned headlines proclaiming: "Ford's 9-month net up 58% over '56. Sales top 3 billion; best ever."

Covering a ten-year period from 1947 to 1957, the UAW issued the following uncontested figures: General Motors: wages rose 72%—but profits rose 259.9%. Net worth went up 3 billion, 87% of it from surplus profits; Ford: wages rose 70%—but profits rose 326.8%. Net worth went up one and one quarter billion, 98% from surplus profits; Chrysler:

wages rose 72%—but profits rose 221.8%. Net worth went up 321 million, 98% from surplus profits. On top of this, as Reuther pointed out, the automotive industry shows a higher return on investment than the national industrial average. While all manufacturers in the U.S. averaged an annual rate of 12% return on investment, the net received for the first six months of 1957 was 17% for Ford, 21% for GM, and over 27% for Chrysler.

EMPLOYERS' PLANS

The loudest voice from management, in protest against anticipated demands by the auto workers, comes from the smallest auto firm—American Motors Corp. Professing to speak out of concern for the competitive interests of this company which accounts for little more than 4% of auto production, AMC president George Romney actually voices the interests of Big Business. He has long been the head and chief ideologist of the Automobile Manufacturers Association and has consistently spearheaded every anti-union campaign of the dominant magnates in this industry.

In a speech before a national meeting of insurance men, held in Detroit on September 19th, Romney called for a united front of all auto companies to resist the UAW. He declared: "All automotive companies should unite to use their combined strength to keep wage and

other economic benefits granted in negotiations next year to a level not in excess of those justified by reasonably anticipated improvements in productivity and the maintenance of a balanced economy." In other words, he summarized the plans of the auto employers, with which the union will have to contend, as a drive for more speed-up in the shops and a campaign to block wage increases by blaming them for inflated prices.

In this situation, an important part of the union's defense of its members needs is a broad public campaign to expose the anti-social character of the auto monopolies. Cynically ignoring their own pretended explanation of inflation, the Big 3 only recently announced a further boost in wholesale car prices, ranging up to \$700. And at the same time that their profits continue to mount, they extract an increasing toll from their workers and the whole economy by means of speed-up, part-time work and curtailed employment. Not only can the auto corporations well afford to provide more jobs and higher earnings for their employees, but the national economy can ill-afford to permit them to refuse to do so.

WORKERS' DEMANDS

This is the basis on which the 16th International Convention of the UAW resolved to make its key demand for 1958 the shorter work

week with increased take-home pay. Already in 1955, the demand had been put forward for a 30-hour week at 40-hours' pay by sections of the union. But the 15th Convention decided, instead, to make its national demand that year the "guaranteed annual wage." This was to have been a form of insurance against the already-threatening spread of part-time employment in the industry.

In the past two years, unemployment has continued to grow. Tens of thousands of workers in such auto centers as Detroit and Flint exhausted the weekly state compensation and supplementary benefits to which they might have been entitled. In Michigan alone, it is estimated that 100,000 auto workers have been made superfluous and will never return to their former jobs. In Cleveland, the Fisher Body plant which has gone down from a permanent force of 5,000 to 3,200 is typical of what is happening in older plants throughout the country. Some, such as Detroit's Packard, have shut their doors permanently, leaving their workers completely stranded.

Even though large-scale unemployment is still mainly confined to a few areas of auto production, its effect makes itself felt among the remaining workers, as pressure for compliance with company demands for greater speed-up. In turn, expanding automation and increasing speed-up continue to displace ever more workers. In face of the prospects for a continuing decline in the

national economy during 1958, the continuous struggle against speed-up in the auto plants acquires special significance. Grievances over speed-up have been the most common issue at the bottom of an unending series of strikes—wild-cat or authorized—which have marked the life of the UAW contracts now in force.

The determination of the auto union to secure a shorter work week—along with increased earnings—arises primarily from the need to counter the twin evils of speed-ups and lay-offs that are now dominant in the industry. Bitter experience has proven to the auto workers that, however much they resist, the companies never cease devising new means of squeezing additional labor out of every minute on the job.

A classic defense of employer-assumed prerogatives was stated in the arbitration board decision which ended an early strike against speed-up at the River Rouge Ford plant in 1949. In rejecting the workers' demands for relief, the ruling declared: "480 minutes of every working day belong to the company." Here, again, was another demonstration of the validity of Marxist analysis of capitalist society, which locates an elementary foundation of the class struggle in the contest between workers and employers over the length of the working day.

Obviously, the direct attack upon the mounting exploitation of labor begins with the effort to cut the

number of hours in which the boss can demand maximum exertion on the part of his workers. Other, indirect, means are also available, however. Many of these are gaining popularity among the workers who keenly feel the need for immediate relief from the intensification of effort being demanded of them every moment. Just as employers, in effect, lengthen the work day by imposing production standards which crowd more labor into every hour, so is the struggle against speed-up an essential component of labor's counter-effort to shorten the work day.

NEEDED CONTRACT CHANGES

The coming convention will certainly have before it numerous resolutions from local unions calling for contract changes that would facilitate the fight against speed-up. Among these would be a challenge to the presently conceded authority of the companies to fix production standards. In anticipation of considerable difficulty on this score, a virtual flood of demands has risen throughout the union to exempt from company penalty any workers disciplined for disputes over production standards, to simplify and speed the settling of shop grievances, to eliminate the final authority of industry "umpires" or to reduce drastically the number of issues presently non-strikeable and to shorten the time required to take strike action.

In addition, a number of other practical demands serve to highlight the need for shorter hours and relief from speed-up. Among these is the demand for a paid lunch period and paid wash-up time. Other urgent needs of a similar nature include allowance of adequate fatigue-time according to the burdensome nature of each job, increased "personal time" and providing sufficient relief men to make possible its utilization, and the authorization of coffee breaks which of necessity are growing as an accepted custom in some enterprises. Such measures as these would contribute to curbing speed-up at the same time that they lay the basis for further shortening working hours.

Even though the demand for the shorter work week was endorsed on almost every election slate of candidates for local office in the union's elections this year, a greater reticence to push it forward has been shown as bargaining time approaches. Not only company propaganda and confusion about charges of inflation have had this dampening effect. Far more important have been the growing difficulties which auto workers experience in making ends meet with their present earnings.

RISING COST OF LIVING

When, for example, the aircraft branch of this industry discontinued overtime work last spring, thousands of UAW members suddenly found

themselves unable to meet the cost of living on a pay check for only 40 hours work per week. Even more desperate has been the situation of most GM employees who in Flint, the heart of GM's empire, were restricted the greater part of this year to a three- or four-day work week. On top of this, the cost of living continues to mount month after month, without interruption.

Little wonder, then, that the appeal of the relief to be found in a shorter work week fades in some sections of the union, and tends to be counterposed by insistence upon a substantial wage increase as the prime need in the coming negotiations. Undeniably, the auto workers need a substantial increase in their pay envelopes. Not only have their wage levels not kept pace with the cost of living, but they have even fallen behind the relatively-leading place they had occupied amongst the scales established by other unions.

However, increased take-home pay and a shorter work week are not mutually exclusive. In establishing the latter, the UAW need no longer pioneer in breaking ground. The 35-hour or 30-hour week has already been long established by a number of other unions such as the rubber workers, typographical, clothing and others. Many additional unions have now resolved to make the shorter week the new standard in other industries as well. The quicker this is done, the more commonly-accepted

and secure will become a substantially higher, minimum, hourly rate of pay. But the auto workers cannot afford to wait. Spreading unemployment dictates that the work week must be shortened at the same time that wage levels are raised, unless one section of the workers is to be permitted to be played off against the other, to the detriment of all.

NEED FOR UNITY

Herein lies a real source of anxiety over the capacity of the UAW to fulfill the mandate given it by its last convention. Will sufficient unity and determination be generated for the coming show-down struggle with the auto monopolies which are already fighting back unitedly? Will sufficient support be forthcoming from the rest of the labor movement whose own future is bound up with success in the auto workers' undertakings? Will other sections of the population, such as professionals and small businessmen, whose incomes are closely bound up with the living standards of industrial workers, lend their aid? There is nothing in the economic situation, least of all in the capacity of the auto corporations to pay, that stands in the way of fulfillment of the economic program projected for the special collective bargaining convention of the UAW. What will be decisive is the unity that will be organized in labor's ranks and with other anti-monopoly forces to compel the auto corpora-

tions to disgorge a part of their phenomenal profits.

Division will continue to be a major weapon in the hands of the monopolists. Unity will be the strongest defense in the hands of the UAW. As never before, the guaranteeing of mutual support and common effort on the part of white and Negro members of the union, and the joining of forces of the forward-moving Negro people's movement with the trade unions, must be guaranteed. The coming convention of the UAW, therefore, cannot permit the repeated shelving of its own "model anti-discrimination clause" when it negotiates next year's contracts. It can afford to do no less than require every employer to sign this model agreement which declares:

The company agrees that it will not discriminate against any applicant for employment or any of the employees in their wages, training, upgrading,

promotion, transfer, lay-off, discipline, discharge or otherwise because of race, creed, color, national origin, political affiliation, sex or marital status.

When a foremost union of over one million workers tackles such powerful monopolies as the titans of the automotive industry, the issues at stake are of major concern to the whole American people. The spreading of employment, the curbing of speed-up, the raising of purchasing power, the elevation of labor's social status are all objectives the auto workers seek to achieve in the new agreements they will propose to the auto corporations. As they unite to make their coming convention serve these ends, they serve not only themselves but the well-being of the entire nation. No less can be expected from progressives everywhere than that every effort be expended to assure success to the UAW in the great task it now confronts.

"FREE WORLD" ENTERTAINMENT

"The Party of the year was Washington's International Ball. Brightest ballgown was worn by Mrs. Jean Gammon. Work of an Oslo designer, the blue satin skirt was embroidered with 100,000 pearls and 700 rhinestones to look like snow and ice. Yes, she couldn't sit down."

—Eugenia Sheppard's "Inside Fashion" column,
N. Y. Herald-Tribune, Nov. 22, 1957.

The Housing Question: Cleveland

By MARTIN CHANCEY

CLEVELAND, like every other large northern industrial city, is in the grip of a housing crisis. The crisis is chronic and persistent. It affects the middle as well as low-income groups. It strikes with particular ferocity at the Negro people; indeed, the demand for decent housing overshadows in its intensity all other aspects of the fight for equal rights in the North.

The primary cause for the housing shortage, according to the troubadours of "private initiative," is to be found in the sharp decline in homebuilding during the depression years and in World War II. What is the cure? Just leave it to private enterprise. And they point to the "unprecedented" housing boom of the post-war decade. On closer examination this boom turns out to be a hoax. To catch up with the housing backlog and to meet current population growth, there is a minimum need of 2 million housing units yearly. But the annual construction since the war has averaged about a million, and since 1950 the trend has been steadily downward. On a per capita basis the number of housing units built during the "unprecedented" boom has

actually been 20% below the 1925 level.

The failure of private initiative becomes even more glaring when we examine the question—for *whom* were these houses built? This question is answered in a study made by the Senate Housing Subcommittee together with 131 mayors of large industrial cities. (Report published Jan. 24, 1957). Its conclusions are: that the housing industry has reached the point "*where it is serving primarily the upper-income groups*"; that the middle and low income groups "have been priced out of the housing market"; and that only 7% of all housing construction was in the \$12,000 range—the rest being in the \$20,000 and \$30,000 level and up. The drop in construction during the last few months has cut primarily into the 7%, those most desperately in need of housing.

The great industrial expansion of the post-war years has attracted to the cities large numbers of job-seekers from farms, the border states and the deep South. Huge sums of capital flowed into the field that would yield the biggest and quickest profits—the war industries, the stockmarket and high rental apart-

ments. As for building low-cost workers' homes—there simply wasn't as much profit to be made.

Thus, while the economic expansion of the post-war years has eliminated the backlog of demand in cars, appliances, etc., the housing shortage continues no less severe.

The chronic inability of capitalism to solve the housing needs of the workers was recognized by Engels as early as 1872. Noting the influx of large numbers of workers with the growth of industrial cities in England, he made the penetrating observation that "under these conditions the building industry, which is offered a much better field for speculation by more expensive homes, builds workers' dwellings *only by way of exception.*"

This fact was acknowledged some 65 years later when the New Dealers initiated the Public Housing Program to provide shelter for the low-income groups—a field abandoned by the private building industry. In 1949 Congress took a major step in this direction when it authorized the building of 810,000 housing units over a six-year period. But this housing program became the first casualty of the cold war. Today, only a fourth of this goal has been fulfilled.

Thus, the cry of President Roosevelt during the depth of the depression, that one-third of this nation is ill-housed, still holds true today at the crest of the biggest boom. In fact, of 45 million housing units in the U.S., 15 million were either

dilapidated, lacking plumbing and bathing facilities, or generally were so run-down as to be unfit for habitation.*

EXPANDING INDUSTRY AND SPREADING SLUMS

Cleveland typifies the housing situation of most northern industrial cities. Emerging as a center of automation, with a varied industry, and soon to become a deep-sea port (with the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway), Cleveland has experienced a most rapid industrial expansion. This has been accompanied by a large influx of Negro and white job-seekers. Greater Cleveland has been growing at the rate of 35,000 a year and is expected by 1960 to double its population over a decade ago. To meet the mounting need for shelter, the total amount of new housing construction is about 11,000 units a year (private and urban-renewal). This is barely enough to replace the 22,000 housing units to be torn down in the next two years as part of the free-ways and slum-clearance program. It is not even an attempt to keep pace with the city's growth. We are actually falling further and further behind. The already insufferable overcrowding is daily getting worse.

Not all strata of the population are effected alike. As for white workers, it is true, they must pay high rents. Many live in crowded dwellings

* Boris Shishkin, Sec'y. AFL-CIO Housing Comm. in *New Republic*, Jan. 16, 1956.

and particularly many of the new arrivals live in slums. But for them there is always the hope of being able to scrape together enough money and escape to the suburbs. It is in the great circle of suburbs surrounding the city that 90% of all new homes are being built. For the Negro family there is no such escape. All suburbs are strictly "for whites" only.

THE GHETTO

Cleveland's Negro population has multiplied four-fold during the last decade and a half, and today comprises 24% of the city's population. All but 2% are compressed into an area of four square miles in the eastern part of the city. Overcrowded beyond belief, in houses which for the most part were unfit for habitation a generation ago, the Negro tenant is often forced to pay half again and more in rentals than white tenants.

This is a made-to-order situation for landlords who have long since learned that there is lots of good money in bad housing. To cite one example: One individual recently paid \$4,000 for three firetraps, which he subdivided into 13 "apartments." These he rented for an average of \$25 a week or \$2,780 a month—enough to pay back his entire initial cost in less than two months.

The plight of the Negro home buyer is not much better. With only 1 per cent of the 145,000 housing units built since 1945 available to Negroes, the would-be home

buyer is restricted to old housing. If he is lucky enough to get a bank mortgage, he can only get it on condition that the house is in a Negro neighborhood. The purchase price for old houses is usually between 30% and 50% higher than what whites pay and the interest rates on his mortgage are much higher than for a new house. Because he has to pay such unreasonable prices, the Negro buyer is often forced to subdivide the house or take in boarders in order to buy a house at all. He is thus compelled to contribute to the deterioration of his own property and though he now owns his home he lives under no less overcrowded conditions than before.

The difficulty in obtaining bank mortgages drives many Negroes to buy homes on a land-contract basis—one of the worst rackets ever devised. The land-contract buyer makes whatever initial payments the seller agrees to, then pays regular installments for a specified number of years. At no time during the contract period does he have any title or deed to the house. The original owner is always free to resell the house if payments are not met. In any event, if the buyer finally obtains title to the house, he winds up paying two and three times as much as he would if he had bought the house in the conventional way. In the Negro community the land-contract racket is widespread and is a source of huge profits to unscrupulous operators

who frequently double their investment in a short time by selling and reselling homes on land contracts.

In short, in nothing is the Negro so grossly cheated as in housing. Here there is not even a pretense of "separate but equal." And no other evil has proven so resistant to change. The Negro people of Cleveland have made much progress in representation and jobs. They can pride themselves in having the largest number of Negro councilmen (7); they have won employment as teachers, government employees, etc. But as regards housing, little has changed.

GOVERNMENT HOUSING— A DISMAL FAILURE

The most spectacular effort to deal with the housing problem has been the urban renewal program launched in 1951. This is a joint venture where the city buys up the slums, tears them down, finds new homes for the families, and then turns over the land to private builders, to erect new dwellings for the slum-dwellers. To date this program has produced very little. Most renewal programs are paralyzed because of the difficulty in finding low-rental apartments to relocate the families. Secondly, in the few cases where new homes are built, the rent charged by the private builders is way beyond the reach of the former inhabitants. The upshot is that the renovated areas are for the most part occupied by white families and some Negroes who can afford the

high rents. Thus we find that in the Central-Scovil area an entire Negro community was uprooted and replaced by a large island of white occupancy. Those formerly living there have had to move into other slums. It is generally recognized among civic leaders that the urban renewal program, far from eliminating slums, has actually resulted in spreading slums to ever new areas.

Nor has Public Housing been of much help. The emasculation of the public housing program to 35,000 units for the entire country, leaves very little for a city like Cleveland. Furthermore, the requirement that only those earning less than \$2400 a year can live in public housing, has virtually excluded all but those on relief and old-age pensioners. Then there is the fact that public housing has followed the general pattern of housing segregation, and as the local NAACP puts it—"no amount of tinkering within the tight confines of the inner-city ghetto will basically solve the problem."

Today the Negro ghetto is literally bursting at the seams. "Sooner or later the combination of more people and fewer dwellings," warned K. C. Jones of the Cleveland Urban League, "will cause a social upheaval with which none of us is equipped to cope."

BANKING AND FINANCIAL INTERESTS—THE REAL CULPRITS

All efforts to break out of the ghetto have run into a stone wall of

resistance, despite the absence of laws sanctioning segregation. Home-owners associations, restrictive covenants, reinforced by intimidation and bombings, have proven quite effective in preserving the segregation pattern.

Main responsibility for that is often placed on the doorstep of the deep-seated prejudice amongst whites. This is no doubt a factor. But it is the banks and big realty interests who are the real power behind the scenes. They are the ones who manipulate the various property-owners associations and exploit existing race prejudice in order to preserve the pattern of jim-crow housing which has proven so extremely lucrative. The Cleveland Trust Co. keeps a map on the wall of its office on which "special areas" are marked off—areas within which loans are not made to Negro buyers.

NEW WINDS ARE BLOWING

Recent experience has shown that ever-growing numbers of white people are ready to support their Negro neighbors' struggle for their right to live wherever they chose. Thus, when the nearly completed home of John C. Gregg, a Negro attorney, was bombed, a group of white neighbors joined a group of ministers in protesting the bombing and helped to clear away the debris. When an attempt was made to form a racist organization, this was effectively countered by a com-

mittee of residents formed to promote friendship among *all* neighbors. This is a neighborhood of Negro and white professionals and includes many well-known civic leaders.

Out of this experience there has emerged an interesting experiment—an organization of all residents who are determined to build an integrated community which can serve as a model for a future integrated city.

More recently a Negro steelworker bought a house on a "white" block. Several hundred whites met in typical Citizens Council fashion and vowed to use all means to drive the Negro family out. They even got the local councilman to attend and pledge his support. But when a group of white and Negro neighbors came to the support of the Negro steelworker, enlisting the aid of several city-wide organizations, the racists beat a hasty retreat. The same councilman now revisited the Negro family to assure it of his support and protection. The Negro family is still there.

THE MOVEMENT FOR BETTER HOUSING

The acuteness of the housing crisis has aroused the citizenry of Cleveland as has no other issue. This problem preoccupies scores of organizations—of private citizens and governmental agencies. There is hardly a Negro church which does not have a housing committee. A

particularly prominent part is being taken by religious leaders, including a large section of the white ministry. From their pulpits they call upon their white congregations to welcome into their communities Negro neighbors.

Most of the important Jewish organizations have taken an advanced position on housing integration. At a recent NAACP conference on housing, the Ohio ACLU pledged its full support to this fight as a major issue of civil liberties. The local press is full of accounts of the housing crisis. Even the big industrialists were compelled to make a show of interest and formed the Cleveland Development Foundation "to do something" about housing.

Nevertheless, one is struck by the disparity between the breadth of this movement and its ability to get results. This was glaringly demonstrated during the last session of the Ohio legislature when a number of important bills were killed by the realty lobby, with little effective protest.

Chief amongst the reasons for this ineffectiveness are: The failure of organized labor to take an active part; the fact that the movement is mainly from the top, with little popular participation. There is a great diversity of plans, much confusion as to the underlying causes, no general agreement as to what is to be done and little coordination of program and activity.

THE PARTY FORMULATES A HOUSING PROGRAM

In light of this situation the Communist Party of Cleveland felt it could make a distinct contribution to the housing fight by making an overall analysis of this rather complex problem, bringing to light its underlying causes, showing where the main responsibility lies and advancing a program of action. This program was hammered out in the course of rather extensive debate with the participation of a goodly section of our members active in their communities.

Two extreme positions emerged in the discussion. Some held to the view that housing was primarily a working-class problem affecting all low-income groups. They considered the underlying causes as being the same for Negro and white people, seeing the only difference as one of degree. This position was rejected in favor of the view that the source of the particular acuteness of the Negro housing problem is to be found in the system of segregation in housing which is fundamental to the whole jim-crow system in the North. That is why the ruling class has fought so tenaciously to preserve the system of jim-crow housing. Hence, there can be no real progress on housing without the elimination of the pattern of housing segregation.

Others took the view that housing was primarily a problem for the Negro people; that for the whites it

has been largely solved. We rejected this position as being factually wrong and politically harmful. An effective movement for better housing requires a united struggle of Negro and white. White support for such a fight cannot be won primarily on humanitarian grounds, but by demonstrating to the white people concretely that this is in their own self interest and that of the entire community.

In a widely distributed Open Letter To the Mayor and City Council, we presented this matter as follows:

The plight of our Negro citizens is a matter of deepest concern to their white neighbors, to the whole community. It's not only a matter of decency and justice.

SEGREGATION HITS EVERYONE IN THE POCKETBOOK

Real estate sharks know no color line. Taking advantage of the housing crisis they fleece Negro and white alike. They force white tenants out and replace them with Negroes, often at a 50% and more hike in rent. When Negro tenants are compelled to pay exorbitant rentals, the rents of white people also keep mounting.

Unscrupulous profiteers deliberately panic white homeowners into selling at a sacrifice, and then resell them to Negro buyers at a handsome profit. . . .

When class-rooms are overcrowded, when sewers overflow, when city services are taxed to the limit—all the result of overcrowding—EVERYONE suffers.

As a result of our discussion we

worked out a program centering around two main points: (1) The need to End Housing Segregation and build an integrated city, and for a City Ordinance, Banning Discrimination in Housing; (2) For a large scale, low cost, public housing program, to be financed in part by a \$10 million bond issue. We pointed out that ending segregation will not of itself end all overcrowding and slums so long as there are not enough low rent houses to go around.

We soon realized that this program was not fully adequate to the situation. This was due to our failure to take into consideration the special character and traditions of Cleveland. Ours is a city of small homeowners. Half of the people own their own homes and most workers' families, Negro and white, aspire to a home of their own. The big obstacle in their way is their inability to get low interest bank loans. Despite all FHA and VA measures, it is the banks who have the last word as to whether building loans would be granted and on what conditions. Hence, the big problem was—how to break the deadening grip of the banks on home-building; how to devise new sources of readily available low interest credit.

It was thus necessary to add a third point to our program: End the Stranglehold of Banks on Loans for Homebuilding and Improvements. We proposed that half of the \$10 million bond issue be used by

the city for low interest loans to be made available to all persons regardless of race or color and without any restrictions as to where the homes are to be built.

As the Party clubs turned their attention to developing housing activity in their respective communities, it was soon realized that a general program was not sufficient. In view of the greatly varying housing needs in each community, ward and even block, it was necessary to also develop local programs based on the special needs of each community, on partial and immediate aspects of the housing problem.

ROLE OF THE PARTY IN THE HOUSING STRUGGLE

The public response to our housing program was generally favorable and in many quarters even enthusiastic. It made its imprint on the municipal election campaign. Not only were the views of the Left accepted, but in many instances known representatives of the Left were welcomed to participate.

The question has been raised—does the Communist Party have a special contribution to make to the housing movement? In our opinion—yes. In making an overall analysis of the housing problem, laying bare its underlying class roots, in developing a general program of action (heretofore lacking), which can provide a broad basis for united effort, the Party has made a special contribution to the housing fight.

We have made a special contribution by showing the broader implications of this movement; the connection between the struggle against jim crow housing and the general crusade for civil rights which registered a new high mark in the Battle of Little Rock.

We have a job to do in combating race prejudice and further strengthening Negro and white unity in the course of the housing activity. We have to show the relation between the monopolists' domination of our government, their cold war policies and the emasculation of the public housing program.

As labor, the Negro people and middle-class elements join forces against the main enemy of decent housing—the banking interests—we can help them realize that it is the same enemy who stands in the way of all social progress, economic security and peace. The housing movement thus becomes an important bridge towards building an anti-monopoly coalition.

Finally, the chronic nature of the housing crisis, in times of boom and bust; the failure of "private enterprise" to cope with this basic social need; the incompatibility between private profits and low-cost housing; the lack of social planning—all these are powerful indictments of the capitalist system. They provide us with singularly telling arguments demonstrating the necessity for socialism as the only social system under which our housing needs can be basically solved.

The Party Crisis and the Way Out: Part I

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

During several days in October, the *Daily Worker* in New York City, published a series of articles by the well-known Communist leader, Alexander Bittelman, in which an analysis was offered of the crisis in the American Left and suggestions given as to how this might be overcome. William Z. Foster, finding himself in disagreement with many of the points made by Comrade Bittelman, prepared a reply which was originally intended for the same paper. Meanwhile, however, it became necessary—temporarily it is hoped—to reduce the size of that paper to but four pages; this has made impossible the publication of Comrade Foster's reply in the paper. Knowing there would be widespread interest in the views of William Z. Foster on the central questions discussed by Comrade Bittelman, we bring these to our readers in the following pages.

Shortly after completing the work hereunder published, Comrade Foster, who has been seriously ill for years, suffered a cerebral hemorrhage. But with the indomitable fighting will which has characterized his entire career, Comrade Foster has been battling his way back to recovery. We know that all our readers, and additional multitudes throughout the world, wish for him a speedy and complete return to activity.—*Ed.*

I. HOW THE PARTY WAS BUILT

THE BASIC THING the Communist Party of the United States needs is an active development of mass work and Party building. At the same time, theoretical clarity is necessary; but I did not find Comrade Bittelman's articles in the *Daily Worker* to be serving either purpose. Ranging throughout the Party's theory, history and practice, his articles constitute virtually a new thesis for the Party; one which conflicts at numerous points with the line of the

Party's 16th Convention. Now, therefore, despite any other considerations, the article cannot stand without an adequate answer.

Before analyzing Comrade Bittelman's main thesis, however, it would be well to consider the policies by which the C.P.U.S.A. built itself over the years, as these policies, in the Bittelman articles, are very much the subject of controversy. Let us examine why, in earlier decades, the Party was able to grow strong and to become a real factor in the labor movement, while all other Left

groups remained stagnant and impotent. Manifestly, the reason for this success did not lay in special environmental conditions, for these were essentially identical for all Left groups, varying as they did from economic crisis to boom, to war, and back to boom again. Decisive, instead, were the subjective factors; the policies used by the various groups.

SEVEN VITAL PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM-LENINISM IN PRACTICE

The basic reasons why the Communist Party could build itself in numbers and mass influence over this long and varied period were three-fold. First, theoretically, the Party was based upon the sound principles of Marxism-Leninism, which sum up the entire world class struggle experience of the proletariat and the scientific thinking of its great leaders. Second, organizationally, as well as politically, the C.P.U.S.A. was what Lenin called "a Party of a new type"; adapted to all the exigencies of the class struggle in the period of imperialism. And third, the Party applied its Marxist-Leninism in a spirit of active class struggle.

In order to learn just how these three basic Marxist-Leninist theories and practices translated themselves concretely into effective mass work and active Party building for the C.P.U.S.A., it is necessary to examine into their application in the class struggle over the decades in question: Of these policies, at least seven

may be listed for analysis, as having been decisive in the history of the Communist Party, particularly during its successful decades.

First: Socialist perspective: Of tremendous importance in strengthening the work of the C.P.U.S.A. was its close sympathy with the first country of Socialism, the U.S.S.R. The struggles, hardships, and successes of the Soviet people were a supreme inspiration to the C.P.U.S.A. and they also attracted to its ranks the best fighters in the working class. A fundamental advantage to our Party also stemming from the Russian Revolution was the theoretical work of its great leader, Lenin, whose writings were the meat and drink of the Party. There were also some important negative sides to the Party's relationship toward the U.S.S.R., but these were far outweighed by the positive influences of the Revolution.

One of the serious negative effects was due to our Party's failure to conduct a comradely criticism of the weaknesses of that country. This "everything-is-all-right" policy antagonized many workers, who rightly believed that criticism was in order. But by far the most serious negative effect upon the Party in this general respect was the Party's long-continued sectarian tendency to apply too literally to the United States the experiences of the Russian Revolution, especially in its agitation and propaganda. This tendency was particularly harmful when the Party undertook to explain how American

Socialism would be brought about, and also how that new system would operate. Here the C.P.U.S.A. (like all other Communist Parties) tended to copy mechanically the Russian experience—Soviets, revolutionary strategy, and all. This error profoundly hindered the growth of the Party and its mass work.

The American workers did not believe the assumption that Socialism could not be achieved through regular American democratic channels. For many years this remained the supreme theoretical weakness of the Party; its failure to absorb into its policies what was fundamental in the Russian Revolution and yet to work out more specifically the probable road to Socialism in the United States. It was not until 1949 that this most difficult of all the Party's theoretical problems was essentially solved, by developing the perspective of achieving Socialism in this country along parliamentary channels and relatively peacefully. This was the most important theoretical advance ever made by the C.P.U.S.A. on its own initiative. It opened up a whole new period of possibilities of Party membership and united front connections with masses of workers hitherto repelled by the Party's unacceptable conception of the road to American Socialism.

Second: Proletarian internationalism: A tower of strength to the C.P.U.S.A. was its working relations with other fighting working forces all over the world. The Communist International, to which our Party

was affiliated for 20 years, had various weaknesses (such as overcentralization), and these were harmful; but on the whole the Comintern was a big plus for the Party, in maturing its Leninist ideology, educating its cadres, and developing the Party's international proletarian spirit.

Third: Democratic centralism: This Leninist form of organization was also a major asset to the Communist Party of the United States. As other Communist Parties, the C.P.U.S.A. made many mistakes in this respect, with bureaucratic practices. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, democratic centralism, even in the limited forms in which we achieved it, gave our Party a fighting capacity, discipline, and working spirit that were the envy of every element in the labor movement. In its ability to move swiftly and resolutely as a unit, our Party had no rival in the labor movement, and this was a fundamental cause of its relative success.

Fourth: National characteristics: Almost from its inception, the Communist Party made war against the bourgeois theory of American exceptionalism, which holds that capitalism in this country is not capitalism at all; that American workers are not real proletarians; and that there are no social classes and no class struggle in the United States. Simultaneously, the Party paid relatively close attention to such important specific American national characteristics as the fact that the

United States is the largest of all capitalist countries; the particular qualities of U.S. monopolies; the non-Socialist ideology of the workers; the lack of a big Social-Democratic party; the higher living standards of the workers; the national diversity of the working class; the special American Negro question; and the specific American democratic and revolutionary traditions. Here again, the Party made many errors, both of omission and commission, and of both a Right and "Left" nature, especially in the realm of theory, and despite the good advice of Lenin. Nevertheless, particularly in the every-day class struggle, the Party lived in the world of American political reality, and it based its immediate demands and struggles generally upon the actualities of the situation in the United States. The C.P.U.S.A. was actually more American in its mass work than any other Left group in this country, all assertions to the contrary notwithstanding.

Comrade Bittelman is only partly correct when he says that the Party "went overboard" in a Leftist direction after it defeated Lovestone's opportunism in 1929. Only a year after this, in the vast unemployment movement of the 1930's, the Party conducted some of the biggest mass struggles in its entire history. And Bittelman is largely incorrect when he says that the Party also "went overboard" after defeating Browder's Revisionism in 1945. Here he ignores the fundamental

working class and American national interests in the Party's fight to defeat the war threat and McCarthyism. He also forgets that what has been called the Party's Leftist leadership, in 1948, developed the most important break with sectarianism in the Party's history, namely the formulation of the parliamentary road to Socialism. His charge that the Party also overestimated the war danger and fascism stems from the Right and has no truth in it. Korea, Indo-China, Egypt, the vast military machine of the United States, and the present tense world situation are the most effective answer to this.

Fifth: The united front: This was one of the most productive policies in the whole arsenal of the C.P. U.S.A., especially in the form of the Left-Progressive bloc in the trade unions. This Leninist strategy enabled the Communists to unite with other progressive forces in a way that was equaled by no other tendency in the labor movement. As usual, however, gross mistakes were made, mainly, but not always, in a sectarian way, such as our disastrous splits with the Fitzpatrick and La-Follette groups in the big labor party movement of 1922-24. Despite all these weaknesses, however, we built our Party primarily with the great united front policy of a Left-Progressive bloc in the trade unions. Count the united front, therefore, especially in the unions, as one of the most fundamental reasons for the growth of the Communist Party.

Sixth: The vanguard role: The

Party's realization of this basic Leninist principle of Party work, was also one of the most decisive reasons for its considerable measure of success. To realize this, all we have to do is to think back to the Party's numberless pioneering fights—to organize the unorganized, to defend the rights of the Negro people, to secure relief and insurance for the unemployed during the great economic crisis, to establish democracy and honest leadership in the trade unions, and to win many a hard-fought strike. In such struggles, it was commonplace for the Party to stand at the head of the workers ideologically, and more than once, as among the unemployed, organizationally as well. The Party's vanguard role among the Negro people in struggle was outstanding, especially in contrast with the A. F. of L. and the Socialist Party. Such militant and fearless leadership and political initiative clearly were among the most fundamental reasons, despite the usual crop of shortcomings, why the C.P.U.S.A. was in a class by itself on the Left in its ability to attract members and to win mass influence.

Seventh: Self-criticism: This is one of the most dynamic and effective of all the Leninist organizational principles. The analysis and admission of errors gives an enormous advantage to Communist Parties over other political organizations. It facilitates the overcoming of shortcomings and the prevention of others. The C.P.U.S.A. was never distin-

guished for self-criticism, especially when it came to its leaders admitting their personal mistakes; but even in the limited degree that it did practice self-criticism, this gave our Party a big advantage over all other Left groupings.

PARTY-BUILDING IN MASS STRUGGLE

The relative success of the Party's mass struggles over the years was based upon the generally correct application of the above seven fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles, especially in trade-union work. Indeed, the Party built itself mainly with its generally sound practical trade-union policy. This policy in its immediate sense, had its roots in the pre-Party work of the Foster-Johnstone group in the Chicago Federation of Labor. By the time the Party was founded, this group had already carried through the national organization of the meat-packing workers (200,000 members) and the national steel workers (367,000) and a 10-year fight against dual unionism, one of the worst sectarian mistakes ever made by the Left—a fight which was brought to a victorious conclusion by the publication in 1920 of Lenin's classical work, "*Left-Wing*" *Communism: An Infantile Disorder*. The Foster-Johnstone group were syndicalists and as such held many wrong theories; but, as has often happened in our Party's history, this did not prevent them from carrying through many relatively correct immediate-demand campaigns. They joined the

Party early in 1921, and from then on led its trade-union work.

The development of the Trade Union Educational League after 1921 marked the beginning of effective Communist work in the trade unions. It was based upon a Left-Progressive (Center) united front, with a militant vanguard trend. It was also animated with a keen sense of American reality in labor's struggle for immediate demands. Coming upon the scene, as it did, in the crisis period for the trade unions of the big post-World War I employer offensive against organized labor, the T.U.E.L. made a strong and immediate impression upon the hard-pressed labor movement with its militant campaigns. Consequently, within 18 months some 2,000,000 organized workers—over half of the whole trade-union movement—endorsed the T.U.E.L.'s central slogan for the amalgamation of the trade unions into industrial organizations. Almost as great a success was had with the T.U.E.L.'s other major slogans, "For a Farmer-Labor Party," "Organize the Unorganized," and "Recognize Soviet Russia."

These broad mass movements of the T.U.E.L. quickly broke the previous isolation of the Communist Party and brought it right into the heart of the living class struggle. The Party moved its headquarters from New York to Chicago, developed united front relations with the Fitzpatrick forces, and at once became an important factor in the strong Farmer-Labor party move-

ment of the period. However, the unfortunate splits with the Fitzpatrick and La Follette forces in 1923—Leftist errors which the Party's trade-union leaders, among others, opposed—cost the Party and the T.U.E.L. much of their previous mass gains.

Nevertheless, in the ensuing years up to the great economic crash of October, 1929, the T.U.E.L. led many important trade-union struggles. These included the united front election campaigns in the Carpenters, Machinists, Needle Trades, Miners, and other organizations—in the U.M.W.A., for example, the Left-Progressive bloc, with three district presidents on its national slate, actually polled more votes than did John L. Lewis; but it was counted out of the election. There were also many big strikes, among them those of the New York Fur Workers and Cloakmakers; the several strikes of Textile workers in Passaic, New Bedford, Lawrence, Gastonia, and elsewhere, as well as other important strikes—all conducted in the militant pioneering spirit of the T.U.E.L. industrial unions and, of course, the Party. A basic achievement of the Party in this period of flush prosperity was its persistent and effective struggle against the intense class collaboration of the trade union leaders and against the current "new capitalism" illusions, which were akin to the "people's capitalism" and "welfare state" illusions of the present time. In this key fight the C.P. was clearly the ideological leader of

the American labor movement.

During the early 1920's the Party, with its characteristic vanguard spirit, revolutionary enthusiasm, and grasp of immediate economic and political realities in the United States, began its historical struggle for Negro rights and against every manifestation of Jim Crowism. Here serious theoretical and tactical errors were made, such as Pepper's advocacy of a Negro republic in the South, but the hampering effects of these general errors were at best partly overcome by the splendid fight of the Party for the Negro people's elementary human demands. For example, the Party's gallant struggle for the Scottsboro boys set the pace not only for the trade-union movement, but also for the Negro organizations and the liberal groupings. By its brave and alert fight, the Party, during these years, laid much of the political basis for the present strong political thrust of the Negro people.

When the great economic crisis of 1929 broke, the Communist Party also rose splendidly to the occasion. Its long training in trade-union work now stood it in good stead. It came forward as the ideological and organizational leader of the huge armies of semi-starving workers. Its militant advocacy of unemployment insurance and relief put both the A. F. of L. and the Socialist Party to the blush. Through the Trade Union Unity League (T.U.U.L.), which was the old T.U.E.L. reorganized in 1929, the big unemployed

demonstration of March 6, 1930—which brought 1,250,000 unemployed to the streets—was organized, and during the next three years literally hundreds of local, state, and national hunger marches, many of them splendidly organized, were carried through. The Communists quickly became the recognized leaders among the vast millions of the unemployed. The "secret" of these big successes by the Party was its application of the seven basic Leninist principles above referred to—including the vanguard role, Party discipline, the united front, proletarian internationalism, and an appreciation of the national characteristics of the American class struggle.

When the C.I.O. forces, in 1935, began their historic drive to organize the basic industries, the Communist Party, fully grasping the significance of the issues involved, was ready for the campaign. The T.U.U.L. promptly liquidated itself, its forces joined the A. F. of L. unions, without conditions, and the Left entered into practical united front working arrangements with the C.I.O. leaders. Here, the wide experience, the thousands of local contacts in the open shop industries, the vanguard spirit, and the sense of grass roots realism, if not always theoretical clarity, of the Communists made them the most effective organizers in this historic struggle. Communist pamphlets on the techniques of trade-union organization were used as textbooks in many C.I.O. organizing committees. Hun-

dreds of Communists, trained in the trade-union work of the T.U.E.L. and T.U.U.L., were members of the local and national organizing staffs in steel, auto, rubber, needle, textile, maritime, and other industries. The epoch-making success of the great movement and the growth of the powerful progressive wing of the C.I.O., were testimonials to the correctness of the organizing line followed by the Left-Progressive bloc and the Communist Party.

One of the major associated developments in the establishment of the CIO was the raising of the Negro struggle to new heights by the admission of large numbers of Negro workers into the trade unions, and some into union leadership. It was the successful culmination of years of tireless and devoted pioneer work by the Communists, and this fact was recognized, especially by the Negro people. There was also, in this general period, the development of the enormous youth movement, involving several millions of young people, and in which the militant Young Communist League, headed by Comrade Gil Green, was admittedly a dynamic factor.

The latter 1930's were the period of the developing struggle against Hitler's fascism, and the Communist Party proved itself to be equal also to this basic test. Here again, the Communists' international relations, their customary vanguard spirit, their effective Party discipline, their united front policy, and their realistic appraisal of American needs in the

complex world struggle against fascism, were of inestimable value in the Party's very effective participation in this great life and death struggle. Of course, serious errors were made, but who can doubt the validity and great effectiveness of the Party's general fight in this period?

In line with its broad Leninist program of uniting with all other progressive forces, the Party in the crucial elections of 1936, gave practical support to the candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Very significant was it that Earl Browder, whom the Right in our Party is trying to build up as a super-effective mass leader, vigorously opposed the policy of this support for Roosevelt. He was for launching a Farmer-Labor ticket, and he never gave up this idea until he was completely defeated. Had this grave error been made it would have disastrously isolated the Communist Party. It was on the basis of the informal united front with the Roosevelt forces that the Party very effectively fought side by side with them all through World War II. An example of the Party's vanguard role in this broad united front combination was its tireless and successful fight for the Second Front.

It was through such sound policies, particularly in the trade-union field, that the Communist Party built up its numerical strength and mass influence. With its eventual 85,000 members, the Communist Party had several times more affiliates and a vastly greater mass influ-

ence than all the other Left groups put together, including the Socialist Party. If the Party did not make a better showing in political elections, this was partly due to the strong grip the two party system had upon the workers, but mainly because the masses were repelled by the Party's Leftist conception of the American road to Socialism, which they considered to be for the violent overthrow of the government.

Most of the errors made by the Party over the years in the application of its policies have been in the direction of theoretical dogmatism and Left-sectarian policies in practice. These "Left" errors were very damaging in the Party's work. But while combatting such "Left" shortcomings, let us not forget that the Party also suffered severely from Right mistakes. The Right opportunism of Pepper and Lovestone deeply hurt the Party, and so did the crass Revisionism of Browder. Browder's opportunism, which came to a climax in his notorious Teheran thesis of late 1943, was already definitely damaging the Party from 1936 on. Also, let us note that the Party, in the current Revisionism of Comrade Gates, is experiencing the most serious political error in its entire history.

The basic thing to grasp in all the foregoing analysis is that the main subjective force which made it possible for the Party to grow in numbers and influence was the fact that the Party operated in practice upon the foundation of Marxism-Lenin-

ism, concretized by the seven Leninist principles enumerated above, despite the Party's very imperfect application of them.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTY CRISIS

During the period of the Cold War, roughly from 1947 until the present date, the Communist Party lost very heavily in members and mass influence. These losses have not been due to an inherent decline in efficiency of the several Leninist working principles, which, as we have shown, made possible the building of the Party over the years. The Party crisis will be found to be based upon other factors, objective and subjective, which we shall examine.

a) *Prosperity illusions*: First and foremost of the objective factors in creating the Party crisis have been the corroding effects of the long-continued upward swing of American imperialism. Since 1940, the United States, basically as a result of World War II and the aftermath rebuilding, has been passing through an unprecedented industrial boom, and with relatively steady employment. Besides, the bourgeoisie has been compelled to improve economic conditions for large sections of the working class, wage increases were won fairly easily, etc. This situation has created powerful "prosperity illusions" among the workers, expressed by political complacency, "welfare state," "people's capitalism," etc., to the general effects that there will be no more economic

crises, that mass unemployment is now a thing of the past, that capitalism is automatically developing into a progressive regime with a beneficent government, that Socialism is not necessary, and the like.

Such illusions were characteristic also of the upswing periods of imperialism in Great Britain, Germany, Japan, France, and other major capitalist countries—except that the situation is more exaggerated in the United States than it has ever been in any other country. These enervating prosperity illusions, although obviously not strong enough to prevent the growth of trade unionism, nevertheless tend to soften the fighting spirit and Socialist perspectives of the workers. The Communist Party membership and leadership, as we have learned in the Party crisis, is by no means immune to prosperity illusions. These are all the more prevalent and injurious in our Party in view of its weak social composition—too few industrial workers, Negroes, youth, and women—and the relatively low theoretical level of the Party. Capitalist prosperity illusions have been very basic, therefore, in provoking the present crisis in the Party.

Comrade Bittelman is profoundly incorrect when he brushes aside prosperity illusions as unimportant in causing the Party's crisis, saying: ". . . the economic situation by itself could not and did not influence the development of the Party crisis." The Party's national convention, correctly, held quite a different viewpoint,

warning sharply of the need to combat prosperity illusions, both within and without the Party.

b) *The Stalin revelations*: Fundamental, too, as a subjective factor in developing the Party crisis were the revelations of the Stalin "cult of the individual" in the U.S.S.R., exposed by Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February, 1956. The shocking story of bureaucracy and brutality there unfolded undoubtedly shook the Socialist faith of numbers of Communists in the capitalist countries, not the least in the United States. This shock was deepened by the developments in Hungary in November, 1956, when the Soviet Army was called upon, as a "grim necessity," to stamp out the counter-revolution, basically organized by agents of American imperialism. The negative results of the Stalin revelations were all the more marked in the United States because of the already prevailing crisis conditions in the Communist Party.

c) *The Government persecution*: A basic factor, objective in nature, in creating the crisis in the C.P.U.S.A. was the prolonged and bitter persecution of the Communist Party by the government, local, state, and national from 1948 to 1955: with wholesale arrests of leaders, jailings, deportations, discriminations in industry, the formal outlawing of the Party, etc., directed against Communist Party members and sympathizers—all of which was carried

out under conditions of pro-war hysteria and malignant fascist-like McCarthyism. Not surprisingly, under these terror conditions large numbers of members dropped out of the Party, mass contacts were weakened, the Party organization was disrupted, and the whole work of the Party was made vastly more difficult.

d) *Leftist errors*: The increasingly difficult position of the Party was also considerably worsened by several serious errors made by the Party leadership during the cold war period. Under the terror situation, these errors tended, in the main, to be Left-sectarian in character, even though the Party was by no means led by those who are now called Leftists and who are being blamed for the errors. During such a long period and under such extremely difficult conditions, it was not surprising that serious errors were made. The three most important errors of the cold war period were: a) The organization of the Progressive Party during the 1948 election campaign, a step which the Communist Party supported. To have the Wallace peace ticket in the field was correct, but for that Party to be launched without the necessary labor backing was wrong. This incorrect move tended greatly to isolate the Left forces in the trade unions. b) The failure of the Party actively to adopt and support the proposition of presenting to the masses the perspective of a parliamentary and relatively peaceful road to Socialism in

the United States—a matter which had been raised in the Party. This serious political Leftist error greatly worsened the position of the Party before the masses and in the courts, especially as it was being specifically charged with conspiring to advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government. c) The excessive security regulations adopted by the National Board in 1950. This wrong move further cut into the Party's gradually declining membership and it also weakened its mass contacts. Further errors can be cited in specific fields of Party work, as among the Negro people, etc. Doubly difficult was the work of applying the Party's peace policy, because the overwhelming mass of the American people believed the Soviet Union (and Communists generally) to be responsible for the threatening war danger.

Errors were also made in the vital trade-union field, usually, but not always, of a Left-sectarian character. Totally unjustified, however, were the reckless efforts of the Right to fasten the blame upon the Party for the great C.I.O. split in 1949, with the expulsion of eleven progressive unions with almost 1,000,000 members. This split, which developed in almost every capitalist country and which ruptured the great World Federation of Trade Unions, was organized by the State Department and its labor allies as a basic phase of monopoly capitalism's pro-war program. The progressive forces in the C.I.O., as in all other affected

countries, did everything possible to avert the split, if not always skillfully.

The combined effect of these various errors and shortcomings of the Party, and of the other crisis factors, was seriously to weaken the Party in its membership and mass contacts. But when the terror period came virtually to a close after the Geneva conference of 1955 and it became possible for the Party to function in a more normal manner, the Party was by no means yet in crisis. Although greatly reduced in size and mass influence, the Party's morale remained high. This was because, in fighting valiantly, as it did, against malignant McCarthyism and the threatening danger of an atomic world war, a fight which was praised all over the world, the Party felt that it was acting both in the interest of the American people and in accordance with the best traditions of Marxism-Leninism—as indeed it was—and it was inspired and strengthened thereby. Its unity remained strong, its outlook clear, and its fighting spirit undaunted. But a new factor was soon to develop, one that, within the framework of the other crisis factors, was to demoralize the Party and to throw it into deep crisis. This was the swift growth of a powerful Right-Revisionist trend in the Party.

THE DISASTROUS EFFECTS OF RIGHT REVISIONISM

Revisionism in the C.P.U.S.A. was generated, basically, as remarked

above, by the upswing of American imperialism and the long-continued industrial boom, with ensuing "prosperity illusions," plus the low theoretical level in the Party. It expressed itself in moods and theories to the effect that capitalism, particularly in the United States, has substantially overcome its inner and outer contradictions and was evolving more or less spontaneously in a progressive direction. The United States and other big capitalist countries were assumed to be in a new period in which monopoly capital had lost most of its malignancy, power, and political control; its erstwhile drive for world conquest did not exist; the war danger, as a serious menace, had disappeared; the class struggle was greatly softened, and the political road to "Socialism" was to be an easy advance for the workers. This was the "new capitalism" of the 1920's and the "progressive capitalism" of the Roosevelt period brought up to date; the opportunism of Lovestone and Browder adapted to the cold war period. The first general current expression of this latest edition of Revisionism was contained in the article in POLITICAL AFFAIRS of November, 1956, written by Comrade John Gates, and entitled, "Time For a Change."

The Revisionists drew many sweeping conclusions from their main political position. The Communist Party was declared obsolete and in need of being replaced, either by a "political action association" or by a "new mass party of

Socialism." Marxism-Leninism was dubbed "Left-sectarian" in the United States and was to be abandoned for a colorless Social Democratic "Marxism," without Lenin. All policies based upon the perspective of an active class struggle were declared out of place, and they had to be supplanted by policies essentially class collaborationist in nature. This Revisionism grew quickly and soon it came to dominate most of the staff of the *Daily Worker*, a majority of 27 to 1 on the New York State Committee, and it had a strong following in various other state committees of the Party.

In order to put through their obvious program of liquidationism, the Revisionists carried on a very active campaign to discredit the past, present, and future of the Communist Party. The general idea seemed to be that if they could make the Party members lose faith in the Party, they would be disposed to give up the Party and Marxism-Leninism and accept the substitute organizations and policies of the Right. To this end, in estimating the policies of the cold war period, the Right multiplied "errors" in every direction. Violating the principle of self-criticism, every conceivable real and imaginary mistake was distorted or manufactured and then paraded to the disadvantage of the Party's reputation. Party achievements were belittled or ignored outright. The Party was thrown into a fever of exaggeration of Left-sectarian errors, with the Right danger carefully

shielded from all criticism. The central theme of this organized defeatism and liquidationism was that the Communist Party and Marxism-Leninism had to be abandoned in favor of opportunistic substitutes.

Concretely, the Right attacked Marxism-Leninism, not only in general, but specifically in all its various aspects, as indicated above. That is: (a) the Socialist perspective of the Party was blasted by sniping attacks against the U.S.S.R., especially with regard to Hungary; (b) Proletarian internationalism was belittled in favor of a lop-sided and opportunistic presentation of national interests; (c) Democratic centralism was rigorously condemned as fatal to Socialist democracy; (4) The Party's essentially healthy struggle against American exceptionalism was condemned and undermined; (e) The vanguard role of the Party was discarded and declared without further validity in the face of the "ideological maturity" of the trade unions and other mass organizations, about the only vanguard function left to the Party being that of advocating Socialism; (f) The united front, especially the Left-Progressive bloc in the trade unions, was discredited and abandoned, upon the theory that there were no longer broad Right, Center, and Left currents in the labor movement; (g) Self-criticism was made a mockery of by being used as a basis for a full-scale ideological attack upon the Party.

During the Revisionist offensive

the Labor-Farmer Party slogan was also virtually discarded. The thinking behind this action was : (a) an opportunistic acceptance of the Democratic Party as the Party of the working class, and (b) a consideration of the correct Labor-Farmer Party slogan as a rival to the liquidatory slogans for the political action association and for the new mass party of Socialism. It is on the basis of a common fight for a Labor-Farmer Party and for labor's immediate demands, that the C.P.U.S.A. should be cooperating with other Left groups, and not simply to advocate Socialism or to try to organize a new Social-Democratic party.

In the Party's difficult situation, the Revisionist campaign of liquidationism did very great harm. This in fact, is what immediately precipitated the Party into crisis. The most profound confusion and pessimism penetrated the ranks of the Party. All told, several thousand members quit it in frustration and despair. Never before has any Communist Party so suicidally torn itself apart. Veteran Party members, who had bravely withstood the violent persecution by the government, and who had kept their political balance in the face of the Stalin revelations, collapsed under the destructive ideological offensive from the Right. Various Party and other Left institutions, which had remained unshaken under the worse blasts of the McCarthy terrorism, crumbled under the liquidationism of the Revisionists, even though, in the meantime,

political conditions had greatly improved. This was the tragic fate of the splendid Jefferson School, the California Labor School, the *Daily People's World* and the Labor Youth League—all of which perished under the Right offensive. Key journals and other vital institutions are also imperiled by it. The substance of the present crisis is that the Party is deeply sick with a heavy attack of Right Revisionism. It is an untenable excuse for the Right to claim, as Comrade Bittelman does, that the Party crisis was inevitable—which it was not.

Comrade Bittelman, in his articles, greatly understates the danger of Revisionism in the Party. In fact, he brushes it aside with the comment that its proposal, from which he mildly demurs, was "to leave Marxist-Leninist theory alone for the moment and let life speak for itself." Of course, there was no such proposal whatever made in the Party. Instead, there were definite attempts backed with great energy, to liquidate the Party as such and to cut the heart out of its Marxist-Leninist theory. If the Right could have had its way—which fortunately the Party membership prevented—our Party and its theory would have been destroyed. In this sharp struggle, the Left was the real spokesman for the Party members in their determination to keep our Party intact upon a Marxist-Leninist basis. Comrade Bittelman makes a serious error in so slightly passing over this fundamental situation. If he goes easy

on the Right, however, he takes many sharp and unjustified cuts at the Left.

The uncertain line followed by Comrade Dennis has also done much to deepen and prolong the Party crisis. While he has opposed in writing some of the worst crudities of Comrade Gates—the political action association, the incorrect stand on Hungary, and the coddling of the anti-Communist, Clark—Dennis has never taken a firm stand against Revisionism, a course which has tended to appease and conciliate it.

The 16th national convention of the C.P.U.S.A., held in February, 1957, gave a sharp rebuff to the Revisionist agitation going on in the Party. It adopted a ringing declaration for the continuation and the vigorous rebuilding of the Communist Party; it reiterated its support of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism as "universally valid"; it portrayed American imperialism as seeking to dominate the world, and it warned against the continuing war danger. The convention also took a correct position on such important theoretical and practical questions as the comradely criticism of other Communist Parties and the countries of Socialism, the practice of more political initiative by the C.P.U.S.A., and the development of friendly and cooperative relations with other Left

forces in the United States—all of which questions had been distorted by the Right. Some elements of Revisionism did, however, manage to cling to the main resolution of the convention, such as a poor sum-up of Social-Democracy, a faulty statement of the vanguard role of the Communist Party, a dubious outline of trade-union policy, and a seriously deficient analysis of the shortcomings and achievements of the Party during the cold war period.

In its 16th national convention the Party gave a strong political setback to Right Revisionism; nevertheless, the Right has remained entrenched organizationally throughout the Party. Together with its conciliators, it is now very strong in all the leading committees of the Party, and this is also true in various state committees. Its main strength is that it controls and uses the *Daily Worker* as its special mouthpiece. This continuing Right strength organizationally is a basic reason why the Party has not been making a more rapid recovery from its serious crisis, as it operates to block the application of the sound policies of the 16th national convention. The whole Communist world remarks this Revisionism in our Party, but our leadership tries to deny it or to hide it.

The concluding section of Comrade Foster's article, entitled "The Road Ahead," will be published in the next issue.—Ed.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE ESTEEMED commentator, "T.R.B.," in *The New Republic* (Nov. 25, 1957) noted the accumulating signs of economic difficulties and agreed that a "recession" was here. He went on to say:

We think the recession was unnecessary. The country has huge reserve productive capacity and huge consumer demand and there is no reason except an artificial one why they can't meet.

The columnist left this "artificial" reason somewhat obscure. Apparently it is indelicate to call it by its name. I am moved, nevertheless, to name the awful "reason." Still, to spare "T.R.B.," we will put it in the form of a riddle; perhaps he can figure it out: The "reason's" name starts with a C and has ten letters in it.

Of course, the Madison Avenue experts have labored so intensely and ingeniously at camouflaging the ugly word, that it is no wonder some very knowledgeable people have permitted themselves to forget the fundamental realities of life. Recently, for example, B. Brewster Jennings, Chairman of the Board, Socony-Mobil Corporation, weighed three alternative names within one brief paragraph.

"Free enterprise" is the term which we use most frequently in describing ourselves and our economic system, but surely the term "responsible enterprise" would be equally accurate. In using it we merely examine the thing from its other side. The other standard phrase, "private enterprise," suffers, I think, from its suggestions of exclusiveness and the implication that its activity is no one's business but its own. We all know that that is a misleading implication (*U. S. News & World Report*, Feb. 22, 1957).

Observe, once again, the absence of that naughty ten-letter word. Actually, the word does need modifying these days, but calling it "people's capitalism" will not do; monopoly capitalism will.

The extent and reality of this monopolization has been documented most recently and most persuasively by Victor Perlo in his *Empire of High Finance*, reviewed in the October issue of this magazine, by Hyman Lumer. So manifest is this process, however, and so threatening is it to elementary concepts of democracy that a man like former Senator Herbert H. Lehman publicly expresses his grave concern at the accelerated rate of Big-Business mergers, especially among monster banks. He finds "the end result" to be:

a more highly centralized control of the nation's financial system, *with mounting danger to the entire national economy if a relatively few individuals should decide, for whatever reason, to misuse their control over the lifeblood of our economy.**

There is also a growing body of literature recognizing another basic Marxist insight—the tendency towards increasing identification of government and Big Business, as monopolization intensifies. This is one of the central points in Lauren Soth's work on *Farm Trouble* (reviewed in our October number by Erik Bert), which demonstrates the gross government favoritism shown to the largest commercial farms. This is markedly present, of course, in industry. There the tax, depletion, amortization, tariff, and procurement policies of the government completely favor the greatest corporations.

For a survey of "the government as promotor" of *Monopoly in America*, readers are referred to the book (Macmillan, N. Y., \$5.00) by that title—its sub-title is the quoted words by Professor Walter Adams (of Michigan State University) and Horace M. Gray (of the University of Illinois). So glaring is this favoritism, and so notorious is the identification in terms of personnel between Big Businessmen and decisive governmental figures, that one finds

* A very considerable portion of the speech takes up three pages in *The New Leader* (N. Y., April 29, 1957); but the italicized words were omitted from this version. They appear in the *N. Y. Times*, April 3, 1957.

an article in the liberal Catholic weekly, *The Commonweal* (November 8, 1957) concluding: "The suspicion must persist in the minds of many that an alliance is being forged between government and corporate power."*

* * *

The obverse side of monopoly capitalism is mass deprivation. While much of the literature of the past has denied the existence of the former, it has "forgotten" the presence of the latter.

It is true that the available resources, physical plant, and productivity of the United States are the greatest in the world. This, plus certain favoring historical conditions (especially, but not exclusively, separation from the devastations of two World Wars, and the garnering of immense profits therefrom), together with the results of imperialist exploitation, make possible in our country a higher standard of living, in terms of physical perquisites, than exists anywhere else.

We do not here consider such matters as insecurity, speed-up, corruption, inadequate educational and medical facilities, crime, immorality, mental illness, alcoholism, drug-addiction—not to mention such an

* Pertinent is the just published government study: *Congress and the Monopoly Problem* (Sup't. of Documents, Washington, \$2), a massive work summarizing major legislative data on anti-trust laws through 1956 and listing all anti-trust prosecutions. See also the apologia for the failure of the judiciary to enforce anti-trust legislation: Milton S. Handler, *Anti-trust in Perspective* (Columbia Univ. Press, \$3).

abomination as racism—all of which, of course, directly effect standard of living in any rounded, human sense, and in all of which the United States is among the “leaders.”* But in the sense of physical provisions, and only in that sense, the standard of living in our country is the highest in the world.

Nevertheless, there is the sharpest kind of inequality in the distribution of wealth here, and there are large layers of the population who live in the most terrible poverty. And when we speak of the impoverished in the United States, we do not have in mind “pockets,” as is sometimes stated; we mean layers.

But while mentioning “pockets,” there are such particular sore spots, which generally go unreported or very poorly reported in the overall official figures but which nevertheless number many hundreds of thousands of people enduring unspeakable conditions. There are, for example, the 350,000 American Indians, whose life expectancy is under 20 years (that of the white American is 69), whose food, clothing, housing, education and health approximate those of South African workers, and who are held, as Carlos B. Embry shows in his *America's*

* For some data on this, see the editorial, “Suicide, Homicide & Beer” in *The New Republic*, Sept. 9, 1957. Readers will also find very useful, *Cancer, Smoking, Heart-Disease, Drinking*, by the well-known Canadians, Charlotte and Dyson Carter (Northern Book House, Toronto, \$1.60).

Concentration Camps (David McKay, N. Y., \$3.50) “in virtual economic, social, political, and legal slavery.” Or, there are the ennobling lives pursued by the literally uncounted thousands making up the scores of “skid rows” in every major American city. One of the few studies seriously investigating the men and women utterly broken and discarded by capitalism is Sara Harris’ recent *Skid Row, U.S.A.* (Doubleday, N. Y., \$3.75).

But we spoke of inequality and of poverty, in terms of whole levels of the population. As to inequality, consider this fact: The Federal Reserve Board reported that as of the end of 1955, the top 10 per cent of American families owned 65 per cent of all family-held liquid assets; the bottom 40 per cent owned less than 1 per cent. Or, as to savings: *Business Week* (June 16, 1956) declared: “At income levels below the \$7,500 mark, savings are trivial.” Trivial, indeed—in most cases they are nonexistent, and, in fact, are less than zero. For, in the case of self-employed Americans having yearly incomes below \$4,000, they operated on an average yearly deficit of \$706; and of others with incomes below \$4,000—that is, salaried workers—they ended their year with an average deficit of \$149. No wonder outstanding personal loans in 1956 came to some six billion dollars, more than twice what it had been in 1950.

As to income as a whole, we must

here be quite brief (much data, through 1955, will be found in Labor Research Association’s indispensable *Labor Fact Book No. 13*, International Publishers, N. Y., \$2). Suffice it to say that the U.S. Census Bureau released illuminating statistics concerning this on September 9, 1957, but the press of the nation was very nearly unanimous in finding the data not “news fit to be printed.” These government figures—always leaning towards minimizing poverty, and presenting income before taxes—showed that 8 per cent of the nation’s families had incomes of \$10,000 or more; 20 per cent had total gross incomes of less than \$2,000; 43 per cent had incomes under \$4,000; and that the median family income—before taxes—in 1956 came to \$4,783. The median farm family income was \$2,371; the median family income for the 17 million Negro people was about half that of the white family.

The data show enormous inequality in income distribution. They show a high persistence of real poverty, a very widespread degree of bare minimal standards of living, a considerable minority in the “middle class” bracket, and a very small minority in the rich brackets. The data demonstrate acute instability in the economy; they help explain the profound sense of insecurity afflicting most Americans.

The evidence demonstrates that “I.R.B.’s” “artificial reason,” for the fatal gap between productive ca-

capacity and consumer demand is monopoly capitalism. This system is woefully deficient in terms of human service. And this is true in that land where that system, for many reasons, has been able to do the most. Given social ownership and rational planning, given the devotion of the enormous American resources and capabilities to human well-being rather than capitalist profit, the actual condition of the American people, in economic, cultural, educational and medical terms would be tremendously advanced.

This observation is all the more true now that we are entering into the age of atomic energy, automation and electronics (and the uncovering and harnessing of additional sources of energy and productivity). While these advances pose terrifying problems for monopoly capitalism, they assure unprecedented rates of production-growth with Socialism, and, indeed, the relatively rapid creation of that material abundance, justly distributed, that will be Communism.

* * *

An historical work of exceptional value is *Opponents of War: 1917-1918*, by Gilbert C. Fite and the late H. C. Peterson (University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, \$6).

The authors’ viewpoint is that of a rather mild liberalism. This makes all the more impressive their carefully documented story of the persecution of anti-war, radical, and

trade-union people, totalling many thousands, that characterized the home-front during the Great Imperialist War. Their shallow analysis of the sources of what they are describing, and their omission of the Negro and women's rights struggles are serious limitations of the volume. Yet they do document more fully than any other work the reactionary domestic policies and conduct of the Wilson Administration.

The book is especially useful in showing the despicable role of the commercial press—notably the *New York Times*—with its disgusting advocacy of repression, and, indeed, of wholesale terror and even lynchings. It is valuable, also, in proving the anti-democratic and illegal operations of the Department of Justice. At the same time, it is the fullest account yet available—though there is room for more work here—of the resistance of the Left to the repression; of the great amnesty campaigns; and of the Left's leadership in rallying large numbers of people, under very difficult circumstances, to defend their political and economic interests.

Not the least important aspect of the work is the documentation it offers for the characterization of justice as then administered made in 1922 by Congressman George Hudleston of Alabama:

The rich, influential, and ably defended, of course, go free. The weak, the undefended, and the friendless are convicted of course. To be an alien,

radical or labor agitator is to go to jail.

This class-tainted and politically-tainted (and, let it be added, racist-tainted) justice remains the essential justice of the United States. There are very precious features within the institutional forms of that judicial system—the whole “due-process of law” concept—but one of the outstanding failures of capitalist society, not least of American capitalist society, is its fundamentally and organically unjust system of justice.

An exceedingly important, if partial, demonstration of this truth will be found in *Not Guilty*, by the late Federal Judge, Jerome Frank and his daughter, Barbara Frank (Doubleday, N. Y., \$3.75). In this volume are described thirty-six actual cases in which innocent men were convicted. And the common denominator here was not political or national persecution, but rather the built-in legal obstacles confronting the poor and the ordinary run of citizen, and the built-in corruption of the law-enforcement apparatus. Some taste of what is in this volume may be gained by a few quotations:

The conviction and imprisonment of innocent men too frequently occur to be ignored by any of us. There are too many cases on record to prove the point, and there may be countless others of which we know nothing. (p. 31.)

All this goes to show that we must

face a shocking fact: *A man may be convicted when his only crime is that of being poor.* (p. 86.)

If we believe in the democratic process, we will not long tolerate a situation in which justice in a criminal case is exclusively an upper-bracket privilege. (p. 87.)

The Frank volume makes the point that Third-Degree methods—which mean, as they state, the denial of all civil rights to the prisoner and the application of physical torture—occur in thousands upon thousands of

cases in every state in the Union. It is applied only against the poor, against those without “influence”; it appears indeed, “that civil liberties are, on the whole, the exclusive privilege of professional criminals and of the so-called upper classes” (p. 183).

This book adds up to a confirmation of the damning aphorism of the great American radical, Henry Demarest Lloyd: “Only the rich can get justice, only the poor cannot escape it.”

“The true patriot, therefore, will enquire into the causes of the fears and jealousies of his countrymen; and if he finds they are not groundless, he will be far from endeavoring to allay or stifle them. On the contrary . . . he will by all proper means in his power foment and cherish them. He will, as far as he is able, keep the attention of his fellow citizens awake to their grievances; and not suffer them to be at rest, till the causes of their complaints are removed. . . .”

—Samuel Adams, in a letter to The Editor, *Boston Gazette*, Jan. 21, 1771.

American Imperialism and Canada

By LESLIE MORRIS

The role of American imperialism in foreign affairs is of decisive importance upon the world scene. In an effort to bring our readers specific and current information on this vital matter we publish below an account of that role in Canada, written for us by a member of the National Committee of that nation's Labor-Progressive Party. Readers will remember that in our October issue, John Williamson examined the impact of U.S. imperialism upon Great Britain; others are now preparing articles on the British West Indies, West Germany, and Cuba.—Ed.

THE UNITED STATES has more capital invested in Canada than in any other country. In no other country is the basic economy so completely in foreign hands. No other country is so completely dependent upon imports from the U.S. as is Canada. And—it might be added—Canada's trade-union movement is unique in that union head offices are, in the main, in a foreign country.

This economic dependence cannot be explained only by the geographical juxtaposition of Canada and the U.S. along more than 3,000 miles of common border. The economic relationships between the two countries cannot "simply" be explained, either, by the fact that Canada's population of almost 17,000,000 is about one-eleventh the size of its big neighbor's.

Such "explanations" are quite commonly found on both sides of the border.

The Canadian capitalist class won political independence from

Britain over the course of many years of political struggle, supported by the people. The act of Confederation, in 1867, which united the British North American provinces into a federal state, started a process of national independence which, as far as Britain is concerned, was formally concluded with the Statute of Westminster in 1921. It was a part of the breaking up of the British Empire following the first world war.

This political independence is a sturdy, national plant, which continues to grow. A national consciousness is being strengthened every day.

The independence won by Canada from Britain and its transformation from a British colony into a politically independent state bore the specific peculiarity that the Canadian population and the economy were not classically "colonial," in the Asian or African sense. Canada and the British

Dominions as the Communist International correctly said, were extensions of the imperialist metropolis and were created on the basis of the pillage and virtual extermination of the original inhabitants and their economy.

As was the case in the U.S.A., so in Canada, capital accumulation for the economic development of the country was dependent, in the beginning, on large investments from Britain. Since the end of the first World War the picture has

changed. As the U.S.A. began to replace Britain as the dominant imperialist world power, capital investments in Canada began to change in favor of the U.S.A.

The following table gives the picture. It will be seen that the shift from dependence on Britain to U.S. capital took place between 1919 and 1922, the years of rapid British decline and U.S. imperialist advance, the years of the commencement of the general crisis of capitalism. In a sense, it was an accompaniment of the general crisis.

INVESTMENTS OF FOREIGN CAPITAL IN CANADA
SELECTED YEARS, 1900-1954

(in millions of dollars)

	All Countries	U. S. A.	% of all foreign investments	Britain	% of all foreign investments
1900	\$1,232	\$ 168	13.6%	\$1,050	85.4%
1919	4,637	1,818	39.2	2,645	57.1
1922	5,207	2,593	49.8	2,464	47.3
1930	7,614	4,659	61.2	2,776	36.4
1939	6,913	4,151	60.2	2,476	35.8
1945	7,092	4,990	70.5	1,750	24.7
1954	12,400	9,500	76.9	2,100	16.9

The trend shown here has strengthened since 1954. It is estimated that U.S. capital in Canada amounts now to about \$15 billion.

* * *

A report in the Canadian *Journal of Economics and Political Science*, November, 1956, says:

No other nation as highly industrialized as Canada has such a large

portion of industry controlled by non-resident concerns.

In its submission to the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects in January, 1956 the Labor-Progressive Party made a solid case for new national policies which would facilitate the independent economic development of Canada. Some of the salient facts brought forward, which

are unchallenged (and, in fact, constantly and increasingly featured in the daily press) illustrate the drive towards the domination of the Canadian economy by U.S. monopoly capital.

That this drive is a deliberate, conscious one, is shown in the statement of President Eisenhower when he was campaigning for the presidency in 1952:

From my viewpoint, foreign policy is, or should be, based primarily on one consideration. That consideration is the need for the United States to obtain certain raw materials to sustain its economy, and, where possible, to preserve profitable foreign markets for our surpluses. (*New York Herald-Tribune*, March 2, 1952.)

This was bolstered by the Paley Report to the U.S. government which studied the raw materials of the world in the light of U.S. needs and declared that of 22 strategic materials necessary for U.S. expansion, 10 were present in Canada.

Brazenly, the Paley Report declared that the rich Ungava and Steep Rock iron ore resources must go to U.S. steel mills; and that the native capital of countries like Canada should be diverted to "power, transportation and other basic services, and investment for increasing productivity in agriculture—fields in which outside private capital takes little or no interest."

The result of this drive for the control of Canadian raw materials, with its counterpart, the export to

Canada of finished U.S. products, is to throw Canadian industry out of balance. It becomes clear that the purpose of U.S. investment in Canada has changed from one of developing branch industrial plants (which was a main feature of U.S. investment when the British Empire preferential tariff system made it necessary to do this in order to come within regulations) to one of gaining control and owning outright Canadian resources to build U.S. industries located in the U.S.A.

This gives employment to U.S. workers, develops U.S. technical and industrial skills, and means the export of jobs as well as raw materials. Thus, Canadian workers are robbed of employment by a) the shipment of raw materials to U.S. plants, and b) the importation from the U.S. of finished goods.

THEFT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The growth of the production of the means of production is retarded. This is vividly illustrated in the case of the "mother of industry," steel. While basic steel production has been increasing in Canada, the massive iron ore deposits are being seized by the U.S. corporations. As the Mesabe range declines as a source of U.S. ore, Canada, with Venezuela, is becoming a main source of supply. The aim of the Cyrus Eaton and other interests is to obtain 40 million tons of ore a year from Quebec-Labrador fields by

1975. The royalties from this ore are ludicrously infinitesimal. To complete the picture, Canada is dependent on the U.S. mills and fabricating plants for a large amount of its steel goods.

The story of steel and iron ore is duplicated in all basic industries: auto (where Canadian plants are dependent on U.S. parts), electrical, newsprint, etc. The giant U.S. corporations are familiar names in Canada: General Electric, Westinghouse, GM, Ford, Chrysler, Firestone, International Nickel Company, and so on. Some of them masquerade under bracketed "Canadian" names; nevertheless, in recent months a cry from Canadian investors has gone up that they are being excluded from directorships in these companies and are discriminated against by the U.S. controllers.

A striking example of the theft of Canadian natural resources by U.S. corporations is seen in newsprint production. Classed (falsely) as a fully manufactured product, 97 percent of U.S. needs are met by Canadian newsprint, and almost half of this is from U.S.-controlled companies.

In nickel production INCO of Delaware (one of John Foster Dulles' favorite law accounts) has paid over \$1 billion profits and dividends out of Canadian labor and resources. Ninety percent of all nickel produced in the capitalist world comes from Canada. The U.S. takes almost seventy percent of the world's supply and produces less than 1 per-

cent. This key metal is under U.S. control. And INCO is waging a years' long battle against paying its rightful share of municipal taxation in the Sudbury basin, where its tentacles reach into every branch of economy and social life.

In the building of the St. Lawrence Deep-Sea Waterway, Canada is paying two-thirds of the cost and the key to the seaway—the locks—are in U.S. pockets.

Canadian foreign trade is lop-sidedly dependent on the U.S. Recently the new Tory government of Canada sent a delegation of cabinet members to Washington to protest the U.S. violation of the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs (GATT) to the detriment of Canada. The U.S., having entered the world wheat market, is seizing traditional Canadian wheat markets and dumping its surplus wheat, selling it for local currencies, and bartering it outright. On protesting this, the Canadian Tory ministers were treated like colonials in Washington. After most U.S. cabinet ministers had left the conference room, leaving only Secretary Weeks behind, he, too, quickly left for more important affairs, and remarked to Canadian newsmen (thinking they were, naturally, Americans): "We fixed 'em!"

The consuls treat their vassals, as always, with contempt. And Canada's 800,000,000 million bushel wheat surplus lies on the farms and gluts the terminal elevators.

The Canadian trade deficit with

the U.S. was \$1,200,000,000 in 1956. For the first half of 1957 it was \$914,000,000 and almost one-quarter of this arose from a \$212 million deficit on interest and dividends payable by Canada to the U.S., as against similar payments by the U.S. to Canada. This deficit is somewhat balanced by the import of U.S. capital, but, of course, the "balance" is really illusory because it leads, in the end, to a further imbalance of the Canadian economy vis-a-vis the U.S.A. The following facts tell that story.

According to the Ontario provincial government's trade and industry branch, since 1946 the amount of fully manufactured goods exported from Canada has declined 15 percent when related to total exports. But, during the same period, the imports of manufactured goods rose 11 percent when related to total imports.

The trend is, then, for Canada to become more and more dependent on the U.S. for manufactured goods; for Canadian manufactured goods to occupy less importance in exports; and for Canadian foreign trade to be more and more dependent on the shipment of cheap raw materials for U.S. plants to manufacture and sell back to Canada at high monopoly prices.

This is a picture of an imperialist-colonial economic relationship. The imperialist country looks on the colonial as a sphere of investment, a source of cheap raw materials, a buyer of high-priced finished goods and a source of investment profit.

POLITICAL IMPACT

The economic domination of Canada by U.S. imperialism is bound to be reflected in the life of the country. The Canadian monopoly bourgeoisie in the main, has accepted and actively cooperated in this domination. This is not to suggest that they are not restive about it, or do not come into conflict with U.S. interests at many points—as in the present talks of "diverting" to Britain 15 per cent of Canadian imports from the U.S.A. However, the dominant feature of U.S.-Canadian imperialist relations is the subordination of Canadian monopoly capital to the U.S., which the Labor-Progressive Party has characterized as a "junior partnership."

This is a peculiarity of Canadian capitalism, and hence of the path to socialism in Canada. It is not a "new" peculiarity for a bourgeoisie which is the undisputed ruler of its working class, itself to be dependent on a bigger imperialist bourgeoisie. Lenin, in his polemic with Rosa Luxemburg, drew attention to tsarist Russia as a state which was in precisely such a relationship with Western European imperialist states.

The U.S. domination of Canada affects the political line of the Canadian bourgeoisie, the labor and farm movements; and the cultural life of the country.

With regard to the line of the bourgeoisie, the Canadian government (Liberal for 22 years until last June, when the Conservative Diefen-

baker government was elected by a minority vote) since the end of World War II especially, has pursued consistently a foreign policy indistinguishable from the U.S. This has led to the actual surrender of sovereignty on a number of key questions.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

NATO is the basis of Canadian foreign policy. As a North American country, capitalist Canada is on the U.S. side in defense matters, and by the same token, sometimes comes into sharp conflict with the NATO countries who form the "shield," the "expendables," in Western Europe, including of course Great Britain.

In the British Commonwealth, a U.S. line is followed. In defense matters, U.S. armed forces are in the North and in Newfoundland, enjoying extra-territorial rights. The radar-detection lines across the North are only formally under Canadian control; actually they are part of the U.S. military installations. Recently, without reference to parliament, the Royal Canadian Air Force was placed under the operational command of the U.S.A.A.F., situated in Colorado. This aroused a four-day discussion in parliament; the government did its best to try to prove that while the American command would "press the button" to send the R.C.A.F. into action, a telephone call to Ottawa should precede this act of war! Such is the substance of Canadian sovereignty under the terms of NATO.

The anti-Soviet, NATO foreign policy of the Canadian government gives rise to a situation in which it is freely admitted that diplomatic recognition of the People's Republic of China (trade with which is sorely needed by Canadian industry and agriculture) is withheld because it would affront John Foster Dulles. Canadian national interests are being consistently sacrificed to U.S. cold-war demands.

In the labor and farm movements the issue of Canadian independence from U.S. domination comes up regularly and is not confined to resistance to the economic consequences of this domination as regards loss of markets and loss of job opportunities, but at times takes on a partially political character. This was clearly put in the resolution calling for action to safeguard Canada's "destiny" at the founding Congress last year of the Canadian Labor Congress which united the CIO and AFL unions and strengthened Canadian autonomy. It is to be found in resolutions and speeches from time to time in the CCF (Canada's social-democratic party which has 25 members in the federal parliament and forms the government of the prairie province of Saskatchewan). However, the CCF is still officially committed to the NATO "defense" policy.

FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

The Labor-Progressive Party, since 1948, has made Canadian independence from U.S. domination and new

national policies in harmony with the needs of the people, a central part of its political work. It is the party which has most consistently and energetically opposed U.S. domination and its consequences. It is correct to say, however, that this matter has not yet become a vital and central part of the policy of the labor and farm movements, which, under the influence of the Right social-democrats, still give support (often passive and critical, it is true) to the NATO policy.

Without a challenge to NATO and its consequences—that is, without espousing an active policy of peaceful coexistence—the struggle against U.S. domination cannot unfold its full potential powers.

Now, when the ICBM has rendered obsolete the expensive equipment for Canadian “defense”—the costly aircraft, radar screens, Canadian forces in Europe, under Hans Speidel’s command, for which Canadians have been taxed since 1948 to almost half of the federal budget—and when the impact upon bourgeois policy of Soviet scientific achievements begins to reveal the qualitative nature of these achievements—it can be expected that the whole NATO policy, the “suicide pact” line, as the LPP has called it, will be plunged into deeper crisis.

This cannot but throw more sharply into focus for the Canadian people the urgent necessity for breaking from the Dulles policy, and going over to new, independent foreign policies in the genuine na-

tional popular interest, which can be founded only on the necessity for peaceful coexistence.

The signs of economic decline and the end of the post-war boom are multiplying. Production is leveling off, and falling in some industries; unemployment may grow to 750,000 this winter. Overseas markets for wheat are already in a state of chronic crisis. Mounting deficits in trade with the U.S. may be expected to exert a serious influence on the economy; high U.S. tariffs against Canadian manufactures and the relative ease with which many raw materials enter the U.S., likely will have an increasingly adverse effect.

The pattern, then, is one something like this: all of the constituent factors of growing national crisis in Canada tend to circle around relations with the U.S.A. and Canadian independence. While the main enemy of the Canadian people is Canadian monopoly capitalism, sharp class struggle will in all probability raise to a higher economic and political level the necessity for new democratic relationships with the U.S.A., based upon national equality and the jealous safeguarding of Canadian national sovereignty. The path to socialism in Canada will involve this question too, for it is inconceivable that the establishment of a socialist, not to speak of a progressive, Canadian foreign policy would fail to include, in the first instance, the necessity for new relationships of Canada to the U.S.A.,

as between equals. This will include border adjustments, as in the case of the Alaskan Panhandle, which robs British Columbia of its rightful coastline.

Thus the movement for Canadian independence, the safeguarding of Canadian national sovereignty, the release of Canada from the stranglehold of U.S. domination, the entrance of Canada into the world markets and her liberation from one sided dependence on the U.S.A.; freedom from the consequences of the Dulles line in international affairs, and the encouragement by the state and all popular organizations of a democratic Canadian national culture to resist the pervading influences of U.S. capitalist culture—all of this will, as the 1954 Program of the Labor-Progressive Party said, merge with the movements towards the socialist solution, towards a Canadian workers’ and farmers’ state.

This is due for a further discussion and greater clarification when the new draft program of the LPP is published shortly. Canadian independence is not a matter that has been “conjured up” by Communists. Relationships with the U.S.A. have been a constant factor in Canadian history. They were in the very center of the struggle to establish Canada as a nation at the time of Confederation in 1867.

While Engels, on his visit to the

U.S. and Canada in the 1880’s, could understandably express in a letter his opinion that Canada would become a part of the U.S.A., history has decided otherwise. Canada has been established as a bi-national state, of French Canada and English-speaking Canada, and its capitalist development has excluded “union with” or “annexation by” the U.S.A.—in the first place because of the stubborn national opposition of the Canadian people to such a fate.

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that information and understanding about Canada among U.S. socialists and progressives are very skimpy. Working class internationalism demands better information and the closest understanding between the Communists of these countries, because an inescapable part of the duty of U.S. Communists will be to convince U.S. workers to support the Canadian people’s struggle against U.S. imperialist domination and for new relations based on equality, at all times and in all stages of that struggle; and for Canadian Communists to convince the Canadian workers to establish the firmest bonds of solidarity with the U.S. workers, while at the same time seeking their support in the struggle against U.S. imperialist domination.

On the Situation in the Polish Party

By WLADYSLAW GOMULKA

On October 24, 1957, Wladyslaw Gomulka, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, made a Report to the Tenth Plenary Meeting of the Committee, which attracted international attention and dealt with problems of the greatest importance. The Washington Embassy of the Polish People's Republic released an official summary of that Report, on October 28, 1957. Published below is the first half of that official summary; in the omitted latter half, the Report dealt with problems in the spheres of production and trade, and with questions in the area of foreign affairs.—Ed.

AT THE NINTH Plenary Meeting [May 15-18, 1957] of the Central Committee we decided to convene a Congress of the Party in December of this year. The Political Bureau has submitted to the present Plenum a motion to reconsider this decision and has proposed that the date of the Congress be postponed.

In submitting this motion we are guided primarily by the situation in the Party. The point is that the situation in the Party since the Ninth Plenum has not on the whole changed and that is why it is necessary to postpone the Congress.

At the Ninth Plenum we were convinced that as a result of the decisions taken by it the situation in the Party would undergo a marked improvement before the Congress and that it would be possible to convene a Congress of a consolidated Party. Alas, this did not happen. In presenting the motion for the postponement of the Congress we are also guided by other considerations which will be explained in the report.

We do not doubt that even in the present situation in the Party, when both revisionist centers and sectarian-dogmatist groups are operating in it and when in addition to this the activity of the Party is hampered by the ballast of indifferent elements, the great majority of the delegates would, despite all this, constitute cadres of activists standing firmly by the principles of Marxism-Leninism, devoted to the cause of socialism and supporting with full conviction the present line of the Party.

But is it only this matter that the Party is concerned about while preparing itself for the Congress to which it attaches such great hope? Certainly it is not concerned only with this matter.

The question of the Congress is not only one of a proper selection of delegates. It is also important that the pre-Congress discussion concentrate round the big constructive problems which should be the subject of the debates of the Congress. Preparations for the Congress cannot take place in an

atmosphere of discussion on dozens of doubts which preoccupy various bourgeois and social-democratic philosophers as to the possibility of building socialism in Poland and in other countries. During the pre-Congress discussion we can and should discuss the forms of putting into practice the principles of proletarian internationalism, but the discussion cannot be conducted from the position of the absurd thesis of the "Geographical Situation of Poland."

The Congress of the Party is confronted with many problems which await solution. In order to solve them in a correct manner, the Congress should be a Congress of a Party whose links are all capable of correctly implementing its decisions. This leads to the following conclusion: it is necessary to change the situation in the Party and to hold the Congress of the Party only in the changed situation.

UNITY

Like other Marxist-Leninist Parties, our Party can and should systematically perfect its activity, eliminate from it all shortcomings and errors. It can—if it is necessary—alter its political line. Our Party did it at the Eighth Plenum [October 19-21, 1956]. The Party has to be guided by the fundamental principles of its program. All changes should serve the cause of strengthening socialism. Socialism is our daily task.

The unity of action of our Party has been considerably impaired, and in consequence the Party is unable properly to fulfil its functions of leadership in the construction of socialism in Poland. It is high time to put an end to this.

Weakening of the unity of action in the Party arises above all from confusion which prevails among a considerable section of active Party members at all levels. This confusion was brought into the Party by revisionists and liquidators of various sorts during a period in which the Party, together with the entire working-class movement, was combating the errors of the past, the errors it committed itself, and was shaping its new political line.

There is no doubt that dogmatism and sectarianism were the breeding grounds which favored an impetuous growth of revisionism, as they always do. There were some in our ranks, and there are still some who, in the depth of their hearts, very often believe that revisionism contributes to the liquidation of dogmatism.

This view is utterly wrong. You cannot cure influenza, even in its most serious form, with tuberculosis. Dogmatism cannot be cured with revisionism. The alignment of forces in our Party shows clearly that an effective struggle against revisionism will considerably facilitate our victory over dogmatism.

In conducting a struggle for the recuperation of the Party from both diseases, we have to strike first of all at the chief source of its weakness, at revisionism and liquidationism. Ideological confusion within the Party can no longer be tolerated.

Up to the present we have not submitted to the Party any determined recommendations concerning Party and organizational consequences for activities contrary to the Party line. We thought that all Party members should be allowed some time, so to speak, to "recover" from the shocks

which our Party and the international workers' movement have sustained during the last year and a half. It seems that this period is enough to recover balance.

TWO WINGS

Ideological confusion is the cause of the decomposition of the unity of the Party organization. In the present state of affairs the Party is only formally unified as an organization. In fact, two wings are at work within the Party which, in a more or less explicit manner, are opposing the Party line, sabotaging the decisions of the supreme Party authorities.

It is true that neither the one nor the other of the wings existing within the Party has assumed the organizational form of a faction, but this fact does not at all affect the extent of the damage which they bring to the Party while carrying on various forms of group activity. I would even say that it is easier to cope with a faction which openly presents its program of action, than with a formally unorganized group mixture which most of the time endeavors to hide behind the Party line and at the same time is carrying on its own policy. Such a state of affairs introduces disorientation and confusion into the Party ranks. This results in a whole chain of negative consequences.

Before the Eighth Plenum, arguments and discussions, very well known to all of us, were in progress among active Party members and within the Party leadership. Party unity was apparently suspended. The Eighth Plenum solved those problems. Former erroneous and false assumptions in

Party policy were eliminated by that Plenum. Conditions were created for reinstating the unity of Party action on the basis of the Eighth Plenum resolutions. Formally, nearly everybody accepted those resolutions and recognized them as right.

Only a few critical voices were heard from the side of the so-called conservative wing of the Party. The other wing, which very often attacked the former Party line from wrong positions, accepted the Eighth Plenum resolutions apparently without reservations. The true picture, however, was different. While refraining from criticizing the resolutions and formally recognizing the new Party leadership, it decided to continue its offensive, aimed, in fact, against the Eighth Plenum resolutions and against the new Party leadership. Even after the Ninth Plenum it kept to the same road.

The revisionists realize very well that their activity is contrary to the resolutions of the Eighth and Ninth Plenum. They do not even attempt to invoke those resolutions, because they cannot find in them any justification for their activity. But they are not inclined to abandon the Party label.

For this reason they attempt to screen their harmful activity with the October ideas. "The October Endangered," "The Party Goes Away from October," "Let us Defend the Polish October"—these are appeals of people who have gone away from the Party line or who never recognized it.

In the Party's understanding, October means the same thing as the resolutions of the Eighth Plenum. In the interpretation of the revisionists, the Eighth Plenum and October are

two different things. Under the hypocritical slogan of defense of October the revisionists break with and attack the Eighth Plenum resolutions. For them October means continuation of a political line of their own, splitting the Party, attacking the People's Government, spreading defeatism and undermining the socialist system.

During that October such symptoms also appeared. The pure Party and socialist current of October also brought reactionary scum into the light of day, and side by side with it, on the same wave, revisionism. The revisionists call "October" everything that rode on its back. Their defense of October is the defense of those who have nothing to do with October except that they rode on its back to break it.

The wing that I call revisionist is by no means composed of revisionists only. The revisionist group proper is very small. But the results of its activities are dangerous in a wide range. For the revisionists utilized, and are partly still utilizing, various means of propaganda, especially a part of the press and certain periodicals.

The best representative of the revisionist wing was *Po Prostu*. Shoulder to shoulder with them stand the disguised opponents of socialism, people who joined the Party guided by their self-interest, so 'alien to the Party. There is no room in the Party for either of them.

There is a third category, which could not easily be considered as belonging to the revisionist wing in the Party and which at the same time could not be spoken of as keeping to the Party line. These are the Party members who yield to revisionism, are under its influence, and adopt a waver-

ing attitude towards the Party line. They constitute the periphery of the revisionist wing. The Party should fight for these members.

The revisionist wing must be severed from the Party. On such wings the Party, People's Poland and socialism could fly only into an abyss. And this we do not want. Together with us in not wanting this are the working class and millions of working people in town and country. We do not want to have any wings in the Party, nor any groups. The Party must be homogeneous.

We shall liquidate with equal determination any organized or individual manifestations of anti-Party activities conducted from a position of dogmatism. For such people there cannot be any room in the Party either. Among the advocates of the dogmatic-sectarian attitude one can find some who reject all the transformations which have been taking place in the last few years in the international workers' movement. Even the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which opened such vast, new prospects before socialism, is described by them as a "great misfortune" to the workers' movement.

This dogmatic-sectarian attitude and the longing for a return to the old methods can only separate the Party from the broad working masses, and are thus objectively playing into the hands of forces hostile to socialism.

LEADERSHIP

A Marxist-Leninist Party should be the leading detachment of the working class. Our Party, regarded as a whole, as the total of all the Party •-

ganizations, has lost many of the features of a leading detachment. It has partly dissolved itself in the non-Party mass of people.

This is due to many causes, the most important of them being the overgrowth of its membership, in our conditions. Perhaps it will sound like a paradox, but it is a fact that the cause of the weakness of many of our Party organizations is the great percentage of Party members in relation to the total number of the workers of a given factory or institution. Speaking more accurately, the question is not so much of the number as of the political and ideological quality of the Party members. This quality, resulting from quantity, is the source of many of the weaknesses of the Party organizations and, consequently, of the Party.

Statistically our Party numbers about 1.3 million members. If we had half this number of conscious, militant Party members unreservedly devoted to the cause of socialism, the Party would be a great power in the country. The deepest sea of difficulties would then reach only to our knees. In fact, despite the great membership of the Party, the waves of our difficulties sometimes reach up to our throats.

It is necessary to carry out an analysis of the quality of the Party members. From this point of view Party members may be divided into something like three groups.

The first group are the Communists conscious of their purpose, irrespective of whether they came originally from the Communist Party of Poland and the Polish Workers' Party or the Polish Socialist Party. They are Party members deeply attached in their thoughts and feelings to the idea of

socialism and spare no efforts to give effect to this idea. They are well-disciplined people, always at the disposal of the Party. The overwhelming majority of them are workers.

The second group includes members of the Party who support socialism with heart and reason. They are good Party members, although not very lively or active.

The third group are people who joined the Party for their own interests. This group is a millstone around the neck of the Party. It is the Party's unnecessary and harmful burden. This group is considerable in size. In principle the third group should leave the Party. Exit from the Party should be made particularly easy for sedentary workers in this group.

There is also in the Party a special category of people particularly undesirable. These are trouble-makers, demagogues and two-faced people, full of negation of socialism and of the Party leadership. Recently we even had strikes organized and demagogic demands put forward by Party members of this sort.

There are also devoted followers of the Church and clergy, conducting activities contrary to Party policy. Finally there are various speculators and purely criminal elements, who disguise their motives behind a screen of apparent Party activity.

RESPONSIBILITY

Our Party is the leading force of the people's power. In the final account we are held responsible for all that is happening in the country.

The question of corrupt practices and various abuses has to be looked upon not only from the angle of mate-

rial losses suffered by the state and community. We have to notice its great political importance for the position of our Party in the working class and in the nation. An important condition for the strengthening of that position is for us to make a radical change in the struggle for the liquidation of corruption and abuse. We have to treat this matter as the struggle against the class enemy. . . .

The Party must eliminate from its ranks everything that is alien to it, everything that brings harm to it, weakens its solidarity, hampers its work and undermines the confidence it should enjoy among the working class and the people. We must cleanse the Party of liquidators and revisionists and of organizers of group activity opposed to the general line of the Party, free the Party from climbers and corrupt people who are morally decayed, rid ourselves of elements alien to the socialist idea, free the Party from trouble-makers, inveterate drunkards and adventurers, from the cumbersome burden of people indifferent to the Party and to socialism.

It is necessary fully to restore democratic centralism and the Leninist norms of life in the Party. All this will strengthen the Party as the leading, organized detachment of the working class; all this will consolidate and make more efficient its role of a leader of socialist construction in our country. . . .

FREEDOM AND DISCIPLINE

The attitude of the working class during the whole period of the crisis suffered by the Party, and the results of the January [1957] elections to the Sejm [Parliament,] had shown that

capitalism as a system of government had been rejected by the working masses. The masses demanded changes within socialism, the proper application of the principles of proletarian internationalism and not the replacement of socialism by capitalism.

Therefore, the Eighth Plenum was able to relieve the tension, its resolutions were accepted not only by the working class but by the overwhelming majority of the nation. The Eighth Plenum changed the situation in the country; the political atmosphere was changed. First of all, the community lost its feeling of apprehension because socialist legality was being rigorously observed.

Broad democratic freedom is universally applied in public life, as defined by the indispensable necessities of the present stage of building socialism. In the framework of these liberties every citizen is entitled to use and does use his freedom of speech, can conduct political and social activity.

Political life is open. The press enjoys the right to criticize the activities of the state authorities. In the life of the state and nation the Sejm was restored to its proper place, as provided for in the Constitution of the Polish People's Republic. Trade unions, cooperatives, and social and cultural organizations are enjoying full democratic rights. They are self-governing. The executives of these organizations are elected by free ballots. Fundamental matters of State policy are decided through inter-Party consultations and by agreement between our Party, the United Peasant Party and the Democratic Party.

We have created the atmosphere and we have shown the best will for the full normalization of relations between State and Church.

The Party did not intend to close the wide open doors of democratic freedom, but it must watch these doors better than it had done. Democratic freedom could serve the purposes of the enemies of socialism.

Forces that were in favor of October from an anti-socialist position had tried to undermine the fundamental principles of the external policy of the Party and the Government—the alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union. The spreading of antipathy towards the Soviet Union served the main aim of these circles—the withdrawal of Poland from the camp of socialist states, the loosening of the ties of Polish-Soviet friendship and the relegation of the role of the Polish-Soviet alliance to a purely formal meaning.

The Party has to put an end to this continuous undermining of the Party line, to all symptoms of harmful activities emanating from the pages of certain periodicals. Freedom of speech and democratic liberties introduced by the Eighth Plenum are supposed to serve the cause of improving the building of socialism, not to facilitate the slandering and undermining of it. Freedom of speech cannot mean freedom to tell lies or freedom of forgery, freedom of propaganda directed against vital Polish interests.

A revival of reactionary and anti-socialist forces is appearing in various forms and in various circles. These tendencies have appeared in the United Peasant Party and also in the Democratic Party, until recently without meeting with any effective counter-action. They have appeared in the Union of Fighters for Freedom and Democracy, and in academic youth

circles. Manifestations of anti-socialist activity are appearing in the Writers' Union and in certain circles of the intelligentsia.

Although the reactionary and anti-socialist forces are conducting their activity in dispersed groupings, this activity cannot be ignored, for in the absence of our counter-action it can transform itself into an all-out struggle against socialism, against our Party and against the People's Government.

Although disappointment and discouragement are being fanned by these anti-socialist forces, the great majority of the people are aware of the necessity of supporting the policy of the Party and the Government, approve of socialism and realize that it corresponds not only to the class interests of the working people but also to the national interests of Poland. One more proof of this was the firmly negative attitude of the community towards the recent irresponsible excesses in certain academic youth circles.

The political situation in the country is characterized by the fact that the nation, headed by the working class, has understood the advantages of the national and individual freedom it has gained by the changes in the policy of the Party made at the Eighth Plenum, and therefore wishes to defend this policy.

The liquidation of all manifestations of weakening social discipline and ideological and moral consciousness is most closely connected with the liquidation of the ideological confusion in the Party, with the improvement of the activity of the Party and of the functioning of the state administration.

Declaration of Communist and Workers' Parties of Socialist Countries

Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties of Socialist countries met in Moscow, November 14-16, 1957. They adopted a Declaration, which is published below in full. The text is that supplied in English by the Hsinhua News Agency of Peking.—Ed.

Representatives of the Albanian Party of Labor, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Vietnamese Working People's Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Communist Party of China, the Korean Party of Labor, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Rumanian Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia discussed their relations, current problems of the international situation and the struggle for peace and socialism.

The exchange of opinions revealed identity of views of the parties on all the questions examined at the meeting and unanimity in their assessment of the international situation. In the course of the discussion the meeting also touched upon general problems of the international Communist movement. In drafting the declaration the participants in the meeting consulted with representatives of the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries. The fraternal parties not present at this meeting will assess and themselves decide what action they should take on the considerations expressed in the declaration.

I.

The main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Today more than a third of the population of the world—over 950,000,000 people—have taken the road of socialism and are building a new life. The tremendous growth of the forces of socialism has stimulated the rapid extension of the anti-imperialist national movement in the post-war period. During the last twelve years, besides the Chinese People's Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Korean People's Democratic Republic, over 700,000,000 people have shaken off the colonial yoke and established national independent states.

The peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, still languishing in slavery, are intensifying the struggle for national liberation. The progress of socialism and of the national liberation movement has greatly accelerated the disintegration

of imperialism. With regard to the greater part of mankind imperialism has lost its one-time domination. In the imperialist countries society is rent by deep-going class contradictions and by antagonisms between those countries, while the working class is putting up increasing resistance to the policy of imperialism and the monopolies, fighting for better conditions, democratic rights, for peace and socialism.

In our epoch, world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems. In the past forty years socialism has demonstrated that it is a much higher social system than capitalism. It has insured development of the productive forces at a rate unprecedented and impossible for capitalism, and the raising of the material and cultural levels of the working people.

The Soviet Union's strides in economics, science and technology and the results achieved by the other Socialist countries in Socialist construction are conclusive evidence of the great vitality of socialism. In the Socialist states the broad masses of the working people enjoy genuine freedom and democratic rights. People's power insures political unity of the masses, equality and friendship among the nations and a foreign policy aimed at preserving universal peace and rendering assistance to the oppressed nations in their emancipation struggle. The world Socialist

system, which is growing and becoming stronger, is exerting ever greater influence upon the international situation in the interests of peace and progress and the freedom of the peoples.

While socialism is on the upgrade, imperialism is heading toward decline. The positions of imperialism have been greatly weakened as a result of the disintegration of the colonial system. The countries that have shaken off the yoke of colonialism are defending their independence and fighting for economic sovereignty, for international peace.

The existence of the Socialist system and the aid rendered by the Socialist nations to these countries on principles of equality and cooperation between them and the Socialist nations in the struggle for peace and against aggression help them to uphold their national freedom and facilitate their social progress.

In the imperialist countries the contradictions between the productive forces and production relations have become acute. In many respects modern science and engineering are not being used in the interests of social progress for all mankind, because capitalism fetters and deforms the development of the productive forces of society.

The world capitalist economy remains shaky and unstable. The relatively good economic activity still observed in a number of capitalist countries is due in large measure to the arms drive and other transient

factors. However, the capitalist economy is bound to encounter deeper slumps and crises. The temporary high business activity helps to keep up the reformist illusions among part of the workers in the capitalist countries.

In the post-war period some sections of the working class in the more advanced capitalist countries, fighting against increased exploitation and for a higher standard of living, have been able to win certain wage increases, though in a number of these countries real wages are below the pre-war level. However, in the greater part of the capitalist world, particularly in the colonial and dependent countries, millions of working people still live in poverty. The broad invasion of agriculture by the monopolies and the price policy dictated by them, the system of bank credits and loans and the increased taxation caused by the arms drive have resulted in the steady ruin and impoverishment of the main mass of the peasantry.

There is a sharpening of contradiction, not only between the bourgeois and the working class but also between the monopoly bourgeoisie and all sections of the people, between the United States monopoly bourgeoisie on the one hand and the peoples, and even the bourgeoisie of the other capitalist countries on the other.

The working people of the capitalist countries live in such conditions

that, increasingly, they realize that the only way out of their grave situation lies through socialism. Thus, increasingly favorable conditions are being created for bringing them into the active struggle for socialism.

The aggressive imperialist circles of the United States, by pursuing the so-called "positions of strength" policy, seek to bring most countries of the world under their sway and to hamper the onward march of mankind in accordance with the laws of social development. On the pretext of "combating communism," they are angling to bring more and more countries under their domination, instigating destruction of democratic freedoms, threatening the national independence of the developed capitalist countries, trying to enmesh the liberated peoples in new forms of colonialism and systematically conducting subversive activities against the Socialist countries.

The policy of certain aggressive groups in the United States is aimed at rallying around them all the reactionary forces of the capitalist world. Acting in this way they are becoming the center of world reaction, the sworn enemies of the people. By this policy these anti-popular, aggressive imperialist forces are courting their own ruin, creating their own grave-diggers.

So long as imperialism exists there will always be soil for aggressive wars. Throughout the post-war years the American, British, French

and other imperialists and their hirelings have conducted and are conducting wars in Indochina, Indonesia, Korea, Malaya, Kenya, Guatemala, Egypt, Algeria, Oman and Yemen.

At the same time the aggressive imperialist forces flatly refuse to cut armaments, to prohibit the use and production of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to agree on immediate discontinuation of the tests of these weapons; they are continuing the "cold war" and arms drive, building more military bases and conducting the aggressive policy of undermining peace and creating the danger of a new war. Were a world war to break out before agreement on prohibition of nuclear weapons is reached, it would inevitably become a nuclear war unprecedented in destructive force.

In West Germany militarism is being revived with United States help, giving rise to a hotbed of war in the heart of Europe. The struggle against West German militarism and revanchism, which are now threatening peace, is a vital task facing the peace-loving forces of the German people and all the nations of Europe. An especially big role in this struggle belongs to the German Democratic Republic—the first worker-peasant state in German history—with which the participants in the meeting express their solidarity and which they fully support.

Simultaneously the imperialists are trying to impose on the freedom-

loving peoples of the Middle East the notorious "Eisenhower-Dulles Doctrine," thereby creating the danger of war in this area. They are plotting conspiracies and provocations against independent Syria. The provocations against Syria and Egypt and other Arab countries pursue the aim of dividing and isolating the Arab countries in order to abolish their freedom and independence.

The SEATO aggressive bloc is a source of war danger in East Asia.

The question of war or peaceful coexistence is now the crucial question of world policy. All the nations must display the utmost vigilance in regard to the war danger created by imperialism.

At present the forces of peace have so grown that there is a real possibility of averting wars, as was demonstrated by the collapse of the imperialist designs in Egypt. The imperialist plans to use the counter-revolutionary forces for the overthrow of the people's democratic system in Hungary have failed as well.

The cause of peace is upheld by the powerful forces of our era: the invincible camp of Socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union; the peace-loving countries of Asia and Africa taking an anti-imperialist stand and forming, together with the Socialist countries, a broad peace zone; the international working class and above all its vanguard, the Communist parties; the liberation movement of the peoples of the

colonies and semi-colonies; the mass peace movement of the peoples; the peoples of the European countries who have proclaimed neutrality, the peoples of Latin America and the masses in the imperialist countries are putting up increasing resistance to the plans for a new war.

An alliance of these mighty forces could prevent war, but should the bellicose imperialist maniacs venture, regardless of anything, to unleash a war, imperialism will doom itself to destruction, for the peoples will not tolerate a system that brings them so much suffering and exacts so many sacrifices.

The Communist and Workers' parties taking part in the meeting declare that the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of the two systems, which has been further developed and brought up to date in the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, is the sound basis of the foreign policy of the Socialist countries and the dependable pillar of peace and friendship among the peoples. The idea of peaceful coexistence coincides with the five principles advanced jointly by the Chinese People's Republic and the Republic of India and with the program adopted by the Bandung Conference of African-Asian countries. Peace and peaceful coexistence have now become the demands of the broad masses in all countries.

The Communist parties regard the struggle for peace as their foremost

task. They will do all in their power to prevent war.

II.

The meeting considers that in the present situation the strengthening of the unity and fraternal cooperation of the Socialist countries, the Communist and Workers' parties and the solidarity of the international working class, national liberation and democratic movements acquire special significance.

In the bedrock of the relations between the countries of the world Socialist system and all the Communist and Workers parties lie the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of proletarian internationalism which have been tested by life. Today the vital interests of the working people of all countries call for their support of the Soviet Union and all the Socialist countries who, pursuing a policy of preserving peace throughout the world, are the mainstay of peace and social progress. The working class, the democratic forces and the working people everywhere are interested in tirelessly strengthening fraternal contacts for the sake of the common cause, in safeguarding from enemy encroachments the historic political and social gains effected in the Soviet Union—the first and mightiest Socialist power—in the Chinese People's Republic and in all the Socialist countries, in seeing these gains extended and consolidated.

The Socialist countries base their relations on principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty and non-interference in one another's affairs. These are vital principles. However, they do not exhaust the essence of relations between them. Fraternal mutual aid is part and parcel of these relations. This aid is a striking expression of Socialist internationalism.

On a basis of complete equality, mutual benefit and comradesly mutual assistance, the Socialist states have established between themselves extensive economic and cultural co-operation that plays an important part in promoting the economic and political independence of each Socialist country and the Socialist commonwealth as a whole. The Socialist states will continue to extend and improve economic and cultural co-operation among themselves.

The Socialist states also advocate all-round expansion of economic and cultural relations with all other countries, provided they desire it, on a basis of equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

The solidarity of the Socialist countries is not directed against any other country. On the contrary, it serves the interests of all the peace-loving peoples, restrains the aggressive strivings of the bellicose imperialist circles and supports and encourages the growing forces of peace. The Socialist countries are against

the division of the world into military blocs. But in view of the situation that has taken shape, with the Western powers refusing to accept the proposals of the Socialist countries for mutual abolition of military blocs, the Warsaw Pact Organization, which is of a defensive nature, serves the security of the peoples of Europe and supports peace throughout the world, must be preserved and strengthened.

The Socialist countries are united in a single community by the fact that they are taking the common Socialist road, by the common class essence of the social and economic system and state authority, by the requirements of mutual aid and support, identity of interests and aims in the struggle against imperialism, for the victory of socialism and communism and by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism which is common to all.

The solidarity and close unity of the Socialist countries constitute a reliable guarantee of the sovereignty and independence of each. Stronger fraternal relations and friendship between the Socialist countries call for a Marxist-Leninist internationalist policy on the part of the Communist and Workers Parties, for educating all the working people in the spirit of combining internationalism with patriotism and for a determined effort to overcome the survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism. All issues pertaining to relations between the Socialist coun-

tries can be fully settled through comradesly discussion, with strict observance of the principles of socialist internationalism.

III.

The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and progress in Socialist construction in the People's Democracies find deep sympathy among the working class and the working people of all countries. The ideas of socialism are winning additional millions of people. In these conditions the imperialist bourgeoisie attaches increasing importance to the ideological molding of the masses; it misrepresents socialism and smears Marxism-Leninism, misleads and confuses the masses. It is a prime task to intensify Marxist-Leninist education of the masses, combat bourgeois ideology, expose the lies and slanderous fabrications of imperialist propaganda against socialism and the Communist movement and widely propagate in simple and convincing fashion the ideas of socialism, peace and friendship among nations.

The meeting confirmed the identity of views of the Communist and Workers' Parties on the cardinal problems of the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction. The experience of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries has fully borne out the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the processes of the Socialist revolution

and the building of socialism are governed by a number of basic laws applicable in all countries embarking on a socialist course. These laws manifest themselves everywhere, alongside a great variety of historic national peculiarities and traditions which must by all means be taken into account.

These laws are: Guidance of the working masses by the working class, the core of which is the Marxist-Leninist party in effecting a proletarian revolution in one form or another and establishing one form or other of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the alliance of the working class and the bulk of the peasantry and other sections of the working people; the abolition of capitalist ownership and the establishment of public ownership of the basic means of production; gradual Socialist reconstruction of agriculture; planned development of the national economy aimed at building socialism and communism, at raising the standard of living of the working people; the carrying out of the Socialist revolution in the sphere of ideology and culture and the creation of a numerous intelligentsia devoted to the working class, the working people and the cause of socialism; the abolition of national oppression and the establishment of equality and fraternal friendship between the peoples; defense of the achievements of socialism against attacks by external and internal enemies; solidarity of the working class

of the country in question with the working class of other countries, that is, proletarian internationalism.

Marxism-Leninism calls for a creative application of the general principles of the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction depending on the concrete conditions of each country, and rejects mechanical imitation of the policies and tactics of the Communist parties of other countries.

Lenin repeatedly called attention to the necessity of correctly applying the basic principles of communism, in keeping with the specific features of the nation, of the national state concerned. Disregard of national peculiarities by the proletarian party inevitably leads to its divorce from reality, from the masses, and is bound to prejudice the cause of socialism and, conversely, exaggeration of the role of these peculiarities or departure, under the pretext of national peculiarities, from the universal Marxist-Leninist truth on the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction is just as harmful to the Socialist cause.

The participants in the meeting consider that both these tendencies should be combated simultaneously. The Communist and Workers Parties of the Socialist countries should firmly adhere to the principle of combining the above universal Marxist-Leninist truth with the specific revolutionary practice in their countries, creatively apply the general laws governing the Socialist

revolution and Socialist construction in accordance with the concrete conditions of their countries, learn from each other and share experience. Creative application of the general laws of socialist construction tried and tested by experience and the variety of forms and methods of building socialism used in different countries, represent a collective contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory.

The theory of Marxism-Leninism derives from dialectical materialism. This world outlook reflects the universal law of development of nature, society and human thinking. It is valid for the past, the present and the future. Dialectical materialism is countered by metaphysics and idealism. Should the Marxist political party in its examination of questions base itself not on dialectics and materialism, the result will be one-sidedness and subjectivism, stagnation of thought, isolation from life and loss of ability to make the necessary analysis of things and phenomena, revisionist and dogmatist mistakes and mistakes in policy. Application of dialectical materialism in practical work and the education of the party functionaries and the broad masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism are urgent tasks of the Communist and Workers parties.

Of vital importance in the present stage is intensified struggle against opportunist trends in the working class and Communist movement. The meeting underlines the necessity of resolutely overcoming revisionism

and dogmatism in the ranks of the Communist and Workers' parties. Revisionism and dogmatism in the working-class and Communist movement are today, as they have been in the past, international phenomena. Dogmatism and sectarianism hinder the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in the changing conditions, replace the study of the concrete situation with merely quoting classics and sticking to books and lead to the isolation of the party from the masses. A party that has withdrawn into the shell of sectarianism and that has lost contact with the masses cannot bring victory to the cause of the working class.

In condemning dogmatism, the Communist parties believe that the main danger at present is revisionism or, in other words, Right-wing opportunism, which as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology paralyzes the revolutionary energy of the working class and demands the preservation or restoration of capitalism. However, dogmatism and sectarianism can also be the main danger at different phases of development in one party or another. It is for each Communist party to decide what danger threatens it more at a given time.

It should be pointed out that the conquest of power by the proletariat is only the beginning of the revolution, not its conclusion. After the conquest of power, the working class is faced with the serious tasks of ef-

fecting the Socialist reconstruction of the national economy and laying the economic and technical foundation of socialism. At the same time the overthrown bourgeoisie always endeavors to make a comeback, the influence exerted on society by the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and their intelligentsia, is still great. That is why a fairly long time is needed to resolve the issue of who will win—capitalism or socialism. The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source.

Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is "outmoded" and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to exorcise the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organization and, above all, of democratic centralism, for transforming the Communist Party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society.

The experience of the internation-

al Communist movement shows that resolute defense by the Communist and Workers parties of the Marxist-Leninist unity of their ranks and the banning of factions and groups sapping unity guarantee the successful solution of the tasks of the socialist revolution, the establishment of socialism and communism.

IV.

The Communist and Workers' Parties are faced with great historic tasks. The carrying out of these tasks necessitates closer unity not only of the Communist and Workers parties but of the entire working class, necessitates cementing the alliance of the working class and peasantry, rallying the working people and progressive mankind, the freedom and peace-loving forces of the world.

The defense of peace is the most important world-wide task of the day. The Communist and Workers Parties in all countries stand for joint action on the broadest possible scale with all forces favoring peace and opposed to war. The participants in the meeting declare that they support the efforts of all states, parties, organizations, movements and individuals who champion peace and oppose war, who want peaceful co-existence, collective security in Europe and Asia, reduction of armaments and prohibition of the use and tests of nuclear weapons.

The Communist and Workers'

Parties are loyal defenders of the national and democratic interests of the peoples of all countries. The working class and the peoples of many countries are still confronted with the historic tasks of struggle for national independence against colonial aggression and feudal oppression. What is needed here is a united anti-imperialist and anti-feudal front of the workers, peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie and other patriotic democratic forces. Numerous facts show that the greater and stronger the unity of the various patriotic and democratic forces, the greater the guarantee of victory in the common struggle.

At present the struggle of the working class and the masses of the people against the war danger and for their vital interests is spearheaded against the big monopoly group of capital as those chiefly responsible for the arms race, as those who organize or inspire plans for preparing a new world war and who are the bulwark of aggression and reaction. The interests and the policy of this handful of monopolies conflict increasingly not only with the interests of the working class, but the other sections of capitalist society: the peasants, intellectuals, petty and middle urban bourgeoisie.

In those capitalist countries where the American monopolies are out to establish their hegemony and in the countries already suffering from the U.S. policy of economic and

military expansion, the objective conditions are being created for uniting, under the leadership of the working class and its revolutionary parties, broad sections of the population to fight for peace, the defense of national independence and democratic freedoms, to raise the standard of living, to carry through radical land reforms and to overthrow the rule of the monopolies who betray the national interests.

The profound historic changes and decisive switch in the balance of forces in the international sphere in favor of socialism and the tremendous growth of the power of attraction exerted by Socialist ideas among the working class, working peasantry and working intelligentsia create more favorable conditions for the victory of socialism.

The forms of the transition of socialism may vary for different countries. The working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist party—seek to achieve the Socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the people as a whole as well as with the national interests of the country.

Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class headed by its vanguard has the opportunity, given a united working-class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organizations, to unite a majority of the people, to

win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. It has this opportunity while relying on the majority of the people and decisively rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords. The working class then, can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, launch a non-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution.

All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism.

In the event of the ruling classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will

of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

The possibility of one or another way to socialism depends on the concrete conditions in each country.

In the struggle for better conditions for the working people, for preservation and extension of democratic rights, winning and maintaining national independence and peace among nations, and also in the struggle for winning power and building socialism, the Communist Parties seek cooperation with the Socialist parties. Although the Right-Wing Socialist Party leaders are doing their best to hamper this cooperation, there are increasing opportunities for cooperation between the Communists and Socialists on many issues. The ideological differences between the Communist and the Socialist parties should not keep them from establishing unity of action on the many pressing issues that confront the working-class movement.

In the Socialist countries where the working class is in power, the Communist and Workers' Parties which have the opportunity to establish close relations with the broad masses of the people should constantly rely on them and make the building and defense of socialism the cause of millions who fully realize that they are masters of their country. Of great importance for enhancing the activity and creative

initiative of the broad masses and their solidarity, for consolidating the Socialist system and stepping up Socialist construction are the measures taken in recent years by the Socialist countries to expand Socialist democracy and encourage criticism and self-criticism.

To bring about real solidarity of the working class, of all working people and the whole of progressive mankind, of the freedom-loving and peace-loving forces of the world, it is necessary above all to promote the unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties, to foster solidarity between the Communist and Workers Parties of all countries. This solidarity is the core of still greater solidarity, it is the main guarantee of the victory of the cause of the working class.

The Communist and Workers' Parties have a particularly important responsibility with regard to the destinies of the world Socialist system and the International Communist movement. The Communist and Workers' Parties represented at the meeting declare that they will tirelessly promote their unity and comradesly cooperation with a view to further consolidating the commonwealth of Socialist states and in the interests of the international working-class movement, of peace and socialism.

The meeting notes with satisfaction that the International Communist movement has grown, withstood numerous serious trials and

won a number of major victories. By their deeds the Communists have demonstrated to the working people on a world-wide scale the vitality of the Marxist-Leninist theory and their ability not only to propagate the great ideals of socialism, but also to realize them in exceedingly strenuous conditions.

Like any progressive movement in human society, the Communist movement is bound to encounter difficulties and obstacles. However, as in the past, no difficulties or obstacles can change now, nor will they be able to change in the future, the objective laws governing historical progress or affect the determination of the working class to transform the old world and create a new one. Ever since they began their struggle, the Communists have been baited and persecuted by the reactionary forces, but the Communist movement heroically repels all attacks, emerging from the trials stronger and more steeled. The Communists, by further consolidating their unity, counter attempts by the reactionary imperialist forces to prevent human society from marching toward a new era.

Contrary to the absurd assertions of imperialism about a so-called crisis of communism, the Communist movement is growing and gathering strength. The historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. are of tremendous importance, not only to the C.P.S.U. and to the building of communism in

the U.S.S.R.; they have opened a new stage in the world communist movement and pushed ahead its further development along Marxist-Leninist lines. The results of the congresses of the Communist Parties of China, France, Italy and other countries in recent times have clearly demonstrated the unity and solidarity of the party ranks and their loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism. This meeting of the representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties testifies to the international solidarity of the Communist movement.

After exchanging views, the participants in the meeting arrived at the conclusion that in present conditions it is expedient, besides bilateral meetings of leading personnel and exchange of information, to hold, as the need arises, more representative conferences of Communist and Workers' Parties to discuss current problems, share experience, study each other's views and attitudes and concert action in the joint struggle for the common goals, peace, democracy and socialism.

The participants in the meeting unanimously express their firm confidence that, by closing their ranks and thereby rallying the working class and the peoples of all countries, the Communist and Workers' Parties will surmount all obstacles in their onward movement and accelerate further big victories for the cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

Index, 1957

- Allen, James S.**—Problems of Foreign Affairs, *Foster, William Z.*—Marxism-Leninism and "American Prosperity," Feb., 39; *Draper's Roots of American Communism*, May, 34; *The Synthesis of Socialism and Democratic Movements Under Capitalism*, Aug., 33; *On Joll's History of the Second International*, Sept., 46; *People's Capitalism— and Djilas*, Nov., 49; *The Party Crisis and the Way Out*, Pt. I, Dec., 47.
- Bert, Erik**—Problems of American Farmers, Oct., 53.
- Brodsky, Merle**—On the Role of the Party, Jan., 46.
- Brown, Homer G. and Muriel J.**—New China As We Saw It, Apr., 53.
- Bulganan, N. A.**—A Letter to Macmillan, May, 41; A Letter to Mollet, June, 36.
- Canadian Economist, A.**—On "Method of Political Economy," Aug., 58.
- Central Committee, CPUSSR**—On the Removal of an Anti-Party Faction, Aug., 52.
- Chancey, Martin**—The Housing Question: Cleveland, Dec., 39.
- China, Central Committee, C.P. of.**—The Chinese Communists Tackle Bureaucracy, June, 48.
- Chou Yang**—Interview, June, 56.
- Communist Party of Chicago**—Why an Anti-Monopoly Coalition: A Discussion, June, 27.
- Communist Party Sub-Committee**—Report: Social Democracy in the U.S., Jan., 5.
- Communist Party of Minnesota**—Communist Activity Today: A Program for Minnesota, May, 7.
- Constitution, Preamble to the**—Mar., 29.
- Davis, Benjamin J.**—Review of H. Aptheker's "Toward Negro Freedom," Apr., 13; *The Pilgrimage to Washington*, July, 14.
- Dennis, Eugene**—What Kind of a Change, Jan., 27; Statement to the Eastland Committee, Mar., 1; Keynote Address, Mar., 3; Errata, Apr., 63; *The Anti-H-Bomb Movement*, Sept., 1; Sputnik, the USA and the USSR, Nov., 1.
- Dobb, Maurice**—Some Economic Reevaluations, Apr., 47.
- Editors, The**—The Communist Party Convention, Apr., 1.
- Fine, Fred M.**—On the Draft Constitution, Mar., 20; *Business Unionism and the Anti-Labor Drive*, June, 1; See, "Letters from Readers," Nov., 62.
- Finkelstein, Sidney**—Notes on Contemporary Music, Mar., 59.
- Fleischer, Louis**—Peaceful Co-Existence, A Discussion, Jan., 55; Why Socialism Must Win, Aug., 22.
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley**—Experiences in Prison: China and America, Oct., 39.
- Garaudy, Roger**—On the "Italian Road to Socialism," a debate, Apr., 33.
- Ghosh, Ajoy**—The General Elections in India, May, 52.
- Gomulka, Wladyslaw**—On the Situation in the Polish Party, Dec., 75.
- Healey, Dorothy R.**—Why an Anti-Monopoly Coalition: A Discussion, June, 27.
- Hester, Hugh B.**—Letter from, Sept., 63.
- Ho Suan-Huei**—China Reconstructs Her Petty Capitalists, Mar., 53.
- Hungarian Intellectuals** on the UN Report, Nov., 46.
- Itin, L. (with S. Kamenitser)**—New Forms of Industrial Management in the USSR, Nov., 28.
- Jackson, James E., Jr.**—On the Struggle for Negro Freedom, Mar., 31; In Memoriam: Edward E. Strong, May, 1; *The Challenge of Little Rock*, Oct., 1; *The South's New Challenge*, Dec., 1.
- Kamenitser, S. (with L. Itin)**—New Forms of Industrial Management in the USSR, Nov., 28.
- Letters from Readers**—Aug., 63; Sept., 63; Oct., 61; Nov., 60.
- Lumer, Hyman**—In Defense of Theory, Feb., 58; *Reviews H. Aptheker's, Truth About Hungary*, July, 21; *Reviews S. Lilley's Automation and Social Progress*, Aug., 46; *Reviews W. Hamilton's The Politics of Industry*, Sept., 60; *Reviews V. Perlo's Empire of High Finance*, Oct., 46.
- Mao Tse-Tung**—On Contradictions Among the People, July, 36.
- Morris, Leslie**—American Imperialism and Canada, Dec., 68.
- Nair, M. N. Govindan**—How the Communists Won in Kerala, June, 59.
- National Committee, CPUSA**—Facing the 85th Congress, Jan., 1; A Message to Party Organizations, Jan., 43; *The Eisenhower Doctrine*, Feb., 1; *On the Senate "Racketeering" Investigation*, Apr., 8; In Memoriam: Edward E. Strong, May, 1; *Resolution on Agricultural Policy*, Sept., 21; *An Evaluation of the "Daily Worker"*, Sept., 26.

Patterson, William L.—James W. Ford: A Tribute, Aug., 13.

Peking "People's Daily"—More on Historical Experience of Proletarian Dictatorship, Feb., 3; *The Chinese Communists Tackle Bureaucracy*, June, 48.

Preamble to the Constitution, Mar., 29.

"Rinascita" Editors—A Reply to Comrade Comradly: French and Italian Communists Debate Programmatic Questions, Apr., 29.

Ilvoro, Blego—An Appeal for World Peace, Aug., 50.

Ruxe, Charlotte—The Youth Festival in Moscow, Nov., 10.

Schneiderman, William—On the Nature of the Party's Errors, Mar., 15.

Shen Chih-Yuan—Multiple Parties in People's China, Oct., 31.

Simon, Hal—Some Concepts of Our Trade-Union Work, Feb., 49.

Soviet Economists—A Discussion of the "Political Economy Textbook," Nov., 40.

Sparks, Nemmy—Reviews A. L. Strong's "The Stalin Era," Jan., 19; *On Relations*

With Other Marxist Parties, Mar., 18; *English or Algebra?*, Mar., 64; *A Talk on Socialism*, Apr., 23; In Memoriam: Edward E. Strong, May, 1.

Starobin, Joseph—A Communication, Jan., 60.

Thompson, Bob—On the Communist Party, Sept., 14.

Togliatti, Palmiro—Report to Congress of CP of Italy (extract), Feb., 27.

Warren, Sue—Reviews Agnes Smedley's *China's Great Road*, Mar., 43.

Weiss, Max—Peaceful Co-Existence: A Discussion, Jan., 55; *On Marxist-Leninist Theory*, Mar., 15.

Wells, Harry K.—Reviews Howard Selsam's *Philosophy in Revolution*, July, 31.

West, Jim—On the Party's Vanguard Role, Sept., 53.

Williamson, John—Anglo-American Imperialism: An Unequal Partnership, Oct., 11.

Winter, Carl—On the Eve of the UAW Convention—Dec., 32.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF

POLITICAL AFFAIRS, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1957.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor, Herbert Aptheker, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 7th day of October, 1957.

MYRON J. BLUTTER

Notary Public, State of N. Y.

03-5360000, Qualified in Bronx County
(My commission expires March 30, 1958)

INDISPENSABLE BOOKS

Decision in Africa

by W. ALPHAEUS HUNTON

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

International, Price \$4.00

The Empire of High Finance

by VICTOR PERLO

A comprehensive, thoroughly-documented study of the structure and operation of the biggest monopolies of the United States, analyzing the various groupings of the monopoly giants and their financial empires, as well as their merger with, and domination of, the government.

International, Price \$5.50

The Truth About Hungary

by HERBERT APTHEKER

A full-length study of the 1956 uprising in Hungary which probes fearlessly into the sources of the popular discontent, the nature of the uprising, the forces involved, and the day-by-day course of the Budapest events, including the meaning of Hungary for world socialism and the lessons the uprising holds for the future.

Mainstream, Price \$2.00; cloth \$3.00

At Most Bookstores

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3