

political affairs

NOVEMBER 1959 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|-----------------|------|---|
| V. KELER | [14] | The River of Time |
| S. G. STRUMILIN | [24] | The Workday and Communism |
| ROGER GARAUDY | [42] | Bourgeois Morality and Communist Morality |
| MARK T. CAMUSO | [48] | The Party's Vanguard Role in the Labor Movement |
| MILTON ROSEN | [54] | The Party and the Masses |
| HYMAN LUMER | [62] | The Soviet Union Today
(Book Review) |

THE KHRUSHCHEV VISIT
by Betty Gannett

[1-13]

**DESPAIR, DEMOCRACY, AND
MARXISM**

by Herbert Aptheker

[32-41]

NEW AND RECENT TITLES

THE COLONIAL ERA by Herbert Aptheker	\$2.00
LABOR FACT BOOK 14, prepared by Labor Research Association	2.00
WHAT I SAW IN THE SOVIET UNION TODAY by George Morris	.35
THE GERMAN QUESTION: TOWARDS WAR OR PEACE? by Herbert Aptheker	.25
ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION: THE MARXIST THEORY OF SOCIAL CHANGE by Herbert Aptheker	.25
CUBA'S REVOLUTION, by Joseph North	.10
SINCE SPUTNIK: HOW AMERICANS VIEW THE SOVIET UNION by Herbert Aptheker	.25
PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM, by J. M. Budish	.50
Coming:	
THE BIG BRAINWASH, by Dyson Carter	2.50
HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford	1.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway

New York 3, N. Y.

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 50 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

Vol. XXXVIII, No. 11 NOVEMBER, 1959

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The Khrushchev Visit

By Betty Gannett

"IT COULD BE THAT when the history books are written," commented one newspaper, "the conference of Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower at Camp David will mark the point in the rushing stream of events at which we turned from war to peace, from death to life."

Giving voice to this age-long dream of mankind, Premier Khrushchev, speaking on his return to Moscow, said:

In our day men are realizing with their own hands the dreams mankind cherished for ages, dreams that were expressed in fairy tales which seemed sheer fantasy. How, then, in this age of flourishing human genius that is fathoming Nature's secrets and harnessing her mighty forces, can one reconcile oneself to the preservation of the primitive relations between men that existed when men were no more than beasts?

Our time can and must become a time of the triumph of great ideals, a time of peace and progress.

This life-giving hope was kindled in the hearts of all Americans during Khrushchev's historic and stirring 13-day visit to this country. And despite attempts to belittle the results at Camp David, despite the continued efforts of the cold-war advocates to hold back the clock of history, this hope will inspire the struggle to realize a world of peace, when life will triumph over death and destruction.

* * *

This country of ours will never again be what it was in the days prior to the Khrushchev visit. Neither will the cold war, with its McCarthyite-fostered Big Lie of "Soviet aggression."

The people in their homes, and on the streets, have seen and heard the leading world Communist personality, shorn of the misrepresentations which they had been fed for years. They heard his sincere appeals for world peace and friendship, and the

repeated theme that our country and his, despite the difference in our economic systems, can live together in one world. They heard him describe the objective, to free mankind from the horrors of atomic disaster, as "the noble aim to which all people aspire." They heard him unfold new vistas for human welfare through the achievement of universal disarmament, when science would be applied to peaceful endeavors instead of human destruction. They listened to his story of how the Soviet people, in a mere four decades, transformed their age-long backwardness, achieved great industrial strength, made phenomenal advances in science, education and technology, and now aspire to attain the highest living standard in the world.

Only yesterday these truths were denied or distorted. Now, over all modern media of communication, they were being explained in simple, direct and human terms, so that the millions could understand. And the millions listened. For the representative of the Soviet people spoke from his heart, driven by a dedication to peace and human welfare. These truths entered every house in our country and did much to break through the prejudicial barriers which helped sustain the cold war.

It is, perhaps, too early to evaluate all the vast new possibilities for the achievement of world peace inherent in the visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States and the forthcoming return visit of President Eis-

enhower to the Soviet Union. But what is already apparent, even to those who may still hesitate to admit it, is the indisputable fact that the visit of Khrushchev marks the beginning of a turn in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Not yet a full turn, to be sure, but an important beginning.

Such a change in the relations between the most powerful capitalist nation and the most powerful socialist state, once achieved, can create an entirely new world situation, in which peaceful coexistence will determine the relations between nations with opposing social systems, and when wars can be abolished for all time.

The joint communique, signed by Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower at the conclusion of the talks at Camp David, is the first major joint expression in the period since World War II on the need for continued negotiations to resolve disputed international questions in a spirit devoid of suspicion and mistrust. The agreement "that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiations" is indeed a far cry from the Dulles "brinkmanship" policy.

* * *

The Dulles foreign policy was in the main a policy opposed to peaceful negotiations. It was a policy

which relied on the military superiority of the United States to bludgeon its "lesser partners" into a bloc aimed at the camp of socialism, under the domination of U.S. imperialism. It was a policy of "massive retaliation," of "organized subversion," of interference in the affairs of other nations against "direct" and "indirect" Soviet "aggression." It was a policy of atomic threats, provocations and intimidation—a policy of instigating conflicts all over the world.

But the Dulles policy has failed. Its bankruptcy has become increasingly evident—in Indonesia and Indo-China, in Africa and the Middle East, and in Europe itself. A continuation of this suicidal policy of "brinkmanship" threatened completely to isolate the United States from the majority of the world. It has already caused serious fissures in the camp of the "free world." The "partners" in the Western bloc, under the pressure of their peoples for an alternative policy to atomic annihilation, and in defense of their economic requirements, have begun to step out on their own. Witness MacMillan's attempt to seize leadership of the Western bloc by his personal visit to Moscow in the early part of this year and his championing of a summit meeting in the recently concluded British elections.

The world of today is no longer a world which U.S. imperialism can dominate by virtue of its superior military and technological might. For the world is not mirrored in the

image of the United States. The reality of today has compelled important sections of ruling and government circles in this country, as elsewhere, to take a new look at where the United States stands in relation to the rest of the world. A new appraisal of this real world has become imperative to avoid being shoved aside by history in the making.

Socialism, having broken out of the borders of a single country, is successfully building a life free of exploitation and oppression for one-third of the earth's population. No distortions and misinformation can any longer hide the fact that the Soviet Union has made such gigantic economic strides that it can place as a realizable objective before its people surpassing the economic might of the "unchallengeable" United States. A once poverty-stricken China has unleashed its vast human potential of 650,000,000 in a historic leap forward. All the Eastern European Democracies are rapidly developing their economies at a faster rate than that of the capitalist nations. No policy of "containment," of liberating the "captive nations" can stem their advance on the rails of socialism.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America as well, one country after another has wrested its national independence from the colonial imperialists and has entered the path of independent development. These new sovereign nations jealously guard their newly

acquired independence and vigorously support all strivings toward freedom in the still unfree areas of the globe. They fiercely resent all attempts to reassert domination by whatever means, and reject "aid" which threatens to weaken their sovereignty.

Neither can U.S. imperialism any longer count on its superior military strength as a "deterrent" to "Soviet aggression." Its monopoly in military technology has been broken.

The people in every corner of the world, aghast at the suicidal course of the race for more "efficient" weapons of destruction, have responded in their millions to the Soviet peace initiative, giving voice to the urgent need for peaceful negotiations as the only alternative to annihilation.

In our country, too, the people look eagerly to an alternative to the Dulles foreign policy, to a thaw in the cold war. Though still imbued with anti-Soviet prejudices, and not yet recognizing the source of the real danger to world peace, the American people almost instinctively sense that an improvement in American-Soviet relations is the key to a relaxation of world tensions.

No, the world is not the same. The balance has shifted in favor of the mighty forces for peace. In this situation U.S. imperialism can no longer play the piper, for others to follow.

The experiences of recent years, and the need for a realistic estimate of the world today, have compelled

a new appraisal of our foreign policy. Important forces in government and business are beginning to realize that the continuation of the Dulles cold war policy is leading them to a dead end, and to eventual disaster.

* * *

It is this shift in the world relationship of forces that explains why a Khrushchev visit can take place today when only yesterday the United States government, pursuing the hidebound Dulles course, adamantly rejected it.

If the shift in world relationships in favor of the camp of peace explains the invitation of Khrushchev to the United States, his 13-day cross-country trip, in turn, has created new opportunities to end the cold war and advance the cause of world peace.

It is now more difficult to pursue the cold war policy in the spirit of the past. The truth of the Soviet Union's peace efforts, and of its aim to live at peace with the United States, helps to expose the baselessness of the burdensome armament program for "defense" against a war threat that does not exist. It thereby helps to strengthen the people's will to end the cold war.

For the first time since the existence of the Soviet Union, its foremost representative was able to explain directly to the American people the peaceful foundations of the Soviet Union, and why countries of differing economic systems must

learn to live together in peace and friendship. Refusing to be diverted by the self-styled champions of "freedom" for the people living under socialism, Khrushchev adhered to one central theme—peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition. His repeated, patient explanation why peace is necessary and what peace would mean for everybody, and his obvious sincerity, had a profound effect on all who listened. The minds of the people began to open.

The *New York Times* columnist, James Reston, who at first impatiently insisted that Khrushchev had increased tensions rather than lessened them—because he was an intolerant man who wanted peace at a price the United States was not ready to pay—was compelled at the end of the visit to admit grudgingly that Khrushchev had convinced a lot of people high in the U.S. Government of his genuine and intense conviction of the need to avoid war.

More and more the tone changed in the course of the visit. "The Soviet challenge is not primarily military, but political, economic, and social," said the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, echoing what was rising in the minds of a great majority of Americans. And, if the challenge is not military, then why not peaceful competition to prove which system can most effectively meet the people's needs for job security, for housing and better educational facilities, for the wiping out of poverty, for higher standards of living? Repeatedly,

Khrushchev placed the question in this way.

Indeed, he asserted, peaceful competition can be of great advantage to the peoples of both nations, and neither stands to lose anything from it. The idea began to seep through to the American working people for whom such peaceful economic competition can only help to raise their sights for a further improvement in their living conditions.

* * *

If the cold war has not ended, the thaw in the cold war has begun. Conditions have been created for the discussion of the major areas of disagreement in a new atmosphere, and a number of disputed questions can be resolved.

1. All concede that the conditions now exist for improved negotiations on the banning of nuclear testing, and the possibility of mutual agreement to halt testing is close at hand. A ban on nuclear testing can also lay a firm foundation for extended cooperation on the use of atomic energy for peaceful pursuits, for exchange of scientific information, and for joint efforts to help cure diseases which yearly take such heavy tolls in many nations. The projected agreements for joint medical research projects and cooperation in peaceful atomic research are concrete steps emerging from the visit.

2. The adamant resistance of the U.S. government to top-level meetings has been overcome. The holding of a summit meeting before the

year's end now appears possible. In the words of Walter Lippmann, "the clogged and frozen channels of diplomatic communication between the Western alliance and the Soviet Union" have been reopened. This meeting, held in a new atmosphere, even if it does not yet settle the major areas of disagreement, can pave the way for regular meetings of the summit as a system of top-level exchanges, which can significantly influence the unfreezing of the cold war.

3. The elimination of the vestiges of World War II by the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two German States and the normalizing of the situation in West Berlin was obviously a matter of considerable discussion at Camp David. There is no evidence that Khrushchev and Eisenhower have developed a common approach to this most serious problem—which in the past year threatened to flare up into a grave crisis. But the agreement to reopen negotiations on the Berlin question has helped to lay low the ghost that the Soviet Union issued an "ultimatum," that it has taken a take-it or leave-it stand. A discussion of the German question, without threats and sabre-rattling, opens the possibility of moving closer to a settlement of this vexing problem based on reality and not on intimidation.

4. The extension of cultural exchanges, especially in the scientific and technical fields, is also assured as a result of the visit. The exchanges

of delegations of statesmen, industry representatives, educators, scientists and artists have already proven of inestimable value. They have helped to bring to our people a sober and more realistic estimate of Soviet achievements in industry, science and education. The removal of obstacles to their continuation and expansion is of prime importance.

The increase in the tourist trade during the past year, testimony to the great interest of tens of thousands in seeing things for themselves, is also bound to thrive in this new atmosphere.

5. The mutual agreement to probe into the question of unfreezing the cold war on trade with the socialist nations can be of inestimable benefit to the peoples of both countries. Both businessmen and workers in this country have suffered as a result of the American-imposed embargo on trade. The removal of the restrictions and the reestablishment of normal trade relations would help further to relax world tensions.

6. Perhaps the most significant result of the Khrushchev visit is the fact that universal disarmament has dramatically become the central issue and chief subject of discussion in the fight for peace. A world of peace can be guaranteed only if all countries are deprived of the means of modern warfare.

* * *

Since the end of World War II

the Soviet Union, supported by the socialist camp and a number of the newly created independent nations, has advanced a program for the outlawing of the manufacture and use of atomic weapons, for the destruction of atomic stockpiles, for the elimination of the armament race and the reduction of the armed forces, etc. But the proposals for universal or even partial disarmament made no headway. Premier Khrushchev's address before the United Nations Assembly on September 18th, outlining the necessity for universal disarmament, and advancing a practical plan for its accomplishment in four years, overnight transformed this question into the key issue in the fight for peaceful coexistence.

There were some in our country who treated this program with derision, trying to picture it as a mere repetition of a "time-worn" Soviet theme dating back to 1927. Others insisted that the Soviet Union wanted disarmament first and then inspection and control later, disregarding the proposals for control and inspection in the step-by-step disarmament plan. But this tune had to be altered. The proposals won an immediate response.

The United Nations General Assembly has given the program top priority, and the Political Committee is now in the midst of its deliberations. While this question will go to the ten-nation disarmament committee for elaborate discussion, the summit meeting can help create

the new atmosphere in which the discussion of disarmament can proceed.

The question of disarmament has evoked a wide discussion on its effects on the economy of our country. But the alternative to the armaments economy is not an automatic collapse of the economy, nor is it necessary that the workers be saddled with the effects of reconversion. The alternative, rather, is a peacetime economy that employs the billions now spent for war to expand housing, schools, hospitals, recreational centers, and other social needs, and to improve further the standard of living of the workers.

* * *

In emphasizing the new possibilities to win the fight for peace, it would be disastrous to close one's eyes to the fact that the proponents of the cold war are very powerful in our country. They are in control of the huge armament industries. They are in both houses of Congress and in high federal and state government bodies. They are found in both major political parties, and even in the leadership of the American labor movement. Who will win this fight to end the cold war is not yet decided.

It is essential to emphasize that the Eisenhower Administration is not yet embarked on a firm line away from the cold war course. Within the Administration there are forces who are determined to prevent a change in U.S. foreign policy. Im-

portant financial circles are exerting pressure to hold the line. At best what we witness is a contradictory course on the part of the Administration, as has been made obvious by events during and after the Khrushchev visit.

Developments on a number of international questions show that the United States had by no means given up its attempts to provoke and inflame critical areas of dispute. Thus, in the spirit of Dulles, the United States is spreading fantastic lies as to what is happening in Tibet, and has taken sides with the reactionary forces who strive to preserve their feudal privileges against the necessary reform of a social system which has kept the Tibetans in bondage and poverty. Thus, too, the instigation of civil war in Laos on the side of an undemocratic government which has made war on the democratic Pathet Lao movement, under cover of resisting the "intervention" of North Vietnam and Chinese troops. There is the bitter fight in the General Assembly, led by the United States, to block the election of Poland to the Security Council. And there is also the conclusion of an agreement with Turkey to build missile bases and, not least, the pouring in of huge amounts of capital and technical assistance to build up West Germany into the major armament producer in Europe.

Immediately on the announcement of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower exchange visits, supporters of the cold

war went into action. Full-page advertisements, articles in magazines and newspapers, commentators over TV and the radio, openly expressed opposition to the visit, declaring that there must be no agreement with this "ruthless butcher," and warning against "appeasement," against "another Munich." The reactionary scum of our society, the remnants of the America Firsters, McCarthyites and professional anti-Sovietees, were rallied to create hostility, to organize demonstrative actions of refugees, to call mass meetings, and to carry out national "mournings" throughout the country.

For weeks before the visit, and in the first days of the visit itself, an artificial atmosphere was created in the country. People were told how to act, how to think and what to do. They were constantly urged: "No applause, no cheers, polite but silent greetings." And the rigid ring of security in Washington, New York and Los Angeles helped to feed this artificial atmosphere, helped to stimulate the idea that this "hated" man was in mortal danger.

But even among many, for whatever reason, who expressed their support of the exchange of visits, the cold-war mentality hung on. It is not accidental that Premier Khrushchev, immediately after he landed, asked the President if he had read Vice-President Nixon's address at the Convention of the American Dental Association.

"Setting Khrushchev straight" was

the red thread of the Nixon address before the Dental Association. It would be a grave mistake, Nixon agreed, to ignore unpleasant discussion under the guise of politeness. The visit gives us a direct opportunity to speak to the "boss," straight from the shoulder, answering him effectively on every occasion and questioning him directly on major issues. He considered "incredibly naive" those who might see in the visit the opening of a new era of "sweetness and light."

Nixon did not use the occasion to help establish a better atmosphere for discussing the problems of mutual concern to both countries, but in order to keep alive the defunct Dulles policy of negotiation from a mythical position of strength. Negotiation on the basis of equality and mutual respect is foreign to this man who has been striving to don the mantle of "peace-maker."

Governor Rockefeller, the second major Republican contender for the Presidential nomination, issued no statements, made no speeches, and was described as being neither cold nor warm. But his cold-war mentality came to the surface in his first public pronouncement on foreign policy, at the New York Board of Trade annual dinner on October 8th. Here he minced no words. Speaking in opposition to any expansion of U.S.-Soviet trade, this billionaire oil magnate declared: "But let me point out, that on the present basis any increased volume of Communist

trade will add in direct ratio to their power to disrupt and dominate world trade by Trojan Horse tactics." And, he continued, "it is the part of wisdom to insist now that East-West trade be conducted according to the rules that the West has established. . . ." Comment is superfluous.

Among the Democrats who aspire to high public office, only Adlai Stevenson forcefully identified himself with the need for a relaxation of world tensions, for improvement in American-Soviet relations. In an article, dated September 29th, in the *New York Times*, he characterized the Khrushchev visit as a "startling chapter in diplomatic history." He continued:

The talks in Washington are the supreme measure of the results of his visit. From the public reports of those talks, all that is certain is that we will talk some more and that disarmament will have a new top priority. But more time and more talks and a halt to the arms race are powerful allies of peace. So I think this fantastic visit was a hopeful omen.

All other leading Democrats, from former President Truman to Johnson, Symington, Kennedy and Acheson, never achieved the statesmanship the historic moment demands. On the contrary they spoke in "cold war" terms and stressed expanding U.S. military potential as the only safe "deterrent."

The degrading spectacle of the top officialdom of the AFL-CIO,

who consider it their main mission in life to attack the socialist lands, will not soon be forgotten. Meany, who together with Dubinsky led the pack in opposing any meeting with Khrushchev, stated in his keynote speech at the AFL-CIO convention: "There is hanging over us as we meet here the grim shadow of Soviet power. Nothing we can do here is of greater importance than the question of how we meet the challenge."

And Meany's challenge was taken up by the Reuther-Carey group, who insisted on organizing a dinner with Khrushchev, not in order to exchange ideas on how labor can advance the struggle for peace, but in order to tell Khrushchev "he is a murderer to his face."

These top leaders of the labor movement find themselves in the camp of the most reactionary cold war advocates. Tied to the cold war policy, is it any wonder they are unable to organize an offensive against the drive of Big Business to undermine the gains secured by the workers in the past two decades? Is it any wonder that they failed to rally labor and its allies to defeat the vicious Landrum-Griffin bill.

Premier Khrushchev, sensing the cold war mentality on every occasion, was not diverted. He countered their position by persistent appeals for an end to the cold war.

* * *

It is an everlasting tribute to the

American people, in their majority, that the proponents of the cold war, open or covert, did not succeed in turning the objectives of the visit into its opposite. The cold-war campaign of hostility found but few takers. The smiling, interested, curious, if silent crowds of Washington and New York (by no means cool and hostile), were transformed into cheering crowds, eager to express their desire for friendship, in San Francisco, Des Moines and particularly Pittsburgh, the heart of the industrial might of our country. The miserable handful of demonstrators who followed Khrushchev from city to city were either ignored by the people or isolated. In some instances their vulgar placards were destroyed. The black bands of mourning were a fizzle from the start.

The letter campaign to "tell Khrushchev off" not only did not materialize, but in the main became a sane discussion for peace and friendship and an expression of resentment against sniping and the efforts to transform the people into "brainwashed robots." Even the Gallup Poll indicated the majority opinion for the exchange of visits.

The arrogance of the labor leaders, who purported to speak in the name of the American workers, also received some setbacks. The huge welcome in Pittsburgh, whose population has so large a percentage of steel workers, indicated that where the workers were not held back by the restrictions of their leaders, they

were as eager to express their desire for peace as any other section of the population. Already, it is evident that the labor officialdom did not speak for those leaders closer to the workers. Thus, for instance, Carl Stellato, head of Ford Local 600, in a full page article in *Ford Facts* entitled "McCarthyism is Dead; Peace Hopes are Alive," dated October 3rd, writes:

This is 1959. Things have changed. For the last two weeks, top officials of the American government and the American delegate to the United Nations have been wining and dining the world's number one Communist—Nikita Khrushchev. . . . Strange as it may seem, the American government is not in a state of collapse but, if anything, democracy is stronger for having met Mr. Khrushchev.

The heads of state of America and Russia discussed their common problems in an effort to find solutions to these problems without the necessity of resorting to a thermo-nuclear holocaust. We are in agreement with this approach. We believe that it is better that the heads of state sit at the conference table rather than have Americans and Russians lying by roadsides, victims of the big bombs.

Stellato, not Reuther, expresses the true sentiments of the auto workers. And that even a Reuther gleans this truth is seen in the fact that the resolution presented to the recent U.A.W. convention, while it repeats all the irresponsible slanders of the cold war, nevertheless, is compelled to say:

A separate consideration of the situation in each area of the world must not mask the truth that without peace life on this planet is in danger.

The pursuit of peace by every honorable means is not a pious slogan but a prime condition of survival.

In this light, the Khrushchev visit to America opens a crack which conceivably could be pried into an opening on a less frightening future.

Such independent unions as the ILWU, and the UE not only greeted the exchange of visits but saw them as a fruition of their position that all nations must learn to live together.

* * *

But the cold war advocates are not yet defeated. Neither is the cold war policy. To guarantee that the proponents of the cold war are not allowed to dissipate the more favorable conditions now created for the fight for peace, rests entirely in the hands of the people of our country. The replacement of America's cold war policy by a policy of peaceful coexistence, will require a long, unrelenting, alert day-to-day struggle. It will require mass movements, actions and expressions on every issue in the fight for peace, whether it be banning of nuclear testing, trade, the issue of Germany, disarmament, or the recognition of China and seating China in the U.N. In the first place, advocates of peace must find the way of achieving organized expressions for peace in the ranks of labor

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

and joining the Negro people's freedom fight with a firm position in support for peace.

The issue of peace and peaceful coexistence penetrates every area of American life today. It will be a determining factor in the outcome of the 1960 elections. This is recognized by those in high government posts and by the leaders of the two major parties. But it is not yet fully recognized by the ranks of labor and the people. More than in any previous election, candidates will be judged by this central question. The crying need is a movement to guarantee that peace candidates, true representatives of labor and the Negro people, are selected and supported against those who continue to keep the cold war aflame. Today, there is no more important task than this.

The fight for peace requires, at every turn, the exposure of those who stand in the way of improving U.S.-Soviet relations—identifying the enemy in high places and organizing the pressure of the people against them.

Only the people, in the final analysis, can impose a new policy on our government.

* * *

Our Party faces a great challenge. During the past decade and more it has felt the blows of McCarthyite reaction precisely because we advocated peace and friendship between our country and the Soviet Union as

the only way in which peace could be maintained in the world. For this activity we were labeled "foreign agents" and charged with support of the Soviet Union at the expense of the national interests of our own country. Today the issue of peaceful coexistence, the urgent need of improving relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, is on everybody's tongue. We have the greatest opportunity in our 40 years of existence to influence the outcome of the battle for life or death, if we resolutely dedicate our efforts to its realization.

To help stimulate and participate in movements that will advance the realization of peace in our time, is our all-embracing task. In the communities, shops and unions we must boldly enter into discussions on the need for peace, improved relations with the Soviet Union and what peaceful coexistence will mean for our country. In the coming weeks, it is essential to work out a thorough program for an economy of peace, as an indispensable part of the fight for universal disarmament. Such a program, outlining how a peace economy can be achieved, should be brought before the working people, Negro and white, for discussion with the aim of encouraging additional ideas and amendments.

Our Party has a specific task which cannot be performed by any other group or organization in the country, that is, the popularization of the achievements of socialism in all parts

of the world. While the anti-Soviet prejudices have by no means been completely dissipated during the Khrushchev visit, the people are ready to listen, with less bigotry, to the actual story of socialist life. We have fallen short of performing this obligation. It is vital that this neglect be rapidly overcome.

In addition, we have to learn how to show what socialism will mean for our country, to explain how it will benefit the workers, the farmers, the Negro and Puerto Rican people, the youth, the professionals—in fact all men and women striving for a better life for themselves and their chil-

dren. The great industrial might of the United States, and its vast technological and scientific achievements, open up the possibility for an economy of abundance once the people take over this country and eliminate the power of monopoly. Such propaganda for socialism will not weaken, but will in fact enhance, the fight for peace and peaceful coexistence.

These are vital times in which to live. Will it be life or death? What happens in our country, the mighty citadel of imperialism, is a decisive matter in answering this supreme question.

The River of Time

By V. Keler

In connection with the 42nd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, we are bringing our readers translations from two articles that appeared recently in Soviet publications. One, "The River of Time," is by an engineer and was published in *Tekhnika-Molodyozhi*, or *Technical Journal for Youth*. This article was prefaced with two paragraphs, reading as follows:

"In compliance with readers' requests, we are printing an article about the new and extraordinary theory of time put forward by the Leningrad astrophysicist, N. A. Kozyrev. The scientist's bold ideas are not accepted by everyone. Some support them, while others oppose them. This appears to be natural. Much that is unexpected is bound to arise along the broad highway of the development of human thought. Some ideas that arise are later swept aside by life. But there also arise ideas of value, which impel science forward, even though at first glance these ideas do seem incredible and extraordinary.

"We do not undertake to judge the correctness or mistakenness of this theory, which has been advanced by a scientist who lately has won a world reputation by his astronomical discoveries: an active volcano on the Moon, and aurorae on Venus. We leave it to our readers to ponder over this interesting theory, on becoming acquainted with it. Experts in physics and astrophysics, as well as philosophers, are invited to contribute their views on this new hypothesis of time."

For American readers, not the least extraordinary feature of this article will be to realize that it appears in a magazine meant for youth. It is published here not only because of its great interest, but also as indicative of the tremendous renaissance of human thinking and creative daring that mark the present USSR, on this its 42nd birthday. Similarly, the second article published here, "The Workday and Communism," by a Soviet professor of economics, reflects the breathtaking sweep and grandeur of human thought and effort in the First Land of Socialism; that article, by the way, is taken from the *Literary Gazette (Literaturnaya Gazeta)*.—The Editor.

THE COURSE OF TIME: A SOURCE OF MECHANICAL POWER

IT WAS AT THE big hall of the Soviet Geographical Society in Leningrad that this lank man, with a bulging

forehead, hair turning grey, and a slightly burring manner of speech, first spoke about these surprising things to a breathless audience.

"As a result of long years spent studying the structure of heavenly bodies," he announced in his calm

and even voice, "I have come to a conclusion about the existence of specific, hitherto unknown forces in nature. The source of these forces is the course of time."

Time in some way being equivalent to energy! The course of time being convertible into forces acting on cosmic bodies!

One had to possess great scientific courage to make this statement to a large audience consisting of experts in physics, astrophysics, mechanics, and philosophy, as well as students. . . .

It was the kind of courage that had to be (and was!) present in Lobachevsky, who was the first to suggest the curvature of space, in Einstein, who formulated the principle of the equivalence of mass and energy, and in Planck, who discovered the atomic structure of radiation. Such courage is natural and essential in people who probe deeply into the nature of a phenomenon, who reflect about it at length, and who eventually become infinitely confident of the correctness of ideas that mature as a result of painstaking and persistent research.

The theory of professor Nikolai Alexandrovich Kozyrev, Dr.Sc. (Phys.-Math.), whom we observed on the platform, has so far not won general recognition. There is much controversy over it, and there are some who even call it a "wild" theory. But the boldness of this theory cannot but strike the imagination of any person with a thirst for knowl-

edge and cannot but encourage his interest in the fundamental problems of the natural sciences. Few people know about Kozyrev's ideas as yet, and those mostly in Leningrad. His "unsymmetric," or "causal," mechanics is unknown not only to the general public with an interest in natural sciences, but even to experts in physics. The book outlining the principles of this mechanics was published by the USSR Academy of Sciences in only 500 copies and became a bibliographical rarity at once.

The packed hall listened with the keenest interest to this exposition of the fundamentals of unsymmetric mechanics:

"Certain phenomena have at present been discovered in nuclear physics which prove that the world is not equivalent to its mirror reflection." The author arrived at this conclusion several years ago on the basis of astronomical data. Astronomical data indicate that this symmetry of the world is due to the unsymmetry of time, that is, to the fact that the future is objectively different from the past. This property of time, which may be termed its directivity of course, determines the difference between cause and effect. For this reason mechanics which takes into account the course of time should logically be called unsymmetric or causal mechanics.

All natural phenomena proceed in time. It is therefore impossible to imagine a field of science concerned with the world in which the proper-

ties of time would not play a part. But if the course of time is really responsible for the fact that the world is not equivalent to its mirror image, the phenomena of asymmetry in biology and the microworld must also be explained by the directivity of time. . . .

Some time later we were at Kozyrev's flat. There he told us about his theory. The subject being a difficult one, the scientist carefully chose figures of speech that would help to convey his ideas to many readers of our magazine.

"Unfortunately," he said, "without recourse to mathematics and highly specialized physics terminology, it is difficult to discuss these profoundly theoretical problems. Let us agree that wherever possible we shall use figures of speech and comparisons. Where I am not able to find a figure of speech, I shall have to resort to more specialized language. Let this part be something in the nature of mental gymnastics for science enthusiasts."

The theory of the Leningrad scientist is indeed very difficult. It is probably more involved than Einstein's theory of relativity in the same proportion in which the theory of relativity is more involved than classical mechanics. N. A. Kozyrev's full narrative would scarcely be comprehensible to most of our readers.

On the other hand, in undertaking this first popular exposition of a most surprising hypothesis, it is very important to retain the author's own

words. We have therefore sought to retain them. So that they could easily be noticed they are in quotations. All the rest is our account of the conversation and attempts to explain the difficult parts of the theory.

HOW TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN CAUSE AND EFFECT

First of all, we must get to the bottom of that property of time which we call its course.

Let us picture a young woman walking down Nevsky Avenue with a baby in her arms. Leaving aside the mother's happy smile, let us consider this phenomenon from the standpoint of "dry" mechanics. From the point of view of mechanics, this is a case of Newton's third law: "Every action has an equal and opposite reaction." The woman presses the baby's body with her arms with the same force that the baby's weight presses upon the mother's arms. The third law does not distinguish in principle between the force of the action and the force of the reaction. Yet there is a difference between them.

"It is precisely obvious," Kozyrev says, "that weight is the cause, while pressure is the effect of the body's weight.

"Mechanics maintains that nothing will change if the situation is reversed. Mechanics fails to take into consideration the difference between the future and the past, between

cause and effect."

How are we to distinguish cause and effect, the active force of the action and the passive force of the reaction? This can be done by introducing the concept of the course of time.

"Up to now theoretical physics and mechanics have used only one property of time, namely the possibility of measuring the duration of events or the length of time intervals. These measurements are made by clocks. However, we know from everyday life that this does not exhaust the properties of time. In reality the consecutiveness of events in time is an orderly one: causes always come before effects. It is our conviction that causes differ in principle from effects and, hence, that the future differs in principle from the past. This difference shows that time has yet another property, which has not been used by the exact sciences and which can be called its *directivity* of its *course*.

"Theoretical reasoning on the basis of the axioms of mechanics has shown that the course of time must be a quantity having the dimension of velocity and identical for the entire world."

Graphically speaking, the course of time is the rate at which a cause becomes an effect. Obviously, therefore, this rate cannot be infinitely great, for in that case there would indeed be no difference (as present-day mechanics does assume) between cause and effect. Nor can the course

of time be equal to 0, since in that case a cause would produce no effect: an active force would either not be transmitted beyond the point of contact, or that "transmission" would take infinitely long.

The course of time must be a finite quantity. Hence, "by introducing the course of time c_2 (designated so to distinguish it from $c_1 = 300,000$ km/sec, *i.e.*, the velocity of light in a vacuum) we can propose an experiment that would make it possible to establish which force is the cause, and which, the effect. This experiment is connected with the rotation of a body."

We have now approached the crux of the Leningrad scientist's theory. Professor Kozyrev reasons roughly as follows. Different points of a rotating body (a top or a planet) move with different peripheral velocities, U . This means that in one and the same interval of time, say, in one second, a point on the equator will cover a bigger path than some other point at some degree of Northern or Southern latitude. The dimension of the quantity U is the same as the dimension of the quantity c^2 . Can they not be added? N. A. Kozyrev replies in the affirmative to this question.

"It is natural to consider," he says, "that the quantities c_2 and U can be added. But this means that for a rotating body the course of time is different."

It is from this that the most surprising and extraordinary conclusions

follow, conclusions about the possibility of the course of time to perform work.

"IF TIME WERE HARNESSSED TO A TRANSMISSION BELT"

The poet Mayakovsky has a line which runs: "If time were harnessed to a transmission belt. . ."

The poet had a prevision, as it were, of the mechanical potentialities of time. For the course of time, it turns out, can do work and this is how.

Let us mentally slice our planet into a multitude of thin discs parallel to the equator. The course of time on the outer belts of these discs will be different.

This difference in the course of time immediately entails a difference in the momentum of two parallel and equal lengths on the rotating body.

"Since the quantity of forces is defined as change in momentum in a unit of time, a different course of time means a different force. When a planet or top rotates there arise, therefore, additional forces or stresses. These forces always exist in pairs and act in opposite directions. Thanks to this latter fact, a change in the course of time cannot move the center of gravity of the system but can alter the total energy of the body. In this way the course of time can be a source of power, like the power of moving water."

Evidently, the faster a body rotates, the greater the gradient of the course of time and the greater the additional forces discovered by N. A. Kozyrev. Besides this, these forces are also proportional to the mass of a body. And they can be measured.

"By measuring these additional forces, which arise in the relative rotation of body and which always act along the axis of rotation, it is possible to establish the quantity and sign of c_2 . It was found that the approximate value of $c_2 = 700$ km/sec., and that it is positive in a left-handed system of coordinates."

What does the latter mean?

Human beings have their favorite directions: upwards, forward, and rightwards. A system of coordinates based on these directions is called right-handed. It is assumed in this case that everything moving from the center along these directions increases, while everything moving in the opposite directions diminishes. Such a system can be reflected in a mirror or simply drawn so that it would look like a mirror image of a right-handed system. It is not difficult to see that in that case two of the three directions retain their position in space, while the third coincides with a negative direction of the right-handed system. Such a system will be called a mirror, or left-handed system of coordinates and is sometimes also used in physics. For instance, we speak of an increase in the temperature characteristic (heating) when the mercury in

a thermometer rises.

But we can also speak of an increase in a different temperature characteristic (frost) when the mercury goes down. That is a good, although highly simplified, example of possible counts in a right-handed and left-handed system of coordinates.

Theoretical calculations and experiments have shown that the course of time is positive in a left-handed system of coordinates. This is, actually, understandable. Time flows in one direction only, from the past to the future. The ocean of time is bearing down upon us. We endeavor to foresee the future, and we arrange for it in our plans and designs. But only the past is tangible and visible to us. It alone increases in the material and spiritual values of mankind. It is only when they look back that people really see the fruit of their work and appreciate the victorious forward march of history.

If we follow the axis of the course of time, we can now easily distinguish the active force of cause from the passive force of the reaction.

"The force of a cause, that is an active force, can be distinguished from the passive reaction by observing which of the forces increases in a given direction of rotation, and which diminishes."

THE ASYMMETRY OF TIME

In physics, as you will remember,

some quantities are called scalars, while others are called vectors. Scalars are those whose value can only be expressed by a number (real number). Such are, for example, temperature, density, work, length, area, mass, the length of an interval of time or what we usually refer to as simply time. Vectors on the other hand, are determined not only by quantity, but also by direction. Velocity, force, and acceleration are examples of vectors.

It was found that the course of time cannot, strictly speaking, be referred either to the first or to the second groups of quantities. This quantity is what physicists call a pseudo-scalar or a pseudo-vector.

"Pseudo-scalars and pseudo-vectors are quantities which reverse their sign upon mirror reflection. For instance, the reading of a thermometer does not change when reflected in a mirror—it is therefore an ordinary scalar. The speed, say, of a moving train is an ordinary vector. On the other hand, the velocity at which a top rotates furnishes an example of a pseudo-vector. Let us assume we hold in our hands a rotating top and are watching it in a mirror. In that case the top will appear, in the mirror, to be turning in the opposite direction. Hence, the quantity **determining** the rotation will reverse its sign in the mirror; it is, therefore, a pseudo-vector."

The course of time, as said above, is likewise a pseudo-vector. But since the direction of this quantity

is always one and the same (discounting the theoretical possibility of its reversal), this direction need not be specified, and the course of time may be called a pseudo-scalar.

What are the practical implications of this? We shall try to answer that question.

Has it ever happened to you that a cinema mechanic—either by mistake or as a practical joke—inserts his film backwards, so that you see it in the reverse order: from the end towards the beginning? If so, the dead and the wounded rise from the battlefield. You see them running backwards, bent forward, to their trenches. They jump down into the trenches backwards, and smoking cigarette ends rise from the ground to their mouths. The soldiers inhale the smoke and see their cigarettes grow in size.

Something of the kind, as we said, is theoretically possible in mechanics. Mechanics recognizes the symmetry of events: forward and backward in time. But the difference between cause and effect rules out the possibility of such symmetry.

This means it is necessary to create some other, more exact mechanics. Such mechanics would distinguish between cause and effect and take into account the actual unsymmetry of events.

What must such "causal," or "unsymmetrical," mechanics be based upon? It should, of course, be based, above all, on due consideration for the course of time. That quantity

should be introduced into the laws of physics and mechanics. Everything would then fall into place and would be in keeping with reality.

Mirror reflection is a characteristic property of the world we live in. Man's right and left hands and a great many other living and non-living objects exhibit mirror symmetry. Nevertheless, there are some, at times negligibly small, departures from ideal mirror reflection: the left hand is not the exact mirror reflection of the right. The principle of the conservation of parity in weak interactions has been refuted.

Nor is ideal mirror reflection preserved in the passage of events in time. If we could reverse the course of time (which we do mentally, say, in historical or paleontological research), the mechanical processes which we would observe would proceed quite differently than if they were the mirror reflection of mechanical processes running in the proper direction.

The world with a reverse course of time should be equivalent to a "mirror reflection" of our real world, but the "mirror," in addition to reflecting, at the same time somewhat "alters" events. It is here that we should seek the reasons why the principle of parity is upset in nuclear processes at weak interactions, the difference between the right and the left in biology, etc.

The asymmetry (flow in one direction) of time is the source of the power potential of this physical

quantity. In those parts of the Universe where the course of time is invariable, time performs no work. Such parts of the Universe can be likened to a serene lake, a reservoir of tremendous energy, which is, however, latent. To make the water of a lake perform work, it must be set in motion. In some way (for example by giving the water of the lake an outlet to a lower reservoir) it is necessary to create a difference of levels, of potentials.

In exactly the same way, time will perform work only provided it is like a stream of water running along some channel, provided it is like a directed stream.

THE "HEARTS" OF THE UNIVERSE

Dr. Kozyrev paused and smiled. "Difficult?" he asked. "I realize that. But it is not at all easy to express all this in terms understandable to your readers. That is precisely why I have so far not attempted any popular exposition of the fundamentals of 'unsymmetric' mechanics. But the most "terrible" is now over. Let's now turn to the practical conclusions, which it is much easier to speak about.

"The most important conclusion from the postulate that the course of time can perform work is, probably, that rotating heavenly bodies do not have the flattened shape they were believed to have up to now, but the

shape of a cardioid, a 'heart.'"

"In rotating planets, specifically the Earth, points rotating with different velocities are mutually attracted. Hence, as in tops rotating in supports, there arise forces acting along the axis of the planet. From the fact that the course of time is positive in a left-handed system of coordinates, while gravity produces pressures inside the planet, it follows that in the tropics and in the moderate latitudes of both hemispheres these forces are directed northwards along the axis of the Earth. These forces cannot shift the Earth's center of gravity. Therefore, in the vicinity of both poles, there must be equivalent forces at work directed southwards. As a result, our planet acquires the shape of a cardioid. It is crushed at the north and elongated at the south."

The fact that the Northern and the Southern Hemisphere of the Earth are unsymmetrical has been known for a long time. In the North gravity is slightly bigger than in the South, which could indicate that the North Pole is closer to the equator than the South Pole. Nevertheless, the geodesicians drew the opposite conclusion: that the North Pole is more elongated. This is also the conclusion reached by the Americans recently after analyzing the movement of their artificial Earth satellite launched on March 17, 1958. They consider that the shape of the Earth is determined only by the

force of gravity and centrifugal force. The excess gravity in the Northern Hemisphere should therefore, they believe, be interpreted as meaning that the substance of the Northern Hemisphere is denser than the substance of the Southern Hemisphere. In other words, the increased force of gravity in the Arctic is mistakenly attributed to a gravity anomaly.

Due consideration of the third type of forces—let us call them asymmetric forces—easily accounts for the difference in the polar gravities without our invoking any anomaly. The explanation in this case is the most simple one: that the North Pole is flattened, while the South Pole is elongated. True, this deformation is not pronounced. Calculations show that the North Pole should be about 100 m closer to the center of the Earth than if it were at a distance of the main radius of the planet, while the South Pole should be, accordingly, 100 m farther away. In other words, the difference in the actual semi-axes is only 200 m. However, even this deformation can be detected by direct measurements.

THE FIRST CONFIRMATIONS

“And has anyone made such measurements?”

The work in this direction with respect to the Earth cannot be considered complete. It was simpler to carry out photographic measure-

ments of the shapes of the swiftly rotating planets Jupiter and Saturn. The velocity of rotation of these planets at the equator is of the order of 11,000 m/sec. as compared to about 450 m/sec. at the equator of the Earth. I have performed such measurements. The results bear out theoretical calculations. It turned out that the South Poles of both planets exhibit pronounced elongation, while the North Poles are “compressed.” For instance, in the case of Jupiter, which has a diameter of 140,000 km, the difference between the semi-axes is about 420 km, that is, the North Pole is about 210 km closer to the equator, while the South Pole is 210 km farther away.

In the case of our planet, it has also been possible to prove experimentally with a rather high degree of accuracy, that there exist asymmetric forces caused by the difference in the course of time. These forces are not so negligible that they could not be detected by instruments. At the equator, for instance, they are equal to about 1/10,000th of the force of gravity.

By means of specially designed, very accurate instruments I have measured the asymmetric forces in the Crimea, in Pulkovo, and in various points beyond the Arctic Circle, to be more exact from 45° to 85° N. Lat. The data obtained confirmed the existence of forces that change with geographical latitude.

“In both Hemispheres there are parallels where the asymmetric forces

reverse their sign, that is their value is equal to zero. In strict accordance with theory, in the Northern Hemisphere this parallel was found to be at 73°05’.”

The discovery of the new forces will apparently help to solve many interesting problems. For example, by means of instruments detecting the asymmetric forces it should be possible to determine the geographical latitude quite accurately, without resorting to astronomical instruments, that is, without reference to the position of the sun or the stars.

The action of the newly discovered forces should account for certain geographical peculiarities of our planet, for example, the difference between the Northern Hemisphere and the Southern. This difference consists

in the fact that the continents are under pressure from the asymmetric forces and are, therefore, situated primarily in the Northern Hemisphere, while the oceans are situated primarily in the Southern. The Northern Hemisphere is warmer than the Southern. There is also a difference in the direction of ocean currents.

All these circumstances can now be accounted for by the action of forces hitherto unknown to science. Their study will yield much new information bearing not only on the climatic conditions of the Earth, but also on many other aspects of the physics of our planet. It can also lead us to new solutions of certain other problems of geology and geophysics.

The Workday and Communism

By S. G. Strumilin

THE REALM OF NECESSITY AND THE REALM OF FREEDOM

THE GOAL OF COMMUNISM is, in our opinion, the creation of a society in which everyone will enjoy an unlimited freedom for the harmonious development of all his or her best qualities and creative possibilities.

Neither high productivity of labor, nor infinite abundance of material benefits can in themselves be this goal, though we cannot conceive of communism without these conditions. The same holds good for a shorter workday. Yet all of these are the basic prerequisites for attaining the ultimate tasks of the construction of a new society.

It is no accident that, entering the period of comprehensive construction of Communism in the USSR, the Party set, among many other tasks, this specific task—to effect the shortest workday within a few years.

What is meant is a work week of 30 to 35 hours, that is, a six-hour workday in general and a five-hour workday, in all branches of more arduous labor. This is only the first decisive shift in this path. The connection between a shorter workday and the movement towards Commu-

nism is as close and inseparable as can be.

We know that a high rate of growth of the productivity of labor is a decisive condition for the construction of Communism. This is our chief trump in the peaceful competition with capitalist countries.

The productivity of industrial work in the USSR had increased ten-fold by 1958 as compared with 1913, while in the U.S.A. it had increased by two-odd times within the same period. Looking forward, we may say that a new, still more considerable growth of the productivity of labor is expected as automation develops. Practically it has no bounds in a foreseeable future.

Under the conditions of capitalism a higher productivity of labor leads to insoluble problems. As a matter of fact, it opens up only two quite real possibilities. The first is the possibility of still greater cuts in the total labor force. But who is then going to buy those mass consumer goods, the production of which is helped by automation? The second possibility is to reduce the workday without reducing the wages. In this case a source of profit will soon end as will the very purpose of capitalist production.

The builders of Communism are not faced with such problems. A shorter workday accompanied by a constant increase in the working people's living standards, far from contradicting anyone's interests as the growth of productive forces attains a certain degree, becomes an objective necessity and a law of development of our society along the road towards Communism. A shorter workday in our country is directly linked with a steadily rising productivity of labor.

V. I. Lenin foresaw these prospects as far back as 1914. "Large-scale production, machinery, railways, telephones—all these offer thousands of possibilities to cut the working time of organized labor to a quarter and ensure living standards four times higher than now." In 1914 the workday in Russia was no less than 10 hours, with a legalized norm of eleven and a half hours. The reduction of these norms to one-quarter would mean no more than three hours a day as a norm of labor necessity under Communism. Quite recently, in May 1959, N. S. Khrushchev, speaking in Moldavia, referred to a time when "the country will come to Communism" and "people will work three or four hours a day or perhaps even less."

A possibility of creative work—individual work and still more powerful and enjoyable collective work—is now becoming ever more accessible to the builders of Communism. This inspires them to overcome the great-

est difficulties and accomplish new labor exploits.

Yet under the conditions of complete Communism these possibilities will increase to such a degree that we may call it a leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom.

Karl Marx maintained that the "realm of freedom" begins only where work dictated by necessity and outer expediency ends, and that consequently, this realm, by the nature of things, lies on the other side of the sphere of material production proper.

To keep on living and to reproduce, man must fight nature, whatever the form of society he lives in and whatever the mode of production. It is an outer element that makes it expedient for man to undertake this struggle and the labor it compels. This is the realm of natural necessity because man feels quite free only when he can put before himself without constraint any aim stemming from his inner inclinations and the social aspirations in him. As man's natural requirements grow, so does the corresponding "realm of necessity" expand. However, there also expand together with this the productive forces used to satisfy these requirements.

"... A real realm of freedom," Marx wrote, "... can flourish only on this realm of necessity as its basis. The reduction of the workday is the main requisite."

When speaking of the reduction of the workday, Marx naturally

means only the labor required for the reproduction of material boons on an expanded scale. By no means does this put any limit to man's free creative activities, outside this material sphere of production. Moreover, the shorter the workday in the material sphere of production, the more time society has left for the perfection of man himself and the development of all his gifts in creative work and social activities. Thus, while reducing our obligatory labor within the "realm of necessity," we are already extending now, as we move towards Communism, the boundaries of the coming "realm of freedom," in which every person will find open all the doors to any activity that suits his desires and abilities.

The boundaries between these two realms are, of course, rather conventional. As technology progresses and the workday becomes shorter under socialism, work in material production noticeably changes its character. It becomes more rational and productive and therefore more interesting. Since it is not too tiring, it keeps on engendering in the sound organism the spirit of emulation for better achievements in the comradely collective. Furthermore, by training the brain and brawn of all the emulating members, this kind of work often assumes in addition an entirely novel sporting interest and fascination of struggle, whereby, incidentally, the entire collective always stands to gain, regardless of who

places first.

We are gradually getting rid of the differences between mental and manual labor. In this respect, too, the productive sphere of labor is coming closer and closer to the non-productive sphere. Moreover, the shorter the workday becomes, the closer the two spheres get.

MORNING, DAY AND EVENING

Let us imagine roughly the following daily regimen under Communism, when no more than four hours will be required for obligatory labor in whatever its application. We can allot 10 hours to sleep, meals, and other daily doings. Then every working man will have at his full disposal another ten hours of free time. Of this amount he could spend at least four on reading and mental activity of his own choice, and another four on sports, amateur art, and social work. He would still have another two hours of free time, which he could spend watching television, going to the cinema or attending a concert. In these two hours he would surrender passively to all the influences of the society around him.

These changes in activity already presuppose rather versatile abilities in every person and ensure an ever broader development due to constant exchange and mutual enrichment in a collective. At the same time the constant changeability of occupations

in passing from some working functions to others, evermore interesting and attractive, throughout the workday facilitates work, reduces fatigue and increases productivity. Seasonal shifts of labor from one branch to another, for example, temporary "mobilizations" to countryside during harvesting, may prove rather important. Given good organization, they may prove highly useful. The fact is that harvesting machinery operates only a few weeks a year and to use it to the best in these weeks the operatives are to work with two or perhaps even three shifts. It would be inexpedient to maintain excessive staff of combine and other machine operators throughout the year. It would be much more desirable to have them sent from the city for this period.

Under the conditions of the world victory of Communism there will be no need of state coercion and management. Soldiers and generals will also be redundant. Yet an anarchic discord and chaos is hardly permissible in large-scale collective production where the efforts of many thousands are united and coordinated.

Even in circles of quite free social self-expression, comradely discipline, leaders and organizers of a common undertaking — coaches, producers, conductors—are necessary, if the undertaking is to be successful. Under the conditions of Communism such "conductors" will be even more necessary in the economic sphere for regulating, planning and man-

aging all production processes in the center and locally. The only essential difference is that under Communism when the level of a college trained engineer or a secondary technical school graduate will be common to all the labor army, the promotion of organizers and "conductors" of all ranks out of its midst and the replacement of those less worthy by more capable will be easier than ever before.

Under such conditions it will be possible to organize the work in shifts for all directors and organizers of production, selecting them for short periods and replacing them with new candidates from the same working environment. Given abundance of talent, this system would only do good, contributing to a more speedy promotion of people to those posts and jobs for which they are especially fit.

A short workday brings us closer to Communism by extending the self-activity of the masses and increasing their general cultural standards.

This has already been showing itself, especially in an extremely broad development of the highly versatile and active cultural self-expression of the working people of the USSR. The Soviet people may and will not only perceive passively, but also actively reproduce, everything that brings them closer to socialist culture and cultivates already mature sprouts of Communism. Free secondary and higher schools are more accessible to them than in any capi-

talist country. This combination of production and science is very valuable in one's mature age. Yet all possibilities of such vigorous studies will be fully revealed only when the workday has been reduced considerably.

The Soviet working person is already striving to make all the arts and literature part and parcel of his or her life. At every factory, state farm or collective farm, the working people are putting out wall newspapers or even small, printed newspapers of a local nature. The dramatic, vocal, music, dance and other sundry circles and groups are widely popular in every city and well-nigh at every big enterprise. The trade unions alone have 216,000 such amateur art groups which have a membership of about 4 million and which in the past year alone gave more than 760,000 shows and concerts.

But to achieve the harmonious development of all of man's abilities, as we go along to Communism, it would be unpardonable were we to limit ourselves to but the narrow confines of spiritual culture alone. As the ancients said: "*Mens sana in corpore sano.*" In the USSR the active work the working masses do on their own goes hand in hand with the education of physically strong, enduring builders of Communism.

FREE TIME AND ITS "DANGERS"

The reduction of the workday is

already an economic necessity. But when we have low cultural levels, extra free time may be spent in different ways. Bourgeois moralists are already prepared to view such extra free time as a menacing danger of encouragement of idleness, giving rise not only to do-nothings and drones but also to drunken debauch and hooliganism.

The shorter workday will allow of enhancing general cultural standards and of broadening fields for the masses' own creativity. We shall require a high cultural standard also to repattern fundamentally the regimen of labor and the entire cultural level of the working men in a way that is bound to take place under Communism.

What do you mean by a high cultural standard?

It is, of course, not only observance of the elementary norms of politeness, social decency and *bon ton*. All these rules tell us only what we shouldn't do. But the task of cultural advancement is precisely to teach each and everyone what he must do to scale all the summits of human culture sooner.

By a high cultural standard we mean not passive acceptance of its components, but an active effort to rise to each new rung in its development. It manifests itself above all in respect for another's man's labor and the working people and in the keeping of one's own dignity as a human being. It is expressed in service to science and worship of the

truth, in the tireless cult of the good and the beautiful, and, hence, in creative self-expression in study, the learning of art and the acquisition of mastery. The high cultural standard gives us an organic disgust for such survivals of the old way of life as swearing, drunken debauch and hooliganism. As we are not Utopian dreamers, we realize that all these ugly things will not vanish at once, even under Communism. But we already clearly see how to get rid of them.

Neither drunken carousals nor abusive insults, neither fist fights nor even killings will disappear of their own accord. There still remain human passions, whether envy, anger or jealousy, that will impel people, in a fit of temporary insanity, and without any concerted repulse from those around them, to take to crime.

Under Communism, however, any collective is bound to repulse criminal passions. People who have made up their minds to live and work the Communist way cannot remain indifferent to wrongs done their friends and to their mortification, or tolerate incorrigible wrong-doers in their midst. Each collective will have more than enough of means at its disposal to act upon such wrong-doers, even when the militia becomes unnecessary. Today it is not only for drunkenness but also for other breaches of communist ethics that the Communist work teams call any member of the collective to book, publicly censure him, or expel

him from their ranks. The future communes will have, whenever necessary, comrades' courts, enjoying broad possibilities for bringing public influence to bear.

"To go over to Communism," N. S. Khrushchev said, "we need not only a powerful material and technical base, but also that all the citizens of the socialist society have a high standard of awareness." In the process of building Communism, "the entire spiritual life of society likewise changes. Man himself changes and his Communist world outlook is molded."

One can easily imagine how the everyday life of the working man will change when, already on the first rung of Communism all the working people will have free meals, free education for their children, and many other things. This day is not at all a long way off. "It is quite likely," N. S. Khrushchev said at the 21st CPSU Congress, "that we can get in the not too distant future to a point when the requirements of all the Soviet people as regards food, housing and clothing will be fully satisfied within necessary and rational limits. We don't need so much time in order, say, to provide school children with free meals and have all the children kept at nurseries, kindergartens and boarding schools at the expense of society." This alone will already completely change the every-day life of the working person.

Household chores and day-to-day

affairs will give way more and more to collective forms and communal services. Free meals, the bringing up of children outside the home, and the maintenance of all the working people in their old age, will not only provide the best guarantee against the dangers of neglect towards and destitution of the old or minor members of the working man's family, but will also free all working wives and mothers from the bondage of the kitchen and other household burdens. This will also refashion the future family in a new way.

CONSUMER COMMUNES

The new forms of the public servicing of the working people outside their places of work will call likewise for the new organization of the working person's everyday life both in town and countryside. This may be conceived, considering the public provisioning of meals and the planned supply of big working collectives, as a whole system of consumers' communes, which would be linked with one or another urban factory or rural collective-farm center.

As a model for such primary consumers' communes of the future, we could take, most likely, any of the present-day Soviet sanatoria or holiday homes, where our working people spend their leisure without burdens or cares.

The combination of such house-sanatoria as primary consumers' com-

munes, together with all the children, public service and cultural institutions catering to the population as well as the factory with which these house-sanatoria are linked, will form already a far more complex but integral big producers'-consumers' commune.

Such a big commune will, as time goes by, make out of its main collective, welded together as it is by common daily work and common interests, a friendly working-class family.

There can be absolutely free creative work, only provided all other civil liberties are guaranteed.

There is no bourgeoisie in the socialist countries. In these countries the working people now fully enjoy all the political liberties. The only elements who could complain of any restrictions here are the rump of the defeated counter-revolution and foreign spies and wreckers who are themselves the arch-enemies of the working people's freedom. Until class contradictions and the state machinery used by one or another class for coercive purposes, are done away with on a worldwide scale there are bound to be such restrictions. When one means the requirements for the fullest freedom of self-expression in all spheres of human activity, one must say together with Lenin: "The fuller democracy grows, the nearer the day approaches when democracy will become unnecessary."

When we have Communist labor, we shall have plenty and more not only of material boons but also of

the fruit of free spiritual creativity and mastery. Thanks to the short workday, there will be at every factory collective and in each sanatorium-commune many splendid artists and connoisseurs of art.

Each factory will become a cultural center. Many are already now becoming combined factories and institutions of high learning, with their own experimental facilities and laboratories.

Each factory will have a green belt around it. Each workshop will have murals showing the working-man's everyday life and scenes from nature. The daylight lamps above the automatic lines of machine-tools

will stimulate the labor of the operatives. The muted rhythm of labor will be enlivened by music. The pure air-conditioned climate of the factories, even in the hot shops—the ozone-enriched atmosphere will feel like the air in a pinewoods after a thunderstorm—will mitigate the infernal heat of the furnaces, and, dispersing by its fresh coolness all smoke and grime, will fill every breast with inexhaustible energy. Naturally, in such surroundings all labor will become only more appealing and productive. And as we imagine this coming Communist labor we are already prepared to exclaim in heartfelt greeting: Glory to Labor!

Many readers will have particular interest in two recent American publications dealing with Soviet scientific developments in the areas of physiology and psychology. First, is a volume entitled *The Central Nervous System and Behavior*, edited by Mary A. Brazier. This consists of the transactions of the First Conference on this subject held in the United States in February, 1958. The papers deal with Russian and Soviet contributions, including the work of Sechenov and Pavlov, and post-Pavlovian research. It is published, for \$5.25, by the Josiah Macy, Jr Foundation, 16 West 46th St., New York 36, N. Y. The second is entitled *The Central Nervous System and Human Behavior* and consists of over 800 pages of articles translated from Soviet medical literature, collected in preparation for the Second Conference, held in Princeton in February, 1959. Requests for this volume should be directed to the U.S. Department of Health, Public Health Service, Bethesda, Maryland—The Editor.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

DESPAIR, DEMOCRACY, AND MARXISM

"Despair is characteristic of moribund classes . . . of those who fail to understand the causes of evil, who see no way out, who are incapable of fighting."

—Lenin, "Tolstoy and the Working-Class Movement," Nov. 28, 1910.

Corruption, moral rot, social decay, ineffable hypocrisy surround us in the United States. Is this the embittered and false estimation of the present writer—notorious Communist, that he is?

But what shall we do with the mountain of evidence that is accumulating upon all sides, and is described by people who are thoroughly respectable and in no way notorious? Harrison E. Salisbury, distinguished *New York Times* correspondent, in his book, *The Shook-Up Generation* (Harper, N. Y., \$5) quotes a New York City school principal:

We try to make the children act the way we don't. We try to teach them to be polite, to be generous, to believe in the sacredness of human life, to respect the rights of others. But the kids have eyes. They look around.

Harold Clurman, a leading Broadway director and producer, writes:

Our world is increasingly depersonalized, a world in which the individual is coaxed, flattered, seduced, bamboozled and blackmailed into transforming himself into a faceless, tasteless, conscienceless instrument to serve the requirements of a super-efficiency that lacks human purpose (*The Nation*, October 10, 1959).

Philip Green, of Princeton University, reports: "There is a persistent depersonalization of human relationships through all our society, and the result, evident wherever we look around us, is the unmistakable spread of

moral and cultural decay" (*The New Republic*, October 20, 1958).

From the acutely embarrassing "riches" of evidence, we choose, finally, the remarks in the essays contributed by two scholars to a recent symposium edited by Abraham M. Maslow, *New Knowledge in Human Values* (Harper, N. Y., \$4.50). Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Director of Biological Research, Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, finds that "the breakdown of the symbolic universe leads to the experience of being lost in a meaningless world." And he warns that "a new symbolic universe of values must be found or an old one reinstated if mankind is to be saved from the pit of meaninglessness, suicide, and atomic fire." Gyrogy Kepes, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, also reports that, "the present human situation resembles that of a lost child. . . . Insecure and afraid, we freeze our feelings and ideas, and we do not know how to take action to eliminate the basis of our fears."

* * *

Certainly, the capacity to discern the decay is a cause for hope that not all is lost. There is, however, increasingly, a tendency to place the onus for the decay upon the alleged failing of democracy, or the asserted low standards of the masses or the "rabble." In reality, this device, with which democracy and popular sovereignty are attacked, itself is a prime demonstration of the social and moral decay not of the masses of the people, but of the ruling class whose system of monopoly capitalism is in crisis, and is creating more and more intolerable material, political, cultural, and psychological contradictions and deprivations.

Increasingly, this false ascribing to the masses of people themselves as the source of the decay is cropping up in the writings not only of reactionaries and conservatives, where it is to be expected, but also in the writings of liberal and progressive-minded people where its power to confuse and distort is even greater. Let us examine representative examples from both sides, culled from a veritable flood of this kind of thinking in the recent past.

Lewis Mumford writes on "The Moral Challenge to Democracy," in the current (Autumn, 1959) *Virginia Quarterly Review*. Here he begins in a very promising manner, indeed: "If we are not to go on giving our passive vote for extinction, moral extinction, political extinction, and finally, as a direct consequence, biological extinction, we shall have to proceed swiftly and competently with the business of self-examination." Mr. Mumford sees as the other witnesses we have already quoted also see, "the insidious devaluation of morality itself, so that the basic human values, which even the most primitive tribal communities hand on to their members, are not transmitted to our children by either precept or example." He finds

therefore, especially among younger people, "the underlying assumptions of impotence and moral irresponsibility, of self-effacing conformity, smooth adaptability." There is, today, in our country, Mumford continues, a "condition of abject dependence and docile conformity." In his concluding paragraph, he refers to "our sick democratic society, so smilingly alive in appearance, but so near in fact to totalitarian corruption, paralysis and death."

Halfway through his article, having established the critical condition of our present society, Mr. Mumford asks: "Have we the courage to ask ourselves how this happened?" But I confess that while Mumford has the courage to pose this crucial question, I was unable to find an answer in his essay. The nearest I could get to an answer was that Mumford was condemning what he called our "mass society" and affirming that all of us were under its "rule"; repeatedly he referred to what he named as "mass organizations" and it was these which "oppressed us and impoverished us" albeit, as he declares, they do not do this "openly." Hence, Mumford's solution was as dubious as his diagnosis; it was that "without men—morally responsible men—democracy cannot work" and that "the only way to govern large organizations, apart from decentralizing them and giving greater autonomy to local groups, is to insert active human agents, trained to register human responses and make moral decisions, at every point in the process."

It appears, then, that it is bigness itself which corrupts democracy; it is quantity, not quality. If the organization is large it will be corrupt and dehumanizing; the only fundamental solution to this is to place moral men in key positions throughout the vast mechanism, who then will save it from corruption. (Query: Where will such men be found; who will so place them; and why?) This is Brandeis' "Curse of Bigness"; pushed to its logical conclusion it results in Gandhi's decision that industrialization itself is the root of present-day human evil, wherefore it is necessary to return to the spinning wheel, if such evil is to be overcome.

Quite apart from the impossibility of this reversal—which keeps its proposal thoroughly academic and will arouse, therefore, no real opposition from the powers-that-be—this view idealizes the stages preceding the modern era of industrialization, and has the further happy attribute of ignoring the actual power relationships in present-day U.S. society, with its base resting upon the ownership and control of the means of production by a small minority class. I know that this is Marx' basic perception, and I know that he announced it over a century ago and that it is smart to pronounce such perceptions to be hopelessly outdated. But are they? I think not, and I think they offer a much more realistic foundations for a truthful examination of society in the United States today than does Mumford's

condemnation of an undifferentiated something that he calls "mass society."

In terms of idealization of the past, Mumford finds his approximation of true democracy to be that society which prevailed here from 1760 to 1860. True, he says these are "rough" dates, but it is the only dating he offers in locating what he calls our "spontaneous small-scale democracy." I suppose, for Mr. Mumford's sake, we should move his dates forward to 1775, when the fight against colonial status was begun. But, leaving imperial domination aside, it is during Mumford's century that the vast majority of the American people were illiterate. It was during this period that from 12% to 20% of the whole population were chattel slaves, and—for much of the period—another 10% were indentured servants. It is during this period that starvation was not uncommon here; that the annihilation of the Indian was government policy; that the U.S. government ravished Mexico; that the rights of labor were nil; that the vast majority of the working population lived in conditions of filth, squalor, and disease; that more than half the population could not even vote.

What is it that a Lewis Mumford sees in this era to justify his term "spontaneous small-scale democracy"? Certainly, he does not see the realities of a class-divided society—any more than he does today. But he does see the production at that time of a self-reliant character here, and a sense of aspiration and direction. That did exist, among segments of the population, in part because it was a time of a rising economic system and a period of the breaking-through of bourgeois democracy, and so a time of intense struggle that did produce along with a Calhoun, a Douglass, and along with a Jefferson Davis, an Abraham Lincoln.

It is worth noting, however, since Mumford cites Emerson in his view of the presence of the "self-reliant" man, that Emerson himself, in his *Conduct of Life*, wrote: "In America, the geography is sublime, but the men are not: the inventions are excellent, but the inventors one is sometimes ashamed of." It is relevant, also, that Emerson's diagnosis of the source of shame was more incisive a century ago than is Mumford's today, for in his diary, March 14, 1854, Emerson noted: "The lesson of these days is the vulgarity of wealth."

"The moral challenge to democracy" that certainly exists today does not come from the masses and does not come from what mass organizations there are in our country. It comes from an elitist ruling class that is exploitative, aggressive and parasitic and which discards, therefore, more and more significant moral values and replaces them with corruption, pornography, violence, cynicism, and despair.

Finally, in connection with Mr. Mumford's stimulating essay; it is permeated, as is customary in reputable circles in our country, with repeated

denunciations of socialist society and of Communism, both of which, he insists, are infected with the worst of the decay he observes here. It is, however, interesting to observe that Mumford himself chooses to point to two and only two particular episodes to illustrate the ignoble and the noble in modern civilization and both of them tend to contradict his denunciations.

He writes, quite correctly, that until 1942, the Western powers had assumed that mass extermination in warfare was barbaric, but that at that time these Powers adopted such a policy, copying the fascists, and going in for "long-range genocide." "At that moment," writes Mumford, "our country lost the moral distinction that had hitherto separated ourselves from our totalitarian enemies." But Mr. Mumford forgets that at that time we were allied with the Soviet Union; he also forgets that of all the participants in World War II, there was only one Power which did not resort to the wholesale bombing of civilian areas, and that Power was the Soviet Union. God knows the USSR had provocation in terms of what the fascists did upon her soil; yet the fact is that the Soviet air force confined itself to battle against troops and other aircraft and distinctly military objectives; it did not bomb cities as such. In fact, even the cities of eastern Germany were demolished and its civilians slaughtered—32,000 in Dresden in one night's bombing—not by the Soviet air force but by the Anglo-American air force, early in 1945 when it became apparent that the USSR was crushing Hitlerism.

Mr. Mumford points, secondly, and quite admirably, to the heroic men and women of the Resistance against Hitlerism as a splendid example of democratic organization and functioning. But it is a fact, never successfully controverted, that these resistance movements were spearheaded by and led by Communists. It is unfortunate that Mumford did not pause in his narrative to examine or to explain this somewhat paradoxical fact—paradoxical, that is, if one accepts Mumford's estimations.

The present writer recently returned from eight weeks in four Socialist lands; therefore, I am able to tell Mr. Mumford that if he wants to see societies—quoting him—without "assumptions of impotency and moral irresponsibility," societies which, as he puts it, worship "human goals" rather than "unlimited wealth," let him go and do likewise. It is time when one writes about "moral challenges" that one did not assume the conventional stance of dominant American ideology—infected as it is with such crisis—concerning the "backwardness" of Communism and of the Soviet Union in particular. It is time one spoke specifically and plainly about "moral challenges," and dealt with those challenges not abstractly but in terms of the real world today; and it must never be forgotten that in the real world to-

day, over one billion people live in socialist societies.

* * *

Another leading current quarterly by and for the American intelligentsia, features two articles which deal with central issues of our time and which conclude by placing the onus for the existence of these issues upon the shoulders of the masses of the people, who, in their ignorance and incompetence, not only suffer the problems to exist, but bring them into existence. I have in mind *The American Scholar* (Autumn, 1959); one of the articles is by Ernest Van Den Haag, a professor at New York University. Its theme is given in its title, "Creating Cities for Human Beings." The other is by the well-known author, Gerald W. Johnson, columnist for *The New Republic*, and formerly editorial writer for the *Baltimore Sun*; its title is "The Invasion of Privacy" and it deals with governmental inquiry into the ideas of individuals. I do not wish, at this time, to enter into a discussion of the particular subjects with which these two scholars deal; but I do wish to call attention to the theses both enunciate.

Van Den Haag, after describing the notoriously bad conditions characterizing American urban living, concludes with this paragraph:

Cities as living entities are endangered. But the trouble is not with real-estate developers, nor is planning as such the remedy. The trouble is that each of us tries to get what he desires, and suffers from the fulfillment of everybody else's desires: for it is fulfilling people's desires that leads to congestion, to overbuilding, and also to sprawling. In a democracy, Santayana wrote, "people can do as they wish and [therefore] do not get what they want." The present development of metropolitan areas, planned and unplanned, seems to illustrate Santayana's dictum.

It is to the point to recall that Santayana chose to live in the city of Mussolini's Rome; given his ideas about democracy, this was a logical choice. It is not quite clear from Van Den Haag's rather cryptic reference whether this is the specific solution he would offer to the general problem he has posed—certainly he has offered no other solution. For if people do not get what they want exactly because they can do as they wish, we certainly must acknowledge the refutation of democratic theory.

But, if the professor thinks that in the city of New York, 300,000 people today live in houses condemned as unfit for human habitation over thirty years ago, because they want to; if he thinks that half a million Puerto Ricans live in rotten holes and pay rentals of \$120 to \$175 a month for them because they want to; if he thinks that millions jam themselves into foul subway cars daily and battle for thirty to fifty minutes to their jobs and then battle themselves back for an equally interminable ride to their

palatial residences, because they want to, then we have news for the professor—he is all wrong.

It is not these millions who have the power to make the kind of life and the kind of city they want; it is the railroad and utility interests of past and present; the bank, mortgage, and real-estate corporations of past and present; it is the transit authorities and the hired political hacks working for those authorities, banks, utilities, and real-estate sharks who do have the power and who have created cities unfit for human beings; and who have themselves fled those cities to their suburban “ranches” and “country homes” and live like lords on the slums their power and greed created and sustain. It is not because people can do as they wish that they get what they do not want; it is because the vast majority cannot do as they wish that they get what they do not want.

Mr. Johnson's article is, of course, of another calibre. It is an impassioned plea for the right of privacy to opinion, in the face of reactionary official inquisitors. As one of many who has had the honor and the opportunity of facing such inquisitions on the part of Un-American Activities Committees, and McCarran Act Committees and the Committee of the late and unlamented Senator McCarthy, I can only say “Amen” to this aspect of Johnson's essay. But here, as in Van Den Haag's case, and in so many other cases today, protest against an evil is largely vitiated by ascribing the source of that evil to the depravity or incompetence of the masses. Here are Mr. Johnson's words:

We are afflicted with too many gutless intellectuals afraid not of a large enemy with a club but of loneliness. They cannot endure the solitude of the sentry on outpost duty. To be misunderstood and therefore rejected is to them an unbearable fate, and in their frantic effort to escape it they consent to explain what ought never to be explained. They surrender the right of privacy because they lack the hardihood to take the position that what the rabble cannot understand it has no right to know. Many, indeed, cannot take that position because they have embraced the egalitarian heresy that denies there is a rabble. This constitutes the moral disaster of rendering unto God the things that are Caesar's, for keeping the rabble in order is Caesar's particular care.

Mr. Johnson is right in insisting upon the courage of one's convictions, but on every other count he is wrong. The matter of “loneliness” is not that of a sentry on outpost duty; this is much too simple. The matter of “loneliness” was a matter of boycott; a matter of not being able to function in that area where your very soul cries out to create. It is a matter of Canada Lee, John Garfield and J. Edward Bromberg—to mention only some

of those done to death by the hyenas. It is a matter of such a creative genius as Paul Robeson being stifled by a pack of well-heeled political pimps unworthy to pare his toenails; it is a matter of writers and musicians and artists being tortured by being forbidden any avenue of creativity, except the dead-end alley owned by the tycoons and opened for traffic only to those who have paid the awful toll. That's the first point that Mr. Johnson has neglected and he neglected it because he was so anxious to denounce the “rabble”—whatever that means—and forgot the owners of TV and radio and movies and publishing and the theatre, which means something very specific and decisively powerful.

Furthermore, where intellectuals turned out to be gutless before inquisitors, there was indeed a large enemy with a club. Mr. Johnson cites only the case of the persecution of Professor Owen Lattimore, but even there, as Johnson himself says, the harassment “cost him every cent he had in the world and everything he could borrow, two years out of his career, immense fatigue of mind and body, anxiety beyond measure”—all this is not mere loneliness. And many others faced jail and exile. These were the results of a very big club that had behind it for several years the courts of the land, the passivity of the President, the encouragement of the Vice President, the commercial press, the trustees of most universities, and the owners of all means of communication and propaganda. Those are the ones who did the harassing and the punishing. They are the elite; most certainly they are not what Mr. Johnson calls, “the rabble.”

True it is, that had there been a strong and democratically-oriented mass movement in the United States in the years of the Cold War, many intellectuals who caved in would have had a source of strength and might not have turned craven; but the fact that there was not such a strong organized democratic force in the country is certainly no reason for placing at the feet of democracy responsibility for what reaction was able to accomplish.

There is still another element in the big club that Mr. Johnson failed to consider—perhaps because he has a sense of delicacy superior to my own. The club has many sides; in addition to those we have touched on, it has the side of reward, and this also played a part in making those who were gutless behave that way. For one was faced not only with the loss of money, and the impossibility of earning a living in the area of one's competence; one was also tempted with rich rewards and lush jobs if one did betray his profession and his dignity. For him who crawled, there was a pay-off. And, once again, it was not the “rabble” that paid off; it was the “men of distinction” who paid off, for they had and have the wherewithal to do so. It was they who made judges of obliging prosecuting attorneys; and

directors out of crawling scenario writers.

* * *

We may close this brief sampling of the literature accumulating in present-day America that holds "democracy" responsible for the corruption flowing from monopoly capitalism, by reference to Elmer Rice's recently-published *The Living Theatre* (Harper, N. Y., \$5.50). Its author is perhaps the most distinguished living American playwright, his work having been produced on Broadway for forty years, and including such internationally known dramas as "The Adding Machine," "Street Scene," and "Judgment Day."

There is much in this volume of great interest, quite apart from the theme I am dealing with, including chapters devoted to the theatre in Japan, England, and the Soviet Union, with the latter described as "fascinating and significant," and the Bolshevik Revolution credited with producing "an expansion of the theatre unique in the history of the world." But the central point of the book is stated in its opening: "Many years ago, the head of a large business organization said to me: 'A play or a book or a painting may be a work of art when the artist creates it; and it may be a work of art when he is dead. But while it is being marketed and exploited, it is a piece of merchandise.'"

Later on, Mr. Rice himself remarks that as for the U.S. stage, "the central fact is that of business control . . . the profit motive and the businessman." Hence, as he notes, "what is seen in the American theatre is determined by the judgment of a person who must be primarily concerned with the monetary aspects of his undertaking." Elmer Rice also notes the steeply rising costs of theatrical production; he estimates that to produce a play today costs four or five times more than it did twenty years ago. He observes that because of prohibitive costs, no new theatre has been built in New York City since 1926. In fact, the number of theatres housing legitimate drama in that city has fallen in the past generation from about seventy to the present total of thirty!

It is no wonder that, according to this author, 90 per cent of the members of the Dramatists Guild "cannot, over the years, make a living by writing plays"; and that "the actor who works in the theatre for more than 15 weeks a year is exceptional" and that, therefore, "the overwhelming majority" of the professional actors in our country "are unable to make a living in the theatre or even to find employment."

It is not possible, however, to agree with Mr. Rice's conclusion that the fault for the crisis in the theatre in the United States lies, as he writes, with "the people." He insists that "if they stay away from the theatre or support feeble plays, they can blame only themselves if mediocrity and vul-

garity prevail." Actually, Mr. Rice knows better, for, as we have indicated, he, himself, shows that the profit motive dominates play-making here, and he knows that the theatre is priced way beyond the means of the average American. Mr. Rice knows, too, what a renaissance the American theatre experienced during the New Deal days when federal support of the theatre was forthcoming, and when prices were reduced to the point where working people could—for the first time in the U.S.—go to the theatre; indeed, one of the fine chapters in his book, "The Federal Theatre Project," details that story.

And Mr. Rice tells a story in his own book which places the blame for cultural stagnation and decay where it really belongs. He tells how a business mogul rejected, a few years ago, a play he had written for television, and he quotes the letter of rejection written by this businessman. In this letter, Mr. Rice was told that there were many objections to the producing of his script, and that:

Foremost among these objections is the squalor of the setting, the lower class social level of all the chief characters, and the utterly depressing circumstances which they all find themselves in. . . . It is the general policy of advertisers to glamorize their products, the people who buy them, and the whole American social and economic system. . . . The American consuming public as presented by the Advertising Industry is middle class, not lower class; happy in general, not miserable and frustrated, and optimistic, not depressed.

The morals of the "American economic system"—which is to say, monopoly capitalism—has been demonstrated once again in the utter corruption and permeating rot partially uncovered in the investigation of television's "contests." It is this which has produced the widespread misery, frustration, and depression characterizing so significant a proportion of the American people. Not democracy, but its absence, inhibits and torments the people. The solution to the ills besetting us today is Socialism, and, as Lenin said, in the present era, the struggle for democracy is the struggle for Socialism.

Bourgeois Morality and Communist Morality

By Roger Garaudy

BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGISTS, since Kant, have kept on repeating that the first maxim of morals is that man should be treated always as an end and never as a means.

But the fundamental law of capitalist development makes the immense majority of mankind precisely into a means; the wage worker is, for capital, a means of production.

The capitalist buys the labor power of a worker in the same way as any other merchandise, or rather as a particular type of merchandise—the kind which serves as a means to the realization of profits. And he extracts the maximum from this labor force with a total disregard for life.

From the economic point of view, this regime accumulates riches at one pole and poverty at the other.

From the moral point of view, it develops corruption amongst those who possess and ruin for the exploited.

The rottenness of capitalism has engendered the rottenness of bourgeois morality.

When man is defined by his property, when the law of the regime is the pursuit of profit, then all hu-

man relations, all sensibilities are vitiated:

—the family is identified with inheritance,

—patriotism with colonial exploitation and chauvinism,

—liberty with egotistical individualism,

—humanism with the lies that are necessary to mask and perpetuate slavery.

The boundary between the normal functioning of the regime and crime itself becomes uncertain.

The Commission presided over by Senator Kefauver (in 1952) revealed that in the United States incomes from gambling dens, brothels, traffic in drugs and armed theft represented 17,000 million dollars, equivalent to a quarter of the State's revenue.

What is so astonishing about that?

Is there a fundamental difference between gambling dens and gambling on the Stock Exchange?

The drug traffic—is this not a form of commerce and a form of commercial freedom?

Is prostitution other than an extension to women of the principle of the exploitation of man by man?

What moralist could trace the pre-

cise frontiers between crime and the "free" play of the regime of this "free world," in which all development is governed by the pursuit of maximum profits?

Intelligence, culture, conscience are enemies; force and bestiality become the marks of nobility.

That which the Colonels of the 13th May called "psychological action" systematizes the contempt for mankind and its degradation.

Claiming to modify the spirit of man by suitable techniques, they consider that man can be analyzed into a small number of elemental instincts on to which one can graft, by obsessional propaganda of the Hitlerian type and by physical or moral pressure, some miserable reflexes which will function automatically! They stupefy in order to dominate.

Colonel Lacheroy—today promoted to General, no doubt because of his humanism—declared: "We must awaken the hunting and warrior instincts which exist in our men."

And here now is the result. A parachutist back from Algeria defined the "spirit of the paras" in this way: "The man who has chosen the 'paras' is distinguished by his dynamic instinct, by possessive tendencies. As a rule he hardly troubles himself with metaphysical matters. He does not think very much and reads very little: digests, thrillers, illustrateds, photo-novels and war stories."

In an army which has monitors like Bigeard and directors of conscience such as Malraux placing intrigue and despair in the first rank of moral values, there is no place for anyone who does not find exaltation in the blind ferocities of the jungle.

What does this regime make of others—those whom it exploits in the metropolitan countries and in the colonies?

The report on "The Social Situation in the World" of the Economic and Social Council of U.N.O. illustrates the law of impoverishment: in 1939, throughout the world, five human beings out of ten were under-nourished; fifteen years afterwards, with a gigantic increase in productivity, six out of ten—and no longer five—were permanently under-nourished.

In France, in the ten years since 1947 the number of accidents in industry has risen from 1,500,000 to 2 million a year.

At the Citroen factory, each day, 600 workers are injured.

With the campaigns for increased productivity, the number put away in mental homes has grown by 5,000 a year.

The inhumanity of the regime appears in even harsher light outside of Metropolitan France.

In Algeria, since the beginning of the war, in five years one Moslem in ten has been massacred. Amongst the survivors one in nine is in a concentration camp. An official report has revealed the horrors of these:

camps. Those responsible for these crimes have not been punished; they remain the rulers of Algeria.

There is no worse hypocrisy than to claim as Pierre Limagne does in *The Cross* of April 23rd, 1959, that the methods of this war are being "humanized" and "moralized." The infamy of the end: to maintain oppression, necessarily implies the infamy of the means. Limagne wants to soothe the conscience of good-natured souls by condemning the tortures; he wants to "moralize" the war, but not to stand up against those who are pursuing it.

But in an unjust war the only morality is on the side of those who are fighting against it.

Similarly, in a regime founded on the exploitation of man, the only way to respect the human being is to combat exploitation.

And don't tell us that you love mankind if you don't hate those who degrade it and murder it.

For us, Communists, the dignity of man is a function of his real struggle to attain the sublime end to which Marx and Engels pointed in their *Manifesto*. "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

Only Socialism creates the material and social conditions of a true humanism.

That is our moral ideal. That is our aim.

And the means to attain this flow from this aim: while capitalism, the enemy of man, necessarily uses criminal means for attaining its objects, Communists on the contrary, cannot use just any kind of means.

The aim: to create the conditions for a fully human life for the masses, can only be attained by the struggle of the masses themselves. Point 30 of the draft theses of our Congress states: "The establishment of Socialism cannot be the act of a faction organized in the dark, the result of a plot, or the result of intervention from outside doing violence to the majority of a people."

To win the masses the only means which can be used are those which strengthen the unity of the working class and its allies, which heighten confidence in the aim, clarity of class consciousness, and self-sacrifice on the part of every proletarian fighter. It is therefore impossible to use means which demoralize the masses.

There is no greater crime than to deceive the working class.

For example, when the railwaymen withdrew their strike order, the Executives of the Catholic and Socialist unions, in order to camouflage their capitulation in face of the Government call-up, proposed that the pretense should be made that there were some government concessions in order to justify the withdrawal of the strike call. The Executive of the C.G.T. opposed this, refusing to lie to the masses. It is indeed true that the moral exigen-

cies of the working-class struggle are more rigorous than those of "Humanist Socialism" or of "Christian spiritualism."

At the same time, when chaplains who had served in Algeria denounced "the disregard of the most elementary natural and civil laws," Mgr. Badre wrote to them: "I infinitely regret this publicity . . . we have the right—and even sometimes the duty—to guide our Bishops. But we must not give the impression that we wish to obtain support by a more or less disguised appeal to French and international opinion. Our role is to be unshaken spectators, vigilant and courageous, but not censors."

What is in question, therefore, for Mgr. Badre as for Pierre Limagne, is to confine the revolt of youth to a purely internal attitude, of "morality" as they put it, and dismiss the only means capable of putting an end to this unjust war and all the atrocities which necessarily go with it; not by being "spectators"—even unshaken, vigilant and courageous—but by telling the truth to the masses and organizing their struggle against the war. It is this which separates Pierre Limagne from the young Communist soldiers whom he calumniates.

* * *

The following are the essential characteristics of our morality.

The morality of the proletariat is born of its class position; the moral

values of the proletariat do not arise from the fact that it is the most exploited class, the class which suffers most, but from the fact that its class position is such that it cannot liberate itself except by totally destroying the capitalism which degrades man.

What makes its moral values is not poverty or misfortune but struggle.

Those who see in the working class only the decadence imposed on it by capitalism, consciously or unconsciously play the game of its enemies. The study of pauperization does not imply, as Mendes-France claims, a doctrine of fatalism and of despair, but a call to struggle.

Whilst for all ruling classes whose morality is founded on the contradiction between the ideal world and the real world, between the soul and the body, the fundamental virtue is resignation, the fundamental virtue for the oppressed classes is struggle.

Maxim Gorky admirably defined the spirit of this morality of the working class when he said: "We must make man understand that he is the creator and the master of the world: that it is on him that responsibility falls for all that is bad in the world, but on him also is all the glory for all the good that is in life."

* * *

Today the working class is the vehicle of this human grandeur. This flows from the Marxist conception of man.

Marx showed that labor is the act by which man produces himself. The

history of the world is the production of man by human labor.

In each epoch, the rising class is that which bears the future of man, it is that which opens to creative work the widest horizons by bringing the relations of production into harmony with the forces of production.

In our epoch, this class is the working class.

In fighting for its class demands, it fights for socialism.

This struggle which alone will bring to every man the means of his full development, gives the proletariat an absolute moral superiority over all other classes.

The worker cannot wage this fight alone: he can only triumph by consciously and voluntarily participating in mass action, the joint struggle of the whole class.

This unity is not spontaneous.

The Party alone can bring to the working class the scientific means of realizing this unity and of winning victory.

The Party alone bears this ideal, this morality.

This is not an individualist but a socialist morality. "The communist man," writes Aragon, "is he who wishes everything for man—yes, he longs for a thousand things, happiness, good health, security—but for all—and at the price of his health, his happiness, his security and his very existence."

This morality is a materialist morality. "For true humanism," wrote

Marx, "there is no worse enemy than spiritualism or speculative idealism which substitutes for real man 'consciousness of himself' or 'the soul.'" If one underestimates the material conditions of the life of man, one does not change the world, but only the idea which men have made of it. Such morality always makes the bourgeoisie enthusiastic, because, if one only wants to save souls its class privileges are not threatened. The people that annoy it are those who want to save the body as well as the soul! It doesn't spare either its calumnies or its blows against these materialists.

* * *

At the Strassburg Congress, Maurice Thorez showed what the abandonment of materialism meant: the founding of socialism on a moral ideal is to refuse to base it on class struggle: "Socialism, from a science, will again become a dream."

Our morality is a scientific morality.

Reality is the source of the ideal and we deduce what the future should be from the analysis of the present world and its contradictions.

Science does not exclude morality; on the contrary, it gives duty a real basis as an expression of a social necessity. Only a sophist like Kautsky, when he tried to justify his capitulations during the First World War, could say that Marxism is content to establish the antagonism between the classes and to foretell in which way this conflict

of forces would be resolved, on the pretext that the just and the unjust are not scientific categories. Pierre Herve has again recently taken up this thesis, which has taken him too

No, Marxism does not, from the standpoint of morality, put the bourgeoisie and the proletariat side by side. On the contrary, it provides an objective historical moral criterion: what favors and what shackles social development, the mastery of man over nature, the liberation of mankind? From this point of view, the a-moralism of the bourgeoisie flows from its reactionary role in society: it holds back social progress, it impedes the free development of the majority of mankind.

The moral superiority of communism flows from its role of liberator of all the energies of man.

The Party makes of each militant a conscious and active participant in the transformation of the world and the continued creativeness of man. It gives us the ennobling responsibility of continuing the age-old efforts of man, of his labor, of his struggles.

For the first time in history, personal morality does not come into contradiction with the collective aims set by the Party.

Personal happiness of the highest order for a Communist is the victory of the working class; happiness is to serve the cause of the over-

throw of the regime of exploitation, of oppression and degradation of man, and no obstacle, no suffering, no sacrifice can deprive him of this happiness.

This communist ideal which raises the personal destiny of each individual to consciousness of and responsibility for the future of the human species, constitutes the greatest spiritual force of our time.

It inspires, throughout the world, millions of fighters and of martyrs, such as that companion of Manolis Glezos, the young Greek Communist Yannis Tsisilonnis, shot at twenty years of age, who wrote to his mother a few minutes before his execution: "When the day of liberty comes, when the bells ring their message of joy and victory, you will say, my mother, that it is Yannis—your boy—who made them ring out."

We must make the young people of our country understand that when they have the good luck to be twenty years of age at a time when there is such an upsurge of human grandeur, they are in danger of messing up their lives if they don't turn to the Party which gives man such a proud consciousness of the meaning of his life and of his death; to the Communist Party which inspires in millions of men the calm and joyous heroism of those who build; to the Communist Party which is, as Lenin wrote, "the intelligence, the honor and the conscience of our epoch."

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

The Party and the Labor Movement

By Mark T. Camuso

THERE IS OBVIOUSLY a need to clarify our concept of the vanguard role of the Party. In my opinion, Comrade Lumer's article in the September *Political Affairs* ("Forty Years of the Communist Party") makes a serious contribution toward filling that need. It is not my intention to repeat what was said there, with which I agree.

The question facing our Party today is no longer: does the Party have a vanguard role to play? This question, raised in the course of the revisionist wave that threatened our Party, has been clearly answered in the affirmative. It would serve no purpose, and would only becloud the real issue, to place the matter that way now.

The real question now is: *how* does the Party exercise its vanguard role *under present conditions*? No good can be served by discussing this question in timeless, spaceless generalities. What we are concerned with is how to play this role in a trade union, in a community organization—wherever Communists may be and should be. Moreover, how can we do it today, taking into account present conditions—opportunities as well as problems, our physical as well as our political situation in respect to the main mass organization.

It is with our eye on the present

and on future perspectives that drawing upon our rich and fruitful forty years' history, as well as learning from our serious errors, can serve a useful purpose.

Certainly, the most decisive area in which the *how* must be answered is the trade-union field. Our Labor Policy Statement, adopted by the National Committee in June, 1958, made a serious effort to grapple with the rich record of Communists in almost every union with their present role.

In my opinion, the developments since then have proved that it provided a solid framework for the construction of such a bridge. It is with the aim of aiding this process that these thoughts are offered.

First, as to the historical relationship between our Party and the trade unions. Many years ago, Stalin put his finger upon a vital difference in the development of this relationship in such countries as the Soviet Union and the Western nations. He noted that in the former the Party developed prior to the trade unions, and in fact led economic struggles in its own name, while in the West the contrary was true. This difference in historic context has been one of the most important factors making for differences in the approach to the trade-union question in

such countries as ours as compared with the Soviet Union.

This is not new to us. Without this awareness on our part, a sound trade-union policy would not have been possible, nor could we have made the many vital contributions we did. Why, then, is it necessary to restate it? Because it is a point that must be clearly grasped when the vanguard role of the Party in relation to the trade unions is discussed.

At no time has a *direct* vanguard relationship been established between our Party and the unions. The period in which the closest thing to such a relationship emerged was during the early depression days, when millions of workers and rank-and-file trade unionists, abandoned by the leadership, turned to the only force that offered a program and struggle for life itself—our Party, which helped create those historic instruments for survival, the Unemployed Councils. Our Party and countless known Communists won the respect and love of the masses of unemployed, many of them trade unionists and many more future trade-union activists.

This close merging of the Party and the mass of the workers, the almost daily leadership in struggle, represented probably the highest level of vanguard role exercised by us. Similarly, this was in large measure the position achieved by our Party among wide sections of the Negro people in those days.

This period not only transformed the Party; it opened the doors to it literally everywhere. Our voice was listened to with great respect among many, and especially among the most militant and forward-looking trade

unionists. Known Communists were not only openly elected to leading positions but widely supported.

Yet even in such a situation, our Party still did not enjoy the status of an openly accepted political current within the trade unions. (I do not intend to analyze the reasons for this, including our own weaknesses; this is a subject in itself.) The historic context within which the Party expanded its vanguard role to the highest level yet achieved, presented formidable barriers requiring more revolutionary transformations before they could give way to the "natural" relationship of openly accepted leadership—as Communists and not merely as militant trade unionists—by the American workers.

Much water has flowed under the bridge since those days. Our position as a party and our status within the trade unions are quite different today. This cannot help but effect the character of our vanguard role.

Comrade Lumer is correct when he says: "The test of the vanguard character of a Marxist party is not its size or the number of posts of leadership which its members hold in unions or other mass organizations (which may vary according to circumstances) but the *extent to which it strives to meet these requirements.*" (His emphasis.)

I would only add that such questions as "size or the number of posts which its members hold in unions or other mass organizations" are decisive in determining the *extent* and *manner* in which the Party strives to play its vanguard role. This is by no means an unimportant matter for us today. For it is the determining extent and

manner that a realistic, practical approach to the vanguard role is projected.

It is here that the theory of the vanguard role merges with concrete practice. For to play this role we must fully understand what it means, not in terms of a glorious past or visions of the future, but in terms of the realities of today.

The self-devouring orgy falsely paraded as "self-criticism" by the revisionists did incalculable damage to our Party, particularly to its morale. One of our prime needs is to restore and raise this morale. But the path does not lie in countering the cannibalism of revisionism with smugness and complacent, dogmatic confidence in an inevitable future. That "inevitable future" must be won. And the starting point, the scientific heart of Marxism-Leninism, is an objective recognition of realities. It is not bombastic shots in the arm, eloquent exhortations, wishful one-sided estimates, rehashes of old, outmoded concepts and forms, or frustrated efforts to overcome our difficulties, that we need.

Our Party is like Khrushchev's "old sparrow," who has gone through the mill. It will not be disheartened by an objective realization of realities or by a sober projection of a course that rings true. On the contrary, that will stir the Party to action more than the most inspired agitational appeal.

It is my opinion that the present Draft Resolution provides a serious basis for this. Its heart, I believe, is contained in the following: "Effectively to carry out the Party's mass political line, to accelerate labor unity and the development of the democratic front for peace, democracy and security,

it is necessary to master and apply concretely and flexibly the Party's united front policy. In many respects this remains our biggest unwon battle. Victory in this battle is the key to progress on all fronts, now and on the morrow."

If these things are true, then it is here that our entire Party, from top to bottom, must wage a struggle to win "the unwon battle." What does this mean?

It means that the Party must be permeated with the understanding that in this lies the essence of its vanguard role today. It means measuring leadership, work and progress by the extent to which they help win this "unwon battle." It means grasping that the role of a Communist everywhere, whether as an individual or as part of a club, is to unite his fellow trade unionists, his neighbors, his fellow youth, around their accumulated needs, which are on many issues reaching the point of becoming unbearable.

It means applying our best efforts to solving the difficult tactical problems without which the call for "united front" is an empty, frustrating exhortation. It means encouraging and searching for the most flexible forms and the utmost development of skillful flexibility on our part, avoiding non-principled differences and emphasizing and bringing to the fore points of agreement and unity.

It means realistic recognition of the present state of development of the united front, understanding that for the present and the immediate future it is one which excludes our Party as such, but in which Communists can and must play their vital part. It means mastery of skill in tactics, if Commu-

nists are to succeed under these difficult conditions.

At the same time, it means that the independent, public role of the Party must be greatly and boldly expanded, so that its full program can be clearly presented to the people, and so that the fundamental solution—socialism—in which interest has been so greatly stimulated by Khrushchev's historic tour, can enter the arena of public debate. But it also means playing our independent role in harmony, not in discord with our overriding objective of development of the united front in the establishment of the democratic people's front.

Some wrongly view the essence of our independent role as the projection of our differences. True, we differ on many questions with non-Marxist individuals and organizations, and it is often necessary to state our differences. But we can never be indifferent to the manner in which they are stated, or the effect of the presentation upon the development of unity of the people.

To have such an approach, and above all to elevate it to a "principle," would bring our independent role in constant clash with the development of united fronts and would isolate us from the mass of the people.

The real essence of our independent role is to find the forms and seize the opportunity to make Marxist solutions—socialism—more popular. It is to find more effective ways to "win friends and influence people." It is not to achieve "principled" isolation, but to seek ways of bringing about mass recognition that our principles are in effect those of the people.

What, under present conditions, con-

stitutes the essence of the Party's vanguard role in the New York trade-union movement? It is, taking into account our present status, to do our utmost in helping to determine the direction in which these unions move. Our task is to reveal to Party members and all class-conscious trade-union militants the bridge by which the gap between *what is* and *what ought to be* can be spanned.

That means to indicate the materials at hand, to define the specific tasks, to project the issues and tactical approaches—to show what is and what not only can be but ought to be in the New York trade unions today.

The *is*, is the ominous offensive of Big Business (about whose far-reaching objectives our Labor Policy Statement warned), revealed especially in the steel strike and the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act. The *can be* is indicated in the rising mood of militancy as shown by the firm ranks of the steel workers, the growing solidarity and support to the strike, the new dynamic role of the Central Labor Council in New York, the strike of the longshoremen and the steps taken for united waterfront support to their fight.

The *is*, is the fact that New York is a low-wage city, standing nineteenth among the twenty largest cities in the country. The *can be* is indicated by the crystallization of moods of dissatisfaction into movements of struggle, most dramatically revealed in the hospital strike with its profound effects on the trade unions and the people of New York.

The *is*, is the present woeful state of independent political activity and organization. The *can be* is revealed in the historic Labor Day parade, the de-

termination announced by Van Arsdale to place labor candidates in the field, in the emphatic call for a third party by the powerful Transport Workers Union, and in the impressive gains registered by the Powell forces and the anti-De Sapio movement.

The *is*, is the strongly entrenched conservative and Right-wing Social Democratic forces of the Meany and Dubinsky types. These are still the dominant forces within the labor movement in New York, who constitute the main barrier blocking its forward advance. The *can be* is revealed in the growing expressions of discontent with the severe setbacks suffered by labor under this leadership, which were shown at the recent AFL-CIO Convention in San Francisco. It is also revealed in the growing differences on many issues—in divergent attitudes toward the Landrum-Griffin bill, toward Mitchell, toward Khrushchev (even though the Reuther forces out-Meaned Meany at their so-called conference), toward political action, toward elimination of segregated locals, etc.

It is demonstrated in the emergence of forces in New York moving, at different levels and in different ways, in a common, generally progressive direction. This is aimed, whether fully consciously at this stage or not, at overcoming the low-wage status of New York and particularly the super-exploitation of Negro and Puerto Rican workers. It is moving in the direction of more forceful independent political action and a more vigorous effort to organize the unorganized.

These forces are far from homogeneous. Nor can all of them be characterized as progressive. What is

decisive is the way they appear to be lining up in the struggle now taking form around the question of a more militant, more independent, more progressive, more effective trade-union movement. Our task is to understand this new, rising element, and to encourage, stimulate and support it with all the skill and resources at our command.

The revolt against the Meany-Dubinsky policies, the New York labor counterpart of the Dulles cold war policies, is bound to grow as the cold war curtain begins to fall. It is the task of all progressives to hasten the end of this shameful decade of cold war.

The *is*, in contrast to a decade ago, mended.

is the non-existence of a bloc of Left-led unions. The *can be* is the stimulating and progressive role increasingly displayed by a number of formerly progressive- and Left-led unions on a variety of issues (the hospital strike, hotel workers, transport workers). Though it is unrealistic to project at this stage a new bloc of Left-progressive unions, it is possible to conceive of the revitalization of dormant but not dead Left-progressive influences, and of their mutual cooperation along common, progressive lines.

The *is*, is a much smaller Communist Party, with far less contact than before, and consequently with a considerably lessened ability to influence the course of events. The *can be* is shown in the small but important beginnings of the revitalization of the Party and Left in a number of areas and in the new opportunities opened up by the profound changes in the political climate resulting from the his-

toric Khrushchev-Eisenhower exchange.

The fulfillment of the *can be* lies in the Party's pursuance of a course of regrouping the large number of dispersed Left forces, among them many former Party members of whom the overwhelming majority, though they have differences are not hostile and move basically in a common direction. The initiative for the consistent pursuit of such a course rests upon us, for from this can emerge renewed ties with many, as well as re-recruits. The realization of the *can be* lies also in establishing ties with new militants in the trade unions, especially among the Negro and Puerto Rican workers, on the basis of mutual participation in struggles out of which new Communists will emerge.

The *is*, is the disgraceful role played by the top AFL-CIO leadership during Khrushchev's visit. The *can be* is shown in the profound impact of the visit, in the easing of cold-war tensions and increased friendship which it stimulated, and in the warm response of workers, particularly in San Francisco and Pittsburgh.

The *is*, is the fact that our Party is still deprived by reaction of its legal rights in the trade unions. The *can be* is indicated in the cracking of the ice floe of the cold war, now more than ever feasible. This, if combined with persistent efforts to develop the broad-

est united fronts against the cold-war diehards and reactionaries at home, can create a new democratic climate, in the labor movement as well as generally. The *can be* does *not* lie in desperate disdain of the realities faced by Communists in the trade unions today; it lies rather in a skillful, patient struggle to hasten the change in the political climate of our unions.

It lies in the part played by individual Communists in their shops and unions as the best trade unionists, the most far-seeing and militant. And it lies in the consolidation of our Party, its clubs, its system of work and the development and refreshment of its cadre.

Such a course, which strives to balance realistically the *is* and the *can be*, would equip us to aid the American workers in gathering material for the construction of the bridge to span the gap between what is and what ought to be. Such a course will enable our Party to meet its responsibilities to help restore the labor movement of New York to the path that leads to its playing once again the role of a leading, stimulating progressive force in the life of our city, state and nation.

Such, in my opinion, is the vanguard role of our Party in the specific conditions of today.

The Party and the Masses

By Milton Rosen

DURING THE PAST 18 months, our Party has been dealing with the question of how our cadres can best play a vanguard role within the mass movements. There has been much discussion and examination of our experiences in the mass movements. Special emphasis has been placed on defeating the "mainstream" theory, which developed prior to the 16th National Convention.

The essential idea behind this "mainstream" theory was that for us to be among the masses, and to do good mass work, would somehow or other develop the mass movement into a Socialist movement.

We now know that such an approach is not enough to ensure influencing the mass movement in a radical direction let alone building a socialist movement. We have come to realize that cadres in the mass movement must begin to build "political bases," on the strength of their work on such questions as peace, civil liberties and civil rights, the Negro-labor alliance, independent political action, etc. They have to become a *political force* in their unions or mass organizations, giving effective *leadership* there on these questions, as well as on the day-to-day questions. And it is through—and only through the further development and extension of *that* kind of activity that the opportunities are created to turn these "political bases" into bases for the struggles for Socialism.

This process or variation of it, in turn should lead to the building of the Party, which after all is one of the principal reasons that our members are engaged in work in mass movements.

We have made progress on developing again such far-reaching perspectives for our cadres in mass work. There are few key areas of mass work where Party cadres are not active, either initiating or expanding such activity. In New York State, our members have been involved in all the important mass struggles—in peace activities, integration action, key industrial strikes, youth marches for example. Our members are not by and large "isolated from the people," and where conditions exist for it, they are actively pursuing united front policies. No doubt, there are still many weaknesses. But if you look at the situation as a whole, it has certainly improved—and is still improving.

We have learned, of course, that the problem of how to become a political force will vary from organization to organization and from one situation to another. There are still many areas, for example, where it is next to impossible to work publicly as a Communist. But we have found that there do exist sections of advanced workers who can be approached today on such questions as the decay of the capitalist system, the meaning of Socialism, and our Party itself. We have found that there are those in the "mainstream"

—people with whom we have worked closely on issues for some substantial period—people to whom one can at some point introduce our Party's and Marxist material, in order to help us recruit.

All our experiences in bringing the messages of our Party to the masses have been generally good in this most recent period. Our public appearances have been well received, and often well attended. Much of our material has been bought, and if we had more forces involved, we often could have sold even more, and developed more contacts on the spot. Our leaflets and pamphlets have been enthusiastically received, and in some areas have become the basis for discussions of a more advanced character, as well as stimulating activity.

All this has done two good things for us. First of all, thousands of people have had the chance to see the face of the Party and to hear its program. Secondly, by showing our members and friends that we can do things as a Party, we have greatly encouraged them.

But there is still a lot more to do before we are out in the clear on these questions.

We have to keep fighting not only against the "mainstream" theory which still persists among us to some degree, despite its basic unsoundness, and despite the fact that it has been disproven. We also have to fight against some other ideas and habits, ideas that are also still working to hold us down.

There is a down-grading, for example, of the abilities of our Party to project alternative courses for the working class, where alternatives are clearly

necessary. One example of this is the tendency still remaining to place great reliance on the trade union bureaucracy. The other side of that coin is to say that when you criticize or expose the class collaboration policies of the Meanys, the Reuthers, the Carneys, and the Dubinskys, that is "wholesale condemnation," that is "sectarian." I wonder what such accusations mean after the Khrushchev business and the Randolph affair at the AFL-CIO Convention in San Francisco!

This does not mean that we should pay no attention to positive utterances from any of these forces, in order to develop positive action in those same directions among the workers. But culling through the labor journals-or convention proceedings for such positive utterances is no substitute for the hard work of initiating currents and actions among the rank-and-file, and of warning them against the obstacles their own "leaders" are still placing in the path of such actions. A chorus of "me-tooers" is not what the workers need. However reliance on the labor leaders occurs when we lose sight of the fact that the working class as a whole is the decisive force. It is the rank and file and lower echelons of leadership which today are the basic force. These forces are capable of forcing changes, and making the false promises of their leaders come true.

There are other ideas, still to be found in our ranks, which stand in the way of our showing this kind of boldness. One of them—a twin theory to the "mainstream" idea, which developed during the same period—is what might be called the "Kiss-of-Death" approach. This harps on all the Party's previous "errors," and uses them to draw the

conclusion that the Party cannot, in its own right, establish itself as a political force among the people. "We are hopelessly compromised," said the proponents of this view; "you can't bridge the gap again." Good work by individual comrades? Maybe, but how can you transfer any of this to the Party's credit?

In effect, this idea was a fundamental denial of the belief that the Party could play a vanguard role and its proponents went about tagging all calls for an open, independent role of the Party as "Left-sectarianism." As a result of these defeatist concepts which arose because of continual attacks from the ruling class, the fight for the Party's legality, the fight for its right to exist, became a nominal struggle. Local Party headquarters were closed down, election activities around Party candidates virtually ceased; simple normal means of reaching the people in the Party's name—such as leaflets, pamphlets, open air meetings, voluntary appearance at public hearings—were virtually abandoned. And by the time of the last National Convention, the question of whether we should have a Party at all emerged as the central question. Along with it came various "get-rich-quick" schemes for circumventing the Party. One of them was the "Mass Party of Socialism." Well, we know what happened to such ideas, at the Convention and after; our membership tossed them into the lake, and set about rebuilding the Communist Party as a political force.

But not without the hobbling effects of some old ideas in new forms. Take the old fear of the "foreign agent" tag, for instance, and the disastrous effects it has had on our recent activity in

relation to the Khrushchev-Eisenhower visit. Here was the biggest single step towards world peace in our time, if not in all time, with millions of Americans and hundreds of millions of people all over the world watching every step of it with eager interest. And what did they hear from our Party—as a Party—on it? Hardly a peep!

Who has fought harder and (even with all our weakness) more consistently than we have for a policy of peaceful coexistence and the negotiation of issues? Who has fought harder than we have all during these last ten to fifteen years, to expose and defeat those who wanted to subvert such perspectives? And along comes a colossal event in just this direction—and *we say to ourselves*, "Hands off!" "Attaching ourselves to this Khrushchev visit won't help it any, and it won't help us, either; it will only harm both!"

And right on the side of this fear of "attaching ourselves" to the lands of Socialism stands that old banner, newly-revived "we have got to make ourselves an "American Party." What can a slogan like that mean to those cadres who have worked assiduously, as American Communists, over the years, to develop ties and to grow roots? Whose problems have we been grappling with all these years, if not those of the American workers? Does associating ourselves with the International Working-Class Movement and with the countries of socialism, make us less than American? The Meanys—yes, and the Reuthers and Careys—say so. They try to defeat our vanguard role that way, and leave themselves a field day among the workers. And now, it seems we say so too;

and Khrushchev goes—but not a word out of us! What a way to play any role—no less the vanguard role that we should and can be playing for peace! Or for international working-class solidarity.

The problem about the Khrushchev affair, however, was not only *whether* we should speak out on it, but *what* there was, in fact, for us to say about it! Our job was to explain to the American workers what they have to gain from such visits, why such events must be successful.

And that brings us to another "theory" about our Party that keeps it from getting things done—and from building our Party. This can best be described as the "who knows" theory. It is reminiscent of the wave of ignorance that took possession of our Party prior to the last convention. At that time, some of our erstwhile "leaders" suddenly discovered that we "knew from nothing," had no answers, and had better "examine" and "re-examine" all questions—until we disappeared! And anyone who still said that our Party *did* have answers—and *does* have them, and *will* have them—that we weren't anywhere near as "dumb" as they were making us out to be—well, anyone like that was just a wild-eyed "Leftist" who couldn't "change."

We did have answers; and we have them now. On most questions regarding the labor movement, for example, we have been basically correct for these past several years. Our estimate of the soundness of the merger was correct; so was our recognition of the dangers in it. We have sized up correctly the effects on labor of automation, and of the cold war armaments program. We have shown correctly how

the unorganized South, and the labor movement's general backwardness on the Negro question was hamstringing labor's advance. We have warned correctly of the all-out attack against the workers, now taking place; and we have also warned concretely of the disastrousness of those class-collaboration policies now coming to roost in the steel strike. *No other single force in America has such a record of vision and of devotion to the American working class.*

And yet the "who-knows" theoreticians come along and tell us, "Who knows what forces are now going to take the worker to new and higher ground? In the thirties it was John L. Lewis and Dubinsky. Who would have ever expected it of them? So who knows who'll do it now? Who knows what issues, what forms, will take the labor movement today to higher ground?"

Well, maybe we aren't so sharp right now at applying the laws of struggle to the concrete circumstances in front of us. And maybe we aren't so good at making predictions. But is that any reason for giving up our role of bringing forward issues, and bringing forward the positive elements in the labor movement in the fight on these issues? In the course of bringing this kind of pressure on the "do nothing" trade union bureaucracy, perhaps we can make some inroads on our "ignorance." One thing is sure: attitudes of "spontaneity," or flaccidness won't ever do it! And neither will attacks of "sectarianism" leveled against those who are fighting for the open and independent and vanguard roles of our Party!

The fact is that our cadres in the mass movements have been moving

ahead decisively in the ranks of rebuilding old ties and developing new ones, and in general proving that—in spite of old and new obstacles—we can extend our influence in the mass movements, and we can grow! And yet our progress in rebuilding the Party as a *political force in its own right* is not doing anywhere nearly as well. Why? Because the responsibility for this task is also being left on the shoulders of our cadres within the mass movements. The drive, the initiative, the thinking that is going into helping our mass cadres develop themselves and their activity, are not being used to make our Party leaders, or the Party itself, an effective force among the American people.

There is still a very strong tendency to equate the Party's—and the Party leadership's—open role with “sectarianism.” Attempts are still made to play our open role against our work within the mass movement. This does not see how one *complements* the other, how things that are raised “from the outside”—that is, more accurately, *alongside*—the mass movements, can enable our mass cadres to attain new heights.

Many of our forces are not always in a position to raise certain questions in their organizations in a general way. Does this mean that such questions cannot or should not be raised *by the Party itself*? Even on various immediate questions, the Party can indicate courses of action, particularly in situations where the mass organizations have actually abandoned their responsibilities. And on more advanced issues, the Party is surely able to stimulate thought, discussion, and action. There is an increasing need—*which we*

can fill—for a fundamental analysis of our whole system, especially at a time when the workers, and the people generally, find themselves suffering increasing attacks on their living standards and on their working conditions. And there is an increasing need—*which we can fill*—for explanations on Socialism, on how it works, and on what it would mean for our people.

And as the Party develops an open identity, a program, a record of achievements and contributions, as it *identifies itself* as a fighting organization, and also establishes its right to deserve the confidence of those who are attempting to move ahead on any front. This in turn stimulates our mass cadres to *expand* their work—and to *recruit*, to build their Party. You cannot build a phantom, you can only build what is visible, active, necessary. Confidence in our Party is of paramount importance today. It is important not only to our friends, but to our members as well. It cannot and must not be left to our mass cadres alone, to build that confidence for themselves and by their own efforts. No matter how difficult it may be, the Party—and specifically the Party leadership—must have a perspective for developing that confidence, through its fight to establish, as a Party, political leadership among the masses, through its fight to establish fully its independent role.

There are those among us who cry that “overemphasis” on the independent role of the Party is nothing but the form that “sectarianism” is taking today. This is a bogus issue. In the past year, there was one Communist Party candidate in the entire country—Ben Davis, our N. Y. State Chairman. In all of New York City, there

is not a single public local party office—with the possible exception of the Ben Davis headquarters in Harlem. The National Auto Commission has just issued its first leaflet; the Steel Commission has—at this writing—two or three to its credit. A small trickle of material, issued in the name of the Party, often on the initiative of the lower bodies, has only recently begun to appear. The fact is, in short, that our public Party work is still in its infancy. It should be encouraged, welcomed and expanded, not discouraged. Above all, it should not be placed in opposition to our growing mass work, as some kind of error in emphasis which, if carried too far, will once more threaten to “isolate” us.

Today sectarianism takes the form of the continued isolation of the Party's leadership from the masses. All too often, our leadership functions merely as guides and advisors to our cadres in mass work, without having any experiences, or even encounters with the mass of the people in their own right. If they have direct contact with the mass movements and mass struggles at all, it is with some “top” people—people of “influence” in these movements, with whom they are engaged in restoring old ties. As far as the rank-and-file in these situations are concerned, our leadership's contact is almost always and everywhere second-hand, indirect.

As a result, the development of our Party's line in the different concrete phases of our mass work is based for the most part on a one-sided set of experiences—experiences which our mass cadres have often had to arrive at through what might be called “semi-underground” methods of work. Such

a lack of direct, open, intimate experience in the Party's own right with the mass struggles going on creates many real problems for us. Very often, it leads to the perpetuation of policies that are no longer, in fact, related to events. On the other hand, it also helps to produce those “pendulum swings,” from one extreme to the other, for which we are always berating ourselves—after the most recent example is over. In any case, this makes it harder and harder to offer real leadership to those who *are* rooted in these mass movements and struggles. They come to view with trepidation the “advice” and “recommendations” they are offered, as to their mass work, by leaders who do not have any significant mass contact of their own.

Not having the “feel” of the people—the sense, *born of direct experience*, of what the people want and will do—often gives rise to another tendency. That is to promote something *between* us and the people—Left groupings and organizations which, instead of bringing us closer to the masses, have often served to cut the progressive force off, to isolate the them away from the main currents of the mass struggle. Sometimes these efforts—sectarian and isolating as they are in actual fact—are put forward in the name of creating “united fronts.” But how can the Communist Party have a “united front,” on even the most minimum basis, with other organizations, if the Party does not have a *base of its own*, no matter how small? When one individual Party member, whose Party membership is not even known, works along with non-Party forces in some joint effort, does that mean that the Communist Party is thereby engaged

in united front activity? I don't think so!

One thing is certain. All tendencies on the part of our Party's leadership to become isolated, to allow themselves to remain isolated, to convert their actual isolation into some matter of "principle"—all such tendencies cannot help our Party in any way, they can only harm us. They lead towards the Party itself becoming an "impotent sect," aloof from the people. Without experiences amongst the people—from the sidelines, that is from the Party offices—it becomes difficult to advance or instruct those who have in fact been developing real mass ties. No serious mass political party can develop with its leadership separated from life. The ruling classes know this, and have done their darndest during these last years to separate our Party from the people. To the extent that we do not overcome the difficulties that still lie before us in that direction, to the extent that we let our growing opportunities go by default, to that extent we ourselves must be held accountable if we are finally reduced to nothing more than a political guidance association instead of a political party.

False cries of "sectarianism" or incorrect characterizations of "Left" and "Right" errors in a particular period tend to divert us from the real problems that face us. They tend to stifle initiative. While the slogan of "fighting on two fronts" sounds noble, if it is not carried out properly, it will turn out to be just words. There is a continued absence of any outlook for developing our Party as a vital, independent, fighting organization—an organization which by its own work, and the work of its leadership, really helps

the work of our mass cadres. This gravely limits our possibilities for growth.

In order to help overcome the "isolation" that actually besets our leaders, to bring us to a position where we can best draw lessons from the people, and to spur our ability to grow, I propose the following:

1. That every state and national leader begin to function in an important working-class community at least 40 percent of their working time. That they become known to the people, to the community in general, as Party leaders; and that, in the course of their activities there, they begin to build the Party as a political force. And, if some of our leaders already have special ties with the labor movement directly, then let them spend their time and their efforts in this respect among the workers there.

2. That we try to eliminate as many echelons of command as possible, so that our leadership can function more closely with the members. That leaders function out of a club, with the club becoming a real part of the collective determining activities in this area of work, thus enabling us to fulfill our outlook of making the clubs function as the basic organization of the Party.

3. That part of the work of the collective of top leadership become the constant review of the developments of our Party, and of its leaders, among the masses. That these developments become an integral part of the yardstick for measuring leadership.

4. That the national and state offices be closed, and in their place, local offices in key areas opened up, to the greatest extent possible. That some

solution be worked out for eliminating the maze of inner-Party meetings, so that more time can be made available to Party and mass work, in the best and deepest and by far most practical sense.

Our Party is the most dynamic political force in America. Small as we

are we can exert great influence on the American scene—provided that we move among the people—all of us! Overcoming our isolation, rebuilding our Party's mass ties—these are the key tasks today, for our leadership no less than for our membership. Let's all get down to these tasks—now!

Book Review

THE SOVIET UNION TODAY

By Hyman Lumer

THE SOVIET UNION of today is the Soviet Union of the Sputnik era, of the Twenty-first Congress and the awe-inspiring seven-year plan. It is a land marching confidently on the road to a communist society, its economy advancing with seven-league boots to overtake the foremost of the capitalist countries, the United States.

All this seems a far cry from the days of the Twentieth Congress, of the shocking Stalin revelations and the tension, confusion and soul-searching which they engendered. Yet it is only three years since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU was held. A short time, to be sure, but it has witnessed a remarkable resurgence, a great turn, in the development of Soviet society. It is a period marked by a new burst of popular energy and fervor, reminiscent of the pioneering spirit of the early days of the first five-year plans, and giving rise to a fresh upsurge in every sphere of activity.

The nature of this transformation and its basis form the central theme of Giuseppe Boffa's book, *Inside the Khrushchev Era*.^{*} Boffa, who is foreign editor of the Italian Communist daily *L'Unita*, writes from the vantage point of five years' residence in the So-

^{*} Marzani and Munsell, New York, 1959, \$5.00.

viet Union as a foreign correspondent for that newspaper, beginning in 1953. These were, to use his description, "the years of the Twentieth Congress," embracing the period immediately preceding and leading up to it, and that which followed.

He writes not only as a first-hand observer and an able journalist interpreting the events he witnessed, but also as a Communist sharing the socialist aspirations of the Soviet people among whom he lived and imbued with a Marxist insight into their problems. It is difficult, he points out, to understand these events as the Soviet people themselves do. He writes: "One cannot understand the Soviets in their full humanity without knowing what they have experienced in suffering and happiness, in errors and achievements. Everything is dear to them, even if they criticize it." Yet Boffa, one feels, has succeeded in considerable measure in penetrating this barrier and in conveying these feelings to the reader. The result is a book written with great perceptiveness, one which adds much to our understanding of Soviet society and its development in these years.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first, entitled "The Great Change," the author deals with the Twentieth Congress, its background and its effects. In the second part,

"The Open Road," he records and analyzes the impressive advances of the past few years, leading up to the Twenty-first Congress.

The initial chapters describe the emergence of the "cult of the individual" in the thirties, as well as the reactions against it which had developed by the outbreak of World War II. This process was interrupted by the war; then, in the stringent circumstances imposed by the cold war and the American brandishing of the atom bomb, the "cult" and the repressions associated with it continued to develop during the postwar years, culminating in the events of the 1948-53 period.

The unjust arrests and executions which characterized these years were by no means the only consequences of the "cult," although they were the most glaring. Of basic importance was the stifling of democratic processes and necessary social change which it produced. The destruction of collective methods of work led to the substitution of formalism and dogmatism for genuine Marxist analysis and discussion, and for real criticism and self-criticism. It served to accentuate individual weaknesses, and thus to perpetuate and intensify errors. Hence it led to the persistence of outmoded methods and institutions, to excessive centralization, and to the growing up of serious shortcomings such as the grave weaknesses in Soviet agriculture, as well as other practices which more and more impeded progress.

Pressure for changes, made increasingly imperative by the very advances of socialist development, was already evident before the death of Stalin. Following his death, the process of correction began in earnest. The year 1954,

says Boffa, became the year of the "thaw," and 1955 became the year of decision, of "changes and choices," leading to the Twentieth Congress. The Congress, by removing the last roadblocks, whatever turmoil this may have caused, opened the gates to a great resurgence—to the birth of a new era.

However the Congress may have affected the situation elsewhere, in the Soviet Union it produced no crisis. The tremendous achievements of socialism throughout the years of the Stalin regime far outweighed the errors and excesses and assured that in the end these, and not socialism, would be liquidated.

From this analysis, Boffa goes on to discuss the accomplishments and problems of the new era. He describes the great push to the East. He records the steps taken to raise productivity, among them an increased pace of electrification, unleashing of local initiative through decentralization of industrial control, and stimulation of output of collective farms through increased prices paid by the government and liquidation of the machine and tractor stations, combined with the sowing of the vast virgin steppes of the East.

He speaks of the advances in living standards which have taken place, and of the tremendous housing program designed to overcome the chronic housing shortage by which the country has been plagued. He deals also with the cultural revolution in the Soviet Union, with the insatiable demand for books, plays and concerts and the astounding development of the natural sciences, all of which the Twentieth Congress greatly stimulated. He describes the school reforms, combining study and work and thus overcoming the gap between the

two fostered by the previous system, which had become outmoded.

At the bottom of all this is the development and expansion of Soviet democracy. This theme runs through the entire book, and is dealt with at length in a highly illuminating chapter on the state and democracy. Boffa concerns himself with the *essence* of socialist democracy, as against the emphasis on form characteristic of those who would measure the degree of democracy in the Soviet Union in terms of the presence or absence of bourgeois-democratic forms. The logical conclusion of such an approach, he points out, is that full democracy would require the restoration of capitalism!

In its essence, democracy is inherent in the development of socialist society, which must base itself on democratic centralism. An industrialized economy requires centralism. In capitalist society, it is achieved without democracy through the control of the big capitalists who own the enterprises. But in a socialist society it is possible only *with* democracy, since it is the masses of workers who own the industrial enterprises.

Thus, the building of socialism and the overcoming of the contradictions which appear in the process demand an ever greater participation of the people in the control of affairs. This, the stifling of collective work by the "cult of the individual" blocked for a time. In the period following the Twentieth Congress, it has experienced a rebirth and has reached new levels, with the growing role of the Soviets and of the trade unions and other mass organizations, increased democracy within the Communist Party, and the emergence of a variety of new committees and other forms of rank-and file participation. And the advance of communism, says Khrushchev in his report to the Twenty-first Congress, will necessitate a far greater expansion of such participation than has hitherto been envisioned.

This brief account scarcely begins to indicate the richness of the content of the book. Written in a lucid style and competently translated by Carl Marzani, it makes interesting as well as rewarding reading. It is highly recommended.

An Important Publishing Event!

THE COLONIAL ERA

By HERBERT APTHEKER

In this volume, Dr. Aptheker presents a profound Marxist study of the essential elements composing the formative decades of the American nation, with special focus on the role, aims and efforts of the masses of people—white, Negro, and Indian. The colonial relationship is brought out both in terms of colonizers and colonists, and in the context of the European heritage as it was transformed by the hard realities of life in the New World. Political, economic and ideological developments are analyzed within the whole structure of constant historical movement, and the people's participation in this movement appraised.

In this way, fresh insights are offered into such significant events as Bacon's Insurrection in Virginia, Leisler's Revolt in New York, the trial of John Peter Zenger, and the heresies of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson. The reader is brought a more meaningful interpretation of the witch hunts in Massachusetts, the "Parson's Cause" in Virginia, the "Great Awakening" throughout the colonies.

Convinced of the validity of the Marxist outlook, Dr. Aptheker shows the class struggle, both within the colonies and integral to the colonial relationship with England, as the fundamental dynamic of the period. THE COLONIAL ERA, while complete and independent in itself, is the first in a multi-volumed effort in which the author seeks to illuminate the entire sweep of the formation, development and growth of the United States by re-examining it from the viewpoint of historical materialism. In addition to its ten chapters, the new volume contains Reference Notes, a Bibliography, and Index.

Price \$2.00 (International)

At Most Bookstores or

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

A November book!

MANSART BUILDS A SCHOOL

By **W. E. B. DU BOIS**

It is a major publishing event that Book Two of W. E. B. Du Bois' great trilogy, *THE BLACK FLAME*, is to be published in November under the title, *MANSART BUILDS A SCHOOL*. Following the publication in 1957 of the first volume, *THE ORDEAL OF MANSART*, the new volume depicts on a vast canvas the sweep and drive of the heroic, stubborn, many-sided struggle of the Negro people for equality during the years between 1912 and 1932.

Across the stage of this massive and brilliant historical novel, a literary form deliberately chosen by Dr. Du Bois because it enables him to penetrate deep into the motivations of his real, flesh-and-blood characters, move such distinguished figures and personalities as Booker T. Washington, Tom Watson, Oswald Garrison Villard, Florence Kelley, Joel Spingarn, John Haynes Holmes, George Washington Carver, Mary Ovington, Stephen Wise, Paul Robeson. Maintaining the continuity of the novel's theme and action through his main protagonists, Manuel Mansart (born at the moment his father, Tom Mansart, was lynched by a mob of racists) and his three sons and daughter, and the key Baldwin, Scroggs and Pierce families, the author brings his story up to the disastrous 1929 stock market crash and the Great Depression that brought Franklin D. Roosevelt into the Presidency of the United States, and with him such men as Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes and many others.

It is a gripping and deeply meaningful work of literary art that will endure.

Mainstream Publishers, \$4.00

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