

political affairs

JANUARY 1960 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|------------------------|------|--|
| HYMAN LUMER | [22] | Disarmament and the American Economy |
| ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN | [35] | Civil Liberties and the Communist Party |
| JAMES E. JACKSON | [46] | Our Party and the World Communist Movement |
| ARCHIE BROWN | [53] | United Front Policy in the San Francisco Elections |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [61] | Signs of a Change |

OUR SIGHTS TO THE FUTURE
by Gus Hall
(Keynote Address to 17th National
Convention, CP, USA)

[1-21]

NEW AND RECENT TITLES

THE COLONIAL ERA by Herbert Aptheker	\$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
Coming:	
THE SOCIALIST WAY, by N. B. Khrushchev	.05
THE BIG BRAINWASH, by Dyson Carter	2.50
HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford	1.00
ON THE NATURE OF FREEDOM: THE MARXIST VIEW by Herbert Aptheker	.35

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

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Vol. XXXIX, No. 1

JANUARY, 1960

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

Our Sights to the Future

By Gus Hall

(Keynote speech to the 17th National Convention, Communist Party of the U.S.A., December 10, 1959.)

I. A NEW ERA IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

These are turbulent times. We are living in a period when events move with great speed—when decades are at times telescoped into weeks. Nor is the turbulence merely on the surface of things. The movement of events today is profoundly reshaping the world. It is basically altering the relationship of forces and is creating a constant succession of new, unprecedented situations. And the pace of these changes grows faster as time goes on.

It is in the midst of these developments that our 17th Convention meets. During the next four days we will undertake, dispassionately and realistically, to appraise the state of affairs in the world and in our own country, and to chart our course for the momentous period which lies ahead of us. This is a difficult task, but it is also an exciting and enthusiasm task—and a rewarding one.

TWO CONVENTIONS

The scope and speed of events is dramatized with special force by the contrast between the atmosphere, surrounding circumstances and outlook of this convention and the corresponding features of the 16th Convention. That convention took place in the midst of confusion and bewilderment resulting from the revelations of the 20th Congress of the CPSU concerning the weaknesses and mistakes of the Stalin era. It took place amid the disorientation and questioning created by the Polish and Hungarian events.

That was a period when world tensions were on the upgrade, and when the Dulles policies of "brinkmanship" and "massive retaliation" were in the ascendency. It was the period of the Suez invasion.

It was a time when the Party was in the depths of a crisis in which its very life or death was a subject of intense debate. It was a time of the gathering of the Right opportunist

and liquidationist forces for their assault on the Party, an assault reflecting the world-wide revisionist swing which developed under the pressures of bourgeois ideology and as a reaction to the "Left"—sectarian, dogmatic practices of the past.

Finally, the convention took place when the Party was just emerging from the disruption created by the attacks on it under the Smith Act and other repressive measures of the period when McCarthyism was at its height.

Looking back on the situation of those days, it must be said that the 16th Convention, in spite of all its weaknesses, was a positive achievement.

That convention had before it two central problems: 1) whether or not there was a place for a Communist Party in the United States, and 2) whether such a party, under American conditions, could be a Marxist-Leninist party. Despite the difficulties of that period, the convention gave affirmative answers to those questions and laid the basis for the re-consolidation of our party. Those struggles were necessary, and they prepared the party to meet today's tasks.

As is true in all phenomena, the elements of change—of the new—were then already discernible. The McCarthyite hysteria had already begun to subside. The Supreme Court decision had opened the doors to a new stage of the school desegregation fight. The peace movement

was beginning to move forward, with the development of the campaign against nuclear tests. And the painful reexamination and correction of the 20th Congress contained within themselves the seeds of a new clarity and cleansing, and of a new upsurge of the world Marxist-Leninist movement. All these developments, however, were then present only in embryo or in their initial stages.

How radically and unalterably different are the circumstances in which our 17th Convention meets! Our Party enters this convention victorious over the elements of liquidationism and revisionism, and having in the main eradicated their twin evils—"Left"—sectarianism and dogmatism.

This is a convention which ends all "holding operations" and sets our sights to the future. It is a convention of advance, of progress. This is the first convention to take place in the era when the socialist forces of the world have attained dominance, and when the world peace forces, for the first time in history, are the most powerful voice and movement on the world scene. This convention is being held at a time when the portals of opportunity have been opened to a new era of mankind, free of the scourge of war.

And it is being held at a time when the decline in our ranks has been halted, when the morale and fighting spirit of our membership is on the upgrade, reflecting these new

developments in the world. The factionalism which caused such tremendous damage and threatened the very existence of the Party has been defeated, though remnants of it still exist.

In view of all this, the goals and aims of this convention must be far higher, far in advance of those of the 16th Convention. The heart of the 16th Convention was the struggle against those who maintained that there was no place for a Communist Party. Today this question does not even exist. Rather the central question of this convention is: what is the role of the Party in this entirely new situation? How can it now move out into the broad stream of the peoples movement; how can it break the bonds of its isolation and become more and more effectively a factor in the life of our nation—in the growing movement for peace, in the struggle of the workers, the Negro people, the youth and other sections of the people.

A NEW ERA

Dialectics teaches us that everything is in a process of endless change, a process in which there is a constant conflict between the old and the new. As Marxists, as fighters for progress, we therefore at all times seek out what is new.

But not everything that is new is important. Hence we have to single out that which is not only new but significant—that which indicates the

future direction of development. To do that, we must thoroughly study the history of the development of the new and its emergence from the past.

We must ever be on the alert for the signs of the new, but at the same time we must not make the mistake of acting as if it were already here full-blown. When we see the first green shoots of grass, we do not say, "Let's make hay." Instead, we do what is necessary to bring it to the point where it is full-grown. *Then*, when the sun shines, we are ready to make hay.

It is in such a light that we should examine what is new in the world of today. And there is plenty. This is the beginning of a new era in the life of our nation, our people and our Party. And we must not only see but must clearly define the features of this new era.

These were born and matured in the era that is ended—the era to which Henry Luce gave the name "The American Century." That was the era of the unquestioned dominance of the American monopolies in the capitalist world, of continuous expansion and growth with apparently no serious challenge from any source. It was an era in which American capitalism reached unprecedented heights, in which the rest of the capitalist world, prostrated by the war, lay at the feet of American big business. It was the era of "positions of strength," of dictation to other countries and in-

fringement on their sovereignty.

It was an era that produced such bombastic, arrogant "carrot and club" policies as "containment" and "rollback" of the socialist world, and of trade embargoes intended to strangle its economic development. It was an era when American military bases mushroomed all over the face of the earth, and when the coffers of the American trusts were swelled with the profits extracted from the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa. Truly, the "American Century" seemed quite real and impressive.

This was the America which molded and left its imprint on our living standards, our culture, our thinking and our attitude toward the rest of the world. This is the America we must understand if we are to grasp the developing new features of the America which is succeeding it.

Let us now take a closer look at the new and developing. First we must look at the position our nation occupies in the world.

The outstanding world phenomenon of today is the fact that the balance of strength is tipping decidedly in the direction of the socialist world. This is a development of profound importance to every capitalist country, but its impact on the leading capitalist stronghold, the bastion of world capitalism, is a virtually explosive one.

The roots of these new relationships lie in the emergence after

World War II of not one but a *group* of socialist countries—a socialist sector of the world embracing fully one-third of its people. These countries, bursting onto the scene of history, have undergone a meteoric growth, and are today moving at a terrific pace in their industrial, scientific, social and cultural development. Within a matter of a relatively few years, these socialist countries, so recently looked upon as backward, bid to become the dominant economic force in the world, producing more than half of its total industrial output.

This is a fundamental change, whose ramifications basically affect all parts of the world. But it is not the only challenge which has developed to the position of American capitalism.

Thus, it coincides with the beginning of the end of the era of colonialism. One colonial country after another is breaking out of its bondage and setting forth on the path of independence and national freedom. Beginning in Asia and the Near East, this development is sweeping across Africa, and is now challenging the dominance of the United States in what has been its own preserve, Latin America. The revolutionary development in Cuba, and the courageous resistance of the Cuban people to American imperialist intervention, is an inspiration to the people's forces throughout this hemisphere. This growing bloc of newly liberated countries represents

a powerful new force on the world scene.

Such developments have narrowed the sphere of colonial exploitation and have shut off, one after another, the pipelines of imperialist superprofits from these sources. The independence of these countries today is not nominal but genuine. What makes it genuine is the existence of the socialist world—a world on which they can rely for the assistance they need, and which imperialism has so long denied them: Certainly the very lives of the new regimes in Egypt, Iraq and Cuba would have been cut short, were it not for the firm position for non-intervention taken by the peace forces of the world, with the Soviet Union, People's China and other socialist nations in the forefront. A further dramatic example was the Soviet Union's economic assistance in the construction of the Aswan Dam in Egypt after the United States had refused. Herein lies the basis of the policy of neutrality adopted by these nations, and of their generally friendly attitude toward the socialist countries.

A third major development of this era is the economic revival of the other capitalist countries. These have repaired the ravages of the war, and have gone through an extended period of expansion and modernization of their productive facilities. Today they are able to compete with American capitalists in field after field in which American products

once reigned supreme. The share of the United States in world capitalist production, once over 50%, is now closer to 40. And the dominance which previously seemed so unquestioned is increasingly being challenged.

Growing competition from abroad has greatly narrowed the trade surplus enjoyed by this country for a number of years, and this has contributed to a huge jump in the deficit in the balance of payments with other countries. The deficit first appeared in 1950, and for the next several years it averaged about a billion dollars a year. But for the past two years, it has totalled more than \$7½ billion. And this has created a threat to the stability of the dollar which is causing American big business no small alarm.

At the recent National Foreign Trade Convention in New York, the new factors in the world situation were recognized by more than one of the speakers. Thus, one said: "American industry must accept the concept that today's customers may be tomorrow's competitors." Another spoke of the need "to face the central issue of how to have both cooperation and competition." Such positions are a far cry from the old policies in foreign trade.

The distinction is also illustrated by the fact that half a dozen years ago the Western European countries were appealing to the United States to let down its trade bars, under the slogan of "trade, not aid." But today

it is Undersecretary of State Dillon who travels to Europe to ask for more markets for American goods from these very same countries.

Today, too, it is President Eisenhower who travels across half the world, on a trip representing an attempt to meet with concrete actions the challenges from all three major sources.

World War II, with the growth of the socialist world and the development of the colonial liberation movement, ushered in a new and deeper stage of the general crisis of capitalism. The developments since then have given rise to yet another, still deeper, phase of the general crisis.

This is the new world in which our country must make a place for itself. In a true sense of the word, the problem our people face is that of finding the least painful transition from the "American Century" to the new era of challenge, of peaceful coexistence.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE— YESTERDAY AND TODAY

The central expression of the "American Century" concept has been the cold war. But with the fading of this concept, the cold-war policies of "positions of strength" and "brinkmanship" have proven themselves increasingly bankrupt. In this, a major factor has been also the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

As a result, American big business has been compelled to begin a painful reexamination of its policies—in the words of Dulles himself, an "agonizing reappraisal"—and to take a more realistic approach to the situation in which it finds itself.

In this lie the reasons for the proposal by Eisenhower for an exchange of visits with Khrushchev, leading to the historic visit of Khrushchev to this country and its momentous consequences. Among these were the Camp David agreement that "all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiations," laying the basis for summit discussions, as well as for direct meetings between heads of states. Among them, too, are a number of immediate gains—the conclusion of an agreement for expanded cultural exchange, agreements for cooperation in nuclear research and for joint medical research projects, and, of great significance, the agreement between the nations regarding the Antarctic continent.

This represents a break in the direction of American foreign policy. How fast or how far it will move in this new direction depends on the American people and on the pressure they exert.

It is not by any means the end of the cold war. The Eisenhower Administration has not yet shown in practice either the will or the actions to guarantee that this is the direction our country will follow. It has recog-

nized the need for a change, but there is no indication as to how far-reaching or complete that change will be. And the die-hard cold war forces, who are very powerful, have already launched a counteroffensive designed to regain the ground they have lost and to wipe out whatever advances toward peace have been won. This is something which must be taken very seriously.

But the key thing is that the public admission of the bankruptcy of the old policies and the need for a change has opened the floodgates of discussion as to what the new policies should be. Peace therefore emerges more than ever as the central issue of our day. It is to this that we must apply ourselves with all the energy, skill and ingenuity at our command. It is to this that our work in all other fields must be related.

In this connection, we must see clearly the distinctive features of the fight for peace in the present period. In past years, we organized, conducted and led a campaign for peace, including the notable Stockholm Peace Appeal. We did so in the context of the fundamentally correct analysis that a danger of war existed, exemplified by Korea and later by Indo-China. Today we are again taking part in a campaign for peace, but in the context of a new analysis—again fundamentally correct—that lasting peace, total disarmament and peaceful coexistence are in the cards, that they are realizable goals.

Both are campaigns for peace, but under such different conditions. Are we not called upon, then, to think about *specific* tactics to meet the *specific* conditions that flow out of the difference in the specific situations surrounding them? The past drive was based on a negative development; this one is based on a positive development. The past drive took place in a situation in which the peace forces were **growing** but not yet dominant; this one takes place in a situation in which the peace forces are already the stronger. The past drive occurred in an atmosphere of jingoism and national chauvinism; this one is unfolding in an atmosphere in which the whole nation is discussing the banning of nuclear tests, total disarmament and peaceful coexistence. These factors should indicate to us the need for fresh, concrete thinking.

WE MUST BE SPECIFIC

There is a general, over-all sentiment for peace. This sentiment has grown in intensity as the weapons of war have increased in destructiveness. And as the balance of world forces has shifted, so have the moods and thinking of the mass of Americans shifted toward peace. It is this over-all yearning and concern for peace that forms the foundation for a concerted mass crusade for survival. This crusade is, of course, of utmost importance, and we must devote our best energies and forces

to it. However, this is not enough. Such a *general* crusade will not by itself secure lasting peace.

The fight for peace must be developed in more specific forms. Its mooring lines must be tied to the specific self-interest of specific sections of the people. The campaign for peace is directed toward saving our lives and our civilization from destruction. But it also brings with it certain immediate benefits for the people and—yes—for the industrialists it means immediate profits. It is in relation to this that we must develop the slogans and the campaign for total disarmament.

Cutting down on armaments is the only possible road to cutting down the ever-mounting burden of taxes. Only if we have a cut in arms production will we have a cut in prices. The building of the schools, roads, hospitals, parks, houses and other things the people so badly need, is blocked by the spending of huge sums for the stockpiling of instruments of destruction. Surely the problem of the huge farm surpluses, with the resulting improverishment in many agricultural areas, is bound up with the opening of world-wide markets in a world free from armament burdens. These and many more are the mooring lines to which the fight for peace must be secured.

A generation of the American people has grown up in and made a livelihood from an economy that in large measure has been supported and souped up by war orders. War

economy has been accepted as a normal and necessary part of our economic system. This stands as a roadblock to a full mobilization of the forces for peace. As Comrade Lumer's report will show concretely, this is a false conception. We have the task of removing this roadblock.

During these same years of the arms economy, a body of thought has developed to the effect that the Negro people can break down the bars of discrimination in industry, housing and education only when our nation is either at war or preparing for war. Unfortunately, there has been an element of truth in this. But we must show clearly how disarmament and peace can be conducive to an atmosphere in which this struggle can more readily be won. Wars and war tensions bring with them a growth of chauvinism and jingoism, while peace is conducive to an atmosphere of brotherhood and understanding. We must understand these special roadblocks to the movement for peace among the Negro people.

Many Negro workers are at the bottom of the seniority list. Therefore any cutback in production means unemployment for them. This is a definite challenge to us in working out a substitute for military production.

Similarly, we need to deal with other specific problems affecting the young people, women, the handicapped and the old workers. Generalities will not do.

Hence, while we take part in the general crusade for peace, we must understand that specific groups, because of specific interests, will start from and rally around narrower issues involved in the fight for peace. With some, unrestricted trade with the socialist countries will be the starting point, with others it will be the dangers of fallout. For still others, disarmament will be the point of greatest interest.

We must see the fight for peace realistically in all its many-sided aspects. At this point, the need is not for starting a peace movement from scratch. Such a movement is here. It expresses itself in a thousand ways and at a variety of levels. At this stage, it is above all expressed through the existing mass organizations of the people.

In a nation like ours, where almost everyone belongs to one or more mass organizations, this is a firm and certainly a broad base. Here is where we should be working to help build and elevate the peace movement. While doing so, we should also have our sights on more concerted and united movements, conferences and actions of various kinds of local, state and national levels. If the central issue of peace is to give rise to the greatest, most persistent crusade of our times, what is needed is not one but a number of national centers to guide, prod and organize it. Not only is this necessary with respect to specific issues but in addition, it seems to me, the youth, wo-

men, farmers, veterans and other groups need such special centers of direction.

PROBLEMS ON THE HOME FRONT

There is a close relationship between world developments and those on the domestic scene.

What is it that best describes our domestic situation as we enter the decade of the sixties? Is it tranquility, stability? Are we moving on the path of unending growth and expansion? In spite of the present high level of production, these words do not fit the realities of life in our country. Rather, the state of affairs in our nation is better described as one of instability, uneasiness and hesitation.

What best describes the United States of the sixties is the growing catalog of serious problems, steadily becoming more aggravated, which are seeking solution. And what gives these developments such importance and seriousness is that they occur simultaneously with the developments on the world scene which we have described.

An outstanding new feature on the home scene is the development of automation, whose many ramifications and effects are now reaching into all aspects of our national life. Strictly speaking, automation is still an infant. But it is already throwing its weight around like a full-grown heavyweight.

A most striking evidence of its effects is the rise in unemployment in the successive postwar boom periods. In the peak boom year of 1953, following the 1948-49 slump, 2.9% of the labor force was unemployed. In 1956, the year of peak economic activity following the 1953-54 slump, the figure was 4.2%. In the present period, which follows the depression of 1957-58, unemployment has remained well above 5% of the labor force. In October, 1959 it stood at 6%. Speaking on this question, Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota had the following to say: "This is far too high for a dynamic economy, but its effect could be managed if it were spread evenly throughout the economy. The fact is that unemployment has reached disaster proportions in certain regions and for certain age, racial and educational groups."

What these figures show is a re-emergence, since the war, of the industrial reserve army on a growing scale. And in this, the displacement of workers through automation is playing a constantly growing part.

Automation, and the determination of the monopolies to clear the way for more rapid automation, is also largely at the bottom of the current drive to undermine working conditions in steel, on the railroads, on the waterfront, and in many other industries. It serves also as an instrument used by big business for the destruction of its small competitors and increased concentration of

ownership and control. The slogan of big business has become "Automate or Die." And in the process, many do die.

Other reports will go further into the problems arising from automation. Here I want only to point out how different are its consequences under socialism. In a socialist society all technological advances are welcome. The fruits of science and technology are no problem, but rather the foundation on which the economy will rapidly be built to new heights, the basis of the goal of surpassing our own standard of living. The rapid development of automation in the socialist nations will serve to prod the development of automation here; but the benefits from automation to the workers in the socialist countries will also serve to inspire our workers, helping them to see the need for socialism, and to struggle for the benefits of automation here.

We must work out definite plans and demands with the aim that at least part of the fruits of this technological advance will go to benefit the working people of our land. A proper examination of the questions growing out of automation is also the key to understanding the present big business drive against organized labor.

A second major feature of the home scene is the growing financial instability of the country. Our national debt is higher than it was at the end of the war, and is still ris-

ing. The taxpayers are saddled with a burden of interest now in the neighborhood of \$9 billion a year and still going up. State and local debts have been going up by leaps and bounds and are at an all-time high. Private debt has multiplied several times during the postwar years. The burden of taxes has grown to impossible levels, yet government debts continue to rise. Prices have risen greatly since the end of the war and the value of the dollar has been steadily shrinking. The federal government is experiencing increasing difficulty in financing the national debt and borrowing more money. As one observer has remarked, the credit of the United States government, once considered the soundest in the world, is now becoming shaky. And because of this country's world role, these developments are having world-wide repercussions.

A third important feature is the chronic agricultural crisis. Farmers are being increasingly squeezed between shrinking farm prices and mounting production costs. Farm income is steadily declining, and is now at its lowest point in seventeen years. Our storage facilities are being choked by the growing mountain of unsaleable surpluses of farm products. There are growing areas of desolation in marginal farmlands, with farmers driven out in rising numbers thanks to the development of modern, mechanized farming in the more productive areas. All in all, America's farmers are in serious

difficulties, which are having an effect on the entire country.

To these features, we may add the failure of our society to provide adequate housing, education and health facilities, whose lack grows more acute from year to year. There is also the growing stench of corruption and moral decay, which is penetrating every corner of American life. As one person expressed it, "Everybody is on the gravy train of payola these days—except the working people."

Affected by all these things in the sharpest measure are in the first place the 18 million Negro people, as well as the 5 million Mexican-American and the million or more Puerto Ricans in the United States. The slum housing and the ghettos to which they are confined are becoming not better but steadily worse. They are the most severely affected by the unfair system of taxation, by rising prices, by unemployment and by the farm crisis.

This is the America we see as we enter the decade of the sixties. These are the realities of life on the home front, corresponding to those in the world situation. It is these realities of life to which this convention must apply itself, and with which the Party must deal.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

How does America react to these developments? What are the differ-

ent currents which are emerging? In what direction are the different groups moving? In short, how is America meeting the challenge?

American monopoly capital is reacting to the world situation with attempts to readjust, reassess and make changes in its foreign policy, to accommodate itself to present-day realities. This is most dramatically demonstrated by the proposal for the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits. And this in turn has been one of the basic factors in opening up the new possibilities which now exist in the fight for peace.

Thus, we have on the one hand the beginnings of a readjustment of direction in the sphere of foreign policy. But on the other hand, monopoly capital has reacted to the developments at home in an opposite manner. On this front, it is developing a most far-reaching, concentrated drive against labor, whose aim is to deprive the unions of all economic and political power, and to place them under complete government domination and control. The drive is marked especially by the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act, by the attack on the steel union, and by a rash of proposals for additional anti-labor laws, including the outlawing of major strikes. The scope of the attack is indicated by the fact that Adlai Stevenson, who seeks the Democratic presidential nomination, has added his voice to the demand for outlawing strikes. The fight against this drive is the central issue,

and we must not permit it to be sidetracked by such peripheral issues as racketeering, corruption and undemocratic practices, important as these are.

Accompanying the anti-labor offensive is a drive against civil rights and civil liberties. The forces of reaction have succeeded in bogging down completely the implementation of the Supreme Court anti-segregation decision. They have wiped the names of a quarter of a million southern Negro voters from the registration lists. They have been able to intimidate the Supreme Court and to make it retreat from its position on anti-Communist laws and other repressive measures, affecting not only the rights of Communists but those of the entire American people. The situation has reached such proportions that a Harry Truman, who once had liberal pretensions, now makes speeches against liberalism.

The entire drive of big-business reaction is of such scope and nature as to make the overwhelming majority of Americans its victims. In this lies the key to our mass and united front policies.

The victims of this drive have begun to fight back, and to give expression to their protests, resentments and demands. This is the basic feature of the situation, which we must recognize despite the confusion, the waverings and the ups and downs which exist.

In the labor movement, there are

pressures and rumblings from below, of which sections of the leadership are being compelled to take note. The bankruptcy of the old policies of the labor leadership in the face of the new problems is becoming increasingly felt. A striking expression of the new moods developing among the rank and file is the militancy shown by the steel workers during and since their strike.

The Negro people's movement has shown an upsurge in a number of fields. New independent political movements are making their appearance. New levels of organization and activity are developing among Negro trade unionists, as witnessed by the struggles they waged at the AFL-CIO and UAW conventions. Of major importance is the formation of the Negro Labor Committee on the initiative of A. Philip Randolph.

Among the youth, there are growing signs of rebellion against the lack of decent jobs and training facilities, against the McCarthyite intimidation which disgraces our educational institutions, against segregation, and against the corruption and lack of perspective emanating from the cold-war atmosphere and pressures. To a growing extent, youth are becoming active in the peace movement today.

And so it is, too, with other sections of the people.

THE 1960 ELECTIONS

All these movements and struggles are developing alongside of the

peace movement, and are related and intertwined with it, so that the success of one is dependent on that in others. To give leadership and guidance to this complex of movements at their existing level is therefore the central mass task of the Party. The multiplicity of forms and levels of the unfolding of the people's resistance must become our primary concern.

While these grow and are built around specific issues as they confront the people, in the direction of their movement and in their objective totality they are movements directed against monopoly. We want to participate in, organize and lead the broadest of united front movements—on every level—in a thousand ways, in 10,000 places, on 100,000 issues—if possible, with 180,000,000 people. Obviously, we cannot make an understanding of the anti-monopoly character of these struggles on the part of others a condition for a united front. But we ourselves must at all times understand that this is their basic nature.

Our electoral policies and activities in 1960 constitute an extension of such a united front policy. In very specific forms, the American people must find ways, through candidates and campaigns, to advance the struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence and to halt the offensive of big business at home. Wherever possible, the gap between these two opposite directions of development should be bridged in candidates and

programs. However, where this is not possible, we should not therefore limit our electoral activities. We must find ways of giving support to candidates who take a positive position on the peace issue, while opposing any support they may give to the big business offensive at home, and vice versa.

While giving priority to the peace issue, all the needs of the people must be fought for—wages, jobs, labor's rights, civil rights and liberties, social security, housing, health, youth needs, etc. It is essential to show the direct relationship between the cold war and vast military expenditures, and the social and economic needs of the people.

On the basis of such movements and in connection with the election campaign, efforts must be made to forge broad electoral unity *to oppose the chief candidates of reaction and the cold war* and to promote the nomination and election of *pro-peace, pro-labor and pro-civil rights candidates* for office at all levels, including trade unionists and Negro representatives. It is also necessary to nominate and elect representatives from other minority groups, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American.

Labor and the Negro people can no longer be satisfied by a small few from their own ranks in Congress and public office. This election must see a substantial number of labor and Negro candidates from the primaries through the final elections.

An imperative task is to make the

Dixiecrats a major target of attack, to expose and isolate them and to defeat their reactionary Republican and Democratic Party allies in the North. In the Democratic Party, in the labor unions and Negro people's organizations, and in all organizations that support the Democratic Party, the demand often raised by liberal forces should be pressed with full force today, namely to *oust the Dixiecrats from the Democratic Party*.

The proposal of the Civil Rights Commission to establish federal registrars must be applied in 1960 and guarantee the full right to register and vote to Negroes and others who are now denied that right by local restrictive practices of any kind.

The offensive of big business has given impetus and opportunity to advance independent political action on the part of the labor movement. By boldly moving into the apparatus of the two-party system, and by mobilizing and organizing an independent political force around this activity, the base for the future can be laid. Only through such activity will there emerge the understanding, the leadership and the personnel for a completely independent organization or party of the developing anti-monopoly movement, headed by labor, in the period ahead.

II. THE PARTY

Our Party has traveled a difficult path—and this not only since the 16th Convention. The enemy has thrown

wave after wave, both internally and externally, against us now for ten years. We can say with just pride that the Communist Party of the U.S.A. has come through the fires battered but intact. We have suffered defeats but in an overall sense we have matured, become steeled and tempered.

As we all know, a Marxist-Leninist Party must not only base itself on the general truth but must gear itself to the specific surroundings and conditions in which it lives and works. So, if we are to reflect this maturity, we must in the quickest possible time gear ourselves to the new period ahead of us. One of the best guarantees that we will be able to meet this challenge is that we are now a united party. Therefore we can now turn all of our attention and energies to the mass tasks and political responsibilities we face. Because of this we can now put aside all oneness and hesitations.

Possibly it was unavoidable, but the fact is that we have now gone through a period that could be called a "holding operation," an operation to stop the decline and deterioration of our Party. I think it is realistic to say that we can now end all such concepts. We are no longer a "holding operation" but a live, growing organization. Many districts have already demonstrated their ability to move and grow, but this must now become a general rule for the whole Party. In short, both the objective and subjective conditions are now ripe for our Party to move into a

position of becoming a serious factor in the life of our nation, in the work of the trade unions, the Negro people, the youth, the farmers and other sections of the population.

END NEGATIVISM

I will not attempt to go into all facets of the work of our Party, as that will be done in separate reports, including a report on Party organization. Therefore, I would like to limit my remarks to one or two specific questions.

I want to call your attention to one left-over of the past period that we must eliminate. Some of our cadre and a small section of our membership, and especially some of the friends and members who left our ranks, are afflicted by a disease one could designate as "negativism." Let me speak directly to you, comrades and friends, who are so afflicted.

This negativism or cynicism is not based on realities. There is no realistic political foundation for such an outlook on life in general, on the prospects of socialism, or on the immediate future. Your moods arise because you have permitted temporary subjective factors to overwhelm your better judgment. You should carefully assess the fact that you cannot remain on the side lines with a wait-and-see attitude without a slow, possibly unnoticed process of corrosion and deterioration setting in. Now let me say that in reading the following quotation from Dostoyevsky, I have nobody specifically

in mind. But I do say that Dostoyevsky describes the final product if negativism and cynicism is followed to its logical conclusion. So, instead of presenting it as being descriptive of anyone I know, let us see it as a warning. Dostoyevsky writes:

For all his intense sensibility he frankly considers himself a mouse and not a man. I grant you it is an intensely conscious mouse, but it is a mouse all the same. . . .

Well, let us now have a look at this mouse in action. Let us suppose, for instance, that its feelings are hurt (and its feelings are almost always hurt), and that it also wants to avenge itself. . . . A nasty, mean little desire to repay whoever has offended it in his own coin. . . . At last we come to the business itself, to the act of revenge. The unhappy mouse has already succeeded in piling up—in the form of questions and doubts—a large number of dirty tricks in addition to its original dirty trick; it has accumulated such a large number of insoluble questions round every one question that it is drowned in a sort of deadly brew, a stinking puddle made up of its own doubts, its own flurries of emotion. Well, of course, all that is left for it to do is to scurry back ingloriously into its hole. There, in its stinking, disgusting subterranean hole, our hurt, ridiculed, and beaten mouse plunges into cold, venomous, and, above all, unremitting spite. For forty years it will continuously remember its injury to the last and most shameful detail, and will besides, add to it still more shameful details, worrying and exciting itself spitefully with the aid of its own imagination. It will be ashamed of its own fancies,

and it will nevertheless remember everything, go over everything with the utmost care, think up all sorts of imaginary wrongs on the pretext that they, too, might have happened, and will forgive nothing. . . . Even on its deathbed it will remember everything with the interest accumulated during all that time. (From *Notes from the Underground*)

The best antidote for this negativism is activity. It is very seldom that one meets in and around our Party a comrade who is both cynical and negative, and also in contact with masses. Activity and exchange of ideas and collective thinking is a thinking person's absolute must. Without this, one decays and deteriorates. If you are one of those who sits and waits and sulks in a mist of negative cynicism, you are so because you have been influenced by the ideology, by the propaganda of the capitalist class.

THE STRUGGLE ON TWO FRONTS

The second general problem of our Party that I wish to say a few words on is the struggle on two fronts. It seems we have never really fully grasped the Leninist concept of the struggle on two fronts. Because of this we have had a tendency of swinging from one extreme to another, of over-correction. We have not always struggled against the same deviation. We have changed from one front to the other, and therefore have

usually fought only one direction of deviation at a time.

For instance, if we look back at our history, we will see that we have spent altogether too much time in discussing in abstraction the question which is the main danger? But we have spent altogether too little time in discussing and debating incorrect ideas and propositions as they are projected in concrete fields of work. Our history also shows that we have countless cases of distortions of a correct policy. This in itself would be serious enough, but what makes these distortions more damaging is that it seems we have not always been able to reject the distortion without also rejecting and throwing out the healthy body with the distorted growth. And I think that we have been doing this while at the same time making speeches and writing articles *against* swinging, and *against* the idea of throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

Many of these distortions have come about because of the confusion between that which is tactical and the factors that go into tactical questions, and that which is strategic, basic and fundamental. During periods when our emphasis is against the Right danger, all tactical questions tend to be raised to the level of principle and during periods when the emphasis is against the "Left" danger, principles are generally brought down to a tactical level. We have not fully learned the lesson that while one or the other of the germs

is active and weakening the Party, the opposite germ moves in.

Let us take a glance at some of these swings and distortions in the immediate past of our Party.

First, let us turn our attention to the period up to that culminating in the Communist Political Association. Up to this point we were developing and growing into a mass party. We were becoming an important factor in the political life of our country. We were an important influence and an important element in the life of the trade unions. We were the pioneers in the molding of the Negro people's movement and the Negro-labor alliance—and we were a very important influence in that movement.

Now let me read you a quotation from that period:

Our nation has a history of several decades, a history which has its own characteristics and is full of treasures. The USA of today has developed from the USA of yesterday. As we are believers in the Marxist approach to history, we must not cut off our whole historical past. Marxism must be integrated with the specific characteristics of our country and given a national form before it can be put into practice. If the U.S. Communists talk about Communism apart from the American characteristics, that will be Marxism only in the abstract, Marxism in the void. Hence, how to turn Marxism into something specifically American becomes the problem.

If I were to ask any of you dele-

gates here who wrote that, I'm afraid many would guess wrong. Actually that was a quotation from the writings of Mao Tse-tung, and I only inserted "USA" in place of "China." Now, is it not true, comrades, that we were developing similar ideas, we were moving in the same direction, and that these were correct and positive thoughts? But then Browder took this correct base and twisted and distorted it into his theory of classless development, and into theories that become the apologies for American imperialism, theories that give characteristics to capitalism that that system could never possess.

So we very correctly rejected this Right-opportunist distortion. And the distortion had to be rejected in toto. But now, looking back, when we made these corrections is it not a fact that we also threw out some of the very correct ideas and thoughts that literally and in every sense of the word had nothing to do with Browder's theories? For example, did we not become shy about developing some broader united front concepts? Did we not become timid about developing specific American forms to fit the American conditions? In other words, we threw out part of the healthy body with the unhealthy distortions of Browder.

So we entered the new period—and here we should keep in mind that it was a period of slowly sharpening class antagonism, of the beginning of increasing war danger in the world, of the first signs of the Mc-

Carthyite reactionary drive, and of many other such signals. I would say that in this period, we refused to recognize the new conditions and especially the element of retreat. And tactics are never more important than they are in periods of temporary retreat. So we began to raise questions that should have been given tactical consideration to the level of principle. In the trade union field, these distortions showed themselves in demands and pressure for a third, Left, trade union federation as an answer to the growing difficulties the Left and progressive and Communist forces were having in united front relations in the trade union movement.

Now, we must look back and ask ourselves: Were we correct in more or less insisting that the Communists in the trade unions make the endorsement of the Marshall Plan a condition or a principled question in our united front relations? And we must ask ourselves: Was it correct for us to put up the fight for the few Left unions to affiliate to the World Federation of Trade Unions? In other words, were not these developments distortions? Is it not obvious that when we put forward such policies, we did not take realistically into consideration the difficult period we were entering, and that we did not give enough tactical consideration to problems of retreat, and therefore were not in the best position to fight for the broadest and most flexible united front policy to

meet that specific situation? Is it not clear that many of our distortions in that period flowed from tendencies towards dogmatism and doctrinairism? And is it not a fact that while the objective conditions themselves played a big role in our continued isolation, that these distortions themselves were also a big factor in this?

As things developed, it is quite obvious that there was a need to find ways of correcting this direction and of breaking out of our growing isolation. These corrections now go into what has become known as the "mainstream theory."

Let us ask the question: Was there anything basically wrong with raising the question of moving into the mainstream? Of course not. What was wrong was the distortion that developed and the swing from the correct base. The distortion took the form that you can only work in the mainstream if you liquidate your Left and progressive base, including Left and progressive organizations. It is true that many Left-led organizations could not have existed through this whole period, but it was a distortion when this became a policy and we theorized about its correctness.

To be in the mainstream without some Left or progressive base is like being up the creek without a paddle. Under such conditions you have to hitch your vehicle to that of somebody else. You necessarily will be buffeted about. You will be at the mercy of every other force. You can

effectively work in the mainstream only if you have your own paddle, your own means of locomotion and your own wheelhouse. Under such conditions, even if you are forced to cross or by-pass a whirlpool where for a short period you have to go against the stream, you can make it on your own steam to the point where you can again take advantage of the mainstream flow.

I think we can now say that this distortion was followed with additional revisions and distortions until it finally flared up into the very serious revisionist swing around the 16th Convention and afterward.

We have now basically corrected this swing and these distortions. Our ship is on more or less even keel now, and one of the big lessons of our history is: *Let's keep it that way!*

There are many other specific instances of distortions and swings in our work. Was there a need to take steps in relation to the questions of illegality and legality when the McCarthy reactionary drive was on? I don't think there is anybody in the Party that can deny that such steps were necessary. But here again we permitted a swing and a distortion, and many fantastic things took place in the name of the original correct policy.

And because of these mistakes, because of these distortions we are shying away now from very important questions that we simply must face up to even under the present-day conditions.

In the 1945 period the Party correctly took up the fight against the influence of white chauvinism. This was a correct and very important ideological struggle. But here again distortions took place and these actually became obstacles in the struggle against white chauvinism. And I think we must say again that while we threw out the distortions, we also discarded much of the correct and necessary struggle against white chauvinism. And we have not fully re-established this struggle to this day.

We should ask ourselves: Why have these swings and distortions played such a prominent role in our past? Here we come back to the question of the struggle on two fronts. And this leads to the question: How does a Party check to determine whether the line and policy is correct or not? What is the yardstick? It certainly can't be that we only check with ourselves to see how nice it sounds in words or on paper. This is meaningless.

The only Leninist test of our policy or line is the test of life—how it helps to guide, lead and organize the masses in struggle. So it is obvious, when we face up to it, that a Party that suffers from isolation cannot be stable and cannot correctly fight on two fronts. The test at the bar of reality is the masses. From this it flows that amongst other things we must listen more carefully to those comrades who are at the point of testing, those comrades

who are giving leadership to workers, the Negro people, the youth, women, etc.

As a matter of fact, the general rule of listening more is not a bad thing. We should heed the advice of the ancient philosopher who said, "Nature has given to men one tongue, but two ears, that we may hear from others twice as much as we speak."

There are many left-overs and influences of both germs—Right and "Left" opportunism. They are still a hindrance to the full unfolding of our Party's participation in the developing struggles of the American people. But they are germs that are under control and we will resist their penetration not as abstractions and in a vacuum, but as we struggle for the correct and proper vanguard role of our Party in life.

LEARN TO APPLY MARXISM-LENINISM

Besides the weakness of not checking our policies against the realities of struggle, we must also admit self-critically that our work has not been anchored deeply enough in the science of Marxism-Leninism.

You have before you, comrades, a very important resolution on the Negro question. As you know, this is a very important shift in the basic and long-range approach of our Party to this question. I will not go into details because Comrade Lightfoot, I am sure, will expand and deepen our thoughts on this ques-

tion. I would only like to say that I think the resolution in a much clearer and deeper way reflects the realities of the developing position and struggles of the Negro Americans. And because of this mature, realistic position our Party will be in a position to play a more decisive and influential role in this developing movement.

I think this document helps to place the resolution of this bourgeois-democratic task in the very center of American life. It helps to strengthen the position that this is a task that all Americans, in the first place, the white workers in the trade union movement, must participate in and resolve in the most decisive manner. It helps to raise the key political alliance—the Negro-labor alliance—strategically and tactically to its necessary level. I think this resolution points to the growing maturity of our Party as a party that understands and knows how to apply the generalized science of Marxism-Leninism to specific situations.

* * *

I am sure all of you have read the planted stories in the press during the last few days—stories of alleged intrigue, of a "power struggle," of

"dumping" and of rolling of heads in our Party. These public actions of the press, as well as certain actions of the government, show that the American capitalist class has not given up its attempt to split and destroy our Party.

These attempts will be in vain. However, we need to be more vigilant than ever, more concerned about our unity than ever before.

We are not going to permit these voices of the enemy to disrupt our convention. We have a heavy schedule ahead for the next four days. Let us spend them as profitably as possible by keeping our eye on the ball. If we do, I have a feeling this 17th Convention will go down in history as the convention that made a decisive turn in the life of our Party.

I have a feeling that this will be the convention

- that put an end to all concepts of a "holding operation";
- that set our Party solidly on the path of becoming a factor in the life of our people and above all our class;
- that puts a *finis* on all factionalism and on all one-sidedness, and a halt to all negativism.

This is a convention of a united party—of a party that is going places.

Disarmament and the American Economy

By Hyman Lumer

(Report to the 17th National Convention, Communist Party, USA)

Among the most far-reaching consequences of the Khrushchev visit to our shores is the impetus it has given to the demand for disarmament, not only in this country but throughout the world. His dramatic proposal for total universal disarmament in four years, made in his speech before the United Nations, has especially contributed to raising the issue of ending the arms race to one of the very first rank.

In our country, disarmament has become the subject of the most intense interest and discussion on all sides—not as an ideal whose realization is relegated to the remote future, but as a goal within actual reach. Today, conservative business publications discuss in all seriousness the prospect of cuts in military expenditures of as much as 50% within a single year and devote much space to probing their consequences. In the pages of our daily newspapers, leading economists write extensively on the subject. And everywhere the question is being

asked: What will be the effects of total disarmament? Will it bring depression and mass unemployment?

What prompts this question is the fact that since World War II, military expenditures have become a highly important factor in our economy. In 1939, they were less than 1½% of the national product. But even at their lowest point after the war, in 1947, they were nearly 5% of a substantially larger national product. During the Korean war they rose to 15%, and since then they have remained at about 10% of our total national output. About 7-8% of the labor force is directly employed in military production. If we add those indirectly employed in connection with it, the total comes to about 15%.

Currently, arms outlays on a world scale total about \$100 billion. Of this, American outlays amount to nearly half. Moreover, for some time, the United States has been exporting arms to other countries to the tune of some billions of dollars a year.

For a number of years now we have been living under a permanent peacetime arms economy, and in what has been termed a "garrison state."

Whole communities have become economically dependent on arms industries. The 40-odd billions a year spent on arms are widely viewed as a necessary prop to the economy and a protection against crisis. And American workers have generally come to look upon arms production as a guarantee of jobs—the answer to unemployment.

But it is in reality none of these things. The American people have been made victims of a hoax.

THE NATURE OF ARMS ECONOMY

Military expenditure is a form of state monopoly capitalism—that is, of using the financial resources of the government to protect and augment monopoly profits, with the working people footing the bill. It is the form of government spending most preferred by big business.

Its desirability to the big corporations lies, first, in the fact that it provides a guaranteed market which is also extremely profitable—as a rule much more so than civilian production. Thus, while profit on invested capital of the 500 biggest companies in 1957 averaged 11.4%, profits of the twelve largest recipients of military orders ranged from 14.1% to 21.3% (*Fortune*, July,

1958). The actual rate of profit is often far higher than these figures show. In the aircraft industry, for example, if we take into account the fact that much of the plant and equipment has been built at government expense and turned over to private corporations to operate, profit rates have in past years been well over 100%, and in some cases as high as 800% (Carl Dreher, "Hot-test Brick in Congress," *The Nation*, June 20, 1959).

Second, the products, in view of their uselessness except for war, offer no competition with production for the civilian market. Third, since the basis presented for arms production is an alleged need to defend the country against aggression, workers can be induced to sacrifice for it, say in the form of higher taxes—something which they would not as readily do for other purposes. Finally, it dovetails with monopoly capital's aggressive tendencies and aims. And the atmosphere of war hysteria which is the necessary justification for militarizing the economy is one which is conducive to McCarthyite political repression and an anti-labor drive. It is not surprising, therefore, that military expenditures have become by far the most extensive form of state monopoly capitalist operation, comprising well over half of the total federal budget.

Economically, the significance of armaments expenditures lies in their utter wastefulness. They are as wasteful as if the goods were simply

dumped into the ocean, or as if armies of men were put to work digging holes and then filling them up. Consequently, they serve especially well as a mean of destroying part of the economic surplus which capitalism cannot productively absorb. In an economic crisis, the surplus is in large part destroyed at the expense of the capitalists. In military production the same thing is accomplished to the profit of the capitalists and at the expense of the workers.

For what is wasted must be paid for by someone. The money which the government spends is obtained through taxation or borrowing. Either way, a share of civilian purchasing power is appropriated by government and then redistributed through the military expenditures. And in the process the workers invariably come out on the short end.

They pay a disproportionate share of the heavy and growing burden of taxes. Thus, a much higher share of personal income tax is paid by low-income groups today than before the war. And today the average worker pays out fully one-third of his earnings in taxes. As for government borrowing, it is chiefly the big corporations, banks and insurance companies which own the government bonds and collect the more than \$8 billion a year in interest on them. It is the working people who pay the major share of that interest, amounting to more than ten cents of every federal tax dollar.

Furthermore, since it destroys a part of the national wealth, the money spent on arms maintains a given level of demand without producing an equivalent supply of goods or services. It therefore leads to rising prices. And if the government, instead of borrowing from the existing money supply, finances its operations by printing additional money, this forces prices up still more. Either way, workers pay through inflated prices. Since 1946, consumer prices have risen by no less than 48%.

But working people pay not alone in high taxes and rising prices. They pay heavily in terms of the social services for which the money spent on arms could have been used, and of which they are deprived. This was dramatically expressed by none other than President Eisenhower himself, in a speech delivered before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1953. He said:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies—in the final sense—a *theft* from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

This world in arms is not spending money alone.

It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities.

It is: two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population.

It is: two fine, fully-equipped hospitals.

It is: some 50 miles of concrete highway. . . .

We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

It would be well for the people to remind the President of these words. More recently, the effects of the arms economy have been shown in a study presented in the AFL-CIO publication, *Labor's Economic Review* (June-July, 1959). Here a recent report prepared under the direction of General J. S. Bragdon, Special Assistant to President Eisenhower, is quoted as saying: "In almost every field in public works—hospitals, schools, civic centers, recreational facilities—shortages are the rule, not the exception. In almost every category we are falling farther and farther behind in meeting even current demands."

The study shows that whereas 100,000 classrooms a year are needed, only 65,000 are being built. The estimated need for public school construction is about \$4 billion a year; but only \$3 billion is being spent. Add to this the need of funds to raise teachers' salaries enough to attract competent teachers and end the growing shortage, or of funds for scholarships to enable the many young people to attend college who cannot now afford it.

We need two million new housing units a year; only 1.3 million are

being constructed. We need more than 1,200,000 hospital beds a year; not much more than half this number are provided for. We need 5,000 public health centers, 15,000 diagnostic or treatment centers, 500 rehabilitation centers for the handicapped. We need 20 new medical schools now, and an equal number of dental schools in the next ten years. We need far more money for medical research.

And so on.

The study manages somehow to avoid mentioning the fact that it is because of the huge burden of spending for arms that we cannot "afford" these things, and that the money now being thrown away on instruments of destruction would more than cover the costs of these vital social needs. But the connection is inescapable.

To be sure, military expenditures may offer a temporary stimulus to the economy. Large-scale war production provides an outlet for capital which, because of limited markets, cannot be so profitably invested in civilian production. In this way, a decline in capital investment can be temporarily arrested. But once the given level of military production is reached, this shot-in-the-arm effect wears off, and increased outlays are required to revive it. In addition, though it may temporarily keep the economy in a state of boom, it does so only by intensifying the underlying factors making for crisis.

The large-scale military outlays of

the postwar years have not been sufficient to prevent the outbreak of three economic slumps and a rising level of unemployment. And they have resulted in the persistence of a huge national debt, higher today than at the end of the war, which creates difficulties in further borrowing and greatly reduces the margin of safety in the event of a crisis. In fact, the United States today has the highest per capita national debt in the world.

Nor is the stimulus of arms spending one which cannot be produced better, from the viewpoint of the working people, in other ways. If the money is actually spent on arms rather than for other purposes, the basic reason is political rather than economic. The arms economy grows out of the cold war, out of the aggressive designs of Wall Street. To change it, therefore, requires a political struggle on the part of the workers for such a change, as well as for monopoly to foot the bill.

Finally, war economy is inseparable from war. It can be maintained, as we have stated, only on the grounds that war threatens. John Foster Dulles, in a book written many years ago, expressed it very bluntly. He wrote: "In order to bring a nation to support the burdens incident to maintaining great military establishments, it is necessary to create an emotional state akin to war psychology. There must be the portrayal of an external menace."

(*War, Peace, and Change*, 1931.)

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF DISARMAMENT

What would be the actual effects of a steep reduction in arms spending? What if the forty-odd billions now devoted to this purpose were to be cut off, say within the next year? Would the bottom fall out of the economy?

Some have argued that it would. They visualize several million now engaged in arms production being thrown out of work, plus nearly three million more being released from the armed forces into a glutted labor market. This would, according to some estimates, raise the number of jobless to some 15 million, or well over 20% of the labor force.

Generally, big business views any threatened cut in arms outlays with alarm, as a harbinger of economic decline. The "peace jitters" in Wall Street with every development toward world peace, however slight, are a familiar phenomenon.

Today, however, some are taking a more optimistic view of the matter, basing themselves on the possibility of very steep tax cuts which would raise the base of both consumer demand and capital investment to new peaks. Illustrative of this is an article in the U. S. Chamber of Commerce publication *Nation's Business* for October, 1959, entitled "What Peace Would Do to You." The article states: "Any abrupt softening of cold war pres-

ures—if it comes—can bring this country a boom, not the recession suggested by such phrases as 'peace scare.'"

It would, the article argues, bring a rise in consumer goods spending far exceeding the cut in military spending, and concentrated in consumer durables. And because of the shift from military goods production, it would bring an upsurge in spending for new plant and equipment for consumer goods. Hence the state of the economy would be greatly improved. The same line of argument has appeared in *U.S. News and World Report* and other publications.

As we shall see, such predictions that disarmament will of itself produce a boom are unfounded. But the dire forebodings of an economic crash are equally unwarranted. They fail to take the entire picture into account, including various possible counteracting factors. History shows that a sharp drop in arms expenditure need not result in a major crisis. To be sure, the War of 1812, the Civil War and World War I were followed by depressions of some severity. But World War II was not, contrary to widespread expectations based on previous experience. Here, with effective price controls and rationing during the war, a large backlog of demand, both for capital and consumer goods, was built up. This, together with certain other consequences of the war, led to a period of rising national prod-

uct, followed by nothing more severe than the relatively mild 1948-49 crisis. And this despite a drop of some \$77 billion in military outlays between 1944 and 1947, \$57 billion of it in 1946 alone. It is therefore dangerous to generalize; each situation must be judged in the light of the existing circumstances.

A sharp decline in military expenditures today would find not a backlog of deferred civilian demand but excess capacity already existing in civilian goods industries, and more than 5% of the labor force already unemployed. At the same time, the total drop in arms expenditures would not be nearly as great as after World War II. But what is particularly important is the fact that such a drop would also lay the basis for important offsetting effects, made possible by the freeing of the enormous sums previously spent on arms.

First of all, it would make possible very substantial tax cuts which would considerably raise consumer purchasing power. If the present arms budget were reduced to half—a cut of about \$23 billion—and half of this in turn were allocated to a cut in federal income taxes, it would reduce the total of these by nearly 20%. If the cut were confined to personal income taxes, it would reduce these by 30%. And if it were concentrated among the low-income groups, millions of workers would be freed of the payment of income taxes altogether. The resulting rise in purchasing power would provide a base

for a substantial growth of production and employment in the consumer goods industries, and help to absorb the men and women released from the armed forces and military production.

Second, the funds released could be used for productive purposes—education, health, housing, old age benefits, etc.—which would also serve to raise living standards and mass purchasing power, and to provide jobs. The cost of thirty missiles—about \$1 billion—would provide 200 hospitals or 100 power plants, and would make available many more jobs than would the production of the missiles. Less than 20% of present military appropriations would provide half a million houses a year, and employment for hundreds of thousands of workers in building and allied trades. In fact, the \$46 billion a year now going down the drain would be more than enough, in addition to a good-sized tax cut, to provide all the unfilled social needs outlined above, as well as to bring the economic level of the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers up to the national average.

Moreover, the huge sums now spent on military research could be used to finance research for useful purposes. A fraction of these expenditures invested in research on heart disease and cancer, for example, would go far toward eliminating these as the number one and number two killers they now are. The devel-

opment of peacetime uses of atomic energy would be greatly speeded up. And not least, the ending of the present secrecy of scientific and technical work would offer a tremendous stimulus to scientific advance.

Third, the money now used to ship arms abroad as "military aid" could be used for genuine economic assistance to undeveloped countries, in the form of long-term credits at low interest for the purpose of industrialization. This would raise living standards in these countries and provide greatly enlarged markets for American exports.

Fourth, the easing of world tensions which is the basis for disarmament would likewise open the doors to ending the embargo on trade with the socialist world. The potential volume of such trade is large enough to make it a factor of major importance to the American economy. In 1958, American exports to the Soviet Union amounted to less than \$5 million. Considering that the Soviet population is equal in size to those of Britain, France, West Germany, Italy and the Netherlands combined, if we were to export to it on the same basis as we now do to these five countries, the total value of such exports would be no less than \$3 billion a year. It is interesting to note that Cyrus Eaton has arrived at a similar estimate. If we add to this the potential volume of trade with People's China and the Eastern European people's democracies, the present volume of American ex-

ports could be augmented by at least one-third—an increase which would provide a considerable number of added jobs.

Summarizing these points in his speech to the United Nations, Premier Khrushchev concluded: "The claims that disarmament would bring on a crisis or economic recession in the highly developed industrial countries of the capitalist world are accordingly unfounded."

This is quite true. But by the same token, neither will disarmament eliminate crises, any more than arms economy will do so. The source of the boom-bust cycle lies much deeper in the economy, and neither arming nor disarming is a panacea against it.

Certainly, there is no assurance that disarmament will automatically give rise to a boom, as *Nation's Business* contends. With considerable excess productive capacity already existing, a big jump in consumer goods spending could be met with relatively little new investment. Apart from this, there is nothing automatic about the extent to which consumer purchasing power will be increased, nor about the realization of the beneficial effects of disarmament generally by the working people. Compelled to accommodate themselves to growing prospects of peace and a consequent growing inability to maintain an arms economy as the principal means of bolstering their profits, the monopolies will seek by other means to protect them at the expense of the

people. If there is to be a tax cut, they will strive to make sure it is they who get the benefit of it. If government funds are to be spent for purposes other than arms, they will demand they be spent so as to benefit big business. (A favorite measure is road-building, which is highly profitable in the construction end and, in the case of toll roads, in the operating end as well.) And they will fight tooth and nail against government spending for low-cost housing or public power projects, as infringing on the sacred domain of private enterprise. At the same time, they will call upon the workers to sacrifice and work harder in the name of meeting an alleged Soviet economic "threat." The working people can benefit from disarmament, therefore, only to the extent that they are successful in fighting to do so.

Of course, in some areas where war industries are predominant (especially where large aircraft plants are the chief source of jobs), disarmament would create problems of unemployment, at least temporarily. In some cases (for example, aluminum or electronics), the product can be used for peacetime purposes with little or no conversion, given an expansion of civilian markets; other industries such as aircraft, however, would either have to convert to new products or drastically curtail operations.

For the workers in such areas, there would indeed be serious difficulties. But these would not be new.

Such problems already exist as a consequence of the decline of employment in some industries such as coal mining, and of decentralization and runaway plants. These have given rise to depressed areas marked by chronic unemployment, areas whose number is growing even with large-scale military expenditures. Furthermore, employment in certain key war industries is falling despite rising arms budgets. For example, the growing weight given to missile production—an experimental and pilot operation which absorbs many dollars but few production workers—has meant a drop in orders for conventional aircraft, and in employment in the aircraft industry. Thus, from the last quarter of 1956 to May, 1959, the number employed fell by 117,000 or nearly 14%. And this number has been further swelled as a result of recent large cancellations of military orders.

These situations require a program of government assistance for the rehabilitation of industry and for public works in such areas, as well as increased unemployment compensation, debt and mortgage moratoriums, job retraining, assistance in relocation and other measures designed to aid the workers affected and their families. Such a program is needed now, and measures of this kind are in fact being advocated by organized labor today. With disarmament it could be more readily carried out, since some of the money saved on arms could be used for the

purpose. Certainly, these problems would be no less capable of solution in a peacetime economy than in a war economy—to the extent that they can be resolved at all in a capitalist economy.

Problems would also be created by the sudden addition to the civilian labor force of some 3 million men and women released from the armed forces. Here, the payment of unemployment benefits to such veterans, along the lines of the 52-20 payments after World War II, would help materially to meet the situation.

Not least, special steps are needed to aid the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers, who, being last hired and first fired, would be subjected to special hardship.

In addition, some assistance would have to be given to small business enterprises affected, in the form of tax credits or financial aid.

These things, too, will not be won without a struggle. In short, disarmament will not abolish the contradictions of capitalism. It will not remedy the basic instability of the American economy and the growing insecurity of American workers. It will not of itself bring about a Utopia in which jobs and prosperity are assured.

However, this in no way negates its enormous import for the American working people. Disarmament will remove the principal obstacle to reduction of taxes and improvement of social welfare. It will vastly increase the possibilities of winning

major economic and social advances and of realizing in some measure the tremendous promise held forth by modern science and technology. If we add to this the incalculable blessing of living in freedom from the fear of nuclear war, as well as the eradication of the reactionary atmosphere of war hysteria, intimidation and repression of the cold war years, there can be no doubt that, whatever profit an arms economy may bring to big business, the working people are infinitely better off without it.

Nor is this confined to the United States alone. Disarmament is a world process, and on a world scale it can pave the way for a far-reaching transformation. In his outstanding book, *World Without War*, the eminent British scientist J. D. Bernal states: "It is not only possible but practicable to raise the standard of living of all the world, within a generation, to that enjoyed by the people in the most favored countries today." This, he says, requires "one proviso . . . that war is avoided. Not only must there be no fighting but something must be done stop the present state of continuous war preparation and threats of war, a waste of human resources and human intelligence that is holding back the whole development of science itself and blocking its useful application."

DISARMAMENT NOT ASSURED

But it is not only the benefits of

disarmament which must be fought for. Though disarmament has become a central issue, the fight to achieve it still lies ahead. Even the initial steps are yet to be won.

To be sure, there is a body of sentiment which takes disarmament with some seriousness. For example, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey recently stated that he believes the Soviet leadership is serious in its proposals, and that we must make preparations so that disarmament will not cause a setback. But the fact is that the cold war has not been abandoned, and this means in the main a continuation of pressures for big arms budgets.

For the past several years, arms expenditures have been rising; since 1959, they have gone up at an average rate of about \$1.4 billion a year (from \$39.1 billion in 1955 to an average annual rate of \$46 billion in the first three quarters of 1959). And this in the face of repeated declarations by Eisenhower that military expenditures were to be held down.

At the same time, there has been extensive pressure for still greater increases. A report of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, issued last year, calls for a rate of increase of \$3 billion a year for the next several years. The unpublished Gaither Report projected a rise to \$65 billion a year by 1963. Still other proposals envisaged a rise within the next few years to outlays of as much as \$75 billion annually.

In this, the top Democratic Party

leadership has joined. Thus, in mid-1959 the Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee urged a program adding up to \$3 billion more per year. ("The Military Forces We Need and How to Get Them," *Democratic Digest*, July, 1959). An equal clamor has gone up from the top labor leadership which, like the Democratic Party spokesmen, has repeatedly charged the Eisenhower Administration with sacrificing the country's defense. So, too, have liberal economists like Leon Keyserling, whose proposed "National Prosperity Budget" includes provision for greatly enhanced arms outlays. (Conference on Economic Progress, *Inflation: Cause and Cure*, June, 1959.)

Nor have these pressures lessened since the Khrushchev visit. The Democratic Advisory Council, in a policy statement issued December 7, urges the establishment and maintenance of "deterrent military powers of such character that the Sino-Soviet leaders will have no doubt that an attack on the United States would surely be followed by their own destruction." The most recent Rockefeller Brothers Fund report (*The Mid-Century Challenge to U. S. Foreign Policy*), also issued in December, again calls for continuation of the arms race. And the position of the labor leadership and the liberal economists remains unchanged.

The Eisenhower proposals, on the other hand, call not for cuts in military expenditures, but merely for

keeping them at present levels. And even this, in large measure, is little more than propaganda looking toward the 1960 elections. As James Reston puts it (*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 13, 1959): "The Administration has embarked on a 'peace program' and does not want to coincide with increased military expenditures. It is talking disarmament. *It wants to go into the 1960 presidential political campaign as the party of 'peace and fiscal responsibility.'*" (emphasis added). In practice, Eisenhower, as in the past, proves not altogether averse to proposed increases. Thus, he recently yielded to pressures from the State Department and Pentagon for higher foreign military aid appropriations.

In the main, the road to peace continues to be viewed as lying in arming ourselves to the teeth for the indefinite future. For large sections of big business, this is, of course, the road to greater profits as well, both here and abroad. American arms manufacturers today are pouring large sums into reviving the West German arms industries. Relying on a continued policy of rearming that country as Wall Street's chief European outpost, companies like General Electric, American Motors, Lockheed, General Dynamics, to name but a few, are buying heavily into West German firms with arms contracts. Similarly, American corporations are profiting from the current rearming of Japan.

On the whole, the idea of disarma-

ment of any serious kind continues to be looked upon as something unreal. *N. Y. Times* writer, Hanson W. Baldwin, frankly regards it as "pie in the sky." He wrote (Nov. 8, 1959): ". . . the agreements so far lie largely in the realm of semantics and of pious hopes, and the disagreements are of fundamental substantive importance. Despite almost fifteen years of effort, there has been no progress in the limitation of arms, much less in 'universal disarmament.'"

He went on to say that, ". . . Mr. Khrushchev's glittering goal of 'universal and complete' disarmament is a mirage, a psychological come-on."

The cold-war mentality dies hard. Just as there are as yet no serious moves toward actual reduction of arms, so also is there no sign of easing the restrictions on American-Soviet trade.

Last June, Premier Khrushchev made a bid for the purchase of \$100,000,000 worth of American chemical and other industrial equipment, an offer he repeated during his visit. The offer was rejected by Eisenhower when it was first made, and again after Khrushchev's visit.

Nelson Rockefeller has chimed in with a demand that the Soviet Union be required to "comply with Western trading rules" as a condition for trade—to pay in hard currencies and to "stop dumping goods" abroad. In November the Commerce Department refused export licenses for the sale of \$15.6 million worth of

stainless steel to the Soviet Union, as well as nearly \$177,000 worth of chemicals. The Manufacturing Chemists Association flatly rejected the Soviet bid to buy chemical plants and processes, part of the \$100 million offer, because this would allegedly give the Soviet Union the advantage of valuable technological shortcuts.

Clearly, here too the cold-war mentality prevails. The fight for restoration of trade, like that for disarmament, is yet to be won.

FIGHT FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

If any real advance is to be made in the direction of disarmament, therefore, the extensive sentiment for it among the American people must find organized expression, reflecting the widest unity of all who desire peace and an end to the arms race. Above all, the main leadership of organized labor must be brought to abandon its present suicidal policy of aggressive promotion of cold-war policies and repeated demands for bigger arms budgets.

At the same time, it is necessary to expose the hoax so long perpetrated on American workers, that arms production is the answer to unemployment, and to launch a fight for economic alternatives to the arms economy. Of primary importance is lifting the embargo on trade with the socialist countries and the widest expansion of such trade. It is also essential to project now a program

calling for tax reductions for those in the low income brackets, for plans for a vast expansion of social welfare of those subjected to loss of jobs and income in the process of reducing arms production, and especially of the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers. Finally, it is necessary to project the perspective of an economy of total disarmament—an economy directed toward the realization of the vast potential which peace and disarmament would make possible.

To be sure, the full realization of this potential requires more than the ending of war; it requires the victory of socialism. But the fight for peace and total disarmament can lead to very substantial improvements in the lot of the working class. And the grand vista of total, universal disarmament in the space of four years, opened up by Khrushchev in his United Nations speech, offers a shining goal for which to fight. In such a fight, we Communists must be found in the very front ranks.

We have just received from the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow, an English translation of K. M. Bykov's *The Cerebral Cortex and the Internal Organs*. This is the major work produced by the world-famous disciple of Pavlov, the translation being from the third (1954) Russian edition. Of great interest is the fact that the translator is the Harvard Professor, Robert Hodes, who, both in this labor of love and in his warm introductory note, contributes greatly to the best traditions of scientific internationalism and, quite explicitly, to the need for terminating the Cold War. The book contains, also, a 38-page bibliography listing all the published writings of K. M. Bykov and his leading co-workers—*The Editor*.

Civil Liberties and the Communist Party

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

THE CHRONOLOGY OF RECENT political repressive legislation began when the House Committee on Un-American Activities was set up in 1938 under the chairmanship of Congressman Martin Dies of Texas. The alleged purpose of this committee was defined as follows: "To investigate the extent, character and objects of Un-American propaganda activities in the United States and to investigate the diffusion within the U.S. of subversive and Un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our constitution and to aid Congress in remedial legislation." While fascist agents and pro-Nazi activities infested our country prior to Pearl Harbor, this committee not only failed to investigate them but actually worked in collusion with them. Congressman Samuel Dickstein, speaking on the floor of Congress in 1941, charged: "One

hundred and ten fascist organizations in the United States have had and now have the key to the back door of the Un-American Activities Committee."

"Communist activities" were the target of this inquisitorial junketing committee from its inception. One of the first to be judged in contempt of this committee was Eugene Dennis (then General Secretary of the Communist Party), who was arrested in 1947 and served a year sentence in 1950. In a ringing statement, which the Committee refused to hear, he challenged the legality of the Committee on four counts—its use of the term "Un-American," which is unknown to law; its usurpation of police power; its interference in union elections and political campaigns; and the composition of the committee, which included then Rankin of Mississippi where 550,000 eligible Negro citizens were denied the vote. The arguments put forth by Eugene Dennis in April, 1947, remain valid against this committee today. Even as I write the press announces the conviction of Sydney Turoff, a Buffalo steel worker, for

contempt. Although he co-operated with the Committee in other respects, he refused as a former Communist to name members he had associated with in the Party.

The committee has hounded and harassed thousands of American shop workers, union leaders, scientists, actors, ministers, reporters, government workers. Many have been blacklisted, lost employment, and been imprisoned. I am sure its long and disgraceful career of repression is well known to our readers. The U. S. Supreme Court decision in the Watson case, which is a historic rebuke to this committee, has laid the basis for a large-scale campaign in 1960, to abolish it, even though the court retreated later in the Barenblatt and Uphaus decisions. Professor Lloyd Barenblatt is serving a six months' sentence in Washington, D. C., at present and Dr. Willard Uphaus has gone to a New Hampshire prison for one year. Some thirty more people are now in danger of going to prison for contempt of Congress as a result of refusing to answer this committee, under the First Amendment. It sends one or two of its members around the country to hold "hearings." Scores of subpoenas are issued, as in California to 110 school teachers and more recently in New York City and Puerto Rico, to 150 people. However, the proposed hearings were abandoned in California and the committee met with stormy protests in Puerto Rico. There is a

rising tide of opposition to the antics of this outfit.

The U. S. Supreme Court said in setting aside the Watkins contempt decision: "*It would be difficult to imagine a less explicit authorizing resolution. Who can define the meaning of Un-American?*" It stated further: "*We have no doubt that there is no congressional power to expose for the sake of exposure,*" and it characterized the committee's inquiry as "*a broad scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens.*" At the opening of the 86th Congress a petition was submitted by a group of distinguished Americans, to abolish this committee, which it characterizes as "habitually misusing its mandate, in unconstitutional ways for political purposes; as an agency of repression; as usurping the functions of the executive and judicial branches of government—a law unto itself, making its own definition of 'Un-American.'"

Questions have been raised as to the propriety of using the Fifth Amendment before such committees, although the Watkins opinion states: "The Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination was frequently invoked and recognized as a legal limit upon the authority of a committee to require a witness to answer its questions." Witnesses before this committee have properly invoked the First, Fifth, and sometimes the Sixth Amendment (relative to being con-

fronted by one's accusers). They are not contradictory. The use of the Fifth Amendment is to deny such a committee information it has no right to ask as to one's personal views; it is to protect oneself from becoming an informer against others on their views and activities; it is to protect oneself and others from possible prosecution under the thought-control Smith and McCarran Acts; and from contempt jailings by this illegal committee. The refusal to answer questions here, on one's political views, affiliations or activities, has no implication of criminal guilt. Rather it is based on the conviction of innocence and the need of a constitutional protection against the invasion of one's rights or against frame-up. Professor Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, sums it up well: "We may better understand the importance of the Fifth Amendment by considering what not having it would mean."

"To use the committee as a forum"—as the argument goes—is not to fight and expose the committee. It is to enmesh oneself in a web of difficulties. One could start very boldly to say, "Yes, I am a Communist." Of course no one is ashamed of it. But a series of eager pressing questions follow—as to organizational set-ups, many names of people, places of meetings, officials of clubs, finances, friends, and what have you. The one who disdains the Fifth Amendment is truly in a serious predicament and must refuse to an-

swer, after all, but by then he has waived the right to invoke it.

THE ALIEN

REGISTRATION ACT, 1940

This law was passed by Congress with what Professor Chafee called a sneak attack on the Bill of Rights, in a rider later known as the Smith Act. The Registration Act, so-called "security measure," forced three and a half million foreign-born residents to register, to be fingerprinted, and to report changes of address. The majority are workers, many employed in basic industries, who have been here for years, some practically all their lives. Many are elderly people with families, whose sons and daughters were in the armed forces, civilian defense and war industries, during World War II. But their contributions to winning the war were speedily forgotten after 1945. Wholesale arrests and deportations began again, as in the 1920's. Naturalization, always a cumbersome and difficult process, was refused to long-time residents, suspected of Left views. Attempts to revoke citizenship hang like a sword over the heads of eleven million naturalized Americans. Twelve million sons and daughters of foreign-born parents are troubled as to the possible fate of their loved ones. Repeated unsuccessful attempts from 1936 on were made to cancel the citizenship of Harry Bridges, labor leader. Cancel-

lation of the citizenship of William Schneiderman, Pacific Coast Communist leader, was refused by the U. S. Supreme Court in 1940, in an historic decision. I will refer later to the Walter-McCarran Act against the foreign-born. The attack against them continues under it in 1960.

THE SMITH ACT OF 1940

In the last few minutes before the House voted on the Alien Registration Act, Congressman Smith of Virginia proposed an addition to it. It was passed without a committee hearing or any debate. It lay dormant for many years. It was used once during World War II against an anti-war and Trotskyist, group in Minneapolis, Minn., who were sent to prison. This is what is called the Smith Act. The gist of it is in the conspiracy section which penalizes "to conspire to teach and advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence when and if circumstances permit." Another paragraph penalizes membership in any organization which so teaches and advocates. With the development of the cold war and the rise of McCarthyism in our country, the Smith Act became a major weapon to attempt to smash the Communist Party, which vigorously fought both of these manifestations of reaction in our country. Twelve top leaders of the Communist Party were arrested in 1948, under the Smith Act.

William Z. Foster was severed because of illness. They were indicted twice—for conspiracy and also for membership. The latter indictments, now twelve years old, are still pending. Thirteen stool pigeons testified against them before a prejudiced judge and jury. After their conviction, the Appellate Court in its adverse decision referred to "the Berlin air-lift" and "Korea" as evidence of a clear and present danger. The Supreme Court refused to review the evidence or the trial procedure. It upheld the Smith Act. Seven men went to prison for five years at that time, Dennis, Davis, Winter, Williamson, Potash, Stachel, and Gates. Four became political refugees, three of whom, Gil Green, Henry Winston, and Robert Thompson, are still imprisoned. Gus Hall has also served his sentence.

In addition to the first Foley Square Smith Act victims, two women and four men from Baltimore and three women and eight men from the second New York trial also served prison sentences. Two others later won new trials, after confession of perjury by witness Matusow, making a total of 26 who have served prison terms under the Smith Act. The stories of these trials must some day be written, particularly revealing the outrageous and prejudiced conduct of Judge Medina, in relation to the defendants personally and his role as a chief prosecutor. The acceptance on the jury of Russell Janney, who had made a speech shortly

before in Macon, Georgia, urging a "fight to the death against communism" and the star role of stool pigeons, including one who had recruited members of his family to the Party and then reported them to the F.B.I.—all this should be highlighted. But the deeper implication was well put by Eugene Dennis, on the eve of their imprisonment in July, 1951, as follows: "*We warn the American people that reaction here, as in Germany, will not stop with the Communists. Reaction will try to exploit this decision not only to suppress the Communists but to smash the trade-unions, sharpen the terror against the Negro people, and stifle the growing peace movement.*" Many thought we Communists exaggerated because we were under attack. This decision not only caused untold damage to democratic rights here but to our country's reputation abroad. A whole series of repressions, arrests, trials, jailings, deportations, loyalty tests, dismissals from employment, contempt and perjury charges, effected thousands far beyond the ranks of the Communist Party. Truer words were never spoken than by Eugene Dennis. It came to pass and is not yet checked and defeated, as this article attempts to point out.

The years 1948 to date have seen fourteen Smith Act cases, in addition to the first at Foley Square, putting the Party under great harrassment and expense. In 1957 a break came, through a Supreme Court decision

reversing the California case on the grounds of lack of evidence of conspiracy or overt acts. "The Smith Act is a shambles," declared a judge ruefully as he dismissed the California case. In addition to California, Smith Act appeals were finally dismissed in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Eastern Pennsylvania, Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, Puerto Rico, Hawaii and Washington State. But the Colorado case still remains on appeal, after a re-trial, with charges pending against a prejudiced juror.

All the original Foley Square defendants, top Communist leaders, remain indicted from 1948 under the membership clause of the Smith Act, except Williamson and Potash who were dismissed for deportation. This leaves William Z. Foster, now Chairman Emeritus of the Communist Party, at the age of 79 and seriously ill, still facing two federal indictments under the conspiracy and the membership sections of the Smith Act. Foster's attorney, Mrs. Mary Kaufman, has fought valiantly for the dismissal of these twelve-year-old charges but so far unsuccessfully. The court-appointed doctors agree that Foster could not survive a trial and the government cannot try him. But his right to travel is limited by the bail requirements, so he cannot leave the Southern District of New York without permission and is denied the right to travel abroad. It is a cruel and vindictive attitude by the government. He is

virtually under house arrest. He has invitations from Socialist countries to come for special and free medical treatment for his condition.

In addition, quite a few of the Smith Act defendants are under deportation proceedings. Claudia Jones, who lived here since childhood, was deported to England on her release from prison in 1955.

Besides the Smith Act defendants, others confronted with membership charges, are at present awaiting a Supreme Court decision on the validity of this section, which will be argued shortly in the joint appeal of Junius Scales of North Carolina and John Noto of Buffalo. Already convicted but also at liberty on bail are Claude Lightfoot of Chicago, John Hellman of Montana and Albert Blumberg, tried in Philadelphia. Lightfoot has been called for retrial on April 21, 1960. Others under indictment but not yet tried include Mike Russo of Boston and Max Weiss of New York. If this section of the Smith Act is upheld by the U. S. Supreme Court a dangerous precedent will be established. We may see many others charged with membership. It can quickly become a dragnet from coast to coast. The Smith Act raids can start over again!

The last three of the original Smith Act group still in prison are Henry Winston at Terre Haute, Indiana; Gilbert Green at Leavenworth, Kansas, and Robert Thompson at Atlanta, Georgia. Winston has nearly three years, Green over two and

Thompson nearly a year, to serve. Review on the contempt charges, which added several years to their original Smith Act sentences, was denied by the Supreme Court. Parole has twice been denied to Green and Winston, and just recently denied to Thompson. Pleas addressed to President Eisenhower are pigeonholed in the Department of Justice office. But the campaign for their release, except in Chicago and the Bronx, has not been adequate. Amnesty appeals in '55 signed by Mrs. Roosevelt and others and in '58 by Thomas, Niebuhr, Muste and other liberals, are the highlights thus far. A group of six French intellectuals, including Louis Aragon, Joliot-Curie, Picasso, presented an appeal to President Eisenhower in Paris, on December 18, 1957, on behalf of Green and Winston, but to no avail. That this is discrimination against *politicals*, especially Communists, is evidenced by the figures on prisoners released on parole. The *Capital-Times* of Madison, Wisconsin, called attention to the fact that 75 percent of embezzlers, 31 percent of white slavers, 37 percent of kidnapers and 31 percent of narcotics violators, were granted parole by the same board.

The special feature to appeal on behalf of Robert Thompson is his state of health, due to wounds received during World War II, and a murderous attack on him in the Federal House of Detention in New York City, while awaiting transportation to prison, which fractured his

skull and has left permanent injury. He originally received a three-year sentence, instead of five meted out to the others, because of his outstanding war record. But Judge Noonan added a year more than the sentences of Winston and Green to even it up.

The human sufferings due to the impact of the Smith Act, especially on families, cannot be forgotten. Deaths caused directly and indirectly by the trials and imprisonment occurred in the loss of Israel Amter, Marion Bachrach, Andrew Onda, William Sentner of St. Louis, William Pennock of Seattle, and Edward Strong, indicted in Boston.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW, 1947

This vicious anti-labor law is responsible for the use of the injunction against the half million striking steel workers, in 1959, ordering them back to work. I will not here deal with its main target, the trade unions, but the effects of a specific clause, known as 9H, which called for non-Communist affidavits from any trade union officials who negotiated for their unions with the N.L.R.B.

It has resulted in a series of arrests and trials, one of which is proceeding, as I write, of a group of officials of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, at Denver, Colorado. At the end of the government's case, two defendants were

released for lack of evidence, Asbury Howard of Alabama and Jack C. Marcotti of Arizona. Nine others remain on trial on a charge of conspiracy to file false affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board. The principal stoolpigeon witness against them is Fred Gardner, a former U.E. organizer, who testified in a similar Taft-Hartley conspiracy trial in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1958. Two trade-union officials and four members of the Communist Party, including Hyman Lumer, (National Educational Director of the Communist Party), were convicted and sentenced to prison terms of eighteen months. Their sentences are now on appeal. Other Taft-Hartley cases involved Maurice Travis, also an ex-Mine, Mill official in Denver, who was sentenced to eight years; Hugh Bryson, an ex-official of the Marine Cooks, who served a minimum of his five-year sentence and is now on parole, and A. A. Fisher, a member of the Woodworkers Union of Seattle, Washington, who is serving a five-year sentence at McNeil's Island, Washington. On December 14th the Supreme Court decided adversely in the case of Walter C. Lohman, Jr., of Dayton, Ohio, officer of a U.E. local there. He is sentenced to five years, charged with filing a false non-Communist affidavit in 1949, under the Taft-Hartley Law. This provision of the Taft-Hartley Law has now been repealed by a worse anti-labor law, signed by President Eisen-

hower September 14, 1959, ten years later, but imprisonments continue under it.

Prosecutions under this section of the Taft-Hartley Law and those that undoubtedly will arise now under the Landrum-Griffin Law, establish a new use of the conspiracy law against Communists and others. Trials are much simpler than under the Smith Act. No elaborate show of theories, books, articles or speeches, is required. An atmosphere of a criminal proceeding is more easily invoked around the charge of perjury. The unsupported word of a discredited stoolpigeon can be sufficient to send men and women of the labor movement to prison.

INTERNAL SECURITY ACT, 1950

The above is the so-called McCarran Act. Under its provisions the Communist Party and twelve other organizations have been cited before the Subversive Activities Control Board, set up under it to investigate organizations and designate those who should be ordered to register as either "Communist action" or "Communist front organizations." This monstrous piece of legislation originated in the Mundt-Nixon bill of 1948. It has built into it outrageous definitions and so-called "facts" which by decree it declares as part of the law, thereby also creating a built-in verdict of guilt on the part of anyone who would register under it. It is the Big Lie written into law.

One would be pleading guilty to being a part of a world-wide conspiracy which (quote) "by treachery, deceit, infiltration, espionage, sabotage, terrorism would establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world." It would be worse than pleading guilty to the Smith Act.

It states further that the Communist-action organizations are under the direction and control of a foreign country to which they owe their allegiance, that they resort to espionage and sabotage, are controlled by foreign agents—all calculated to overthrow the government of the U.S.A. by force and violence. A Communist front is one that does not deviate in matters of policy from the Communist action—in other words if an organization advocates the same things that the Communists advocate—peace, rights of labor, rights of the Negro people, etc.—it is in danger of being so labelled and called upon to register. On this specious theory the Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the Civil Rights Congress and others, some of which became defunct as a result, were cited by the Board. An order to register would practically outlaw any organization that either complies or refuses. Not to register is punishable by a ten thousand dollar fine and ten years' imprisonment for each day that the refusal continues—or a life sentence.

Since November, 1950, the Communist Party has challenged the constitutionality of what Attorney John Abt has called "an enabling act for American fascism." It has resolutely defended its constitutional rights and legal status, in the lengthiest litigation ever carried on in the District of Columbia. It has participated in the hearings of the S.A.C.B. under the sharpest protest. In so doing it has spearheaded the fight for the rights of all others, since no organization can be called upon to register as a Communist front until the Communist action organization is established.

In 1955 when the issue first reached the Supreme Court it was returned for further hearings on the grounds that some of the government's informer witnesses were "tainted." In fact by 1959 out of a lengthy array only two were left, and the major one, Budenz, had suffered a stroke and could not be cross-examined on the notes of his interviews which the F.B.I. were reluctantly compelled to produce, under the Jenkins decision and which they had previously denied existed. The U. S. Court of Appeals upheld the much shorn decision of the Board on the grounds that there is a Communist Party in the U.S.A. and "there is a Communist Party in Europe based upon Marxism-Leninism and in power in the Soviet Union," therefore they are identical! So the issue is now before the Supreme Court again. It may be decided this

year or next, after argumentation before and deliberation by the court. One cannot hazard an opinion on the outcome, if we depend solely upon the Supreme Court, which vacillates, as Arnold F. Robler pointed out in his article in *Political Affairs* (November, 1958) on "The Supreme Court and Democracy." He wrote: "The inescapable fact is that the constitutional rights and liberties of labor, the Negro people and the Communists will stand or fall together," which is another way of saying what Justice Jackson once remarked: "The rights of all are tied up in the same bundle with the Communists."

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION ACT, 1952

The above, known as the Walter-McCarran Act, was passed to put teeth in the earlier law of 1940. The Department of Immigration was once a part of the Department of Labor. Now it is a part of the Department of Justice—a transfer which indicates the changed status of the foreign-born, as suspect persons to be spied upon. A retired Army General, Joseph M. Swing, is the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. On June 17, 1954, his agents rounded up Mexicans, citizens and non-citizens, in a shameful manner. The hundreds of cases in which foreign-born Americans have been perse-

cuted is shown by that of William Heikkela, a Finnish-born, San Francisco draftsman. On April 15, 1958 he was kidnapped by immigration authorities and flown to Helsinki. A public clamor here and abroad, in the press, on the radio and television and in Congress forced his return at government expense. The court proceedings around him were not yet finished when he was snatched up and it is still pending in the Court of Appeals. Meanwhile the Immigration Service started new proceedings and a new order was issued excluding him from this country as an illegal incoming alien when he was flown back. General Swing had vowed to deport Heikkela "if it takes from now till I get kicked out." The sooner the better! The American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born has done a magnificent job over the last quarter of a century.

OUTLAW ACT

This weird proposal, made in 1954 by Senator Humphrey, to outlaw the Communist Party, declared however that membership is not a crime. No attempt has been made to enforce it. Indirect effects are the refusal of meeting halls and office space in many cities, that Communist candidates are barred from the ballot, that radio and TV time cannot be purchased, that there is harrassment of individuals by the F.B.I., Communists are hounded in employ-

ment, and children of Communists are harrassed in schools and colleges.

LABOR MANAGEMENT REPORTING DISCLOSURE ACT

This toughest anti-labor law yet enacted, passed in 1959, is called the Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy Act by Congress and the Killer Law by organized labor. It puts the unions directly under government control. The section that replaces 9H of the Taft-Hartley Act lumps Communists and criminals together and bars from union office anyone either convicted of a crime or being a member of the Communist Party for five years past. Acceptance of office in violation of the law or union officers knowingly permitting such violations, are subject to one year in prison and \$10,000 fine or both. The law is retroactive.

The first challenge to this red-baiting comes from the International Longshoremen and Warehouse Workers Union, headed by Harry Bridges, which refused to undertake "any such burdensome and oppressive inquisition" as demanded by Secretary of Labor Mitchell. Many other unions are extremely critical of the Act and some real challenge of this fascist-like control of unions is assured.

WHAT HAPPENS IN 1960?

In a speech in New York City in January 1958, Senator Eastland of

Mississippi said: "The time has come when the Supreme Court must be curbed and bridled. It is the greatest menace to domestic security and tranquillity." In pursuance of this purpose, he and others have introduced seven bills in the Senate, endorsed by the American Bar Association. They propose, in brief, to expand the Smith Act; to reinstate supervisory parole over persons subject to deportation; to withhold passports for political reasons; to tighten up loyalty screenings of government employees; to invalidate the Nelson decision under Pennsylvania law, and to revive state sedition laws. These proposals will come before Congress in 1960. Over 300 Negro leaders in 18 southern and border states have gone on record against reviving the state sedition laws which they state "under the guise of fighting subversion could be used against Negro and white southerners working for integration." They called upon all Negro organizations to help defeat this bill.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE

IN 1960

This article is just a reminder of the state of affairs in the civil liberties field. Much more could be

elaborated upon and should be from time to time. No matter how tensions relax internationally we cannot take for granted that reaction will let up on the home front in its attacks on labor, the Negro people and the Communist Party. The contrary is true. Continuous struggle is necessary, through organized effort. The setting up of local committees or task forces to fight for civil liberties such as now exist in Chicago, in the Bronx and in some other places, is required. The fight for all the legal rights of the Communist Party, is a test of democracy. A sustained effort for amnesty for Green, Winston, and Thompson as well as joining in efforts on behalf of Sobell and all imprisoned Taft-Hartley victims, is a prime duty. To continue the struggle to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, the Smith Act, the McCarran and Walter-McCarran Act and the anti-labor laws, is a must. To stop all deportations, demand the dismissal of membership indictments under the Smith Act, and to secure the full freedom of William Z. Foster, also takes precedence. *Defend the Bill of Rights* is the all-over slogan for the full restoration of civil liberties in 1960. Let's get to work!

Our Party and the World Communist Movement*

By James E. Jackson

Member of the Secretariat, of the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.

Forty-two years ago in the desert of a war-wracked capitalist world, a tender sprout burst through the barren earth. The first land of workers' rule came into being.

The first act of its government of workers and peasants—led by the Bolsheviks and headed by the great Lenin—was to proclaim peace to the world and declare its goal to be the establishment of a truly just society free of exploitation of man by man, without oppressed or oppressors, a society wholly dedicated to the abundant satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of mankind, that is—a socialist, a communist society.

The class-conscious among the workers of the whole world looked upon this heroic sprout with wonder and ardent sympathy. All of their own dreams and aspirations seemed to rest on the outcome of its he-

roically brave and brutally unequal struggle for life. They watered it with their own tears of pride and joy and hope.

And so it was, for over three decades, far-seeing and militant American workers—we Communists in the first place—did what we could to defend the right of the first working peoples' state on earth, the U.S.R.R., to live.

Then, in years past, by working for peace and friendship, we endeavored to help relieve the plight of the young Soviet Union's hungry and hard-pressed millions of toilers.

Now, in our day, we Communists are still crusading for peace and friendship with the Soviet Union. What is the difference between *the then* and *the now* of our continuing work for peace and friendship with the Soviet Union?

Then, in the early days, it was mainly a matter of international solidarity, rendering assistance to hard-

pressed class brothers of another country, a kind of "strike relief" activity, so to speak.

Today, the central significance of our struggle in the cause of peace and friendship with the Soviet Union is more than a matter of international workingclass solidarity, more than a question of discharging moral obligations of world proletarian solidarity. It is, in the first place, an imperative necessity for serving the most urgent and broadest national self-interest. To promote understanding, peace and friendship with the great Soviet Union, the Chinese Peoples Republic and the whole rich and flourishing socialist world, is to serve the best self-interest of our own working class, our own people, our own nation!

As Soviet-American friendship is the cornerstone for the upbuilding of the peace of the world, so it is the rockbed foundation for the hopeful present and future well-being of our own people. Indeed, in promoting peace and friendship with the Soviet Union—mighty representative and symbol of the whole new world in being and continually developing—we serve both the immediate and long-term goals of our own class and we serve the whole nation's best interest.

Comrades, from the greetings we read yesterday and today, you are already aware that our Party is being showered with lovely and heart-warming bouquets of beautiful words, soul-stirring messages of mili-

tant solidarity and fraternity in the fight for peace and disarmament, progress and socialism from the Communist and Workers parties the world over. Our well-wishers are the representatives of 34 million Communists of 84 countries of North and South America, Europe, Africa and Asia, from the lands of socialism and the fighting working classes of the remaining capitalist countries. On our part, we wish to express to the Communist parties in the socialist countries where the working class is in power, and to the Communist and Workers' parties throughout the world, our gratitude and deep appreciation for these expressions of solidarity which they have so generously manifested toward us in their greetings!

What a marked contrast this is with the situation that prevailed at the time of our last convention! As you recall, comrades, at our last convention the prestige of our Party was not at peak level in the eyes of Marxists in our own Party or in the other Communist parties in the world. There was grave concern on the part of all the fraternal parties as to the phenomenon that was occurring within our party. At that time we faced the strident revisionist challenge to the whole concept of the unity of the workers of the world in the cause of the advancement of humanity and the progress of the peoples. There was an appeal to a special kind of isolationism—a peculiar kind of American inde-

* Speech, at 17th Convention of the Communist Party of the United States.

pendence of world working-class ties of fraternity and bonds of mutual relationship. Since the 16th Convention, the National Executive Committee and Comrade Gene Dennis in particular, have done much to change this situation. We can report, comrades, that the greetings read at this Convention are added testimony to the fact that between the 16th Convention and the present 17th Convention our party has grown in prestige in the eyes of our own class and of the world Marxist movement. Our struggle to advance the cause of peace, democracy and socialism is duly regarded and appreciated. If in the past, ties were weakened and in some places severed with our friendly brother parties and organizations of working people around the world, in this intervening period a whole number of developments have occurred to put an end to such alienation. Our Party takes great pride in the fact that it was able to be represented on the guest list of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Third Congress of the Polish United Workers Party, the Seventh Convention of the Communist Party of Canada. We take pride in the tours of our communist journalists to Europe, to Canada, to Latin America and so on. This is not simply a matter of ties between Communists, but it is a part of a welcome, happy, new development that is characteristic of our day, in which new thousands of average

Americans are journeying beyond our borders and developing friendships with the workers and the people of the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries. This new movement of tourism strengthens the bonds of understanding which are a foundation for peace and co-existence. Our comrades are also taking part in this development and it has resulted in greatly enhancing the understanding and appreciation of the Communist Party of the USA in the eyes of the people of the whole world.

Comrades, traditionally our class enemy—even some of our non-Party colleagues—have sought to misrepresent and abuse us when we hold forth the banner of solidarity and internationalism. They try to represent this as some kind of an “agency” relationship to Moscow. They represent this as some kind of puppet status of American Communists. They try to suggest that working-class international solidarity is somehow diabolical. We hold to the conception of Abraham Lincoln that “the closest bonds, outside of the family relationship, are those which bind the workers of the world.” More than this, the conception of the internationalism of the working people is now extended to the internationalism of the people everywhere who realize their common stake in the struggle for the preservation of peace and ensuring world-wide prosperity. Today internationalism is a popular thing. To a certain extent

it is understood and voiced by no less a personage than Eisenhower himself. Only yesterday he called for exchange of students by the thousands of not only the colonial people and the Americans, but between the American people and the Soviet peoples!

* * *

But what is the precise relationship between the Communist Party of the United States and the Communist parties of other countries? There are ties and there is independence. It is important that we understand this relationship and that we help to lay the ghost of the false charge of “foreign agents” that again and again the capitalist press drags into print. The Communist Party in the United States is linked to the Communist parties and the vanguard parties of the working people in every country in the world by common ideological precepts — all Communists everywhere stand on the foundation of a common ideology. They are linked with the workers parties of the whole world on the basis of a common aspiration for the earliest realization of that flowering, joyful era of mankind which we Marxists call Communism. This common goal and aspiration which communist and advanced workers in all countries pursue, is the second tie that binds us one to the other in a special kind of fraternity. But *there is no organizational or operational identity or tie-*

up between Communist parties— neither between our Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, nor between any of the parties of the world. We have always proclaimed and demonstrated to reasonable people that our Party has its first and primary allegiance to our nation and above all to our own class. And it is in the pursuit of the maximum happiness for our class and our nation, its struggle against those who would demean the nation and oppress the class, that the Communist Party of the United States conducts its activities and defines its policy. We do not live on Mars—we live in one world that is constantly shrinking. The indissoluble linkage between the national and the international interest is an objective reality. Therefore, we Communists, in arriving at policy, always take into account the inter-relationships between peoples and forces—on a world scale. There is no conflict between these two and there cannot be. To further fortify what we have always contended—not as some legalistic device in a Foley Square trial, but as a basic, cardinal feature of the application of Marxism-Leninism to the task before us—let us invoke the authority of Comrade Khrushchev whom every American viewer knows is no minor Marxist. In his report to the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Khrushchev said:

All the Communist parties are in-

dependent and shape their own policy proceeding from the concrete conditions in their respective countries. . . .

Imperialist ideologists, and the revisionists who take their cue from them, strive in every way to undermine the growing influence of the Communist parties and spread the spurious tale about the Communist movement being "made in Moscow" and being dependent upon the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. . . . They contend that our Party interferes in the internal affairs of other countries and wants to control the other Communist parties. . . .

The history of social development reveals that Marxist parties come into being with the emergence and growth of the working class. This means that the communist movement came into being as an objective necessity, that it was born of the very living conditions of the working class in each country. There are classes in all capitalist countries and, consequently, there are political parties there which represent their interests. The Communist parties are political parties of the working class and they will exist as long as there is the working class. It was not due to some center "planting" Communist parties in all countries that they have come into being. No miracle of that kind is possible.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union does not control any of the other parties. . . . There are no "superior" and "subordinate" parties in the communist movement. And each Communist and Workers' party bears responsibility to the working class, to the working people of its country, to the international workers' and communist movement.

In their struggle for working-class interests, for socialism, the Communist parties combine the universal tenets of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete historical and national conditions in their countries. Only a Marxist-Leninist party connected with the working-class, with the people of its country, is able to know the concrete conditions of struggle; it alone can work out a political line conforming to these conditions and taking account of the traditions of the working-class movement in its country.

All the Communist and Workers' parties exist and struggle on the basis of complete independence and proletarian internationalism. . . .

As you see, Comrade Khrushchev in a very special way and in some detail describes the fact that small Communist parties and large parties, Communist parties with much seniority in the world Marxist movement and with little seniority in the world Marxist movement, are equal brother parties, equal and independent parties, not only with the right to be in cordial agreement with each other but also with the right of initiative; and that old Communist parties, or large and distinguished and accomplished Communist parties, have no closed market on all creative and useful ideas. He documented and illustrated this. Comrade Khrushchev hailed the fact that the Communist parties of each country are independent and that their allegiance is to their own class in the first instance and that in fulfilling this allegiance they will be in a really

serious and basic way contributing to international solidarity.

* * *

With all the inspiration which it derives from the manifestations of solidarity, appreciation and love which have been showered upon us in greetings, and desires expressed to send fraternal delegations to our convention from parties all over the world, I am sure that our party, following this 17th National Convention will deepen its consciousness of the need to be fully worthy of this high regard. To be worthy of it first of all we must strive to fill the magnificent conceptions put forward in the report from Comrade Gus Hall and that will be reflected in the resolution in terms of service to our own class and our own nation in making a peaceful and a better world. Further, and more concretely, we must be more attentive and responsive to the need for practical measures of solidarity with, and above all the promotion of mass understanding and explanation of the struggles of the hard-beset fraternal parties in many parts of the capitalist world.

Let me call the attention of the delegates, first of all, to the need for undertaking special educational measures and special practical measures of international solidarity such as are required of us in regard to the glorious Cuban revolutionary government. The Cuban Communists, modestly and self-effacingly, are

playing an important role in all of the great struggles that are unfolding there. And then, too, Comrades, bear in mind and understand more profoundly the developments throughout Latin America — in Panama, Venezuela, Uruguay and elsewhere. Important struggles are unfolding or pending in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and other countries. Nor should we, Comrades, be smug because we are representatives of a very big population. We should also be extremely attentive to the big developments taking place in Canada, our neighbor to the North. Though a country small in population and a country overwhelmed and dominated economically and to a certain extent politically by the United States, it is a country that houses a truly heroic, imaginative and creative Communist party that from year to year is deepening its ties with masses and will certainly play, in the not too distant future, a big role in the affairs of that state.

Furthermore, comrades, the revolutionary movements of Africa—Guinea, Ghana, Algeria and so on—deserve expressions of solidarity from us, timely responses to their appeals. In this connection, Comrades, let us signalize the situation in Greece where one of the outstanding leaders of the Greek working class, Manilos Glezos, has been imprisoned (not unlike our own Gil Green, Henry Winston, and Bob Thompson). Reaction momentarily holds sway in Greece. The Greek

Communist Party has appealed for aid and solidarity. Expressions of pressure upon the Greek Government and an appeal to the conscience of the world are called for. Certainly we will not be tardy to respond to such appeals.

A central task before us in the coming year is to help our countrymen develop an ever greater understanding and friendship for China; for the recognition of the Chinese Peoples Republic by our government and for securing to China her rights in the United Nations; for relinquishing China's Taiwan territories and the taking of all necessary steps toward the establishment of normal diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with the government of the great Chinese peoples.

So, Comrades, in conclusion, let us take a certain satisfaction in the fact that yesterday we alone could perceive how Soviet-American friendship would serve the interest of our own people and the people of the world and we were calumniated and incarcerated for our pains. Today, Soviet-American friendship is a fashionable and popular issue. Why, even when the dangers of the Bolshoi ballet came to our city, the first families in the social register competed with one another to entertain them! We are encouraged by the fact that last year over 15,000 Americans toured in the Soviet Union and many more will visit the lands of socialism in 1960. There is a sudden rediscovery of all the

rich cultural rewards as well as scientific and other rewards that flow from buliding up the bonds of friendship with the Soviet Union, and this is no less true of the other socialist countries—of Poland, Hungary and so on. We are entering into an era where the tens of millions of Americans are prepared to understand the rich veins of gold that lie in the hills of friendship with other peoples of the world—of the socialist countries and of the embattled countries of yesterday's colonial world in the first instance.

Comrades, success in the all-sided struggle for peace and disarmament today will bring nearer our vista of golden tomorrows.

Comrades, may our Party soon be in league with all those parties who have already taken the high road to the establishment of socialism and then again of communism in their own countries. There are in the world today some 34,000,000 Communists. We are proud to be counted among those who are in our day changing the face of the world into a truly promising garden for mankind. We cherish our ties of international working-class solidarity and ever-enduring bonds of common ideology and noble vista for the unbounded well being, happiness and brotherhood of all mankind.

Comrades, long live international solidarity in the cause of peace, democracy and communism!—in the struggle against war, colonialism and imperialism!

United Front Policy in the San Francisco Elections*

By Archie Brown

THE 1959 ELECTIONS in San Francisco took place hard on the heels of the Khrushchev visit. Fresh in the minds of the people was the skillful handling of the visit by Republican Mayor George Christopher, already popular as the man responsible for bringing the Giants to San Francisco. On the other hand, in 1958 he had endorsed the "right-to-work" measure and the candidacy of Knowland.

His chief opponent was Russell L. Wolden, former city-county assessor, who had been a Republican up to a year before the elections, at which time he had switched his registration to the Democratic Party. In his campaign he avoided all the issues, and tried to get himself elected simply as a Democrat. Neither did Christopher deal with

the issues, evidently regarding his re-election as a cut-and-dried proposition.

The Union Labor Party, the legislative arm of the San Francisco Labor Council, supported Wolden, accepting him with no guarantee on program or issues. But labor leaders like Harry Bridges, and other liberal union elements, supported Christopher, as did some important sections of the Democratic Party.

The mayoralty campaign was a fiasco, with no fight on issues and with Christopher and the entire incumbent slate coasting in. The fiasco can be laid mainly to the official labor movement's tailing after the major parties and their candidates and their uncritical acceptance of Wolden. Some challenge was offered in the race for the Board of Supervisors, however, by some 97,000 votes cast for Morrison, a candidate who represented varied coalition forces and who was viewed as a challenge

*This is part of a report presented to the convention of the Communist Party of Northern California.

to the "milk the city for the rich" program of the incumbent administration. In a much more fundamental way, 13% of the voters showed their desire for far-reaching solutions to their every-day problems when they voted for this writer for supervisor.

THE BROWN CAMPAIGN —ORGANIZATION AND OUTCOME

San Francisco has a combined city-county government, headed by a mayor and a Board of Supervisors of nine members. These are chosen in alternate elections, five in one and four in the next. This year there were five to be elected, and fourteen candidates in the field. The labor movement endorsed four, leaving one open.

A Party conference was called to discuss the situation. It was felt that it would be desirable to have a Negro candidate or else an independent labor candidate in the race. However, efforts to secure a candidate of either type had been unsuccessful. It was decided, therefore, that I should run.

A campaign committee was set up, which opened an office and got out an announcement of the candidacy. A group of about forty young people formed a youth committee, which issued a campaign statement, raised money, held a successful campaign meeting and toured the city with a sound truck. A Negro committee of 80 people took up such issues as

FEPC, police brutality and discrimination in housing, and issued a campaign leaflet. A labor committee was organized, headed by a business agent of ILWU Local 10, and put out a leaflet on the Landrum-Griffin law and the attack on labor. A speakers' list was set up and a drive was organized to cover every union meeting during the campaign. A loud speaker truck covered the unemployment compensation office every day for a week.

SOME PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION

We were late in getting started. Partly this was due to apathy and factionalism in our Party. There was great resistance to getting into the campaign. Too many people thought it was the wrong time, we were too weak, too divided, etc. In view of the factionalism which existed, it must be admitted that we took a big chance in tackling a campaign. Now it is apparent we were correct. Actually the campaign helped many people see the bankruptcy of the factionalists.

The chief thing that made us late, however, was our valiant but unsuccessful attempts to get a Negro candidate to file. It was worth the effort, and everyone concerned gives us credit for at least trying where most others didn't even bother.

Our main appeal was to the unions, calling upon them to counter-attack by electing a labor man to of-

ice. We did a good job in presenting the need for a people's coalition led by labor, without using those words. We raised with the unions the problems of peace, trade with China, youth, housing and discrimination, and other important issues. We pointed out that labor had better give leadership to the people or its enemies would alienate it from them—that labor needed allies to throw back the attack and gain the ability to counterattack.

We sent speakers to some 160 unions. We gained entrance into 96 and covered the others with material. As a result, a number of our friends who had long been inactive now came forward with financial and other help. Several others not previously connected with us also came forward with good wishes and help. Most important, relations were established with rank and file leaders as well as officials. These must now be broadened, looking toward 1960.

The main issues in the campaign were the fight for peace, opposition to the Landrum-Griffin Act, discrimination in housing, jobs for youth. We also raised the question of socialism. Our campaign on these and other issues brought us endorsements from the ILWU legislative committee and the local Negro newspaper, the *Sun-Reporter*.

The result of this campaign was that our coalition program, based on the needs of the working people was endorsed by more than 33,500 voters. By and large this was a con-

scious vote for a Left solution of a number of their problems, and to a lesser degree for a socialist solution. This vote was obtained by consistent, devoted work on the part of many of our members and friends. It was the result of speaking at 109 meetings, including union meetings, distributing 80,000 pieces of literature, mailing over 800 letters, using a sound truck for two weeks, holding a car parade, making personal contact with hundreds of voters, and countless other actions.

The vote was obtained in the process of hammering out a coalition line and approach, in the face of a sharp factional attack in our own ranks and a red-baiting campaign directed against the Party and the candidate. Our election experience proves that a people's coalition starting at the grass roots and extending upward along the lines presented in the Draft Resolution is possible, and we have some experience on how it can be done.

When we first determined to enter the elections, we set ourselves the task of promoting the broadest coalition of labor, the Negro people, businessmen, professionals and all forward-looking people. Within that concept, we decided to run a Party person for supervisor based on a coalition program and issues. We can report that we accomplished this task in a big way. We demonstrated the validity of coalition work and the possibility of a Communist leading certain types of coalition.

If we put it in percentages, it can be said that we accomplished 75% of the goals we set. For an outfit that has been limping along and has a record of less than 75% accomplishment these last few years, this a real achievement and we should feel quite proud. We overcame a number of barriers. We made new contacts and connections. We renewed contacts with old friends, including ex-Party members. We drew around us a number of people who actively participated for the first time in years or altogether.

We have the basis for rebuilding our organization and influence in the Negro community, and for a healthy and lively youth movement. There is once again a chance to rebuild our trade union organization and influence, though that is a much more difficult task. We are in a position to consolidate the Party and build it with new recruits.

There are a number of experiences that can serve as lessons on how to fight to carry out a political and tactical line. We will deal with some of them here.

WHAT COALITION MEANS

In the beginning of the campaign, some people, dogged with narrowness and sectarianism, and a certain amount of adventurism, advocated that our candidate run for mayor. Now remember—the labor movement had endorsed a candidate for

mayor, and every politically active force had already taken or would soon take a stand on the mayoralty race. Imagine running for mayor in the face of all this! My own fellow union members would think I was crazy. Imagine the *Sun-Reporter* giving me an endorsement under such circumstances! Of course, the source of this kind of proposal is the sectarian ideological line followed by our factionalists, who think it is more important to speak of "revolution" than to rebuild our contacts and forces.

These sectarians and their misguided followers don't understand the needs of the times, the workers or the Party, or the Party's role in the labor and people's movements. They don't understand what a coalition is, or how the Party goes about helping to build coalitions.

They say we committed gross political opportunism in not having our candidates run as a candidate of the Communist Party. In this, they agree with the *Chronicle* and other bourgeois organs which claimed that I should have run as an out-and-out Communist candidate, and not as an independent labor candidate with the support of anyone who wanted to back us, including the Communist Party.

What was the need of the labor movement—to be alerted that the Communist Party had a candidate or to be unified around a militant program and to be shown how to give leadership to the people? Did the

Negro people more than anything else need a Communist candidate or to be unified around a hard-hitting program against discrimination and for proper housing and jobs? What did the young people need? Slogans to elect a Communist candidate or a program for ending the draft, for jobs and proper education?

To put it another way, is the issue Communism or is it peace and defense of the people's elementary right? The answer is obvious.

In connection with this, it should be noted that we not only took part in the campaign on hard-hitting issues, but in addition the Party and the Left played their proper role. The issue of socialism was properly posed in the campaign, and the Party and its members grew in stature, influence and authority. We did not pose one against the other, because to have done so would have limited activity.

The needs of the Party are not in contradiction to those of the mass movement. The Draft Resolution says:

... the cardinal problems of Party renewal, of building the Party and of establishing broader united front relations, remain largely unsolved. Therefore the chief task before the Party still is to overcome its isolation from decisive sections of the labor movement, to strengthen the Party's base, ties and influence among the basic industrial workers, Negro and white, and among the youth. Without this, the Party's capacity for helping transform its pol-

icy into living reality will remain seriously impaired.

Despite mistakes or weaknesses on our part, our over-all line has been proven by life to be correct.

We want to make it clear that there is no principle attached to running or not running as a Communist Party candidate. The principle is to work in such a way as to advance the cause of the workers and the Party. There will come a time when it will be necessary and correct to run a candidate of the Communist Party. But we don't don heavy overcoats in the heat of the summer just because there will be a cold day when winter comes.

Another wrong concept we had to fight came from certain union forces. They thought it was important for me to run for supervisor, but that this was only incidental to the main thing, which was to lay a better basis to fight the new anti-labor law. They said the campaign itself did not mean a thing, that it would not increase the vote by fifty. In other words, don't bring the issues to the people; just make a token effort. It took an uphill fight, carried out with great tact, to break down this concept among the union forces and to build enthusiasm in individuals and groups.

SOCIALISM AS A CAMPAIGN ISSUE

There were a number of lessons regarding the posing of socialism in

the campaign, in relation to the coalition policy. Along with this, there was the problem of how to handle the question of the candidate's Party membership. Let no one pretend that he has the full answers to these questions. One thing is clear, however: it is not necessary to drop one in order to carry through the other.

In every leaflet, in some press releases and in some talks at unions and elsewhere, we made it clear that the candidate was of socialist persuasion. In the main leaflet, this was connected with the Khrushchev visit, and in most instances it was connected with trade with the socialist world and the issue of peace. In a negative way, and for their own purposes, the newspapers also made the candidate's political connection quite clear.

We failed, however, to picture to the people the true state of affairs in the socialist countries, or to explain what socialism would mean to the people of the United States. Of course, some 200 people attended our most successful meeting, on the 40th anniversary of the Party, where they heard Gus Hall speak precisely on such matters. The leaflets issued for the meeting also raised such questions. But more could have been done. The main obstacle was lack of time, because we started so late.

In only a few places did we speak on socialism as such. The time limit (five to seven minutes) did not permit us really to develop the point, and we have not learned the tech-

nique of doing it in so short a time. Perhaps one answer is to pick certain unions where this is the main point made, depending on the literature to carry the other points. However, it would be wrong to try this in more than a few unions, in view of our coalition program and goals.

We also faced a bit of red-baiting in the newspapers. A story was picked up by radio and television, claiming that the candidate termed himself a "candidate of the Communist Party." Of course, the candidate actually ran as an independent labor candidate with a socialist viewpoint, and backed by some union and other committees and the Communist Party. The red-baiting had an effect in the Negro community. It also gave certain labor and civic forces a handle with which to counteract our growing campaign, and it resulted in the Democrats backing down from participating in the youth meeting.

The District Committee of the Party, through its chairman, Comrade Lima, had an interview with the *People's World* which set the record straight in a forthright way. His statement did not deny the candidate's convictions or affiliations (it even said he had run on the Party's ticket in the past). But it made the point that the Party had no candidate and that it endorsed me, as had others, as an independent labor candidate. Unfortunately, the statement was somewhat late and was not sent to all the papers.

At the largest election meeting, or-

ganized by the Negro community, the red-baiting was attacked as a device to stifle the demands of the Negro people and the workers generally. The attempt to vilify the candidate by branding him "subversive" was compared to the outlawing of the NAACP in the South on the same outlandish charge. The response of the audience was terrific and demonstrated their rejection of red-baiting.

What is significant is that despite the lateness, and despite our lateness in handling it, thousands of people voted for me—that after eight years of absence from this scene we defeated the red-baiting.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

Of utmost significance was the visit of Premier Khrushchev to San Francisco just before the election campaign got into high gear. His stress on the theme of peace, and particularly his total disarmament plan, had a terrific effect. We allied ourselves with this sentiment and called upon the people to implement the fight for peace by opening up trade with China. We showed that it would not only lessen the cold-war tensions but would also mean jobs for the people of the city. The activity of the young people for ending the peacetime draft also met with great response. Even soldiers in uniform came up to congratulate the campaigners on their stand.

We speak of divisions in the ranks

of the capitalists. This certainly is true on the West Coast and in San Francisco. The PWA has long been on record for trade with China, and now several Chambers of Commerce on the coast have likewise gone on record. It is highly significant that when Nelson Rockefeller came to Oregon, he too had to speak about trade with China.

Undoubtedly, ending the peacetime draft and trade will be key issues in furthering the fight for peace. All these developments give us courage to go among the people and help them organize to impose their will for peace.

THE NEGRO COMMUNITY

Our experience in the Negro community is proof positive that while we are relatively isolated, we do have the basis for reviving our influence and organization there. But we have to be in contact with people and discover the issues that concern them. The general idea that the Negro people suffer from discrimination does not mean too much in conducting an election campaign or in mobilizing people for struggle. When we were able to get a number of Negro people together and they not only discussed the issues but wrote and distributed their own material—then we were beginning to work in the correct way.

First and foremost they demanded representation on the Board of Supervisors. To accomplish this, they felt

it necessary to divide the city into districts, so that a Negro candidate would not have to compete against everyone else running.

They then took on the scandal at Western Addition, an urban renewal housing project in which, of 2,500 units already contracted, nearly 2,000 were to rent at more than \$140 a month. They exposed the way in which Negroes would be excluded by the high rents and new ghettos created by forcing these families out of the urban renewal area.

They put the jobs question right on the platter, stating that the new FEP law would be meaningless unless commissions consisting of labor, Negro and other minority group representatives could help administer it. Then they decided to put their picture on the leaflet. It caused a sensation in the community, and while the citywide vote averaged 13%, that in the precincts with heavy Negro population averaged 25%.

YOUTH

The campaign brought forth a group of wonderful young people who not only added zest but made specific contributions. Keep in mind that 90% of them have no organizational connections. Their contributions were due entirely to personal

conviction, though as time went on there was a realization for organization and progressive policies. These young people belong in our ranks.

They were responsible for the sound truck, for organizing the youth meeting and for a successful car parade. They took part in the leaflet distributions and accompanied speakers. Their presence and activity were felt everywhere.

* * *

Well, comrades, we have projected ourselves into the mainstream. How do you feel about it? Are you scared? Can we be equal to our obligations? I believe we will. It will be necessary to consolidate our mass contacts, to follow through with the organization of the struggle on mass issues. The Negro people are anxious to continue what they started. The young people can be mobilized to fight for their needs and we can be a much greater influence in the labor movement. We can rebuild our Party and add dozens of new recruits.

Let me say again, the mistakes we made and the weaknesses we displayed are minor compared to the most competent, politically correct and successful election campaign which was carried through by our Party and our friends.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

SIGNS OF A CHANGE

The "New Conservatism" heralded and justified McCarthyism. It is a truism to say that the worst of McCarthyism is over; it is less widely understood how deep have been its inroads upon the institutional structure and intellectual fiber of our country.

There are, however, accumulating evidences, in the ideological field, of growing dissatisfaction with the "solutions" and rationalizations offered by the "New Conservatism." This is one of the reflections of the fact that the problems of reaction are insoluble—politically, there may be enhanced repression, economically, there may be intensified exploitation, morally, there may be utterly nihilistic expressions, and ideologically, there may be extraordinary systems of obfuscation and irrationality. But these tend to exacerbate the evils and do not meet the real needs of the overwhelming majority of the population. Hence, they are of more or less limited duration, the time span being directly related to the degree, quality, and organizational strength of the resistance mounted against them.

We are now in a time of change; on the international and the national scenes—and the two are interdependent, of course—aggression and reaction are on the defensive. Given sufficient effort by the Left, the repulse of the Right can be developed into a major setback, particularly with the elections of 1960.

* * *

The signs of change for the better in the intellectual atmosphere are numerous. Reasons of space—especially in connection with making available to our readers, in this and the next issue, the full results of the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party—make it possible for me at this time to deal with only four examples of this development.

The first two I wish to mention are strikingly similar; yet, in important respects, they complement each other: John W. Caughey's *In Clear and Present Danger: The Crucial State of our Freedoms* (University of Chicago Press, \$4); and Benjamin Ginzburg's *Rededication to Freedom* (Simon & Schuster, N. Y., \$3.50). Caughey is a professor of history at the University of California in Los Angeles; he was fired in 1950 for refusing to subscribe to a test oath and was reinstated some years later following a decision of the California Supreme Court. Dr. Ginzburg was Research Director for the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for two years after World War II.

The different interests and positions of the two men naturally reflect themselves in the different areas upon which they focus in their common effort to assess the extent of the damage to civil liberties in the United States during the Cold War era. Caughey dwells particularly upon the academic and intellectual scene; Ginzburg tends to concentrate upon the governmental.

Both men, and especially Ginzburg, do not question the existence of what the latter calls "Communist barbarism," and from that viewpoint neither represents any improvement over earlier liberal books on the same theme, as those by Francis Biddle (*The Fear of Freedom*, 1951), Alan Barth (*The Loyalty of Free Men*, 1951), Henry S. Commager (*Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent*, 1954), and Elmer Davis (*But We Were Born Free*, 1954). In this sense, the Caughey and Ginzburg volumes contain basic weaknesses which seriously reduce their effectiveness in accomplishing what both of them undoubtedly want to accomplish—namely, the fullest implementation of the Bill of Rights and the elimination of all practices, institutions and agencies which impair that Charter of Freedom.

Neither offers any rational explanation for the devastating attack upon civil liberties that followed World War II; there is no sense of the class nature of American society, of the general crisis besetting capitalism, and of the immutable tendencies within imperialism towards greater and greater reaction at home and aggressiveness abroad. Hence both—and again this is clearest in Ginzburg—scribe the onset of McCarthyism to a popular clamor for repression at home in the face of a popular fear of attack from the USSR. Neither really investigates just how "popular" both ideas were; and neither even asks why all the media of mass communication turned to the incessant repetition of both themes.

In accepting the caricatures of communism that have come from J. Edgar Hoover—though both authors in all other respects find this chief policeman fast and loose with the truth and contemptuous of legal requirements—the authors make Communists supreme Machiavellians, whose motives always are the worst imaginable and who, even when they may participate in commendable efforts, do so for the worst possible reasons, fervently hoping that the objects being pursued are not achieved!

Yet, these are not the central features of the two volumes and both of them do go beyond the limits reached by the authors writing earlier in the fifties, previously mentioned. They do so in two respects. First, the earlier authors were participating in a holding action, undertaken at a time when reaction was on the offensive and was riding high; they were trying to stop an advance. Caughey and Ginzburg, on the other hand, are writing when the turn has come and their own works are part of that turn. Hence there is a greater vigor in these later volumes than in the former and sharper attacks upon those who have emasculated the Bill of Rights. Second, and above all, both volumes call unequivocally for the complete abandonment of the "loyalty-security" technique and apparatus; they urge that the whole edifice, from the Smith Act through the McCarran Act and all Executive orders in-between, be demolished and that the country return to the pre-1940 status both in law and in administrative pro-

cedures. In doing this, both volumes, more strongly than earlier works, condemn the "Communist hunt" as based on a maliciously-concocted myth, having the aim of curbing all progressive, democratic and liberal ideas and efforts. In Ginzburg's words:

What I learned as a result of my intimate contact with the security programs was that the whole government anti-Communist campaign was wrong from top to bottom. It was not a matter of incidental abuses in activities that were otherwise necessary or desirable. The whole government campaign was an abuse—a hoax on the American people.

These ideas constitute the very great value of the Caughey and Ginzburg volumes; they represent an advance over the best of the liberal works produced a few years ago. They reflect the great opportunities opening up for the Left in our country to lead in a real effort to accomplish these purposes.

* * *

Even more significant, however, than the works considered above, is the really remarkable book, *Pride of State: A Study in Patriotism and American Morality*, by Joseph P. Morray (Beacon Press, Boston, \$4). The author, a graduate of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and an attorney, formerly served as Assistant Naval Attache in the U. S. Embassies in Paraguay and Spain; he is now a Visiting Professor at the University of California in Berkeley.

This volume has, as the author writes, "two principal propositions: that abroad we are embarked on an incipient imperialism and that at home the American communists are more sinned against than sinning." The major portion of Morray's text is devoted to demonstrating the latter point. If there has been another book, from a commercial publisher and written by a non-Communist in the United States, carefully and persuasively examining the content of the anti-Communist position and explicitly finding it to be wanting, this writer has missed it.

There are areas in the book—particularly in its first fifty pages, where the author develops a rather idealist "theory of patriotism"—with which I am in disagreement, but this is of very small consequence. The great fact is that Professor Morray denounces anti-Communism as being, in fact, an assault upon democratic values and institutions, and that he eloquently comes to the defense of American Communists. His work is directly within the mainstream of the American radicalism that produced Jefferson, Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, and Eugene V. Debs. He insists that "progress depends in large part upon a creative patriotism which has the courage to innovate," and adds: "In fact, we might define creative patriotism as innovation justified by posterity." He finds that, "socialism seems to be winning the minds of those who are in a position to choose either capitalism or socialism," and believes that, "Socialism is nothing other than patriotism introduced into economic affairs."

Professor Morray denies that Communists are enemies of freedom: he refuses to "dismiss as a fraudulent disguise the theory of freedom" held by Communists

that "a rational political order provides the greater freedom." I do not mean that Morray fully accepts this view; but he insists that it is a view worthy of careful consideration, and that it cannot properly be dismissed out of hand as demagogic or Machiavellian. Moreover, he declares that his study has convinced him that the Communists' "intentions are generous, and [that] to condemn them as 'enemies of freedom' is, at best, a kind of sophistry. . . ."

Professor Morray weighs and finds wanting the arguments holding that Communists are members of a criminal conspiracy, or that they are foreign agents or advocates of force and violence. He specifically denounces the Smith Act and excoriates the Un-American Committee and other such so-called investigative bodies. Writing of the witnesses hauled before such bodies he is so eloquent that I cannot refrain from quoting at least one paragraph:

If the witnesses are true to their consciences against the pressure of the persecution to which they are now being subjected they can prove their patriotism, and with the likelihood that posterity will applaud them as loudly as their own generation denounces. They have the good fortune to be set alone, like Socrates before the Athenian assembly. They need not doubt that the country will soon forget the members of the committee. Meletus, the accuser who, proclaiming his patriotism, had the satisfaction of sending Socrates to his death, turned out to be the villain and the fool with posterity, which remembers him only to disgrace him. Time has made Socrates, not Meletus, the glory of Athens.

There is much else in Professor Morray's splendid book; not least is an ardent appeal for a reversal in present U.S. foreign policy, with the active seeking of peaceful co-existence. But the latter, most happily, is no longer unique in American books; the insistence, however, that "Communists have been more sinned against, than sinning" is the special quality of *Pride of State*. The work in which these words appear tends, in these times of Big-Business morality, to be deluged by bright rationalizers for cynicism and pornographic substitutions for literature. But it is to such a book that future historians will point as representing the best kind of thinking produced by Americans in the middle of the 20th century.

The final example of the changing American intellectual scene which I wish to bring forward is the most encouraging of all. This is the launching of *Studies on the Left: A Journal of Research, Social Theory, and Review*, whose editorial board consists of ten young men and women—graduate students. This journal is to be published three times a year—volume 1, number 1, Fall, 1959, has appeared; its address is P. O. Box 2121, Madison 5, Wisconsin, and the price of a year's subscription is \$2.50 (\$3 outside the U.S.A.).

The one hundred pages of its first number contain articles and reviews by thirteen different authors, including students, professors, and scholars unaffiliated with any university. The views represented have one common denominator, radicalism; otherwise the whole gamut of opinion is represented, including

the Communist. The articles and reviews are first-rate contributions, but the most important thing about the journal is its appearance, and the editorial statement, "The Radicalism of Disclosure." I urge readers to examine the magazine as a whole, and, in particular, to read the entire editorial statement. Here, I wish to quote brief passages in order to convey something of the essence of this wonderfully encouraging phenomenon:

There is room in scholarship for the application of reason to the *reconstruction* of society, as well as to legalistic interpretation and reform. There is a place for the scholar who looks upon traditional formulations, theories, structures, even "facts" with a habitually critical attitude stemming from his distaste for things as they are, and from his distrust of the analyses of those who are committed to the maintenance of the status quo.

Here are the editorial's concluding sentences:

Studies on the Left wishes to participate in the struggles of radical scholars by existing as a meeting place where, in spite of philosophical and political differences, they can join in their common dissatisfaction with present academic standards and myths, and work harmoniously and creatively toward the future; and by helping such scholars demonstrate to the academic world the unique contribution which the radically committed thinker, by the very nature of his emotional and intellectual partisanship, is able to make. We hope that the radicalism of what is disclosed, as it increases and matures, may provide knowledge and theory for the future growth of a radicalism of what is proposed.

With such manifestoes issuing from American youth—allegedly beaten, tired, and depraved—there is every reason to turn to our work of bringing the message of peace, freedom and Socialism, and the component of Marxism-Leninism, to our country's thought and life, with renewed enthusiasm and confidence. Dear readers, a fruitful New Year to all of you!

Just Published!

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*, has been issued 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.