

political affairs

MAY 1958 • 35 CENTS

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER [19] **The Superiority of World Socialism Over World Capitalism**

ALBERT J. LIMA [29] **The California Primary Elections**

MARTIN CHANCEY [40] **The Economic Slump and the Party's Role: Ohio**

ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN [61] **Master of Deceit**

THE RISING STRUGGLE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

By **GEORGE MORRIS**

[1-10]

U.S. FARMERS: PROBLEMS AND PROPOSALS

By **JOHN HELLMAN**

[11-18]

THE EDITOR [47] **"Ideas in Our Time"**

Ready in May—

NO MEN ARE STRANGERS

BY JOSEPH NORTH

A book of affirmation in these troubled days is like a fountain of clear waters in a parched time—it is good for the health! Joe North's *No Men Are Strangers* (International Publishers, price \$3.25) is such a book, a kind of modern Pilgrims' Progress except that, instead of dealing in allegory, the author writes of living facts, observed at first hand, reportage from all the fighting fronts of man's struggle for a better world, the human documentation of the most turbulent, swift-moving, epochal half-century of modern history.

Truly a reporter of a special kind, North chronicles his earliest remembrance of his blacksmith father, soon after the turn of the century in Pennsylvania, the shock of his first contacts with bigotry and hardship, his first meeting with Communists. "The beginning of wisdom came when I encountered men who introduced me to a philosophy which scientifically explained Man's existence, and indicated the inevitability of his triumph over hunger, oppression and war."

His on-the-spot observations of America during the Great Depression; his activity in founding the weekly *New Masses* and his lively contacts, as editor of that soon-to-become famous magazine, with the best known writers and artists of that day; his eye-witness narratives of the militant sit-down strikes which helped to usher in the C.I.O.; his stirring coverage of the battlefronts of Spain during the Civil War; his danger-fraught voyages on convoys crossing the Atlantic in World War II; his first grisly entrance into the still-smoking hell of Dachau, all are brilliantly told in this book. Don't fail to order your copy from your nearest bookstore or, by mail, from—

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

Vol. XXXVII, No. 5

MAY, 1958

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The Rising Struggle Against Unemployment

By George Morris

THE STRUGGLE FOR a program to combat the current depression, with the unemployed themselves taking an increasingly active part in it, is spreading. In the months ahead, with the administration itself anticipating 2,000,000 exhaustions of unemployment benefits, the struggle will accelerate in scope and intensity. In the first three months of 1958, more than half a million benefits ran out. Already in March, the fifth month since the heavy layoffs began, the movement for a program of jobs and adequate relief measures, was wider and more vigorous than any we have seen in the post-war period.

One indication of the developing mood among sections of the unemployed and labor movement, was the march of 4,400 jobless Michigan workers to Lansing, the state capital, April 9, to demand more adequate

measures for jobs and aid for unemployed. But that event also gave a measure of the cold-blooded callousness among some of the politicians comparable in a way to what was experienced in the Hoover period of the thirties.

The representatives of the state's 450,000 unemployed were locked out. The legislature adjourned on their arrival. The spokesman of the Republicans who control the legislature told them their problem was "psychological."

Michigan is the worst-hit state. But the militancy and angry sentiment rising among the auto workers also can be regarded as an indicator of what may be expected, or is already prevalent, among other hard-hit industries, especially steel, metal manufacture, copper, railroad, lumber and textile.

The movement against the crisis

manifests itself in varied forms and degrees of militancy. Usually it develops on the initiative of the trade unions on a local, county or state level. In some states or large cities, delegated conferences have been held on the economic situation. In some areas the still divided unions found the struggle against the depression a basis for unity. In New York City the AFL central body and CIO Industrial Council called a joint conference on unemployment and adopted a joint plan of action. In some cities a further step to bring the rank and file into action took the form of mass meetings, as in Minneapolis and Rochester; or through delegations to city or state legislative bodies and pressure movements for distribution of government surplus food.

The Chicago area district of the Packinghouse Workers formed an "Unemployed Council" through which the activities of all the local affiliates in the district are coordinated and directed. There is also some evidence of activities on behalf of unemployed on the part of community groups outside unions. Also, of the formation of groups for action where large numbers of unemployed without union protection are concentrated.

The AFL-CIO has issued a call to its affiliates for the formation of committees and activation of counselors in every local on the problems of its unemployed. The rapid alarming rise in unemploy-

ment and the increase of the load of problems affecting unemployed in the locals, is compelling unions to form the committees. Already thousands in need of relief want to know how to get it and, even more important, help to obtain it. Members in the many thousands seek aid to stave off repossession of cars, furniture, TV sets and foreclosures and on what to do against the garnishee menace. Already, many face the serious family problems that always come in the wake of unemployment.

STRUGGLE ON A HIGHER LEVER

The above sketchily pictures only the beginning of the movement. The form and program are still in the process of taking shape. But there are some definite elements in the present-day movement affecting unemployed that differ from our past experience in the field:

1. The trade union movement today officially assumes responsibility for a program and activities affecting the unemployed and rejects the concept dominant at the start of the 1929 depression—that the union has an obligation only toward its employed dues-paying members. Even the demand for unemployment insurance was frowned upon by the top leadership of the AFL during the early thirties.

2. While at the start of the 1929 depression, relief for unemployed

was in the category of a charity problem, with even cash relief a rarity, today as a result of the struggles in the past 29 years—struggles in which the Communist-influenced Left pioneered—there is an extensive pattern of rights and benefits provided by law: unemployment insurance, social security, aid for aged, orphaned children and widows, blind and other disabled, and there is a recognition in most areas of the municipality's or state's obligation to provide welfare for the needy.

3. The problems affecting the unemployed are no longer treated as a matter apart from those concerning the workers on jobs, or of groups allied with labor—farmers, professionals, etc. Those problems are treated within the framework of a general "anti-depression" program.

Marxists and other Left-progressives find much ground for criticizing labor's leadership today on its economic outlook and policy. The issue today is no longer, as in 1929, whether unions should be interested in the problems of the unemployed. How those problems are met, the scope of the program and the extent to which rank and file participation is encouraged in the struggle for it, are the issues today. The AFL-CIO Economic and Legislative Conference held in Washington March 11-13, reflected some of the important changes that have come about since the great depres-

sion of the thirties. The very fact that the AFL-CIO called such a conference was evidence of a change.

THE CONFERENCE PROGRAM

The composition of the conference was limited to about 1,000 representatives, predominantly full-timers of national leadership level or officials of state and local central bodies. Rank and file unemployed were hardly in evidence. Nor was the super-ornate Park Sheraton Hotel the most fitting place for a conference on unemployment.

There was still an evident reluctance to encourage rank and file participation in the struggle. The emphasis was on a "controlled" movement, limited to a program that was already drawn up, laid before the conference only for approval. There was no discussion from the floor. The plans called for only platform speeches by AFL-CIO leaders and invited members of Congress, and for lobby delegations to members of Congress for the eight-point program submitted to the conference. There was no opportunity for the delegates to either alter the program or add to it.

The conference, nevertheless, was a positive event. It served both to focus national attention upon labor's program in the current depression, and to launch a campaign of action for that program on a national scale. The conference was, in fact, the

kickoff for the type of activities now getting under way in many areas of the country.

The eight-point program unquestionably has wide general support and provides a basis for united action of all trends in the labor movement, notwithstanding its inadequacy in some important respects. The program covered:

1. The Kennedy-McCarthy Bill for extension of unemployed benefits to a maximum of 39 weeks with a rise in the amount to from a minimum of a half of earnings to a maximum of two-thirds.
2. A cut in taxes on lower incomes.
3. An expanded program of public works.
4. A comprehensive school-construction program.
5. Expanded housing construction in the lower price level.
6. Improvement in the Social Security system (Foran Bill).
7. Federal aid for chronically depressed areas (Douglas Bill).
8. Expansion of Wage-Hour coverage for some 9.5 million more workers.

SOME WEAKNESSES

There are some striking weaknesses and omissions. The demand for a tax cut by a rise in personal exemptions from \$600 to \$700 is so limited that some of the lobbyists reported congressmen told them they were too modest in their demand. This was a comedown from the CIO endorsement of a \$1,000 exemption several years ago and the AFL's past support of an \$800 ex-

emption per person. And the cost of living has gone up considerably since. The AFL-CIO leaders were evidently still hampered by the view they held as late as the December convention, when George Meany said in his keynote speech:

Yes, maybe it will be good to reduce taxes in a campaign year, and we, like all citizens, like relief from taxes. But the American people must take the position that there is no sacrifice that we cannot and should not make to protect our security as a nation and everything we do must be measured against that security.

Underscoring his point, Meany added "we do not want a single cent of reduction" at the alleged cost of "defense" and "there is no price too high to pay" for an armament program to combat Communism. In a sense, therefore, Meany and his associates backtracked some on taxes, although hardly enough to give the average person \$20 more to spend per year.

The shorter workweek was not in the program. Nor did it receive mention at the conference, although the December AFL-CIO convention approved it and the demand was to figure as a major objective in 1958 bargaining. Nevertheless, although the demand was shelved for bargaining by the auto and other unions, the shorter workweek should have had a place in the Washington conference as a legislative issue. A bill by Senator James Murray of

Montana had been collecting dust in congressional files for some years. It would amend the wage-hour law to effect a two-stage reduction of the week to 35 hours. That bill had been endorsed by labor. Even from the standpoint of keeping the shorter workweek alive for later bargaining, it was essential to keep the bill before the public legislatively.

Neither the conference nor its program even mentioned the fact that the Negro workers are hit by unemployment more than twice as hard as whites. The Census Bureau's latest report on employment shows sixteen per cent of the Negro labor force is unemployed against seven per cent of the white labor force. It goes without saying that this evidence calls for a vigorous revival of the fight for Fair Employment Practices legislation. But no less urgent are immediate steps, possibly through executive action, that would call a halt to the discrimination trend in layoffs. The government's strong influence in the economy on the basis of the rules to which receivers of its contracts must conform, should enable it to wield an immediate weapon against discrimination.

Neither the conference nor its program made any reference to the possibilities of a quick expansion of trade with the East. Today it is no longer a matter for speculation on how big a market the socialist countries offer. And there is hardly an "anti-recession" measure that

can be turned to jobs faster than the available trade with countries populated by a billion souls. The AFL-CIO leaders overlooked trade with the socialist countries because they are still drawn back by their hard-bitten anti-Sovietism.

Another element that was missing in the conference was the direct voice of those who suffer unemployment; it did not reflect the spirit of militancy that the thirties taught us must accompany the struggle for an "anti-depression" program. There was a strong reliance on "friends of labor" in Congress although Meany rapped both parties for playing political football with the depression.

LEADERS DISORIENTED

It was apparent from the tone of the conference that the leaders of labor are quite disoriented. The rapidity of the economic decline caught them by surprise. On occasions, to justify wage increases, many of the labor leaders have pointed out that unless mass purchasing power is raised the country will plunge into a crisis. But basically the leaders of most unions are guided by the economics and ideology of capitalism. The assurances of most economists that the economy is merely experiencing a "breathing spell" influenced the leaders, too.

Another retarding influence in the thinking of some of the labor leaders was the view that the economy can be pump-primed to a "prosper-

ity" level permanently through military orders. This view was a close companion to the pro-cold-war position of many of those leaders. It was noteworthy, however, that the prepared eight-point program did not include a demand for higher military expenditures. It was in his keynote speech that Meany spoke of more military orders, placing them third after the Kennedy-McCarthy Bill and a tax cut, of the measures he thought could have most immediate effect on jobs and mass purchasing power. Reuther and David McDonald, however, made no mention of military orders in their speeches.

But even Meany, as others, stressed that neither military orders alone nor any other single measure would be sufficient to influence the economic situation. They saw the magnitude of the problem as so tremendous that only the application of *all* the proposed "remedies" could have an effect. It is becoming harder than ever to make the prosperity-through-guns argument sound convincing to people. McDonald noted that in the past ten years the country was hit by three economic declines. And those were the years of steadily rising military expenditures to a record annual peacetime figure of \$38 billion.

The tremendous military orders for the auto, farm implement and aircraft industries did not stave off the mass unemployment of Reuther's members even during last

year's high "prosperity" level. But while labor leaders recognize they can no longer convince people that the cold war offers "security" for jobs, they are reluctant to admit that it is precisely this cold war influence on the economy that had distorted it and sharpened the contradictions that bring crises.

It is the ever-growing military budget that has built up the government into a monopolistic Moloch who now eats a fifth of the country's economy. That government influence, greater than any corporation monopoly, demands the high tax rate that eats substantially into the worker's earnings. It is also a big inflationary factor because as the country's major purchaser of goods, the government, run by big business executives who encourage such a policy, is also the biggest bidder up of the general price level. Also, the government, through its tax write-off and other forms of subsidy, has been the major stimulator of new technology, including automation, and much of the industrial expansion for which there is really no constructive utilization in our capitalist society.

It is the cold-war policy, of course, that is responsible for cutting off from America the bulk of the vast potential Eastern market. Finally, as has been proven in life, the legislators in Washington don't have to be "prodded" by labor to develop a higher temperature for "defense" spending. But by shouting so much

of the non-existent "urgency" for more military spending, the leaders of labor give the legislators good reason to hold expenditures for constructive domestic objectives to a minimum.

"PERMANENT PROSPERITY" ILLUSION CRASHES

The speeches of Meany, Reuther and McDonald voiced anger and bitterness because the Administration and the lords of the capitalist economy have both bungled matters and refuse to do much about them. Meany's lengthy speech, notwithstanding his own strong loyalty to the capitalist system, was, in fact, a sharp indictment of capitalism in America today. *Pravda* ran the speech in full in its March 18 issue; so did *Trud*, organ of the Soviet trade unions, and Communist papers in France and elsewhere. *Pravda* noted in an accompanying article that Meany's speech was an eloquent admission that the much advertised "built-ins" in the economy assuring it "permanent prosperity" have gone up in smoke. One explanation for the anger of Meany and other labor leaders is their difficulty to build confidence in the capitalist system within the labor movement as a "healthy" economy in face of the economic heart-attacks now coming every five years.

Conspicuously absent at the conference was the talk of programs to make the economy "depression-proof" of which we have been hear-

ing much in the recent past within labor and liberal circles. It seemed futile to do so in face of what life itself has done to the "built-ins" and "safety-valves."

Only two months before the conference, a group of labor leaders and some liberals in the business and farm field, issued a document in the name of the Conference on Economic Progress, drawn up by their economist, Leon Keyserling, who headed President Truman's board of economic advisors. Among the labor leaders of that committee are Reuther, Hayes of the Machinists, and Knight of the Oil Workers. Keyserling drew up a dreamlike picture of a "depression-proof" America with all present unemployed on jobs and several more millions added to the labor force at work, if—and it's a big "if"—the country's national income were raised by \$81 billion in three years, half of it in higher wages. He thus saw the possibility of a capitalist economy on a steadily upward trend, if, in some manner the government and business executives of the country could be brought around to agreeing on a \$1,000 average rise per family income by 1961. The trade-union press, of course, greeted the idea of more jobs through higher wages. But at the conference no one spoke of Keyserling's or similar programs that have been advanced in the recent past. They seemed so unrealistic in face of the opposite trend developing in life with the pur-

chasing power falling, not rising. The current depression has again—and more strongly than ever—refuted the concept of the steadily rising economic curve under capitalism. The main concern, as expressed by Meany, is that the crisis will “feed upon itself” and run out of control, if some drastic measures aren’t taken immediately. The question, as the leaders of that conference now saw it, is not whether the economy, again in a depression, can be made “depression-proof,” but whether the decline can be leveled off at some “not-too-bad” level.

Harry Van Arsdale, president of the New York Central Trades and Labor Council, addressing the New York conference on unemployment, said it was useless to talk of stopping this depression because it should have been done years ago. The problem now is “how to stop the next depression,” he said.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The ideological helplessness of the top labor leaders today was also well illustrated in the speeches of Reuther and McDonald. After picturing the sad state of employment in the auto and farm equipment field, Reuther warned that American capitalism faces a challenge from the socialist world and asked “why is it that we are capable of our highest achievements only in time of war?” He asked further, why “is our society not able to match its wartime achievements in time of peace?”

He only asked the questions. He didn’t answer them.

McDonald drew an equally depressing picture of employment in the steel industry. The problem, he said, was not just to see how bad the situation is, but to find a “cure.” He said some way must be found to plan “permanent prosperity.” But after thus holding his listeners in suspense, what was McDonald’s “cure”? He suggested the President name a committee of top business, labor and other leaders who would hold meetings until they “find a cure.” But McDonald hadn’t the slightest idea what it should be. He only reaffirmed his confidence in what he called our “democratic capitalism,” and was horrified at the possibility that unions out to “destroy our democratic capitalism” may replace those led by conservatives.

Stanley Ruttenberg, the economist of the AFL-CIO, observed that in the past forty years (and they happen to be the forty years since the Russian revolution) there were eight economic declines in the United States. Ruttenberg said nothing of the Soviet Union and why there and in the socialist countries as a whole, there have been no crises. But most of the speakers did speak with horror of the still greater loss of “leadership” for U.S. capitalism because of the new crisis. They were no less horrified by the tremendous victories for the socialist world in the months preceding the conference. The Sputniks only

served to dramatize the trend. Within the four-month period that saw U.S. production drop 13 per cent and idle 25 per cent of the country’s productive capacity, the USSR’s economic data showed an eleven per cent rise in production. And the rate of increase is running about the same in the other eastern countries—substantially higher in China.

A bare few months ago leaders of the Right-wing labor-liberal camp (and even the revisionist stripe “Marxists” who tail after them) were singing hossanahs to a “new” capitalism that had found a way to a depressionless era. Some of the revisionists showed more interest in Strachey than Marx. And a companion to this refrain were drumbeats of hope that the billion-peopled socialist world would split over ideological differences brought on by the “new” capitalism, and that Hungarian-type revolts would spread and bring discredit upon the Soviet Union. But how differently events have turned out on both sides of the “iron curtain”!

CONCLUSIONS

As we have said, the struggle against the depression is still at an early stage. The course of the struggle in later stages will undoubtedly bring new developments and influences into the working-class movement. But some features of the struggle and the obligation it places upon the militant Left, are already quite evident.

1. The fact the labor movement assumed an obligation to wage a struggle in the interest of the unemployed, and the inaugural step with the Washington conference, is an important move in the right direction.

2. The program in that struggle is inadequate and the conference did not emphasize the need of mass struggle to win it. But Left-progressives should put primary emphasis on helping to arouse and broaden the struggle for that program. Experience is already showing that as the struggle progresses at state and local levels—as demonstrated in the Michigan march on Lansing and the Chicago and New York conferences—the fight and its program also take on a more advanced character. Experience is the greatest teacher, especially during struggles in the midst of a depression.

3. Left-progressives should not be limited to the demands endorsed in Washington, but should find every opportunity to stress others, like those we noted above. But such improvement on labor’s program should be sought in a positive way, within the framework of active support for the objectives advanced by labor.

4. While the labor movement assumes a responsibility for its unemployed, it must be borne in mind that not all sections of labor show an equal awareness and vigor in the struggle. Moreover, there are large sections of unemployed in

whom no union assumes even formal concern. They are the non-unionized. Or they may be of communities largely populated by Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican and other groups subject to discrimination and neglect by the unions. Large numbers of unemployed are uninformed of their rights to benefits. Thus, work in the unemployed field need not be confined to union auspices. Some existing community groups can take the initiative or new groups of unemployed can be formed on a community level, where advisable.

5. AFL-CIO headquarters in Washington, in calling on every local to activate the Community Services Committee or counsellors to assure all possible help and activity for the unemployed, has opened an important avenue for involving tens of thousands of rank and file workers in the work. Here is another form of activity in which the work of Left progressives could be most valuable to the labor movement.

6. The traditional pattern that was so brutally evident in the Hoover depression—of Negroes being last hired and first fired—continues in force basically notwithstanding the progress that was made against discrimination in the past generation. The Left-progressives are expected to give special attention to conditions of the most oppressed groups, especially the Negro and Puerto Rican workers.

7. The role of socialism in the struggle assumed both ideological-agitational and immediate practical importance. Never was a situation more ripe for socialist education. Never was capitalism as a system more under question among many people. Never was the opportunity better to translate socialism in terms of conditions in America. The trend throughout the world is in the direction of a greater prestige for socialism, and refutation of anti-socialist ideologists in or outside the ranks of socialism. Marxists, while fighting for every big and small measure to combat the depression and resist the efforts of Big Business to shift the burden on the backs of the masses, have an opportunity to revitalize socialist thinking in America. And there is another related element: those who hate capitalism most fight the hardest even for the elementary immediate objectives. It was quite apparent in the tone of the speeches at the Washington conference that the labor leaders who so fervently state their confidence in the capitalist "free enterprise" system, are very reluctant to even embarrass it, let alone fight it. It is enmity towards the system of capitalist exploitation that lends to Marxists the vigor and militancy in the fight against all that capitalism brings. That was proven in the Hoover depression and will be demonstrated again in the Eisenhower depression.

U. S. Farmers: Problems and Proposals

By John Hellman*

THIS ARTICLE WILL outline some features of the economic and political situation in U.S. agriculture today and the historic trends in operation; against this background it will discuss our past and future approach to rural problems. May any controversial opinions stimulate a constructive discussion. Statistics are taken from reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Census Bureau, unless otherwise noted.

Three most significant features of U.S. agriculture are: The steady and rapid elimination of farmers; the chronic crisis of "over-production"; the fact that many millions of rural people constitute the rock bottom of the economic and social ladder.

In 1957, the U.S. farm population of 20,396,000 was 12% of the national total. This was less than half of the 1933 percentage of 25.8% (32,393,000 on farms). The rate of elimination is increasing. U.S. farm population dropped 1,861,000 from April 1956 to April, 1957. The Census Bureau reports this as "one of the largest (changes) ever recorded."

Total farms dropped from 6,812,000 in 1934 to 4,783,000 at the time

of the last census in 1954. The sharpest decline was in the South as sharecropping gave way to technological change such as the mechanical cotton picker. In 1935 Southern tenants including sharecroppers totalled 1,831,475; their number had shrunk to 681,483 in 1954.

Agriculture is the sector of our economy which is most chronically in a crisis of over-production. The only exceptions in recent decades have been the two World Wars which created a vast export market and military demand. Farmers who selfishly jumped on the bandwagon for the Korean War, because they expected a big increase in consumption of farm products and a consequent boom in prices, were sorely disappointed to find that it takes a world holocaust to absorb their full production potential.

Farm acreage in production in 1957 was the lowest since 1919, yet production equalled the all-time peak. Farm productivity rises steadily as a result of:

1. Existence of genuine competition which also influences,
2. Increased investment of capital.
3. Hybrids and other improved varieties of plants and animals.
4. More fertilizers.

* The author is Chairman of the Party in Montana, and a member of the National Committee, CPUSA.—Ed.

5. Greatly increased use of insecticides, herbicides and anti-biotics.

6. Use of urea to promote rapid fattening and growth of animals and fowl with less feed.

The steady deterioration of economic conditions in the country-side is indicated by the following:

1. *Wages paid farm workers in 1955 were 32% of what factory labor got, while in 1945 the ratio was 48%.* (Reported by Frank L. Noakes at "A Conference on Migratory Labor and Low Income Farmers" in New York City, Nov. 13, 1957).

2. Net income of farm operators was \$11.6 billion in 1957 compared to the peak of \$16.9 billion in 1947.

3. The farm operators' share of the national income dropped from 9.1% in 1947 to 3.5% in 1957. A further breakdown of income by size of farms increases the picture of inequality. In 1954, 582,945 farms had sales over \$10,000, and this group, amounting to 12.2% of all farms, accounted for 58.2% of all farm income. At the bottom, with sales of less than \$2,500 each, were 1,225,775 full-time farms representing 25.7% of total farms but only 7.1% of total dollar output. In addition, part-time and residential farms totalled 1,455,404—30.4% of total farms with only 2.0% of farm receipts.

4. The farmers' parity ratio of prices received compared to prices paid fell to 82 in 1957 from a peak of 115 in 1947.

5. The farmers' share of the consumer's food dollar was 40% in 1957 compared to a peak of 53% in 1947. This was lower than the 42% in 1929 but above the bottom of 32%

in 1933. These percentages indicate the success of monopoly food processors, in contrast to farmers, in maintaining profits during a depression.

6. U.S. farm exports are down 20% from a year ago (*Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 24, 1958). In 1957, exports represented 15% of farm cash receipts and included 55% of all wheat production and 57% of all cotton production.

WHAT ROLE FOR THE PARTY?

In the face of these rural problems what role can our Party play in the countryside? For the past year a National Farm Commission of our Party has been operating on a limited scale. Its discussions have dealt with program, activities and organization among family farmers—in other words, mainly middle farmers. The Commission has not yet probed the special problems of the South or the critical problems of farm workers. The Commission, while reminded at times that several million agricultural workers exist, includes no representation from this vast group, and apparently our work and contact among them are very limited.

This weakness has been recorded frequently in the past. For example, Comrade Pettis Perry stated (*Political Affairs*, July, 1951): "To me the most important question is the lack of sufficient attention to the organization of the agricultural workers." And, "The greatest over-

all weakness in all of our work is the lack of building our Party rapidly and increasingly among the poor farmers and agricultural workers."

His words are still valid today. This long-continuing weakness is a serious opportunist error that has its roots in the composition of our rural Party members and in a lack of application of Marxism-Leninism. Top Party leadership bears a heavy responsibility for neglect of the farm question and the failure to develop understanding of it among all sections of the organization. A review of our educational endeavors fails to reveal any comprehensive study of the agrarian question. To restrict discussion and study of the agrarian question to farmers is as wrong as restricting study of the Negro question to Negroes. Only by understanding the agrarian question can farmers be won as an ally of the working class.

The most important future class struggles in the countryside will be fought by the agricultural workers—the lowest paid and most impoverished group in the U.S. Their permanence and growing importance is assured by the rapid growth of larger-scale production, division of labor and the extension of monopoly control with its "vertical integration" whereby production and any or all of such other operations as processing, packaging and distribution are brought under unified control. But U.S. agriculture needs to

be studied on a regional basis, and any approach must be modified with the understanding that agricultural workers have far greater significance in some states than others.

Our scattered rural Party membership is mainly small farmer. The result is a subjective approach. These farm comrades tend to see their own economic and political problems as *the* farm question. Likewise, such farm comrades do the most prodding of Party leadership on the farm question and the leadership falls into the same narrow approach.

A program for the protection of poor and middle farmers is an urgent question with which we are concerned. But what should be our approach and program?

The U.S. has had a tradition and history of vast numbers of small farmers because of peculiar features of development, especially the availability of new land for a century after the establishment of capitalism and during its rapid expansion, and the bourgeois-democratic advances during the Civil War period which won "homesteads" for many settlers, despite weaknesses in the Homestead Act.

Nevertheless the small farmer is a survival of a past mode of production. His counterpart in industry is long gone. The elimination of small individual producers under capitalism is a law of development that can be softened or modified but not halted or reversed. Our

greatest emphasis in the countryside must not be on that group which is being eliminated and steadily declining in importance. A few small farmers will, with the most favorable combination of conditions, hard work and the exploitation of their children, climb the economic ladder to where they can live from the labor of others. Far more small farmers will be eliminated as such.

We will unite with all who are sincerely interested in shielding poor and middle farmers from their enemies and in saving them from extinction as family farmers; but any success will, at best, be only partial. We do not advocate the elimination of the small independent farmer. We recognize it as an inevitable development due to modern technology, and under capitalism it is carried out with characteristic harshness and indifference to human consequences. The small farmer does not give up his difficult struggle to enter a better, easier and more hopeful activity in industry or as a partner in a modern collectively-owned farm enterprise; but leaves his home a beaten, bitter and miserable man, his family in like condition, to become an impoverished farm laborer or to seek without skill or experience an existence among the poorest sections of the industrial working class. For the remainder of his life he frequently nurses the dream of returning to the land.

Since World War II the Chamber of Commerce, NAM and others

have frequently called for the elimination of several million small farmers for "inefficiency." On the average, small producers cannot match the large producers in the effective use of modern machinery, scientific methods and division of labor. Yet this is far from the whole picture. Huge enterprises do not automatically result in greater efficiency, especially in the production of certain farm products. *The present advantage of the larger operator lies heavily in his exploitation of labor and the reaping of surplus value.* Also the large competitor of the small farmer uses his greater resources and size of operation to secure special political and economic advantages such as favorable legislation, partial or unfair administration of laws, cheaper credit or special prices for his products.

In the recent past we failed to clearly and widely explain the causes and inevitability of the extinction of family farmers; and therefore, by inference, supported the reformist illusion that the elimination of family farmers can somehow be halted under capitalism. It is our responsibility to be honest and forthright on the matter even though the truth be painful.

Frederick Engels wrote:

It is the duty of our Party to make clear to the peasants again and again that their position is absolutely hopeless as long as capitalism holds sway, that it is absolutely impossible to pre-

serve their small holdings for them as such, that capitalist large-scale production is absolutely sure to run over their impotent antiquated system of small production as a train runs over a pushcart. If we do this we shall act in conformity with the inevitable trend of economic development, and this development will not fail to bring our words home to the small peasants. (*The Peasant Question in France and Germany*).

We sharply oppose the Big Business program of callously scrapping millions of farmers, but what program can actually aid the small farmer? Obviously past and present legislation is ineffective. Practically all farm programs to date have been set up or administered (or both) to the advantage of the big farmers. Also there are many instances where farmers large and small were "propped up" not for their benefit but to indirectly subsidize financial, machinery and supply institutions to whom the farmer was in debt.

From the great Populist movement of the 1890's through more recent times the small farmers have a generally fine record of anti-monopoly struggle, unity with labor and opposition to war and militarism.

Our contribution to present struggles of family farmers should be the development of a more consistent class approach and consciousness. Family farmers can only be assisted under capitalism by the most determined resistance to their class

enemy—monopoly capital and the corporate and rich farmers. The family farmer can only be aided by programs that have a decidedly unequal approach in favor of the family farmer—at least not unequal in favor of the big ones. Following are suggested approaches to a program for poor and middle farmers:

A SUGGESTED PROGRAM

1. Parity prices paid to a farm operator must cover only that amount of production necessary to sustain a family farmer. Such a limitation was first proposed by the Progressive Party in 1948, with \$10,000 gross value of farm production per farm operator to be protected by price supports. Later, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan borrowed the idea for his Brannan Plan but weakened it by raising to \$25,000 the amount of production to be supported.

2. All cuts in acreage or production must be taken on the big producers, with a minimum level of production absolutely protected against any cut-back. For example, wheat farmers have had their allowable acreage cut approximately 35% the past several years. Such a cut reduces the profits of the big operator, but is disastrous for the small farmer who was just getting by on his full acreage.

3. Loans at very low interest rates must be made available to family farmers only.

4. Federal hail, drought and other crop insurance should cost a nominal amount on that quantity of production necessary to maintain a family farmer.

5. A graduated land tax that sharply increases the rate of property taxation on large holdings. Our tax structure requires that this issue be raised on a state rather than Federal level.

6. Agricultural workers must be organized and their living standards raised to the level of factory labor. Some family farmers already realize that this will be of key assistance to them; others will readily understand it. The family farmer sells on a market that is decisively influenced by the cost of production on large industrial farms which pay wages that are 32% (in 1955) of those paid in other industries. If wages of agricultural workers were tripled this would have a dramatic effect on the living standards of small farmers. It is true that food processing, machinery and other monopolies rob the farmers, but the prices paid and received by farmers still have a definite relationship to the cost of production in agriculture as a whole. The family farmers who depend mostly on their own labor cannot maintain an "American" standard of living when agricultural prices are keyed to the operation of big farms who exploit labor to the extent that it receives a miserably inadequate standard of

living and this for only part of the year. Inevitably the small farmers must consume (and surrender) their meagre bit of capital; they cannot even in any numbers survive by reverting to the primitive existence and methods of a century ago.

SMALL FARMER CHARACTERISTICS

The family farmer displays the vacillating weakness of the petty bourgeois. When he is about to go under he becomes ultra-rebellious; and when temporary prosperity comes his way he swings quickly in the other direction. Our Party helped lead mass farm struggles during the Great Depression and recruited thousands of family farmers who left the struggle for basic change all too quickly when war brought better times. The failure to appreciate this vacillating quality of family farmers and to realize that their relative prosperity plus the attacks of McCarthyism would result in a substantial political retreat, contributed heavily to sectarian errors in farm activity after 1947. Unfortunately some progressive farmers still self-righteously refuse to be critical of their tactical error of trying to advance when the mass of farmers were in general retreat on controversial questions of international relations and civil liberties. Instead these progressives assume a cynical attitude toward existing farm organizations and an aloofness towards

the great need and good opportunities for political work among organized farmers.

The material conditions of the small farmer create a strong individualism. His system of production requires great self-reliance and he often works for days without much human contact beyond the family. Consequently a collective approach is difficult to develop. On the other hand, small farmers do more reading than other groups because of the isolation of rural life and the slack seasons of work. Literature should play a prominent role in political activity among farmers.

By far the best, and the main current in the defense struggles of the family farmers has been and must be one which recognizes and promotes their fraternal interests with the industrial workers—the principle expressed as farm-labor unity, a unity in resistance to monopoly capitalism which we may confidently expect to reach logical fulfillment in unity for achievement of a socialist economy.

The growing economic crisis increases the extreme difficulties of agricultural workers. They are almost totally unorganized. Most work is seasonal and uncertain. City unemployed are now seeking farm work and will further flood the rural labor market and make it possible for employers to drive wages and conditions still lower. (A spot check in Montana indicated that ranchers who have been paying nine to

twelve dollars a day for good hired help expect to get it for as low as five dollars this year because of the heavy unemployment.)

NEED FOR ORGANIZATION

The key question for agricultural workers is their organization into effective unions. Only a few thousand out of several million are now organized. In 1957, H. L. Mitchell, president of the National Agricultural Workers Union (AFL-CIO), reported 1,500 members. The United Packinghouse Workers is reported to have a few agricultural workers organized.

Widespread backing for an organizing drive was indicated at "A Conference on Migratory Labor and Low Income Farmers" called by the National Sharecroppers Fund in New York City on Nov. 13, 1957 (a good detailed report is in *Facts For Farmers*, Dec., 1957). Though the AFL-CIO was asked to provide all-out "moral and financial" aid for an organizing drive, no such campaign has yet developed or been announced. In fact, the AFL-CIO recently discharged a considerable number of its organizers. It has been argued that agricultural workers can't be organized because of migrancy and seasonal work. Seamen frequently change jobs and travel over the globe yet maintain effective unions. In many other nations agricultural workers are well-organ-

ized and are vital sections of the trade-union movement.

Actually the major insidious obstacle to organizing agricultural workers and improving their lot is *chauvinism*. A majority of such workers belong to national minorities—Negro, Mexican, Indian, Puerto Rican, Oriental and others. Chauvinism is undoubtedly a strong factor in the failure of the AFL-CIO to launch the necessary organizing drive.

Urgent legislative needs of agricultural workers—needs that can be fought for and won by existing trade union, farm, Negro and other mass organizations to their own great benefit as well as that of the agricultural workers—include:

1. The key issue is to extend the Federal minimum wage law to agriculture. Most agricultural work pays less than the present Federal minimum of \$1.00 and much work is done for less than 50 cents per hour.

2. Unemployment insurance coverage. A survey of a considerable number of states failed to locate any that extend unemployment compensation protection to farm workers.

3. Provide full social security cov-

erage. The present law is discriminatory. Farm workers must work at least 20 days or earn at least \$150 with an employer before their wages are considered for social security purposes.

4. Eliminate restrictions that usually exclude migrants from welfare and relief payments.

5. A Federal housing and sanitation program for farm workers.

6. Reduce length of residence requirements and other restrictions that disfranchise migrant workers. Very few of them now vote. Of course this is over and above the large problem of the right to vote for all citizens of the South.

Space does not permit the discussion of such vital aspects of the farm question as farm-labor unity, the role of farm cooperatives, the question of large-scale cooperative farming under capitalism or the possible features of U.S. agriculture under socialism.

Communists made notable contributions to farm struggles during the Great Depression. With the same spirit of dedication and with a Marxist understanding of the trends in U.S. agriculture, our Party can again play a vital role in the countryside.

The Superiority of World Socialism Over World Capitalism*

By William Z. Foster

We know our readers will be especially happy to see this article by William Z. Foster; its appearance is a highlight in his battle to recover from the severe attack that laid him low over half a year ago. Foster still is very ill, but with indomitable courage he is fighting his way back into active service on behalf of Socialism.—Editor.

ONE OF THE MOST striking features accompanying the world excitement over the launching of the Soviet Sputnik in October 1957—the first American satellite was launched in February 1958—were the admissions by the spokesmen of the United States and other imperialist countries, of lagging behind the USSR in various lines of basic activity. Never before had anything like this taken place. One thing about this orgy of “self-criticism,” however, was the fact that although American spokesmen confessed the inadequacy of United States work in various fields, they were careful not to impugn the capitalist system itself as being inferior to Socialism.

Here is exposed one of the most marked attitudes of the capitalist system towards the Socialist system over the years—the refusal of the United States and all imperialist countries to recognize in any way the superiority of the Socialist system, even when this is of the most outstanding and unmistakable character. The imperialist spokesmen have expended great efforts through the years to explain away the remarkable achievements of Socialism

by all kinds of excuses and shallow arguments. The reason for this is, of course, that it is psychologically impossible for the capitalist class to recognize the superiority of Socialism, for to do so would be to admit the bankruptcy of capitalism. Hence, since the foundation of Socialism by the Russian Revolution in 1917, up to the present time, one of the fundamental principles of the imperialists has been to never admit any kind of basic superiority of Socialism in practice, although now they are finding it increasingly difficult to obscure from their own followers the tremendous advances of the Socialist countries.

Of course, increasing millions of people have been able to perceive the revolutionary core and unique character of Russian history; they are beginning to realize Socialism's superiority to an extent never possible before. This is an event of major historical importance. This ideological re-evaluation of capitalism and Socialism is one of the most basic characteristics of the present period.

* The author is happy to acknowledge the assistance of Jack Shulman in the preparation of this article.

SOME EXAMPLES OF SOCIALIST SUPERIORITY

Innumerable instances may be given of capitalist spokesmen obscuring the outstanding achievements of Socialism by a tissue of lies. In the past forty years of the history of the Soviet Union, the young Socialist country has made many magnificent achievements which clearly showed the superiority of Socialism. Some of these are:

1) First, was the seizure and holding of power by the Bolsheviks. This refuted every political concept of the bourgeoisie, and they did not hesitate in prophesying daily the defeat of the Russian Revolution. But it lived on, showing the special vitality of this revolution, and its unlimited power.

2) The specific victory of the Revolution in the Civil War of 1918-1920 was undoubtedly one of the outstanding political events in the history of mankind. It was one of the many "impossibilities" that have made up the history of the Russian Revolution. The war-weary, starving, non-industrialized Russians were able to beat back the combined imperialist countries of the world trying to strangle the young Socialist Republic. Here undoubtedly was an event of superlative quality. The bourgeoisie have nothing in their history to compare with this achievement, and they have taken great pains to obscure and hide the special significance of this whole episode in the history of the Russian Revolution.

3) The rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union through the Five-Year Plans and the collectivization of agriculture, also represented one of the most revolutionary developments in the

history of mankind, which far surpasses the erstwhile revolutionary achievements of the bourgeoisie. The capitalists have tried by every means to paint these achievements as failures, and to hide the amazing accomplishments of the Socialist system in these fields; thus they attempt to obscure the innate superiority of the Soviet system in industry and agriculture over the capitalist system.

4) The superiority of Socialism over capitalism was also made manifest during the economic crisis of 1929. The fact that the Socialist system was able to boom ahead, making unprecedented gains in production while the capitalist system lay prostrate all over the world, was such a dramatic demonstration of the superiority of Socialism over capitalism that even the most clever soothsayers and devoted servants of the capitalist system had great difficulty trying to defend their system in the face of the tremendous strides being made in the USSR.

5) Another of the many outstanding examples Socialism gave as it grew over the years, of its inherent superiority over capitalism, was its crushing defeat of Hitler's mighty armies. Hitler, at the height of his power, had practically all of Europe in his grasp, with most of its labor force (except England) working as slave labor behind his "invincible" war machine. It outnumbered the productive power of the USSR by at least 4 to 1, and its armed forces also heavily outnumbered the Russians. When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941, the bourgeois experts throughout the capitalist world, including America, relying upon their own traditional standards of measurement, were in unanimous agreement that he would

defeat the Soviet Union in a matter of a few weeks. Yet, when the chips were all counted, the Hitler war machine was completely crushed, while the Soviet Union emerged victorious and stronger than ever. While, of course, Hitler's defeat was not due only to the Soviet Union, the main blows against Hitler came from the USSR. This represents a superlative achievement totally without comparison in bourgeois history.

6) Among the many achievements of the Russian Revolution without parallel in capitalist history was the rapid rebuilding of the Soviet Union after the destruction it suffered in World War II. The Hitler war machine had wiped out about half of the industry of the USSR, and killed off 12 million of its people; nevertheless, the country recovered its economic forces at a rate unmatched all over the world (and without the "aid" of American dollars) showing that the recuperative power of the Soviet Union as a Socialist country was incomparably greater than that of any capitalist country. The USSR has already surpassed the productive capacity of pre-war years several times over, and is forging far ahead.

The above list of examples of the superiority of Socialism in practice in the Soviet Union, over capitalism in the past period is only partial; many more could be cited. The revolutionary vigor and accompanying characteristics of the Soviet Union from its birth are now being duplicated by the younger Socialist countries which have come upon the scene lately. This is shown particularly by the great Chinese Revolution, which has gone through a revolutionary period of 25 years of civil war and intervention, and is now

astounding the world with the speed of its progress in industrialization and modernization. The Chinese Revolution, embracing one-fourth of the human race, is accomplishing things that are obviously far beyond the possibility of any capitalist country. The imperialist apologists are trying to obscure and minimize the significance of the great achievements of the Chinese people, but these fabrications will prove just as empty and foolish as their long-continued attempts to belittle the results of the Russian Revolution.

* * *

By the time of the end of World War II, the tempo of revolutionary development of the Soviet Union, and later of China, was very great, and becoming more and more obvious. This period, as we have already indicated, had already produced the rapid rebuilding of the Soviet Union after the war's destruction, followed by the swift breaking of the atom bomb monopoly of the United States, and then the still swifter liquidation of the American hydrogen bomb monopoly. These startling developments badly upset the time-table of the war-planning imperialists, who didn't consider it possible for the Soviet Union to achieve these results for many years, if ever. The imperialists had always regarded the Russians as a nation of peasants, who would never be able to overcome the tremendous head-start of many years of development of science in the capitalist countries, which had the resources of the whole world to draw on. Consequently, it became extremely difficult for the imperialists to explain away these new developments, and they had to resort to all sorts of fantastic reasoning; thus, the

quick development of the atom and hydrogen bomb by the Russians was ascribed to the kidnapping of German scientists, or to the stealing of atom bomb secrets by the martyred Rosenbergs in this country.

Among the other striking achievements of the period, indicating the rapid development of the USSR and China, was the defeat of the imperialist armies during the Korean War of 1950-53, in which the Chinese smashed the most highly developed imperialist forces, although they themselves were largely without airplanes and other modern equipment. Then came the ending of the Indo-Chinese War, in 1954, where once again the armies of this backward country, repeating the successes of China in Korea, were able to defeat the most highly equipped imperialist armies of France, which were aided by the United States. Then again note the inability of the British and French imperialists to go through with their attack upon Egypt in 1956, basically because of the opposition of Socialist lands.

One of the most striking aspects of this whole period was the enormous growth of the military strength of the revolutionary forces, particularly the USSR and China. In fact, so great was this, that the imperialists were seriously checked in their avowed purpose of a "preventive" atomic war against the USSR and China.

Already the growth of the revolutionary forces was so rapid in contrast with those of imperialism, that in Socialist circles it was freely talked about as the historic period when Socialism would establish its world superiority with regard to the capitalist system in general and imperialism in particular.

This became a living question at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, in May, 1956, where the rapid advance of the Socialist powers to world superiority was clearly pointed out. It also was concretely discussed in the Chinese, American, and other Communist parties. Obviously, the question of the superiority of Socialism as against the erstwhile superiority of the capitalist system was now on the immediate order of the day.

* * *

At this time, two general events developed which tended to obscure, at least for the moment, the rapid growth of Socialist superiority in the world; and even to create false beliefs that Socialism was suffering a regression. The first of these was the capitalist post-war industrial boom. This was especially strong in America, and influenced the post-war capitalist boom all over the world. An especially vigorous crop of prosperity illusions mushroomed, and theories developed on all sides that capitalism had finally mastered its economic crises, was entering a period of endless prosperity, and that Socialism was now no longer necessary, much less inevitable, for the imperialist countries.

The second of these features tending to obscure the growth of Socialism, was the anti-democratic practices of Stalin in his later years, as revealed by Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This factor, of Stalin's violations of Socialist democracy, particularly taken in connection with the post-war imperialist economic boom, tended to confuse many people, and even to cast discredit upon the Socialist movement, with the effect that in several countries (Poland, Hungary,

etc.) considerable dissatisfaction existed among the workers, while in Great Britain, Canada, and especially the United States, serious crisis developed in the Communist parties. Undoubtedly, Stalin's mistakes had greatly facilitated the success of the always-present plotting of the imperialists against the Socialist states, and this tended to give some semblance of workers' support to the counter-revolutionary attempts of world imperialism to overthrow the Socialist regimes of various People's Democracies. The Revisionists throughout the world Communist movement began to declare with great distortion that the Communist world movement was in a crisis similar to the crisis of the Second International at the outbreak of World War I.

These factors, however, of the post-war capitalist economic boom and the Stalin revelations, could not change, much less for long obscure, the rapid revolutionary developments that were taking place in the Soviet Union, China, and other Socialist countries. In fact, capitalism was in for the most startling shock in this respect, in the development of the Soviet earth satellite, the Sputnik, the effects of which have continued ever since to shake the foundations of world bourgeois ideology after its appearance in October 1957.

At first, the imperialist soothsayers, such as Charles Wilson, U.S. Secretary of Defense, tried to laugh off the new Russian satellite as being a gadget and a clever trick; but this obviously fell flat. The launching of a satellite into space by human endeavor, was of such stupendous importance that it broke through every attempt of the bourgeoisie to belittle and minimize

its significance, until it set the whole capitalist intellectual world atremble. Man had at last broken the bounds of space and had launched a vehicle that was no longer confined to the gravity of the earth. This marks an epoch in the life of man and of science. Space travel between the planets has now become a practical matter.

The consternation and confusion of the American imperialist world over this question lasted for several months, until early February 1958, when the U.S. Army succeeded in launching its "Explorer" satellite (later to be followed by more successful launchings). This notable achievement did much to restore the gravely damaged prestige of the United States, but it must be remembered that the Soviet Sputnik is on a much larger scale than that of the U.S. forces. It is generally recognized that in this field the American techniques are far behind those of the Soviets.

The success of the Sputnik, coming as it did on the heels of the advances in the jet plane field, as well as the ICBM field, lighted up a whole series of other outstanding and revolutionary achievements and superiorities of Socialism over imperialism, of which the bourgeoisie, with its domination of the press and other means of information, had succeeded in hiding the real significance, as usual. Among these may be mentioned the revolutionary significance of the rapid industrial rate of growth of the Socialist countries. All of a sudden, the bourgeois thinkers began to realize the revolutionary implications of the fact that for many years the Soviet Union, and now China and other Socialist countries, were increasing their industrial output at a rate from 2 to 10

times that of the imperialist world. They began to see that this is a fatal handicap in the long run for their system.

Another thing revealed by the Soviet Sputnik, as by a flash of lightning, was the superiority of the Soviet educational system. It had been noted previously by many that the Soviet Union was training more and better equipped scientists than the United States was, but this was slurred over and obscured, and belittled in the usual manner. But the advent of the Sputnik exposed the revolutionary significance of this superiority of Socialist education over capitalism, and the bourgeoisie learned with a soul-shaking shock that the Soviet Union was producing scientists at twice as great a rate as America, and generally had an educational system far superior to the American, and particularly so in the field of science. It became also suddenly obvious that in many branches of science the Russians were in the lead; and where they were not yet ahead, were rapidly catching up and about to take the lead.

Then ensued one of the most remarkable ideological breakdowns in history, with the imperialists, not only in the United States, but also in the rest of the capitalist world, standing more or less aghast at the exposure of the backwardness of their system. They were not prepared as yet, however, to recognize the superiority of Socialism over capitalism, which is the true meaning of this series of events which we have been reciting; but they did come closer to such a recognition than ever before.

These spectacular demonstrations of the superiority of Socialism over capitalism in these all-decisive spheres, put an end to the so-called crisis of world

Socialism, which the imperialists had been doing their utmost to develop, and which was the stock-in-trade of the Revisionists everywhere. Instantly, the shallowness of these charges was exposed, and the irresistible forward march of Socialism was again made clear. To make the embarrassment of imperialism all the more dramatic, it happens that this development of Sputnik was accompanied by the development of an American economic crisis, which is affecting the whole capitalist world. An important indication of this fact is the figure for American steel production, which is running at about 50 per cent of capacity (at this writing).

Unemployment in America is now over 5½ million, and growing; our industrial production is slowing down considerably; and the other capitalist countries of the world are rapidly being dragged down into the crisis. At the same time, the industrial production and the standard of living of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries keep rising steadily. The world is able to see in this another glaring example of the superiority of the Socialist system over capitalism.

WHAT MAKES SOCIALISM SUPERIOR?

At the present time, the imperialists of various countries, near panic-stricken at the Sputnik and associated successes of the Soviet Union, have adopted for themselves the slogan that their task now is to catch up with the Soviet Union. And the key to this "catching up with the Soviet Union" is the spending of more and more money. The impression has grown up that if they spend enough government money they are bound to catch up with the USSR.

But this is an illusion. The reason for the falling behind of the imperialist powers is not that they have not spent enough money "for defense." It is to be found basically in the inherent inferiority of the capitalist system in contrast to Socialism. Nor is the answer to their problem of "catching up with the Soviet Union" to be found in the enlargement of the National Debt, or the sharp increase of the arms program, or deficit spending, etc.

It is of course within the realm of possibility that the United States may "catch up" with the Soviet Union in one or another field where it is at present behind. This is because it has so many resources and because it has had a great head-start in many fields. But this does not alter the basic relationship between the two social systems; that is, superiority for Socialism, and inferiority for capitalism. The tendency for Socialism to outrun capitalism is bound to continue at an accelerating pace, although it may be uneven in spots. We are now in the period where the Socialist system is very definitely accomplishing Lenin's slogan of catching up with and *surpassing* the capitalist system.

Among the many reasons why Socialism is superior to capitalism and why it is impossible therefore for the capitalists to "catch up" with Socialism are the following:

1) Under Socialism, all the basic means of production and natural resources are owned collectively by all the people and are operated in the interest of the whole nation; whereas under capitalism, all the means of production and resources are owned privately by a small class of capitalists. The capitalist system is based upon the principle of production for profit,

while the Socialist system is based upon the principle of production for use. The contradiction of private ownership of the means of production, imposed on a social form of production, is the basic weakness of the capitalist system; and the elimination of this contradiction is one of the supreme sources of strength and superiority of Socialism.

2) By its nature as a privately-owned economy, production under capitalism is carried on essentially upon a planless basis, under the slogans of free competition and free enterprise; whereas under Socialism, production, because it is based on a socially-owned industry, is carried on upon a planned basis. This is no contradiction of the fact that capitalist production is dominated by monopoly and is essentially monopoly state capitalism. The planfulness of Socialism is one of the most vital points of superiority of Socialism over capitalism. This is particularly to be noted in respect to the stability and lack of economic crises in the Socialist countries. This also helps explain why Socialist production can grow at a rate several times faster than any capitalist country.

3) Fundamental to its organization on an individual basis, the capitalist structure is divided into a series of hostile, antagonistic and quarreling classes; whereas Socialism, based upon the common economic and political interests of all elements of society, and its common ownership and planned production, is essentially classless and has eliminated forever the exploitation of man by man. What classes do remain for the time being in Socialist societies at this stage of development, are essentially non-antagonistic, and the whole Socialist system is moving in the direction of a

completely classless society. This greater homogeneity of Socialist society enormously favors it in every test of strength, whether it be military, scientific, economic, organizational, or cultural; and this clearly contributes to the superiority of Socialism over capitalism.

4) Inevitably for the private ownership form of organization the capitalist system is also guilty of the grossest inequalities with respect to the distribution of the product of industry. It is inherent to capitalism that a small group owns millions and billions, whereas vast numbers of the common people own nothing and live throughout their years in poverty. It is precisely to end this gross social inequality that the gigantic Socialist movement has come into existence in the world, and is carrying on its struggle to abolish capitalism. The establishment of Socialism destroys the basis of this inequality by socializing the industries and freeing the workers from wage slavery; however, it must be remembered that full equality cannot be established until the introduction of Communism. The superiority of Socialism in thus protecting the interests of the entire people as against the capitalist system which operates only for the benefit of the exploiting classes, is manifest.

5) One of the major inferiorities of capitalism to Socialism is the gigantic wastefulness involved in its system of class distribution. American capitalism supports a system of private owners involving in the neighborhood of 15 million parasites of useless occupation or no occupation at all, with many billions to squander on themselves, and they have a large part of the whole social system involved in luxury production which is useless ex-

cept for a small percentage of the population. Socially useless production for some at the expense of useful production for the great majority is an outstanding characteristic of the capitalist system. The devotion of the product of labor to the interest of the useful working elements of society is one of the outstanding advantages Socialism has over capitalism.

6) One of the major points of superiority of Socialism over capitalism is its greater basic democracy and security for the people. Despite certain weaknesses in the achievement of democracy—in the midst of the hard, disciplined struggle carried on by the workers under difficult conditions against the constant attacks of militant imperialism—as for example, the mistakes of the “cult of the individual” period under Stalin—nevertheless, Socialist democracy in the Soviet Union has achieved the greatest level of freedom for the working classes in the history of mankind. This democracy and profound concern for security are fundamentally rooted in the common ownership of the means of production. The very heart of Socialist society is that it looks after the interests of all the individuals who make up society, and this is one of its greatest strengths; whereas capitalism focuses its attention basically on the interests of the well-to-do classes. Such limited democracy and social security as the workers have under capitalism was achieved and is maintained as a result of many long years of bitter battles. The elementary democratic superiority of Socialism is a fundamental reason for the great strength of the Socialist states; and it also explains why scores of millions of workers throughout the world are casting off their illusions in capitalism and

beginning to struggle for Socialism.

7) Another elementary superiority of Socialism over capitalism lies in the realm of the general cultural level of the Socialist peoples. This manifests itself in various directions—for example, in the fight to raise the literary level of the masses; in the fight against superstition, obscurantism, and other forms of mass ignorance cultivated by the ruling class; and many other ways. The superior culture of the masses of the people in the Socialist countries is one of the major manifestations of the fundamental superiority of Socialism over capitalism.

8) One of the outstanding characteristics of monopoly capitalism, and therewith one of its fundamental weaknesses, is its imperialist nature. The big monopolies, which dominate capitalism, undertake to rule the world and control all social life generally, in order to rob and exploit the peoples of weaker countries. The inevitable results are wars and national oppression of all kinds. One of the great strengths of the Socialist countries, on the other hand, is that they are opposed to imperialism and all its works.

The conflict between imperialistic capitalism and anti-imperialist Socialism reflects itself upon numerous fields. At the basis of the struggle against colonial oppression is the urgent drive of the people to develop their own industries. It is the inevitable position of the imperialist powers to prevent the colonial countries from building their own industries, while the Socialist countries are doing everything they can to extend fraternal and generous aid to those countries in this respect.

The monopolistic, imperialistic nature of capitalism has prevented the

lesser developed countries from making full use of steam power, electricity, and machinery generally. It is especially preventing the use of atomic power for the development of the backward countries. In fact, the imperialist powers cannot even develop fully their own productive forces, much less develop the industrial power of the weaker countries. On the other hand, the nature of the Socialist countries makes possible the full development of all the productive forces both of their own countries, and of their allies, the less developed countries. This characteristic of Socialism to further the industrial development of the backward countries, is one of the most powerful of all tendencies making for the victory of Socialism in the world, further demonstrating the superiority of Socialism over capitalism.

The anti-imperialist nature of Socialism makes possible relations of complete equality and respect between all nations; whereas monopoly capitalism, because of its imperialist nature, strives only for domination of one nation over others. The great struggle of the Negro people in America for full freedom and equality is akin to the tremendous world-wide struggle of colonial liberation, and throws a bright searchlight upon the oppressive nature of American imperialism. Significantly, in the Soviet Union about half the scientists, doctors, and teachers are women; also a high percentage of these professionals and government officials are Jews, Armenians, and members of other national minority groups; and in all the formerly backward nations of Czarist Russia which now make up the Soviet Union, there are flourishing spectacular scientific and cultural developments.

9) The historic process of the ascendancy of Socialism over capitalism reaches its apex in the fight of Socialism for world peace over the forces of imperialism making for war. World imperialism is fundamentally war-like, developing a constant urge for wars between the imperialist powers themselves, for wars of imperialist powers against the colonial peoples, and for wars of imperialist powers against the Socialist states. World Socialism, however, is fundamentally peaceful, since there are no classes in a Socialist society which stand to gain anything from war. Because of these fundamental characteristics, world Socialism has emerged as the recognized outstanding champion of the whole world struggle for peace. This reached its sharpest expression recently, when the whole world was thrilled to hear the Soviet Union announce, on March 31, 1958, that it would unilaterally stop further testing of atomic bombs. Whereas up to the present period in world history, the workers of the world and the peace forces generally were not able to prevent the imperialists from unleashing devastating world wars, the strength of the Socialist peace camp has become so great that it is now a practical possibility for the peace forces to prevent the outbreak of another world war. But, as the recent 64 Party Peace Manifesto points out, war, while not inevitable, still remains a grave danger, and must be fought against with every ounce of strength.

The fight for peace now becomes literally a life and death struggle for society. The struggle grows all the more acute and crucial because of two factors: first, because of the deepening

of the general crisis of capitalism, which forces the imperialists to resort more and more to violence in order to try to save their obsolete system in the face of growing Socialism; and second, the growth of the lethal qualities of modern weapons—the A-bomb, the H-bomb, ballistic missiles, etc.—which make it impossible for society to indulge in major wars without catastrophic consequences. The fight for peace therefore assumes the most sweeping importance, and it displays in most concrete form the superiority of Socialism over imperialism.

The most important slogan in the world of practical politics today is the fight for peace—the peaceful coexistence of all nations. In this fight, Socialism demonstrates beyond all doubt that it is fundamentally operating on a higher plane than capitalism. Bound up in its program of peace and Socialism is the whole future and progress of humanity.

The foregoing are some of the more outstanding elements of the superiority possessed by Socialist institutions. They are insuperable reasons why the imperialist countries, including the United States, will never, under their present social structure, be able to “catch up” to the Socialist world in the fields of science, education, technology and others, where Socialism is now in the lead. This lead is bound to grow in the main as Socialism develops and registers its fundamental superiority over capitalism. In order for the United States, or any capitalist country, to “catch up” with the Soviet Union, it will be necessary to make a basic change in the structure of society, namely to abolish capitalism and establish Socialism.

The California Primary Elections

By Albert J. Lima*

THE MONOPOLISTS WHO dominate the top command of the Republican Party have selected the California general elections of 1958 as a key testing ground for the 1960 Presidential elections.

William Knowland was chosen from his top spot in the U.S. Senate to replace (via the political blackjack method) the incumbent Governor Knight. Knowland promptly took the offensive against organized labor by following in the wake of the McCellan Committee, and presented his “Bill of Rights for Union Members,” point seven of which is the so-called “Right-to-Work” plank.

Thus, for the labor and progressive movement, the main issue of the 1958 elections was clearly joined. William F. Knowland, the Senator from Formosa, an aggressive and able political representative of the most belligerent and war-minded sections of the big monopolists, represents a clear threat to progress and peace. His candidacy represents the preventive-war, union-smashing, most reactionary wing of the Republican Party.

* The author is Chairman, Northern California District Committee, and a member of the National Committee, CPUSA.—Ed.

THE KNOWLAND CANDIDACY

The Knowland candidacy represents a shift in tactics for the Republicans in California politics. In 1942 they utilized the liberal policy and methods of Earl Warren to be the front-running statewide Republican in a state with an overwhelmingly registered Democratic majority. The success of Earl Warren carried over to other state-wide candidates, including those for U.S. Senate.

When Warren was elevated to the U.S. Supreme Court, Lt. Governor Knight changed his political hue overnight from reactionary to Warren-type liberal. He confounded all political skeptics and Left-wing cynics by his ability to make the switch successfully. He strengthened his position with the top leadership of the labor movement. He made shrewd moves in his dealing with leaders of the Negro community.

Governor Knight, an old-fashioned type of politician, seemed to find nimble feet in the political climate of California. Then came 1958 and the arch-reactionary Knowland rudely thrust the “liberal” and politically successful Knight aside, and

the Republicans had carried through a major shift in tactics in California politics.

The Republican Party does not needlessly sacrifice the Chairman of the Republican Senators to be defeated as a candidate for Governor. They did not callously whip a successful Governor out of his post where his chances for success seemed to be favorable just to be changing their horses around.

It is much more likely that the Republican high command is shoring up to meet the political and economic crisis of our country. The big monopolists are being impelled by the urgent needs of a system in trouble toward an aggressive political offensive against organized labor. They are confronted with a growing crisis in foreign policy abroad and the economy at home.

Whatever differences exist within the Republican high command on questions of foreign and domestic policy, there seemed to be unity on forcing Knight to step aside to make room for Knowland. The direct intervention of Eisenhower and Nixon in the callous political move against Knight was indicative of this unity.

There has been some speculation to the effect that Knowland made a mistake in supporting the so-called Right-to-Work petition and that he would back away from this position. His April speech in Oakland belies this. In this talk, Knowland repeated his "Bill of Rights" for union members. He stated:

If the union does not act in the best interests of the membership, the individual should be able to withdraw from the union without losing his employment. He should not be a captive of a dictatorial or corrupt set of officials that he cannot recall from office. In California, I am challenging the power of labor bosses.

He is striking at some key weaknesses of the labor movement, and is giving leadership to an aggressive public offensive against labor. He has joined the issue and gives every indication of carrying through a campaign on that basis.

Will this change in tactics on the part of the Republicans be successful? The state remains strongly Democratic in registration. The Democratic Party continues to show increased strength due to the growth and activity of the club movement which now numbers some 40,000 members statewide. Labor and the minority peoples are more effectively influencing the Democratic Party. There has been a gradual shift from the Republican domination in farm and rural counties to the Democrats in the past few years, and a number of formerly Republican centers have fallen to the growing Democratic Party movement. The economic depression is now giving further impetus to this trend.

The labor and progressive forces have the potential to defeat the Knowland threat, but in order to do so they will need to mount cam-

aign activities of a more effective kind both programmatically and organizationally than they have up to now.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The convention of the Democratic Party has assumed a great deal of importance in the political life of the state. The convention is a combination of delegates from the club organizations, the county and state committees, office holders, etc. The endorsement of candidates by these conventions has enabled the Democratic Party to enter the primaries sufficiently united to put a halt to the Republican capturing of both party primaries by cross-filing.

This year's convention had between 1,800 to 2,000 delegates and all candidates had their campaign material and their supporters working diligently to win the endorsement of the convention.

The convention this year had a labor caucus of some 150 delegates, which devoted itself largely to the "Right-to-Wreck" campaign. The Democratic Minority Conference included some 100 Negro and Mexican-American delegates.

The strength of labor and the Minority Conference as well as of the strong progressive trend among the club delegates, made itself felt on issues and candidates. The attempt of the machine to steamroller support for the team of Attorney-General Brown for Governor and Con-

gressman Clair Engle for U.S. Senate ran into stiff opposition. Brown had overwhelming support from all groupings, mainly because he was considered to be the most substantial candidate with a possibility of defeating the Republicans. Engle, who voted for Taft-Hartley and supported the Democratic Party position on foreign policy, ran into stiff opposition. Professor Odegard of the University of California, contested Engle and he received substantial support. Engle was forced to declare himself against Taft-Hartley and the "Right-to-Work" bill.

The Minority Conference and the progressives amongst the delegates won a major victory when they nominated the Los Angeles Mexican-American Lopez for Secretary of State over the machine proposal of John Anson Ford.

The State Convention is to be followed by an Issues Convention later in the campaign, and the convention acted only on skeleton resolutions. But here, too, the strength of the rank and file and their growing awareness of issues made itself felt. They adopted a position in favor of FEP and censured both party legislators who voted against FEP in the state fight; against the seniority system of Congressional Committees; for utilizing the economic opportunities of trade with China and the Far East; on the Un-American Committee, calling for

reform of its procedures and limiting of its mandate.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The labor movement in California is nearly 1,800,000 members strong. The threat of the "Right-to-Wreck" petition and the Knowland campaign has plunged labor into political action in a manner not equaled in recent years. There has been a development of unity around the slogans of defeating the initiative and Knowland which is a marked change in recent elections.

The unions have been conducting a vigorous campaign to get all of their members registered to vote. There have been conflicting reports of the results of the registration campaign, but generally there has been a considerable pick-up in trade-union registration. A number of successful mass meetings have been held, both for the public and for the members of the unions.

The bulk of the campaign has been directed toward their own membership. The public aspects have been directed toward getting public pledges of support from business, church and community leaders. This has been extended to all politicians running for office, and by resolutions being presented to city councils—adopted in some instances. In business circles, the main support for labor against the initiative has come from small business people and heads of associations holding indus-

try contracts with the labor movement.

The content of the material put out by the unions obscures who the real supporters of the initiative are. The NAM, in 1946 stated its position: "The right of employees to join or not to join a union should be protected by law."

In 1947 the big offensive was launched and in that year eleven states adopted "right-to-work" laws. In that year the NAM conducted a national advertising campaign against the "closed shop." They stated: "The NAM believes that all forms of compulsory union membership should be prohibited because they are contrary to the American way of life." (Note, *Oakland Tribune*, April 11: "No one considers that membership in any church, fraternal organization, or civic association should be compulsory, Knowland noted.")

The politicians who do NAM's bidding seek to find fronts for the NAM campaign. Rep. Marion E. Burks of Evanston, Illinois, spokesman for the Illinois proposition being prepared for the 1960 ballot, stated (*Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 10): "You can't just have the support of the National Association of Manufacturers or of the Chamber of Commerce—you have to have a citizens' group."

Their political strategy is to make it appear that some unknown "little people" are behind the law, some modest "citizens" group. The labor

movement is playing into the hands of the strategy of the proponents of the bill by failing to unmask the monopolists who are behind this move.

The labor movement needs to know who are its friends, but the membership also needs to know its real enemy. To be really aroused, the members of organized labor need to see clearly, behind the mask of obscurity, the face of the monopolists who have a major economic and political stake in this drive against labor.

Big business has a long range objective—it aims to cripple labor by legislative action. Legislation is its main weapon today. This places on the agenda for labor the organization of permanent and more effective forms of independent political action.

With the mounting "recession," the economic stake is all the more clear. Big Business desires to maintain its profits despite the depression and that can be done only by wringing more out of each individual worker, by making the workers pay the cost of the depression.

Labor's rank and file cannot be best aroused to battle against a supposedly invisible enemy. Equally, the state's farmers, business people, the professionals are more likely to resist the "Right to-Wreck" propaganda when they are clearly aware that big business is behind the scheme.

The general top level forms and

methods used by the trade-union leadership are causing uneasiness on the part of some of the most active trade unionists who are beginning to feel discouraged and frustrated. The need to build the forms and organization to mobilize thousands of rank and file workers in this campaign will undoubtedly loom increasingly important as the primary election stage approaches.

The "reward your friends and punish your enemies" concept still dominates the political thinking of the top leadership of the California labor movement and leads them into strange paths considering the stakes involved in this election.

KNIGHT'S POSITION

The State Federation leadership supported Knight for the Governorship four years ago, in spite of a vigorous movement which developed in support of the Democratic candidate, Graves.

When the crack-down on Knight took place, and he moved over to the Senate race, the opposition to him was strengthened. However, last week-end his supporters on the State Federation Executive Board felt strong enough to recommend his endorsement over Engle by a 12 to 11 vote. This proposal was adopted by the one vote majority after a bitter struggle. Engle's vote for Taft-Hartley was a key issue in the push of Council Secretary Haggerty to endorse Knight over Engle.

In support of the fight to endorse

Knight, Haggerty said that while about 80 per cent of the League members were registered Democrats, they do not vote their ticket. He argued that the members would still fight against the "Right-to-Wreck" initiative even if Knight were endorsed, though it was argued that the endorsement of Knowland's running mate would weaken the fight against the initiative. The council defeated the proposal of the executive council, but it did move to endorse Knight on the Republican ticket and Engle on the Democratic ticket. This maneuver prevented a wide open split at the conference. The "Right-to-Wreck" danger was imposing unity on a labor movement which in the previous state election four years ago was sharply divided over state political tactics.

Thus the labor movement will campaign against Knowland as the outstanding proponent of the "Right-to-Wreck" initiative, and support his running mate for the U.S. Senate. This will not add to clarity in the California electoral scene.

OTHER ELECTORAL CONTESTS

There are a number of Congressional, Assembly and Senatorial races of importance to the labor movement. Among these candidates it will be possible for organized labor to make some advances both in terms of victories for pro-labor candidates as well as of members of or-

ganized labor who are running for some of the congressional and state posts. But at this point the dominant electoral struggle, the one which will be the major test for labor is that of defeating Knowland and the "Right-to-Wreck" initiative.

At this writing the possibility of significant gains for Negro candidates seems to be remote. Two of the most important races involve Negro Republicans campaigning against liberal and labor-endorsed incumbents. One of these is the candidacy of Crispus Wright against James Roosevelt in the 26th Congressional District in Los Angeles. In San Francisco, John Adams, Republican, is running against the incumbent labor Assemblyman, Ed Gaffney.

Governor Knight has appointed Attorney John Bussey to the municipal bench in San Francisco. This is the first Negro to be so appointed in Northern California, the fourth for the entire State. In some city council elections, Negro candidates made significant showings in Fresno and in Monrovia, while in Seaside, Monterey county, an incumbent Negro led the entire slate for his city council post.

One of the most significant developments was the state FEPC fight in the 1957 session of the State Legislature. In the Assembly, the support for an FEP measure was so widespread that the vote snowballed to 61 for FEP to 15 against. When the same issue hit the Senate it was tabled

by a 21 to 13 vote, when four reactionary Democrats lined up with a group of Republican Senators to give the tabling motion the necessary majority.

THE ROBERTS CANDIDACY

In San Francisco, an FEP county ordinance was recently adopted, and in the city of Berkeley and county of Los Angeles motions were adopted urging the state legislature to adopt a statewide FEP as a means of avoiding local ordinances.

To round out the general electoral picture, Dr. Holland Roberts, the Director of the California Labor School, has entered the race for the important post of State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Dr. Roberts has outstanding qualifications for this non-partisan post, having been an Associate Professor in the School of Education at Stanford University for some ten years. He is widely known and respected in the teaching profession.

As director of the California Labor School for the past twelve years, Dr. Roberts has won recognition as one of the nation's leading Marxist educators. He therefore brings to this race social consciousness which has already made an important impact on the electoral scene in California.

The crisis in education and in the school system is particularly acute in California. Local bond issues are now being overwhelmingly defeated by voters. Dr. Roberts in-

dicates that the state needs 45,000 qualified teachers and 300 schools to relieve the overcrowding and make it possible to re-establish class rooms of 20 children.

In order to achieve this, his campaign has struck out at the cold war budget which provides unlimited funds for the most awesome instruments of death, but no funds to guarantee every child a full education.

MAJOR ISSUES

A number of major issues have thrust themselves into the center of the political arena. Water and power has concerned the people in the valley and farm counties for a number of years. They have waged a fight to prevent Pacific Gas and Electric and the land monopolies from muscling in on the power and water rights of the Central Valley project. This struggle has been the key issue leading to the change in the political control of a large section of the state from solid Republican to Democratic.

In recent years the water issue has taken on a new dimension. The tremendous growth in population in the southern part of the state has forced the Los Angeles metropolitan area to seek water from the northern part of the state. The lack of adequate water resources in the southern part thus forces attention to the Northern watersheds. The farmers and rural people now are not the only ones interested in water and power, but it is now an issue

of major concern throughout the state.

The State Legislature is now in special session to adopt a budget. For the first time in the memory of old timers on the capitol scene the lawmakers failed to enact a budget in the 30-day period prescribed by the State Constitution. The cause of this was the state water issue, which none of the three conference committees of Senators and Assemblymen could resolve. The Governor has had to call another special session.

The southern Assemblymen want a constitutional amendment spelling out water rights. The Senate, which is based on one per county, felt such an amendment is unnecessary. The impasse has tied up the adoption of the budget, and there is no end in sight. This is a major issue which labor and the progressive forces have long neglected, other than giving a nominal and formal support to maintaining the good provisions of Central Valley.

The Peace issue has been given tremendous impetus by the proposal of the Soviet Union to halt nuclear testing. The demand for halting nuclear tests has been strengthened in the Bay Area by the outraged concern over the falling of radioactive rain during the recent storms.

The failure of the State Legislature to appropriate \$40,000 needed to employ a radiation physicist, prevented the Air Sanitation Bureau from testing water and leafy

vegetables following radioactive rains that began in March. The University of California finally conducted tests which showed a radioactive concentration of 208 times the safe drinking standard. The people in the entire area have been greatly aroused, and the Donner Laboratory, which conducted the tests, is deluged with phone calls from frantic parents.

Increased unemployment, and the movements around the crisis in schools complete the scene. If labor could move beyond the "Right-to-Work" issue, and seize upon this political ferment, Knowland could be smoked out from behind his phony "Bill of Rights for Union members" into the political arena of real issues. This would lead to his exposure and overwhelming defeat. It is this great potential and the existent gap in the political scene which are causing concern amongst the Left and progressive forces.

There is emerging, however, planks of a program around which the Left and progressives and liberal forces tend to rally. In the Democratic conventions held in California this year a very sharp position was taken by the bulk of the delegates to oust the Dixiecrats from the Democratic Party.

The State CIO convention adopted a policy against nuclear testing which was in line with the program of a Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy with which the State Secre-

tary of the CIO Council is identified.

THE ILWU POLICY

In January of this year the 16-man executive board of the ILWU adopted a policy on the international and domestic situation and economic outlook. The members stated that they were ready to meet with anybody and everybody to find minimum basis for pooling their strength and influence. They indicated the following planks to be considered:

1. Fight the increased power of monopoly and big business.
2. Begin to use the nation's natural resources for the people's welfare.
3. Use the nation's wealth for a national health program, for an improved educational system, and for similar objectives which private enterprise has failed to provide.
4. Negotiate away international differences to help build a more peaceful world.
5. Resist to the utmost by political and, where necessary, economic action, any further restrictions on labor's right to organize, bargain and strike; and to gain an ever increasing share of the nation's wealth through shorter hours and improved living standards.

Two new factors have now entered the picture—the economic depression and the new dimensions of the peace movement. The recent national economic conference of the AFL-CIO in Washington, indicated that the economic depression is

shaking the illusion of even such cold war economy supporters as George Meany that military expenditures will solve the economic problems of capitalism.

PROBLEMS OF THE LEFT

There is today in the ranks of the general Left and progressive movement as well as within the ranks of the Party great unclarity and disunity on how best to influence the political scene. There is general agreement of the need for an independent party led by labor and its allies amongst the Negro people, the working farmers, the liberal intelligentsia, etc. However, on the tactics of the Left and progressives to achieve such a political realignment, there is the sharpest kind of disagreement today.

In a memo by Dorothy Healey for the Southern California District, the problem was posed in the following manner:

Generally, it seems to us that much of this disagreement comes from a rejection of starting with the realities of the present level of political consciousness; of allowing those realities to determine methods that provide for levels of new consciousness to be developed as a result of mass experiences; of seeing that movements develop in stages, and that an important role of the Left is helping to draw lessons from each stage that can assist the broadest sections of the people's movement in projecting new levels of the political struggle.

There is also disagreement with the coalition concept of our Party as well as unclarity in regard to the meaning of the concept.

In another memo by Nemmy Sparks, the Southern California District dealt with the problem in the following manner:

Are the Republican and Democratic parties twin parties of Capitalism? Of course they are. But having said that, have we solved any problems for the Party of the working class?

Is it not safe to say that one of the peculiar relationships and features of our country is the two-party system which has now lasted with only temporary variations for 160 years? And does it not seem probable that the Labor-Farmer-Negro people's party to which we all look forward will have to emerge not only from the mass struggles outside, but also from political struggles within the two party system?

Some would like only to survey this struggle from the mountain top, where they would proudly display our Party's banner of socialism, sound the bugle, and wait for the masses to climb up to us.

The State Co-ordinating Committee, representing both Districts of the Party, considered the approach to independent candidates along the following lines: we stated that the main interest of labor and the people as a whole in this election lies in the struggles on issues; in the effort to develop a coalition among the forces of the people that will last and continue to grow after the

elections; and to defeat the major standard bearers of reaction.

It was proposed that any independent candidacy should be considered in relation to the above points. An independent candidacy with a base among the general Left it was felt, could exercise considerable influence on the issues in public debate and counteract the pressures upon candidates to water down issues and make concessions to reactionary opponents. The alternative to the above could be a party candidate whose campaign would be much more limited, but who could present the party's position on the issues of the election. Because of the ballot restrictions in California this might have to be in the form of a write-in candidate for the finals.

The above policy tends to be caught between extreme viewpoints. On one hand, some say that only candidates should be supported who can get the broadest kind of support. From this source, Left-independent candidates are strongly opposed unless they have substantial labor and liberal support. In the present uncertain political atmosphere and lack of organizational forms, candidates who could run independently and have support in labor and liberal circles are very reluctant to be candidates. The Left, therefore, tends to find itself confined to pressuring major party candidates on issues as the only form of electoral activity.

The Dr. Roberts campaign en-

tered this disunited and uncertain political scene, and he has been attempting to project an approach which would be most effective in influencing the California electoral scene on two major issues—the crisis in education and the cold war economy of the Administration. The response to his campaign has been mixed from among the Left-progressive circles.

From the extreme Left his campaign has been under strong pressure to convert his candidacy into a distorted and narrow interpretation of a "Socialist" candidate. This pressure comes not only from Trotskyites who have eagerly tried to force their concepts on the candidate, but also from other Left forces. This pressure is in the direction of seeking a "Socialist" candidate to unite the Socialist Left—not in the direction of labor and the Negro people's community and liberal wing of the Democratic party—but in the direction of the isolated splinter groups in California.

The Left has the alternative of entering the electoral arena through the limited means available, and based on a policy of influencing the main electoral tasks; or of abandoning the electoral arena so far as candidates are concerned, to the extremist splinter groups.

The main problems flow out of a lack of clarity and unity in the Party, and within the entire general Left progressive movement, as to the tactics and role of the Left in

the political arena.

When we originally projected our electoral policy, we indicated a three-way test to judge the correctness and effectiveness of our election policy:

1. Can our policy help consolidate the Labor-Negro-Liberal alliance?
2. Can our policy help advance an awareness of the need for independent political action.
3. Can our policy advance our contact and influence among the grass roots?

The *People's World* has been the most effective weapon for the Left progressives in the course of the elections. The paper has carried an excellent series of articles on the origins, economic motives, and class forces involved in the drive against labor. It has also dealt with the Knowland candidacy, the peace issue, and the Dr. Roberts' campaign. It makes an effective presentation of political news and developments.

It will be important if the Party and general Left forces achieve some minimum of agreement and clarification during the course of this election. The stormy weather of the future will require a unified Left if the most effective job is to be done on the issues of unemployment, the anti-labor drive and peace. The 1958 elections can result in a resounding rebuff to the Republicans and their plans for the 1960 elections. It can also be the arena in which the Left begins to solve some of its problems.

The Economic Slump and the Party's Role: Ohio

By Martin Chancey

THE ECONOMIC SLUMP and the question of jobs—this has emerged today as the number one problem facing the American people. Within a few short months the mood of our country has changed drastically. All talk of everlasting boom has given way to an atmosphere of fear and anxiety.

The economic decline, which set in toward the latter part of 1957, is continuing at an ever increasing momentum. Last month unemployment jumped nationally by more than a million and is approaching the 6 million mark. In Cuyahoga county, the number of jobless shot up by 90 per cent and on a state scale nearly doubled since December, to around 300,000.

Hardest hit were the steel areas: Youngstown, Canton and Steubenville. With production down to between 40-50% of capacity and unemployment ranging from 20 to 40%, these areas are now in a situation not much different from the 1930's. The plague of unemployment is spreading to the machine-tool centers such as Cincinnati, where new orders are down by 53%; to the electrical and appli-

ance centers of Dayton and Mansfield. It is rapidly extending into auto. Even before the Ford announcement of a 14,000 layoff at River Rouge, there were already 20,000 jobless in the auto-parts center of Toledo.

Once again the Negro workers are the greatest victims. In Lorain 9 out of every 10 Puerto Ricans are out of work.

The effects of the slump reach out way beyond the unemployed. For every one laid off there are two on short work weeks in steel. The miners in Ohio Valley are working two and three day weeks and a large layoff is now expected. The decline is registered in every pay envelope. A round-up of Ohio cities by the *Plain Dealer* shows that take-home pay has declined anywhere from \$2.50 to \$6.00. Small business is in a bad way, with business failures at the highest point in eighteen years.

Considering the picture as a whole—the drop in industrial production, the number of jobless, and the wide-ranging scope of the decline—we are now in the sharpest slump since the 1930's.

Cold statistics cannot convey human misery and suffering. While 65 per cent of the unemployed are covered by unemployment compensation, families with children find it impossible to make ends meet, particularly with the high and ever-rising prices. Even more critical is the plight of the 35 per cent not covered, and those who have already used up their unemployment compensation. In the steel areas, where layoffs began about eight months ago, a large number of workers have already used up their compensation but are unable to get on relief because they own a car, a home or carry insurance. The "lucky ones" who manage to get on relief soon find that the relief agencies are so swamped and overwhelmed by the sudden rise in relief cases, that the relief check is hardly enough to keep body and soul together.

Most Ohio cities are today in a relief crisis, which takes on a particularly acute form in the steel towns. In Lorain and Canton, emergency conferences were called by labor, relief agencies and city authorities. Speakers compared the distress in their cities to areas hit by floods or tornadoes and appealed for emergency help. A number are trying to cope with the crisis by passing payroll or income taxes, thus placing the burden on the workers, many of whom are on short work weeks.

Such in brief, is the picture in Ohio.

THE ROLE OF THE PARTY

Some comrades point to the differences now as compared to the 30's when most workers were unorganized, when the trade unions refused to concern themselves with the unemployed; they come to the conclusion that our main and perhaps sole contribution lies in analysis and mass education. Let's leave the rest to the powerful trade unions—they say.

There is no question but that we as a Party have a special responsibility to bring to the workers a class understanding of the basic reasons for the crisis and the way out. With the unlimited faith of the bourgeois-minded labor leaders and many workers in the workings of the capitalist system, with many of them claiming that the present decline could have been prevented had not the monopolists deliberately planned a recession as a club against labor—we have a big job of explaining to the workers that crises are not the result of mismanagement of the capitalist system, but are an inevitable and integral part of it. That we can't eliminate one without the other.

Furthermore, in the months ahead, the contrast between a declining capitalism and an expanding socialist society will become ever more glaring. We need to explain why it is that the Soviet economy is able to expand at a most rapid rate, add more than two million to the labor

force in 1957 and still have a labor shortage; why overproduction and mass unemployment are impossible in a socialist society.

We have a job to do in combating the guns and butter program; the illusions that increased arms spending will restore the health of the economy, and show that an economy of *Peace and Jobs* is possible; that further arms spending will be at the expense of the peoples' needs, and may lead to a new hysteria to justify increased armaments, and to the danger of a resurgent McCarthyism. We need to sell labor on the possibility of a peacetime economy based on coexistence and trade with the socialist as well as all other nations.

Yes, we have a big job of analysis and explanation. But we have much more to do. Some say that the unions are big and strong today and that we should leave it to them to lead the fight. Recent experiences here and in other states do not bear this out. Despite the widespread distress in the steel areas, the powerful unions have failed to move. The union leadership has ignored and tended to disassociate itself from the unemployed and their problems.

The need for our Party to help spark mass activity, to rally rank and file pressure so as to move the leadership—this need is as great now as ever. The best proof of that was the steelworkers' response to the Party's leaflet. This leaflet was our

first step in formulating an unemployment program. It suggested the setting up of local relief committees to take up the problems of the neediest members. Among other proposals it called for a mass fight for a 30-hour week without cut in pay. While some of our comrades feared that we would be accused of "interference," the reaction of the steelworkers was quite different. Several hundred copies were distributed by non-Party steelworkers inside the mills. The response was enthusiastic. The response to Party initiative in Washington and Illinois further underlines the need for Party activity along these lines.

One of the main directions of our trade-union work today is to get the organized labor movement to take up the fight for the unemployed; to spearhead the struggle for the 30-hour week at 40 hours pay, for a federal unemployment compensation law, for a moratorium on withholding tax, etc. As the trade unions move into the lead of this fight on all levels, it will begin to transform the character of the labor movement itself. In considering how we can help move the trade unions we will have to re-examine the position and role of the "Left" in the unions, the role of union welfare committees, Negro caucuses, the various nationality union groups and the exceptional importance of developing rank and file struggles on a shop and departmental level. The way workers in the shops are turning

for advice and help to our comrades, whom they have avoided for years, the way union leaders on a district level are seeking out and encouraging known Left unionists, all this points up the possibilities for a revival of the Left in the labor movement.

IN THE COMMUNITIES

The problems facing the unemployed are beginning to emerge in the communities and in neighborhood organizations. Thus at the last meeting of the Glenville Area Council the problem of jobs for Negro youth became the center of a heated discussion. In Rosedale School, the PTA is concerned with children coming to school hungry and inadequately dressed. In a number of Party clubs the question has arisen as to the forms of community activity on unemployment. Shall our main effort be directed toward moving the existing organization or shall we form new organizations of the unemployed? It seems to me that at this stage *every effort should be made to convince the existing organizations*—block clubs, churches, area councils—to take up the problems of the unemployed.

Finally, working through existing organizations does not mean surrender of the independent role of the Party, which can and must be brought forward. It means that we have to learn new forms and methods of projecting the Party's

role in a situation which is much different from the 1930's.

THE 1958 ELECTIONS

As the 1958 elections get under way the question of the economic slump is already moving into the center of the political arena. It is evident that the Democratic Party will make this the dominant issue and has already opened up with Truman and its other big guns on the "Republican depression." They will no doubt make the most of the failure of Eisenhower to act. They are counting—with good prospects—on a Democratic landslide in November.

There are many vital issues in this election—the new phase of the struggle for peace and a summit conference; the fight for Negro rights; and against the "right-to-work" laws. But all these issues must now be approached in a new way—within the framework of the dominant issue, the economic slump. The fight for a summit conference will take on immeasurably greater strength as it is tied in with the possibilities for jobs through peaceful trade with the socialist world. To the Negro worker, the fight for equal job opportunities now emerges as the most important aspect of the fight for equal rights.

In 1958 all members of the House, a third of the Senate, as well as all state officers and the state legislature are coming up for re-election.

This will bring to the fore both national, state and local issues. There is no dearth of candidates. For Senate, Bricker vs. Stephen Young. For governor, O'Neill and Charles Taft vs. Mayor Celebrezze, DiSalle, Porter and others. In the 21st C.D., Vanik is being opposed by a Negro candidate, Ernest Watson. There are some dozen Negro candidates in Cleveland on both party tickets and about three times that number throughout the state.

It is not too early to begin to move into the elections by projecting an anti-depression program. The Cleveland CIO and other groups are calling for a state emergency conference and for a special session of the State Legislature to act on strengthening the unemployment law, a public works program, raising the minimum wage scale, etc. The Party has a special responsibility to bring forward the issue of a state FEPC law and equal job opportunities as an integral part of such a program. Secondly, we need to re-adjust our housing program so as to place all emphasis on large-scale public housing and liberal credit facilities for small home-builders. Incidentally, the issue we first raised of ending the stranglehold of the banks on home building by having the city make low interest loans to all, has now been introduced into the city council as a resolution and needs the fullest support.

A most important and exciting development in this year's election

is the unusually high level of labor activity. Spurred by the threat of a "right-to-work" law, the Ohio trade-union movement has plunged into action as never before. It is out to get one million additional registered voters. A whole number of conferences and meetings have taken place all over the state which are outstanding for their high attendance, the strong spirit of militancy and the high degree of unity between the AFL, CIO, RR and Miners unions. *This affords the Left an important opportunity to help advance the independent political activity of labor*, to broaden the fight by linking it with the Negro people's movement, the farmers, small business groups and all victims of monopoly. Top labor leaders are resisting pressure from the ranks to combine the fight against "right-to-work" laws with the needs of the unemployed. These two issues are linked in life and in the minds of the workers and by combining them labor will be greatly strengthening the fight on both fronts.

Labor is placing major emphasis on reaching the workers' families and small business people in the communities. The close tie-in between the unions and labor political organization on a ward and precinct basis has been a major reason for the effectiveness of labor political action in Michigan. The absence of such organization in Ohio largely accounts for the woeful ineffectiveness of labor's political action in our

state. Whatever its form, whether COPE or something else, the building of labor-community political organization merits the fullest attention of all progressive forces.

As we move further into the elections we will have to work out in much greater detail our Party's role in terms of bringing the issues to the people; stimulating the independent political action of labor; advancing the fight for Negro representation and the independent role of our Party.

THE PARTY

The period ahead presents a great opportunity and real challenge to our Party. We are entering a period of sharpened class struggle. The working class will put up a real fight before it will allow the monopolists to shift the burden of the crisis to their shoulders. But militancy is not enough. Now more than ever the workers sorely need an experienced Marxist Party.

As we move into a new phase of struggle, I think that the Ohio Party finds itself in a comparatively better shape than most districts. There is no factionalism in our ranks. Our leadership is united. I think that the discussion around the 12-Party declaration, which took place in all sections and many clubs, showed a high degree of ideological unity in our ranks. There has taken place a further organizational consolidation, with more comrades

in clubs and more clubs meeting regularly with an improved content in our work. Our losses have been relatively small. I believe that this will be reflected in our registration. We have accumulated much fresh and valuable experience in mass work—particularly in the course of our housing activity.

The period ahead will make much greater demands on our Party. If we are to break with our inner preoccupation and turn full face towards the struggles now unfolding, we must take a number of steps to more fully equip ourselves to meet the demands of the coming period:

1. We need to strengthen the Party ideologically. More specifically, we need to undertake a systematic study of political economy and the crisis. The Marxian theory of crisis, after being demolished for the rooth time, is once again being fully confirmed by events. There is no other theory of crisis which has been able to stand the test of nearly a century. To explain the causes of crisis; to be able to refute such newfangled theories as that high wages are responsible for the slump; to understand the course of events, *we need to thoroughly study this theory and be able to apply it to what is new in this period.*

2. We have to reach the people on a scale we have not attempted in the past decade. In addition to our excellent auto-shop paper, *Spark-*

plug, we should consider shop papers in steel and rubber. We need many more leaflets on all levels, more mailings of pamphlets, etc.

3. *The Worker* takes on exceptional importance at the present time as a medium for analysis, as an agitator and collective organizer. Since Gates' departure we have noted a constant improvement in the content and a growing enthusiasm for the *Worker*. This enthusiasm has to be transformed into activity. We need to take steps to insure that the *Worker* carries more Ohio news. We need a circulation building program.

We propose that we undertake to raise the *Worker* circulation by 200 by July 4; that circulation plans be prepared by the state and sections and clubs.

4. As we increasingly turn our attention to the question of how to move people into action, we will have to take a fresh look at our ties with community organizations, particularly the block clubs, and renew our fight to get all comrades into mass organizations.

5. We will have to give further thought to new methods of work. We find today that in many industries and communities our Party forces are very small, but that there are around us many people who have been in the Party or associated

with the Left in one form or another. These people are willing to meet and discuss with us various problems, but are unwilling to tie up organizationally. In working with these forces we have to avoid a twin danger. The problem we face is how to develop forms of activities between Party and non-Party forces without on the one hand liquidating the Party group into a loose, amorphous body, or on the other hand, imposing Party forms of organization and discipline, which these people will reject.

The further strengthening of our clubs, politically and organizationally, is a key to the ability of our Party to meet the challenge of this period.

We face new opportunities and great challenges. In responding to them, we will no doubt face many difficulties and obstacles, not least our internal weaknesses. The solution to these problems will not come through more soul-searching and pure inner preoccupation. It is only as we begin to cope with the big mass issues facing our class and country, it is only as we turn fully, boldly and unreservedly towards dealing with the problems arising from the economic slump, that we can best overcome our inner weaknesses and resolve our ideological differences.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

Within our country there is a widespread and rapidly growing uneasiness about U.S. foreign policy. Some of this is generated for narrowly political reasons—elections impend—and to a degree is fraudulent; yet, I think, most of it reflects a profound and very real process of “agonizing reappraisal” going on in the minds of millions, if not in that of the Secretary of State.

Evidences of this reappraisal are abundant. The distinguished scientist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, for example, writes that he has waited in vain for someone in authority to speak out “in a way that suggested complete integrity, some freshness of spirit and a touch of the plausible.” “The United States,” he continues, by which he must mean those presently conducting the country's affairs,

has not developed an understanding of its purposes, its interests, its alternatives and plans for the future in any way adequate to the gravity of the problems that the country faces. There is a widespread impression that we live from astonishment to surprise, and from surprise to astonishment, never adequately forewarned or forearmed, and more often than not choosing between evils, when forethought and foreaction might have provided happier alternatives (*Foreign Affairs*, Jan., 1958).

Geoffrey Barraclough, a professor of international history at the University of London, assessing the impact of American foreign policy *among its friends* in Western Europe, finds that it “has provoked a crisis of conscience” (*The Nation*, Jan. 4, 1958). The former banker, James P. Warburg, now director of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, charges flatly that “U.S. foreign policy is bankrupt” because of “an unwillingness to seek peaceful settlements through patient diplomacy and an obsessive reliance on obsolete military power” (*N. Y. Post*, Jan. 3, 1958).

Walter Lippmann, rigorous realist serving the Economic Royalists, who has been raising warning signals anent the failures of Wall Street's diplomacy for many months, has never written more sharply than he does in the April issue of *The Atlantic*. Here he expresses full agreement with George Kennan's call for “disengagement”—itself a major instance of rifts in upper circles because of manifest failure. “The Western allies,” writes Lippmann, “had come to a dead end on the road which they had been following in the post-war years.” In fact, “the underlying premise of our post-war policy has been shown to be false”; that underlying premise, says Lippmann, was the superiority of the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. But the fact is, and he italicizes these

words, that when it comes to the USSR, "we are dealing with an equal power, not an inferior one." Hence, the conclusion must be, for Lippmann, an agreement between the two powers mutually protecting their vital interests; this he takes to be the principle of disengagement.

Here, too, there is much of the traditional; and it is not possible for Walter Lippmann to move out of the old-fashioned balance-of-power framework, characteristic of capitalist diplomacy. Nor is it possible for him to base his analysis on the class-conflict reality that dominates that diplomacy. Yet even within these powerful restrictions, the reasonableness of co-existence is compelling—a tribute to and a promise of the necessity of co-existence, given the world as it is today.

Fundamentally similar findings, arrived at from quite another standpoint, are offered by Norman Cousins, editor of *The Saturday Review*. In a series of editorials this past April, Mr. Cousins, who writes from a World-Federalist, near-pacifistic view, sees the dominant line in American foreign policy to have been "a fantasy in which security was compounded at least partially of self-serving legends and myths of invulnerability and superiority"; he thinks persistence in such a path may produce "a moral disaster for the United States"; in any case, he finds as a fact that "there has been a steady and costly shrinkage of American influence in the world, especially among peoples of darker skins, which is to say, the preponderance."

Similarly—and as a final instance—the *N. Y. Post*, voice of the Liberal Party in New York City and important weathervane of liberal and petty-bourgeois influences within the Democratic Party, has never written more impatiently than in its editorial of April 20, entitled "The Last Brink." The editorial had reference to the charges brought by the Soviet Union against the United States in connection with the Strategic Air Command "alerts." While it was liberally spiced with the anti-Sovietism that the *Post* finds indispensable, it nevertheless, in fact, accepted the justice and the seriousness of the charge and demanded alteration in the policy which produced such practices. It denounced "our national stupor"; the State Department's "smugness [which] has alienated so much of the world from America"; and "the insanity of the Administration's nuclear policy." At the same time, while it was not new to find this paper excoriating "the foot-dragging summitry of Dulles," there was to be noted, when the *Post* paid its compliments to "the frozen formulae of Mr. Acheson," a weariness with ineffectual "bi-partisanship" in foreign affairs that was something new. Since Acheson and Dulles have been responsible for foreign policy under Truman and Eisenhower, one can see that the *Post's* even-handed slaps do indeed herald a process of "agonizing reappraisal."

What are the essential features of the foreign policy, denounced in such strong terms by the varied staunch friends of capitalism whose words we have just quoted?

The Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy starts from the position that the Soviet Union is the enemy whose destruction would redound to the benefit of the United States. Ever since it appeared possible that the release of atomic en-

ergy might be transformed into a deliverable weapon, that weapon—thought of as the ultimate one—was looked upon as the instrument with which that fundamental aim could be accomplished.

Thus, the atomic bomb project really started when General Leslie Groves was placed in command of the Manhattan Project, in September, 1942. When Gen. Groves was questioned, in 1954, at the Oppenheimer hearings, he testified:

I think it important to state—I think it is well known—that there was never from about two weeks from the time I took charge of the project any illusion on my part but that Russia was the enemy and that the project was conducted on that basis. I didn't go along with the attitude of the whole country that Russia was a gallant ally. I always had suspicions and the project was conducted on that basis. (*In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer*, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, Washington, 1954, p. 173.)

It was to demonstrate to the Russians the invincibility of this weapon that formed an essential reason for the atrocious decision made by Truman to drop this bomb on two Japanese cities, without warning, despite the fact that he knew that Japan had started surrender negotiations in July, 1945—that is, one month before the first bomb was dropped. The incineration of over 300,000 Japanese men, women and children was done, too, to hasten that surrender and to assure that in the Japanese peace settlement, the USSR would not have a hand. Despite these facts, Mr. Truman persists in justifying this horror; he gets away with it in this country because the victims were Japanese, because the knowledge of the actual truth is not widespread, and because the nature of that truth is simply too shattering and too terrible.*

Complementing and supplementing the American government's dedication to the destruction of the socialist Soviet Union, is its support to colonialism. This support derives in part from the relationship of colonialism to the strength of its allies—Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Portugal, Belgium; but it is ambivalent, largely because of the simultaneous desire to strip those allies of much of the loot they obtain from their colonies. It is this ambivalence which is at the heart of what Matthew J. Kust has called "The Great Dilemma of American Foreign Policy" (*Virginia Quarterly Review*, Spring, 1958). The author, a former associate in the Dulles' law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, for years Legal Adviser to U.S. Embassies in Asia, and now practicing law again in Washington, acknowledges that today, in the world generally, "America is considered the champion of Western colonialism and imperialism." This is not difficult to understand since, as the author himself declares, ever since the end of World War II, "the United States has been on the side of the colonial powers." The "dilemma" appears because our allies "are vitally dependent on the economic advantages colonialism gives them in Asia and Africa"; wherefore "we support European colonialism in

* Substantiation will be found in Robert J. C. Butow, *Japan's Decision to Surrender* (Stanford University Press, 1954); and in P. M. S. Blackett, *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations* (Cambridge University Press, 1956).

order to keep our European allies strong"; but this tends to "alienate the people of Asia and Africa."

Of course, Mr. Kust, while counting up the economic spoils that England and France derive from colonialism, fails to mention that the United States is in this game up to its neck, and that the spoils taken by the American investors far exceed in value that appropriated by the French and the British taken together. The failure to acknowledge this and probe it and oppose it, allows Mr. Kust to lament and deplore, but not to eliminate and cure; hence, he is indeed left with a "dilemma"—that is, a problem with equally distasteful solutions.

With these motives and intentions, the masters of our country see their own concocted Cold War as plainly antecedent to, if not really part of, actual war, conducted when, how, and under the circumstances they hope they will be able to choose. The war may take the form of one enormous engagement or—and there is a growing tendency towards this view—it may take the form of more or less "limited" conflicts. If it takes the latter form, they know there is no assurance that this may not burst forth into a full-scale global conflict; in any case, when projecting "limited" warfare, they project its recurrence for an unlimited time.*

The assumption of being at war, albeit in the preparatory stages, permeates the various confidential papers prepared for the Committee for Economic Development at its recent 15th annual meeting. These papers—coming from experts attached to the government, like Edward L. Allen, in charge of economic research for the CIA, or from others frequently consulted by government, like Professor J. Sterling Livingston of Harvard—are filled with such terms as "adversary," "antagonist" and "opponent" when referring to the Soviet Union. The matter is made altogether explicit by the introductory remarks offered by Vice-President Nixon who, noting 1942 as the founding year of the Committee, said: "Just as surely as we were in a war then, we are in a war today." (The papers are published in a volume entitled, *Soviet Progress vs. American Enterprise*, Doubleday, N. Y., \$2.00).

Given these ends and this view, it is not surprising that official policy rejects the possibility of effective disarmament. It is important that this rejection be pinpointed, because it illuminates the actual practice, tortuous as it is, of Dulles-diplomacy. Dr. Edward Teller, for example, in charge of major governmental weapons projects, and described by Nixon as "a man who perhaps has as keen an understanding of the whole world struggle as any man to whom I have talked," has flatly stated that in his view "effective disarmament" schemes "are doomed to failure" (*Foreign Affairs*, Jan., 1958). Henry Kissinger, in his quasi-official and extremely influential study, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* (p. 208) argues that "a meaningful [disarmament] agreement is almost impossible."

On the basis of such statements from such people, it is no wonder that thoroughly responsible individuals have charged that the United States gov-

* The present writer examined the arguments of and some of the literature dealing with "limited" war, in this magazine, August, 1957. See also, chapter 1 of the Blackett book already cited.

ernment, as presently administered, is opposed to disarmament. For example, Norman Cousins writes:

There is no point in fooling ourselves. The State Department has been willing to talk about arms control for propaganda purposes. But its basic position, well known to close observers in Washington, is that it does not believe that arms control is *desirable*—even if a foolproof system of enforcement could be achieved (*Saturday Review*, April 19).

Surely, one of the "close observers" in Mr. Cousins' mind must be the Washington correspondent of the *New York Times*, E. W. Kenworthy, who declared in that paper (April 13) that the "real reason" for United States opposition to halting its testing of nuclear weapons was because of its "opposition to a total ban on atomic weapons"; it did not avow this "real" reason, wrote Kenworthy, because it feared the reason was one which "it would be difficult to explain and justify."

The present official policy, furthermore, is not only to reject the desirability and the possibility of real disarmament; it also is one directed towards the fullest use, at its own discretion, of any and all weapons, no matter what their destructiveness. In fact, American official policy is based upon the use of nuclear weapons in particular.

Quite recently, Henry Kissinger has affirmed that "our whole strategy is dependent on nuclear weapons" (*Foreign Affairs*, April, 1958). This is the meaning of the phrase in the original Baruch Plan of 1946, "instant and condign punishment"; it is the meaning of Dulles' declaration of policy in January, 1954: "massive retaliation at the time and place of our choosing."

Nothing can be plainer than this statement made by Field-Marshal Lord Montgomery in October, 1954:

I want to make it absolutely clear that we at S.H.A.P.E. are basing all our operational planning on using atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons in our defense.

In October, 1957, Dulles threatened atomic annihilation against the Soviet Union, should its troops enter Turkey; in January, 1958, the Defense Minister of Great Britain stated that an advance beyond their own borders by Soviet troops carrying conventional arms would bring into instant play the full arsenal of the Allies' thermo-nuclear weapons.

Dr. Teller drops the pose of "defensiveness" and simply writes: "Our announced policy is that in case of war we shall use the most effective weapons available to us. This is plain common sense." (*Foreign Affairs*, Jan., 1958). The common sense of this we shall examine later; at the moment we point to what is stated as announced policy.

True it is, as I have noted, that there has been a tendency in official circles to move towards the "limited" war theory; it is said, as by Professor Blackett, for example, that the "action" policy of the Allies is now "limited" warfare,

while its "declaratory" policy remains "massive retaliation" envisaging global warfare. Concerning this, it must be pointed out that so important a figure as Defense Secretary McElroy confines his concept of "limited" wars to those not fought between the major powers, and even there he envisages the use of smaller nuclear weapons. But he states that if the Soviet Union and the United States, or any of its major allies, come into combat he does not see how that can be kept on a small or limited level (*U.S. News and World Report*, April 25, 1958).

* * *

It may be well at this point to return to Dr. Teller's idea of "common sense." This is in line with his whole emphasis playing down the horror features of nuclear weapons, and minimizing or denying their awful power. It is in line, too, with State Department efforts, by use of such words as "clean" and "discriminating" to accomplish the same purpose and to accustom people to the employment of nuclear weapons. In fact, today, NATO considers the smaller, or so-called "tactical" nuclear weapons to be part of its "conventional" arms. Kissinger, in his book already cited (p. 311) specifically set out as "one of the chief tasks of U.S. policy" that of "overcoming the trauma which attaches to the use of nuclear weapons."

The indubitable fact is that nuclear weapons have added a new quality to war-making; they have rendered possible the utter annihilation of all life on this planet. The further fact is that warfare conducted with nuclear weapons, even if on something like the "limited" scale projected by Kissinger, would carry with it casualties that would make the two World Wars appear as minor forays.

It is worthwhile to spell out, even if quite briefly, the facts on this matter. George W. Rathjens, Jr., a member of the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group under the Secretary of Defense, writes that were nuclear weapons to be used today in warfare the "destruction of at least 50% of the population of each antagonist is quite likely" (*World Politics*, Jan., 1958)—in a war confined to the United States and the Soviet Union that adds up to two hundred million people killed.

Professor Blackett, Nobel Prize Winner for Physics in 1948, in his cited book, declares that a standard H-bomb—that is, one of ten million tons of TNT equivalent—would destroy an area of 400 square miles, somewhat larger than all of Greater London. He finds that a maximum of ten such bombs would utterly cripple Great Britain, and thinks about fifty would do the same to the United States. It is his opinion that the stockpile of all kinds of nuclear bombs in the possession of the United States as of 1955 came to about 30,000; of the Soviet Union, possibly as many as 6,000. And: "There is no effective defense at present, nor is there one in sight against a large-scale and determined atomic attack on cities and centers of population."

The Australian physicist, Professor M. L. Oliphant, puts the truth in three stark sentences:*

Atomic weapons have so increased the destructive power of modern push-button warfare that the complete destruction of the industries and cities of both sides in any world combat is inevitable.

There is no effective defense against atomic weapons and it is very doubtful whether any defense is possible.

The effects of radioactivity produced in all-out war with atomic weapons might be disastrous for the human race.

As to radioactivity and fall-out, mentioned by Prof. Oliphant, much obscurantism and down-right lying has been forthcoming from officially blessed American quarters. Yet the fact of real danger is indubitable; how pressing is in question. And the fact of real harm is indubitable; how extensive is in question.

The most useful and readable book on this matter that I have yet seen is by Ralph E. Lapp, *The Voyage of the Lucky Dragon* (Harper, New York, \$3.50). Dr. Lapp was leader of the scientific group at the 1946 Bikini bomb tests, and was head of the Nuclear Physics Branch, Office of Naval Research. His volume is a careful study of the facts concerning the radiation poisoning suffered by Japanese fishermen in 1954 when their ship came within one hundred miles of an H-bomb explosion. All of the men became severely ill and were hospitalized for more than a year; one of them perished. The life-expectancy of the survivors was cut by five years. As a result of the five explosions conducted in that 1954 series by the U.S., fish were contaminated over an area of one million square miles in the Pacific Ocean; 8,000 square miles were dusted with a lethal dose of radioactivity; and the inhabitants of Rongelap, an island in the vicinity, who had been arbitrarily moved by the United States, were not returned to their homes, for fear of contamination, until 37 months after the explosions.

Dr. Lapp declares: "What happened to those aboard the ship was a very small sample of the radioactive peril which would be unleashed in a nuclear war." He continues:

Three years after the explosion, officials of the U.S. Government still refused to acknowledge the type of bomb detonated at Bikini. Instead, they promoted the virtues of a "humanitarian" bomb—a label they soon regretted and for which they substituted the adjective "clean." The semantic nonsense about the "clean" bomb continues. Perhaps it is more dangerous than mere nonsense, for it implies a kind of aseptic war, seeming in some way to remove an element of terror and hence deterrence from the use of nuclear weapons.

What is "common sense" to Dr. Teller is "nonsense" to Dr. Lapp. For me, when one enters the realm of promulgating policy which can only have a

* In an essay in the very useful book edited by V. H. Wallace, *Paths to Peace* (Cambridge University Press, N. Y., \$3.75).

an end result the annihilation of hundreds of millions of people, he has passed out of the zone of sense altogether and into the area of criminal insanity.

* * *

Official U.S. policy is based not only upon the use of these monstrous weapons; it seeks to spread their availability to its allies as widely as possible. It insists that West Germany accept nuclear weapons, and the rulers of that country have obliged; it desires to set up bases for the launching of nuclear-armed missiles in half a dozen countries and is going ahead with this; it is encouraging France in its nuclear-weapon program. And the Eisenhower Administration, as I write these lines, is pressing vigorously for the enactment of legislation that will enable it to give fullest assistance to numerous "reliable" countries so that they may develop their own capacity to make nuclear weapons. "We want to keep our allies strong," says the President of the United States at his press conference on April 23. "We want them to have the use of just as modern weapons as we do." Mr. George W. Rathjens, Jr., in the already cited article—and he is now in the service of the Office of Defense—admits: "Of course, there is implicit in the widespread distribution of nuclear weapons a greater risk of irresponsible usage." Yet, that is official American policy—urgently and vigorously pushed.

So, of course, is the entire fantastically dangerous policy of instant and constant alert practiced by the Strategic Air Command from hundreds of bases throughout the world ringing the Soviet Union. This has been highlighted by the demand made by the Soviet Union that this practice cease. What it means is that hundreds of crews, trained in the performance of a particular mission—as the destruction of Odessa—move to the accomplishment of this mission, in planes flying seven to nine hundred miles an hour, when radar screens pick up images showing objects apparently moving from the direction of the USSR outward.

These planes, armed with H-bombs, not only fly all about the world, but actually take off regularly on combat missions for half a dozen places within the Soviet Union. That the same act is not performed by the Soviet Union,—that it is not, was stated by Gromyko—appears to be all which up to now has prevented irretrievable disaster, for if flights from both sides set out at these speeds, armed, towards each other, it is difficult to know what would then prevent Armageddon.

Claims of a foolproof system advanced by the U.S. government are absurd. One of the bases for this claim is held to be the fact that the final order to carry through the attack must come from the President himself. Meaning no disrespect to so exalted a figure, I must protest that having a decision rest in the lap of Mr. Eisenhower is far from a foolproof arrangement. We are told elaborate code systems are in force; code systems have been read incorrectly and have been sent wrongly. One may point out that the Nazi destruction of Rotterdam was carried through because a coded message sent from the Luftwaffe to an officer reading: "Do not attack," was read by that officer as, "Attack."

Furthermore, in addition to the ever-present possibility of error, one has the problem of provocation. Here several considerations appear. First, is the fact that the advocacy of "preventive war" is still heard in highest circles. It is not only that in 1950 the Secretary of the Navy called for this; as recently as the spring of 1955, in the *Yale Review*, Henry Kissinger published an article entitled "American Policy and Preventive War"; there he stated that preventive war was being seriously discussed in responsible quarters. Furthermore, how responsible need the quarters be, if an officer in charge of a plane can himself decide whether or not he is to obey a coded message—that does arrive and that he does read correctly—telling him to turn back? Suppose he decides not to turn back? Lloyd V. Berkner, president of the International Council of Scientific Unions, has remarked about the pressing dangers arising because "critical command tends to devolve to lower and lower echelons" (*Foreign Affairs*, Jan. 1958). Now, critical command is not only devolving to lower and lower levels, but with the policy of spreading possession of nuclear weapons, it is encompassing more and more countries and lower and lower levels within their responsibility!

It is also necessary to state—without intending to indict any individual—that the phenomenon of provocation exists. It is, for example, now admitted by the late Admiral Horthy in his recently published *Memoirs* that while Hungary went to war against the Soviet Union, in 1941, charging that the Red Air Force had bombed a Hungarian border town, the bombing actually had been done, by prearrangement, by Nazi planes. According to the American magazine, *Missiles and Rockets* (Jan., 1958) there have been "numerous and continuing SAC flights over the sovereign territory of the USSR. . . ." The *New York Times* (March 20, 1958) reports that a former officer of the British Royal Air Force published an article in an Oxford University magazine, describing his own participation in deliberate aerial incursions over Soviet territory, undertaken in order to test the tactic and speed of the Soviet response. So glaring was this, that a Member of Parliament demanded in Commons: "Could not this kind of crazy provocation spark off a new war?"

Most serious is the report made by Paul Johnson, in the internationally respected London weekly, *New Statesman* (March 8, 1958) which I have not seen commented upon by the American press. Mr. Johnson states that on November 2, 1956, the National Security Council—the highest strategic body—met in emergency session in Washington, and that throughout the night intelligence reports reached it of "Soviet military overflights" in Turkey and Iran. Mr. Johnson continues:

Mr. Dulles wished to respond to these moves by alerting SAC and deploying its squadrons in a manner which would provide "ocular evidence" of America's will to resist. But the air force chiefs explained that such an action would be tantamount to war; that the size and nature of SAC meant that it would not get all its aircraft airborne, and begin the complex process of aerial refueling, without revealing to the enemy its

axes of attack, knowledge of which would undermine the deterrent *unless it was really intended to use it this time.* [Italics in original.] Moreover, they added, once it became clear that SAC was getting into position, the Russians would be bound to do the same, and then a conflict would become virtually inevitable.

This, then, was one of Mr. Dulles' brinks that have not been publicized here. Happily, while the Council was still sitting and pondering, writes Mr. Johnson, "further intelligence reports revealed that there was no radar evidence of Soviet overflights." One rejoices that the Council hesitated, and that the screens found what they did, and that they were read correctly and that the intelligence reports were dispatched promptly and arrived in time. But there is an actual example; there is something that, we are responsibly informed, really happened—who would say that the arrangements here were "fool-proof"?

* * *

It is necessary also to remind readers of a well-authenticated occurrence which demonstrates that on the highest levels there appears at times outright deception; that such deception is practiced in pursuit of policy; and that this policy carries with it commitment to the use of nuclear weapons and therefore opposition to anything which induces the cessation of weapons-testing, let alone progress towards actual disarmament.

On September 19, 1957 the Atomic Energy Commission, in order to demonstrate that one could produce atomic explosions, under proper conditions, which could not be detected from any considerable distance, detonated an atomic bomb one-tenth as potent as that which destroyed Hiroshima and did this within a 2,000-foot long tunnel dug into a mountain. AEC thereafter reported, with the full weight of its official position behind it, that the explosion had been detected at a *maximum* distance of 250 miles. The U.S. Government did not fail to announce that this confirmed its view of the impossibility of effectively banning atomic weapon-testing.

The terrible fact is, however, that a *station of the U.S. Government* in Alaska, over 2,500 miles away, had recorded the blast. This was not made known; rather the contrary report was made public and was used, though known to be false, in support of a policy furthering the atomic arms race. It was only the revelation made first by Harold E. Stassen, in February 1958, after he had been fired by the President, that the blast had been picked up at distances greater than stated by the AEC, and after further inquiry by Senator Humphrey that the full truth about this became public.

It is clear, therefore, that the unilateral cessation of nuclear-weapons testing by the Soviet Union is an act that could be subject to effective international supervision even under present conditions. Furthermore, the USSR has offered to participate at once in an inspection system which would provide for the establishment of international detecting stations on its own borders, at distances

of 500 miles. Where the U.S. government stands now on this matter, we will let Professor Charles C. Price, of the chemistry department of the University of Pennsylvania, explain:

The refusal of the Administration even to discuss seriously with the Soviet Union their proposal to set up instrumental inspection posts throughout the Soviet Union to monitor a ban on further nuclear explosions raised grave doubts in my mind as to the sincerity of the Administration statement on the arms-control problem. (Letter to *N. Y. Times*, April 24.)

* * *

Why is it America's policy which induces among Europeans "a crisis of conscience," and here a "moral crisis"? Why is it America's policy which is "obsessed with military power"; that is "at a dead end"; that produces "a national stupor"; that the world "identifies with colonialism"? Why is it American policy to disguise nuclear destruction with words about "cleanliness"; to lie about the results of its own experiments; to practice a brinkmanship that terrifies humanity and identifies to the vast majority of mankind the name of our country with the main obstacle to disarmament; that makes of our country the source of deliberate and continued contamination of the seas and the air that belong to all men?

The idea is gaining ground that the very horrendousness of modern war makes war impossible; that in these new terms it is not really important to inquire into the cause of the war danger; it is enough only to point to the annihilating quality of modern weapons to insure their not being used. There is nothing in the experience of humanity to justify this view; on the contrary, everything that has gone before points to the extreme dubiousness of such a position. One of the values of Louis J. Halle's new book, *Choice for Survival* (Harper, N. Y., \$2.75)—with the main thesis of which, an argument for "limited" warfare, I disagree—is that it brings forward something of the past illusions that the frightfulness of weapons assured the elimination of war.

No, weapons—of any kind, even so qualitatively new as thermonuclear weapons—remain instrumentalities of policy. And that policy remains the function of organized states, and those states remain the expressions of particular social systems, and are themselves, ultimately, the instrumentalities of those ruling such systems.

Thus, despite the enormous and insistent propaganda here to the effect that the Soviet Union threatens war and aggression, it is a fact that leading figures repeatedly have admitted, to their confidants and under private circumstances, that this was not true. Forrestal, for example, before madness befell him, confided to his diary in June, 1946 that he did not believe the USSR would attack "at any time." In June, 1948, General Walter Bedell Smith reported to the Security Council that "the Russians do not want war"; a military report to the NATO Council in 1951 found that there were "no serious indications that the Soviet Union is preparing for hostilities"; Eisenhower's Chief of Staff in 1952, General Gruenther, reported to him that he saw no

such preparations and felt certain the Russians were not going to war.*

To the degree that one is serious in his efforts to contribute to wiping out the scourge of war, he will seek to comprehend its source. For, of course, effective therapy depends first of all upon accurate diagnosis. Then, one can seek to apply the means to overcome the disease; but first one must know, with as much accuracy as possible, exactly what disease he is combatting.

In the modern era, the great, central cause of war—that cause without which the effect would not appear—has been imperialism. To know and prove this truth today, with what is at stake in war or peace, is of transcendent consequence. And for an American, for one who lives in that country representing the apex of monopoly capitalism's power, for him the duty of exposure is all the more urgent. No more patriotic task exists.

An Australian scholar, Dr. Frederick E. Emery, of the University of Melbourne, finds that the basic source of World War I, "lies in the inherently unstable and highly explosive balance of power, arising from and spurred on by the imperialist demands of the dominant financial and industrial monopolies of the major powers." He finds that the process leading to World War II "was basically similar"; and study convinces him that these basic war-driving attributes of imperialist systems are absent from socialist ones.**

The impact of these forces on American foreign policy today are also decisive. This encompasses ideological hatred and economic fear of socialism; the enormous profits to be made from war and war-preparations***; the internal necessity to seek areas for investment of excess capital at higher rates of profits; the drive to assure cheap and abundant raw materials; to undercut or eliminate competing imperialisms; to repress colonial liberation movements; to foment chauvinisms and jingoisms that divert from domestic exploitation and insecurity; to pay off components within the potentially dangerous sectors of society with excess obtained from overseas; to buy "permanent prosperity." These are all living realities in American life that one may find documented in any issue of the *Wall Street Journal* or *Business Week* or *U.S. News and World Report*; one may find it in naked form in the reports made to the Committee for Economic Development, published recently by Doubleday in a volume already cited—all this quite apart from the work of Marxist scholars as Victor Perlo, Hyman Lumer, Paul Baran, Alphaeus Hunton, James S. Allen, to cite only a few of the more recent contributors from our own country.

I have referred to monopoly capitalism's power, and to dominant financial and industrial monopolies. This is decisive in comprehending the modern drive to war. Its existence in our country is unmistakable, though its denial, in mass media of circulation, is continual. But here is a study, *Economic Power and the Free Society*, by A. A. Berle, Jr., a former Assistant Secretary

* Documentation for this and other instances will be found in the essay by Geoffrey Sharp in the volume edited by V. H. Wallace, and already cited.

** Emery's essay is also in the Wallace volume.

*** The late Harold Laski, in his *Liberty in the Modern State* (1949) quoted a French general as saying in 1908: "The corporations believe that it is the government's duty to make war so that they may be assured of their profits." And fifty years later?

of State, a leading attorney and an authority on the nature of the modern corporation, in which these words occur (p. 14):*

Today approximately 50 per cent of American manufacturing—that is everything other than financial and transportation—is held by 150 corporations, reckoned at least by asset values. If finance and transportation are included, the total increases . . . about two-thirds of the economically productive assets of the U.S., excluding agriculture, are owned by a group of not more than 500 corporations. This is actual asset ownership . . . in terms of power, without regard to asset positions, not only do 500 corporations control two-thirds of the non-farm economy but within each of that 500 a still smaller group has the ultimate decision-making power. This is, I think, the highest concentration of economic power in recorded history. Since the U.S. carries on not quite half of the manufacturing production of the entire world today, these 500 groupings—each with its own little dominating pyramid within it—represent a concentration of power over economics which makes the medieval system look like a Sunday school party. In sheer economic power this has gone far beyond anything we have yet seen.

Mr. Berle draws conclusions from his observations about "the free society" with which I sharply disagree; and politically he feels it necessary to acquiesce in this domination of the economy of our country. But the point here is the influence of this economic power over politics; and more specifically, the influence of this economic power over the shaping of American foreign policy and over the conducting of American diplomacy. Mr. Dulles has taken it upon himself lately to speak of a debauched and prostituted diplomacy; I would suggest that one in the service of the kind of concentrated economic power to which Mr. Berle has pointed had better exercise caution in accusing others of being debauched and prostituted.

* * *

The capacity to give every human being a good and abundant life has been achieved by mankind; with that capacity has come also the capacity to annihilate all mankind. The development of these capacities has gone hand in hand with and been the product of that social development which has made capitalism senile and brought socialism to ever-increasing millions of people. The disintegration of the system of exploitation and its replacement by a system of collectivity and fraternity offer the possibility in our era, for the first time, of eliminating war.

Hence, everywhere, the struggle for peace is taking on dimensions and urgency and militancy that are exhilarating. This is organized and fully conscious and enormously potent among Socialist nations; the leadership in the struggle against World War III by the Soviet Union has been as magnificent and as decisive a contribution to mankind as was the same Socialist country's leadership in the defeat of fascism in World War II.

* Obtainable from The Fund for the Republic, 60 E. 42nd St., N.Y.C., at no charge.

The developing movement for peace in the colonial world and in the countries recently liberated—particularly India—constitute an additional reinforcement of the greatest importance. And in the major European capitalist nations the opposition to war is spreading and deepening; the same is occurring, so far on a smaller scale, in our own country. Here I wish only to mention two very broad and magnificent efforts seeking an end to nuclear-weapon testing, the destruction of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, a ban upon their use, and general disarmament—all of which are necessary steps towards the guaranteeing of peace on earth: the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

These movements encompass in their leadership men and women like Clarence Pickett, of the American Friends; Dr. Linus Pauling; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union; Jerry Voorhis, of the Co-operative League of America; Dr. Mordecai Johnson, President of Howard University; Pearl S. Buck; A. Philip Randolph and many others of equal distinction. On certain minima, as enumerated above, agreement can be achieved among the vast majority of the American people; war is made more remote to the degree that the program is spread and explained, the issues made clear, and the will for peace organized, even if it be only around those elementary demands directed towards wiping out the nightmare of nuclear extermination.

Harrison Brown, renowned American scientist, in a closely reasoned appeal for disarmament and coexistence, concludes (*The Reporter*, April 3, 1958):

I realize that it is a long way from cessation of nuclear tests and the assignment of the control of space to the establishment of a truly peaceful world. But it seems to me that we have got to start someplace, and we have got to start soon. We are rapidly approaching the time when it will be too late.

Let us have a new race—a disarmament race. Let us overtake and surpass the Russians in this! Let us test the Russians and not the bombs!

Can we not at last say, with Longfellow:

*The reign of violence is dead,
Or dying surely from the world?*

Book Review

MASTER OF DECEIT

Masters of Deceit: The Story of Communism in America and How to Fight It, by J. Edgar Hoover (Holt, N. Y., 374 pp. \$5.00).

In reviewing this book I feel like simply saying: "Any resemblance to the Communist Party or any of its members, alive or dead, is purely coincidental," and let it go at that. It is a hodge-podge of slander, gossip, hearsay statements by informers, and downright lies. How can one dignify it with a reply? This mess is buttressed by a sly suggestion that the author is, of course, not revealing "a body of material known exclusively to the F.B.I."—a stock in trade of Hoover over the years. J. Edgar Hoover is today the undisputed Czar of the F.B.I., a master of self-adulation, who continually publicizes himself on the radio, in the press and magazines, speaks to women's clubs, graduating classes, business men, the Legion, etc. If ever there was a shining example of the "cult of the individual," it is exemplified in this politically illiterate and conceited man, who has used almost unlimited power for the attempted repression of the Bill of Rights.

He claims to be the outstanding expert on the American Communists since 1919. I have known the Communists even longer, going back several years before the founding of the Party, when many were in the Left-wing of the Socialist Party. I have also known the words and deeds of J. Edgar Hoover for the past four decades. He is incapable of a fair and objective opinion on any radical group of the entire period. He was a professional Red-baiter and Red-hunter before there was a Communist Party, from his first employment by the Department of Justice in 1917, at the age of 22. Previously he had worked in the Library of Congress, where he became familiar with card index systems—no doubt helpful to his future efforts at establishing dossiers on millions of Americans, from Presidents and their families, Congressmen and Senators, down to dog catchers. He has also collected a fingerprint file of prodigious proportions—76 millions in 1943.

In 1919 the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice set up an *Anti-Radical Division*. Hoover became its chief and his career was launched. Four months later, he sounded off on his theme song (repeated in this book)—"The present organized world-wide class struggle threatens the foundations of society and civilization." He named his outfit the General Intelligence Division, which became the F.B.I. in 1924, with Hoover as its chief. Fourteen Attorney Generals and seven Presidents, Republicans and Democrats, have come and gone but for 34 years this man has remained, head of his personal police

force, refusing even to allow it to be placed under Civil Service, as are other Government agencies. His bright young men are trained in his methods and are responsible to him. A mantle of secrecy in the name of security, shrouds their records. Only after a recent Supreme Court decision did the F.B.I., faced with the charge of perjury, reluctantly admit that there were tape recordings of Louis Budenz' first conversations with them in 1945, which they had previously denied even to government lawyers. War on radicalism has been Hoover's preoccupation for four decades. It has caused the F.B.I. to commit excesses rebuked by courts and investigated by Congress. But all to no avail. He remains a law unto himself.

Yet Mr. Hoover is signally inept when dealing with real crime. He never solved the mystery of the 1919-1920 bomb plots, which he blamed on the I.W.W. and others, but which he used in June, 1920 for frantic appeals for more funds. It was my opinion then, and nothing has happened to change it since, that these acts were committed by provocateurs, like the New York policeman who later planted a bomb in St. Patrick's Cathedral and got himself promoted to a detective, in consequence of his arrest of a group of Anarchists. Before there were "Communists" Mr. Hoover's targets in crushing dissent were Socialists, Anarchists, I.W.W.'s, and conscientious objectors.

Methods were originated which are still in use—with more up-to-date techniques—such as placing informers and provocateurs in organizations, wire-tapping, making stenographic reports of public speeches, opening of mail, seizing of libraries (sometimes of valuable personal collections), publishing lists of pacifists and antiwar radicals, causing people to lose jobs and be blacklisted, revoking second-class privileges of periodicals, night raids, etc. Radicals were lynched, as was Frank Little, and force and violence, by beatings and tar and feathers, occurred in many places, as the early records of the American Civil Liberties Union show—yet we never heard of any F.B.I. investigations of these brutalities. Why should they investigate acts which their own organization encouraged?

Try as he will, J. Edgar Hoover cannot evade responsibility for the infamous Palmer raids of 1919-1920, when reports of the nationwide midnight raids were ordered sent to him in Washington. Ten thousand men and women were arrested, 6,500 were released only after days of F.B.I. inquisition incommunicado. The majority were freed later by indignant Federal courts. Several hundred were deported, after long confinement under excessive bail demanded by the Bureau. These high handed, illegal practices were denounced by prominent attorneys, including Felix Frankfurter, Zachariah Chafee, Roscoe Pound and Francis Fisher Kane, who had resigned as U. S. Attorney in Philadelphia in protest against such actions. Hoover now tries to disassociate himself from the terrible human tragedy of these raids. But he secured the ship, the *Buford* (called the Deportation Ark), from the Navy and personally supervised its departure, on Dec. 21, 1919. Families were torn apart, separated forever, and wives and children left penniless. Nor can Mr. Hoover evade responsibility for the tragic fate of Andrea Salsadeo, an Anarchist printer

who was held for eight weeks in 1920, as a private prisoner, without warrant, in the offices of the Bureau in New York City. His crushed body was found one day at dawn on the pavement below. His companion, Robert Elia, similarly held a prisoner, was immediately deported before reporters could question him.

I could go on indefinitely out of my memories of labor defense in bygone days. I could mention the state raid instigated by the Bureau in 1922 against the Communist Party convention in Michigan when planted agents were uncovered. I can cite the aid given to the state of Massachusetts in the prosecution of Sacco and Vanzetti, although two agents who attended the trial later admitted they were convinced of their innocence. Yet Mr. Hoover asserted then, as now, that the F.B.I. is merely a fact-finding body, not involved in prosecution. How can he explain its activity in 1922 which caused the arrest of 1,200 striking railroad shopmen under the Sherman Anti-Trust law and the loss of their strike?

In Chapter 21 of this book, Mr. Hoover asserts that the Communist Party has been an agency for espionage and sabotage since 1919. How does he reconcile this with the report he made in 1924 to his superior, Asst. Attorney General Donovan? Then he wrote: "It is, of course, to be remembered that the activities of Communists and other ultra-radicals have not up to the present time constituted a violation of the Federal statutes, and consequently, the Department of Justice, theoretically, has no right to investigate such activities as there has been no violation of Federal law." The restraining hand of Attorney-General Stone was felt at this time, when he ordered the end of spying, telephone snooping and undercover work. However, Hoover bided his time until he was able to return to the old tricks, with the departure of Mr. Stone. By 1940 another Senate Committee which included Harry Truman, Robert Wagner and others, heard a list of charges against the F.B.I. that sounded like 1919-1920. This was the year that F.B.I. agents conducted midnight raids in Detroit and Milwaukee, arresting a large number charged with recruiting men to go to Spain several years before. In Detroit the prisoners were marched through the streets in chains.

This is the background for *Masters of Deceit*. It is a dull and superficial book, parroting all the distortions, exaggerations and misrepresentations of the last forty years. It is based on such a deep-seated hatred and prejudice that it is akin to vile stories peddled by unscrupulous anti-Catholics against nuns and priests, or those of anti-Semites who proclaim the forged Protocols of Zion. It is a rehash of every canard, hoax and legend, plus every stereotyped charge either rejected in our trials or thrown out later by the Supreme Court.

Much of this book is ridiculous, although some of it unfortunately follows the line of people who have recently resigned from the Party. The chapter called "This Is the Party," is a travesty.

Nothing the Party does is good, nothing it does is right; all in the Party are slaves or dupes; tyrants and bureaucrats; traitors to their country, potential spies, agents of Moscow, etc., *ad nauseum*. All Communists conform to a pat-

tern with J. Edgar Hoover. "Ruthless" is the word. Marx was "egotistical, crafty, stubborn." Lenin was "utterly cynical." Foster is "a miniature Hitler." "Russian control" is the chorus to every verse. Co-existence must be the bane of Hoover's existence. How could he live without a Red Menace?

To answer this tirade would be to dignify deliberate fabrication. I refer every honest American to the real history of the Communist Party in the past 38 years. It fought in the 20's to maintain civil liberties for itself and others; in the 30's for the unemployed; in the 40's against fascism; and always to build unions, and to secure full rights for the Negro people. And it believes in Socialism, and fights imperialism. In the last decade, our Party has spearheaded the fight for the Bill of Rights, against the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, the Taft-Hartley law, Loyalty tests and against all forms of McCarthyism; it has fought against war. It is because we have challenged the reactionary purposes and immoral methods of Hoover and the F.B.I. during all these years that we have won his hatred.

Let me add a few further comments. Mr. Hoover is greatly concerned to protect the Negro people from us, lest we "disaffect the Negroes of the U.S.A.," as the Bureau reported in its early days, when it attacked *The Messenger* as dangerous; and spied on people like W. E. B. Du Bois, John Haynes Holmes and Mary White Ovington for their support of equal rights of the Negro in America. The Negro press was accused by the G.I.D. of being "insolently offensive" and filled with "defiance and insolently race-centered condemnation of the white race." James Weldon Johnson, Negro writer, Secretary of the NAACP, opposed a Bureau-sponsored sedition bill that would have made agitation on the race issue seditious. He read to Congressmen an advance notice of time and place when a Negro was to be burned at the stake and Governor Bilbo's statement that he could not prevent it. Where was Mr. Hoover and the F.B.I. when these terrible events occurred? In 1941, Negro organizations called the attention of Congress to the fact that Mr. Hoover had never hired a single Negro as an F.B.I. agent. But far more important, the F.B.I. has done nothing for the right of Negro citizens to vote in the South, where millions are barred from the franchise by force and violence, nor has the F.B.I. done anything to help enforce the Supreme Court decision on desegregation of schools, busses, etc. The F.B.I. is conspicuously absent from every situation involving an invasion of the rights and freedom of the Negro people. I know of no instance of a single arrest or prosecution originated with an F.B.I. investigation of mob action or illegal denial of rights to Negro people. Negroes have been lynched, burned at the stake, shot down for attempting to vote, have been framed-up, deprived of their civil rights and of their legal right to be tried by their peers; denied jobs; herded into Jim Crow communities, sections of railroads, busses and stations; denied service in restaurants and theatres; denied the right to attend schools and colleges. Where has the F.B.I. ever come to their aid? Yet we Communists are "exploiting" them if we speak out on these outrages and try to help the Negro people secure their full rights in their own country!

While I was in Alderson Federal Women's Prison, serving a three year

sentence under the thought-control Smith Act, I met many juvenile offenders, who were the victims of an over-zealous F.B.I. in enforcing the Dyer Act against young "joy riders." Mr. Bennett, head of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, has objected on more than one occasion to these juveniles being brought to federal institutions and Congressman Dyer protested against the law being used in this manner rather than against adult criminals. The view shared by other Government Bureaus, except the F.B.I., is that these cases should be dealt with in their own communities. Young girls, sometimes away from home for the first time, are exposed in a Federal prison to foul language, boastful tales of all sorts of crimes, details of prostitution, of narcotic sales and addiction, and to lesbianism. No one of them but is bound to be affected by this terrible environment. It is a tragic thing to see the change for the worse take place in these children—so that Mr. Hoover can pose as an authority on juvenile delinquency.

From my personal experience before, during and since my prison term, I can state that I know literally hundreds of people who have been harassed by the F.B.I.—Smith Act defendants and their families, families of Communists who were not available to the F.B.I.; foreign-born workers; trade-union members, far removed from the Communist Party; students, teachers, artists, actors, inter-racial social groups, housewives going about their shopping, hotel keepers, restaurant owners, landlords, doctors, all for purposes of surveillance as to their beliefs or those of people with whom they might have associated. Not even in prison are men and women safe from F.B.I. interrogation. This \$20,000 a year snoop, whose men are ready to sift garbage or spy on the family affairs of a Senator, who will arrest a child but have been unsuccessful in tracing down the top hundred gangsters of the country—surely it is time for him to be exposed as an incompetent fraud. His bureau spends millions every year, his army increases and so does crime. He is so busy witch-hunting, that the F.B.I. with all its facilities actually contributes approximately only 1 per cent of all criminal arrests and convictions in the U.S.A.

The title of this book is a complete misnomer, as applied to the Communist Party and Hoover has made no case to prove it either in court or in this book. Actually, Master of Deceit and Conceit would be a fitting title for a biography of J. Edgar Hoover. It will yet be written, with a myriad of interesting comments on this man and his foul deeds, which could include those of Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson, Assistant Secretary Louis F. Post (1920), Federal Judge Anderson of Boston; Senators Borah of Idaho, Walsh of Montana, Norris of Nebraska, Wheeler of Montana, McKellar of Tennessee, Connolly of Texas, Hatch of New Mexico and many others. Some day, in a calmer political climate, to paraphrase Justice Black, the F.B.I. files will be opened and undoubtedly will reveal a veritable Collier-mass of rubbish fit only for the incinerator. Meantime this book is grist to the mill of the next request for increased appropriations to Mr. Hoover.

ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN.

New Spring Books

HISTORY AND CONSCIENCE:

The Case of Howard Fast

by Hershel D. Meyer

The first full-length study of the social and personal dynamics which lie behind the political reversal announced by the formerly progressive writer. Dr. Meyer probes to the heart of Fast's not-so-special case, buttressing his analysis with historic, philosophic and psychological data in a study which goes beyond the Fast case, into major issues facing intellectuals in our time.

ANVIL-ATLAS, Cloth \$1.75; Paper \$1.00

HERE I STAND

by Paul Robeson

"Robeson weaves his background with overtones of moving beauty. Pain and struggle, poverty and heartbreak, humiliation and disappointment are there; but there is too so much love, so much devotion, so much of unselfish giving. . . . *Here I Stand* is a blueprint for action. It is a book to read and to pass on and on."

—SHIRLEY GRAHAM in *Mainstream*

OTHELLO, Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.00

THE DAY IS COMING

The Life and Work of Charles E. Ruthenberg

by Oakley Johnson

The long-awaited biography of one of the chief founders of the American Communist Party vividly describes his socialist background and typical midwest boyhood in Ohio, and the lessons of his life and work for today.

INTERNATIONAL, \$3.00

TOWARD A SOCIALIST AMERICA

by 15 Contemporary American Socialists

Edited by Helen Alfred, this volume contains essays by Herbert Aptheker, Homer Ayres, Reuben Borough, Carl Dreher, W.E.B. Du Bois, Philip Foner, Stephen Fritchman, John Howard Lawson, John T. McManus, Broadus Mitchell, Scott Nearing, George Olshausen, Victor Perlo, Bertha Reynolds, and Paul M. Sweezey, setting forth their views on the political and economic shape of socialism in the U.S.A.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS, Cloth \$3.50; Paper \$1.50

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3