

political affairs

JULY 1958 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|-----------------------|------|---|
| WILLIAM ALLAN | [27] | The Coming Michigan Elections |
| GEORGE LOHR | [32] | Two Germanys and the Danger of War |
| HU CHIAO-MU | [40] | China's Great Leap Year |
| FRANZ MAREK | [45] | The Draft Program of the Austrian Socialist Party |
| COMMUNICATIONS | [54] | The McClellan Committee and Labor
On Government Spending:
A Discussion |
| HYMAN LUMER | [62] | "The Capitalist Revolution" |

THE ROOTS OF THE FRENCH CRISIS
By JACQUES DUCLOS [1-8]

ALGERIA, FRANCE AND FREEDOM
By HERBERT APTHEKER [9-26]

Now Ready

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. 7

JULY, 1958

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The Roots of the French Crisis*

By Jacques Duclos

THE MINISTERIAL crisis which began in France with the fall of the Gaillard government, emphasizes the further deterioration of the French political situation. That situation is dominated by the major problem of the Algerian war, an end to which was demanded by the parties of the Left, including the Socialist Party, in the course of the campaign preceding the January 2, 1956 elections.

After he had become Premier, in the new government, Guy Mollet, instead of making the search for a peaceful solution to the Algerian problem his main objective, followed a policy progressively drawing France down into the quickstands of a bitter-end war policy, in accordance with the demands of the ultra-colonialists of Algeria.

It is under these circumstances that the war in Algeria was continued through 1956 and 1957 with much more powerful means than formerly;

this course of action failing, however, to force a decision. While Minister for Algeria, Robert Lacoste, repeatedly announced, from "final quarter of an hour" to "final quarter of an hour," that victory was at hand, the truth was that the prospect of victory, far from drawing nearer, was steadily receding into the distance.

The facts having systematically contradicted their predictions, the strategists of the Algerian war concluded that in order to bring about victory the war must be extended to Tunisia, being fully aware that if events evolved in this direction, the question of extending the war to Morocco as well must inevitably arise.

Such a policy, inexorably leading to abrogation of Tunisian as well as Moroccan independence, cannot fail to make the socialist leaders reflect on the situation, knowing that the masses whom they influence are not geared to approval of this reactionary solution. It is true, moreover, that the economic and social consequences of the Algerian war, determining factors in the development of the

* Translated, by Amy Schechter, from the May, 1958 issue of *Démocratie Nouvelle*; hence, presumably, written by Duclos sometime in April—Ed.

united struggles of the State and public service employees, and their repercussions within the working class as a whole, would tend to cause the socialist leaders to differentiate themselves from their reactionary associates who are hostile to working-class demands on principle.

Thus the contradictions have grown more acute among the various parties in the government coalition in which the reactionary elements are more and more openly acting to make their point of view prevail, placing emphasis on the use of repressive measures against those opposing the policy of force in Algeria. At the same time, they pressure the government to show complaisance, not to say complicity, in its attitude towards the traitorous groupings whose activities inside France are becoming more intensive, in direct relation with the conduct, and the further embitterment, of the war against the Algerian people. These are the conditions in which the "Good Offices" dispute developed, leading to the dissolution of the government. And now that the problem of constituting a new government has been posed, some advocate recourse to de Gaulle, presented as a man of destiny.

What is being contemplated, in view of the weakness, increasingly evident, in the policy succeeding governments have been following, is obviously to prevent the Left forces from achieving unity, the only possible method for implementing the pledges made by the Left to the

voters in the January 2, 1956 elections.

This Left solution, advocated by the Communist Party, has come to be approved by ever larger numbers of Frenchmen. It is becoming increasingly clear that it will be impossible to bring the war in Algeria to an end quickly, as the true interests of France demand, unless effective measures are taken to smash the anti-national and fascist resistance of the ultra-colonialists of Algeria, together with the resistance of the extension of these groupings existing in France.

The principal obstacle blocking this solution is none other than the leadership of the Socialist Party, which, while it declares that it opposes the return of de Gaulle to power, at the same time claims that it was defending the Republic when continuing its participation in the Gaillard government. Among its members this government included Minister of National Defense Chaban-Delmas, who, on March 23 last, supported a call by the national council of the Social Republicans for a government dictatorship headed by de Gaulle. And all this was done without the Socialist Party leaders, who claim vigilance in safeguarding republican institutions, thinking that it was their duty to utter not even a single word opposing it.

De Gaulle, on his side, maintains deliberate silence, cultivates ambiguity, permits an agent of the ultra-colonialists like Soustelle to come out in his favor, and, at the same time,

encourages certain of his friends to "reassure" the Left.

These politician's maneuverings have a precise objective: they are meant to deter the people of France from taking part in a democratic and national solution to the problems their country faces: they are meant to create conditions which will make it possible for them to continue following, in its essential features, the policy the country has condemned, though using other men and a different governmental formula.

ON DE GAULLE

As the British newspaper, *The Observer* underlined in 1947: "In De Gaulle's attitude there is no doubt that symptoms exist which can properly be called fascist."

These estimates of yesterday are still significant today; and it is in the light of De Gaulle's former political behavior that he must be judged today.

Some people claim that by giving up power in 1946, Gen. de Gaulle did take an attitude which should reassure democrats, but the truth of the matter is not so simple.

When De Gaulle abruptly stepped down in January, 1946, two months after the First National Constituent Assembly had begun functioning, he demonstrated his inability to tolerate even the slightest degree of parliamentary control; and his decision was made in the secret hope that,

following a brief period, there would develop a strong tide of public opinion which would allow him to take power again on the basis of a dictatorship, without any sort of control.

The General's hopes met with disappointment: nobody called him back. He did not pause long before getting into the battle of politics, beginning by formulating principles on which to base a new constitution, which he wished to be "tailored to his measure."

On June 16, 1946, in a speech at Bayeux, De Gaulle recommended a parliament to be composed of two Chambers, specifically stating that the executive power should not emanate from Parliament but from a much larger College, which would place the Chief of State above those elected by the nation, against whom he would be enabled to use, at pleasure, the threat of dissolution.

When, in April 1947, General de Gaulle founded the "Rassemblement du Peuple Francais" (R.P.F.), he denounced the parliamentary system; and, taking over a procedure others had made use of in the past, added to his "arguments" against the democratic system, virulent attacks against the Communists, whom he labelled "separatists," without even the least attempt to justify this label.

Under the influence of the intoxication brought on by the success of R.P.F. in the municipal elections, De Gaulle took to prophesying; and, on November 12, 1947, he declared,

with solemnity matching his presumptuousness, that "The R.P.F. will continue to spread and develop to the point where it will embrace the entire nation, with the exception, naturally, of the separatists." Events since then have shown the gauge of the De Gaulle clairvoyance and the seriousness of his forecasts.

In the ratio and measure that he believed he saw approaching the hour of his assumption of power, De Gaulle stepped up the aggressiveness with which he opposed those millions of Frenchmen and Frenchwomen who put their trust in the Communist Party, at the same time that he extended the hand of friendship to the men of Vichy.

Thus, for example, at a press conference held on October 1, 1948, the General, displaying his contempt for the people, declared: "If it should come to pass that the Separatists enter what is still known as the government of France, then it would pass completely beyond the bounds of legitimacy."

In contrast to the attacks he made against the Communist Party, heroic vanguard of the resistance to the Hitlerite invaders, De Gaulle openly made advances to former Vichyites whom he attempted to whitewash, when he stated that "The R.P.F. deals with all men of good will. There are some who went with Vichy . . . but going with Vichy was, after all, only a manner of speaking. Who really went with Vichy to the end of the road? Did

Laval himself go with Vichy to the end?"

Putting on more and more spectacular performances in his role as aspiring dictator, De Gaulle spoke at Saint-Etienne on January 4, 1948, concerning the social achievements made when he was in power; he omitted mention of the fact that these achievements had come as a result of the presence in the government of representatives of the working class.

The R.P.F., lacking a social program, drew up a draft law stating that its object was ". . . the establishment of a system bringing together in association, instead of opposing to one another, all those who cooperate at a common economic task in an enterprise."

General de Gaulle, taking over clichés which are at the same time demagogic and reactionary, in regard to the association of capital and labor, and "corporation," makes the claim that he wishes to bring about the disappearance of ". . . the psychology of exploitation of some by others, of the class struggle. . . ."

This program very closely resembles that of Spanish dictator Franco, according to whom ". . . capital and labor must dwell together intensely united." A state of things far from characteristic of today's Spain.

Summing up, behind all De Gaulle's opportunist slogans, the truth remains that he at no time has envisaged power under any form other than Personal Power; the clear

significance of this being that, should he succeed in taking over as head of the government, his first concern would be the destruction of republican institutions and all the democratic rights.

These are the sole conditions under which De Gaulle sees himself in his turn "making a gift of his person"; and, if the circumstances differ from those which accompanied the advent of Petainism—it is to a similar brand of political system that De Gaullism must necessarily lead France, unless republicans with all resoluteness block the road to adventurism.

No one claims to have any illusions about De Gaulle breaking with the vicious policy which has so greatly harmed France in the course of the past eleven years. And here it must be stated specifically that he played an important role in elaborating and implementing that policy.

It cannot be forgotten that De Gaulle did, in fact, come out in favor of the Marshall Plan. He said at Compiègne, March 7, 1948: "The efforts of old Europe and those of America must be joined . . . in order that our poor world may be set upright once again." The expansionist plans of the American imperialists, directed towards domination of Europe and preparing the way for a revival of German militarism for anti-Soviet ends, were likewise presented as an expression of American generosity.

Speaking of the Atlantic Pact, which, in his own words, De Gaulle

"saluted in advance," he declared, on March 28, 1949: "Signing a Pact of this sort is very natural on the part of the powers of western Europe, and especially on the part of France."

West Germany was in no wise excluded a priori from the Pact, by de Gaulle, which is not surprising, since when he headed the provisional government he had made statements favoring the revival of Germany as a military power.

All this was in preparation for assuming a new position, the importance of which appears at first glance. This position he stated as follows, on March 16, 1950:

"One is almost dazzled by the perspective of the joint contribution that could be made by French prowess and German prowess extending operations into Africa. In Africa, there exists a field for joint development which could transform Europe. . . . I am speaking of returning again under modern conditions, to the project once launched by Charlemagne."

In this definition of his European policy, nothing is lacking. It postulates the rebirth of German militarism, it invokes onetime Franco-German collaboration in Europe—a collaboration which since that time has become one of the planks of the Common Market agreement of which Eur-Africa is the extension.

Later, on January 7, 1951, in a speech at Nîmes, de Gaulle, alluding to the ". . . necessary influx of American forces into Europe. . ." launched

an attack against the Soviet government on the grounds that it was demanding the demilitarization of Germany. At the same time he demanded that the coming battle in Europe should be ". . . prepared along the most advanced lines, and that the powerful elements which existed there, should henceforth be held in readiness . . .," a statement which, from all the evidence, implies the formation of military forces in West Germany.

Such then was the policy of De Gaulle at a decisive moment for our country's future, at a time when the American imperialists were employed in, on the one hand, creation of a wave of anti-Communist fears, and, on the other, exploitation of that fear for the purpose of extending their domination. De Gaulle, urging what he called the defense of freedom against the countries of the socialist camp—and this in collaboration with former Hitlerite officers—had no hesitation in using a madman's formula declaring: "We prefer the dropping of the atom bomb to the loss of freedom." (*Press Conference*, March 16, 1950)

Thus, under the most diverse circumstances, and a time when the future of our native land was at stake, General De Gaulle, whom they now seek to present as a model of intransigent patriotism, took a political stand openly counter to the national interest. Far from seeing, for instance, that the war in Indochina (which certain of his followers, among them Admiral Thierry de Argenlieu, had

played an important role in launching) was opposed to the interests of France, De Gaulle adopted the narrow and stupid position of the worst of the colonialists whose policy inevitably led to Dien-Bein-Phu.

Following the cantonal elections, on March 29, 1949, De Gaulle, giving proof of his total lack of political realism, made the following statement:

"It is in the person of the Emperor Bao Dai that the principle of Vietnamese sovereignty truly resides. France signed treaties with his ancestors. She is in Indochina by virtue of those treaties, which still remain in force. The first thing to be done in Indochina is to rectify the military situation there."

General De Gaulle thus held views on the problems of Indochina determined primarily by class considerations. He bears the same responsibility for what happened there as those governing France at the time, who guaranteed, in fact, that the war in Indochina should continue.

For seven years France continued to wage war, in accordance with this insane policy, only for the final outcome to be the installation of the Americans in South Viet Nam, when it would have been possible to conclude agreements with Ho-Chi-Minh allowing our country to establish solid and durable bonds with a Viet Nam that was independent and free.

Recalling past events in Viet Nam cannot fail to make those Frenchmen skeptical to whom it is whispered today that De Gaulle would, of his

own accord, consider "a liberal solution to the problem of Algiers" which he has repeatedly declared to be an integral part of France.

ON ALGERIA

It is true that because of the difficulties barring victory in Algiers, changes have been brought about in some French political and economic circles, in their views regarding solution of the Algerian problem; but it is not with De Gaulle that a solution can be found corresponding to the situation's demands.

Under the conditions of modern reality, whose outstanding characteristic is the power and sweep of the national liberation movements breaking in colonial lands, there is no other way of bringing the Algerian war to an end than that of arriving at a negotiated solution at last rendering it possible to establish new relationships between France and Algeria.

In order to proceed in this direction the French Communist Party has proposed to other parties of the Left that a compromise be sought which could make the Algerian people a friend and an ally of France.

But implementing such a policy will come into violent collision with the ultra-colonialists determined to stop at nothing in order to maintain their privileged position; it will clash with their agents in France, among whom the Gaullist Soustelle is playing a leading role; it will clash with the activities of the military or-

ganizations whose chiefs place preservation of colonialism before the interests of France; it will clash with the traitorous groupings which have been set up in France to push the continuation of the war in Algeria—set up under the conditions of the growth of chauvinist trends in France which are a result of that war.

From all this it follows that when De Gaulle declares he desires to be summoned by "all" to head the government, and that a priori he would exclude none, at the very time that he is covering by the shield of his silence, the ultra-colonialists who flaunt their Gaullism, his purpose is equivocation, the creation of political confusion and the wish to turn the will to unity animating the popular masses away from its true objectives.

It is not out of a politician's deal involving some sort of melange of Rightist conclave and "guarantees" to the Left, beneath the banner of Gaullism, that salvation will come to France. This type of deal only sanctions, in a new form, keeping and strengthening the Right to run the country's affairs.

"Union of Everyone" can be nothing else than a fake to dupe the people. Only union of the men and the parties of the Left—which of necessity includes the Communists—against the reactionary and anti-national Right, corresponds to the political realities of the moment, and to the country's needs. The De Gaulle solution which is being considered, can operate only to hold back the in-

dispensable changes which the country awaits, changes which in no way at all pose the dilemma to Frenchmen and Frenchwomen which some people are claiming—either fascism or Communism.

THE TRUE CHOICE

The choice to be made is altogether another one. A choice must be made as between the march to fascism, on the one hand, with its perspective of personal power and liquidation of republican institutions, and, on the other hand, safeguarding of democratic liberties under the conditions of changes in policy conforming to the pledges made by the majority of the Left, on January 2, 1956.

The return of General De Gaulle to power would lead France into adventurism. The march towards adventurism must be halted, of any sort whatsoever, at the same time that every attempt must be blocked which aims at sucking France down into the morass of a still more reactionary policy.

Eager to contribute all its forces to the creation of conditions in which changes in French policy can be made as quickly as possible, and to spare France the fearful ordeal of personal power, the Communist Party declares itself ready to support every step forward taken in the interests of the people; and, by the same token, any government which responds to the aspirations clearly ex-

pressed through the vote of the people.

But the best solution would be formation of a government reflecting the national and democratic majority wherein the Communists would assume their share of responsibility.

The solution lies in the union of the Left. This union refuses to admit those Socialist leaders who have collaborated in the government with the reactionaries, among whom is the Gaullist, Chabon-Delmas, who congratulated themselves on having elected their candidate in the Department du Nord by means of Gaullist votes, precisely at the time that they were declaring themselves to be opposed to General De Gaulle coming to power.

Assumption of an anti-Gaullist position by the Socialist Party, considered by some, perhaps, simply in the light of a tactical maneuver, is taken seriously by the militant socialists; and, because of this fact, their leaders will be forced, through the pressure of events, to give a clear answer to the specific question which is confronting the popular masses.

For the logic of the situation will pose the problem of the choice which has to be made between recourse to De Gaulle, or some other variant tending in the same reactionary, fascist direction, on one hand, and on the other, the solution through a union of the Left, which the Communists advocate unceasingly.

De Gaulle is not the supreme savior. It is up to the people to save themselves, beneath the banner of unity and of action.

"Ideas in Our Times"

By Herbert Aptheker

ALGERIA, FRANCE AND FREEDOM

Do you remember Gulliver's description of the beginnings of European colonialism? "A crew of pirates" find themselves approaching a likely-looking new land, and "go on shore to rob and plunder."

They see a harmless people, are entertained with kindness; they give the country a new name; they take formal possession of it for their king; they set up a rotten plank or a stone for a memorial; they murder two or three dozen of the natives; bring away a couple more by force for a sample; return home and get their pardon. Ships are sent with the first opportunity; the natives driven out or destroyed; their princes tortured to discover their gold; a free license given to all acts of inhumanity and lust, the earth reeking with the blood of its inhabitants; and this execrable crew of butchers, employed in so pious an expedition, is a modern colony, sent to convert and civilize an idolatrous and barbarous people.

The nearest and earliest of the areas ravished in the manner indicated by Swift was Africa; it was the first assaulted, and will be the last to secure its release. "Africa," wrote Du Bois, "has been literally bathed in blood at the behest of Europe." This is true of every inch of the tortured continent, not least the northern quarter where, thirteen decades ago, France began carving out for herself a vast empire. She touched first, in the form of 30,000 troops, on Algiers, and then moved south and east and west; in eighty years of blood-letting and rapine France annexed Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia.

To conquer the coastal plain of Algeria took France seventeen years; to reach the first range of mountains guarding the interior took her another decade. When, by 1869, France had reached the northern end of the Sahara, and so occupied a tenth part of Algeria, she had lost 300,000 soldiers and colonizers—the losses among those resisting the Christians have never been even estimated.

With conquest came subjugation, exploitation and unspeakable indignities—and continual rebellion. In this seething torrent of unrest, moments of wholesale eruption stand out—the great uprisings of 1864, 1871, 1876, 1879, 1881, 1884, 1901. . . . Stephen H. Roberts, author of a standard *History of French Colonial Policy* (London, 1929), speaks of Algeria as "a charnel-house of massacred natives" and describes the typical imperialist policy of slaughter, expropriation and impoverishment. He adds this resulted in the inhabitants "hating France with the accumulated hatred of four [five, now] generations."

In our own day the awful slaughters have continued and intensified—intensified as capitalism's technical prowess has grown almost as quickly as its callousness. While casualties reaching the tens of thousands took imperialism some months or years a few generations ago, similar and even more grandiose "accomplishments" occur today in a matter of days, or even hours. Thus, confining ourselves only to the French in Africa, and then to but a few examples: in Constantine, Algeria, something like 25,000 Arabs killed in a matter of days in 1945; in Madagascar, about 85,000 killed in a few weeks in 1947; in Casablanca, Morocco, some 800 murdered in a single day in 1952; and about 600 more in the same city in one day in 1955; and 5,000 killed in two days in Algeria in 1955. . . .

And what of those who remain alive, with that fantastic persistence which is the miracle and the glory of human history; what of those the French imperial administrators refer to as "the original vice" of their colonies—*i.e.*, the indigenous population? Let us consider Algeria today and suggest an answer to this question.

In Algeria, a country four times the size of France, live about ten million human beings. Nine million are a mixed Arab-Berber people, Islamic in religion, Arabic in language; one million are European, the majority *not* of French extraction. Despite pretenses toward the political enfranchisement of the Arabic men—gestures extracted through mass pressure—the reality of French rule ever since 1830 has been that of imperial overlordship, with the original inhabitants stripped of all real political power.

The land remains basically agricultural; its main products are wine (which the masses are forbidden by their religion to consume!), wheat, and esparto grass (alfa). What industry exists is of an extractive and processing nature; but the country's natural resources are rich, and considerable mining of coal and iron occurs. Oil, too, has been discovered—of which more later. In the cities, hugging the coast, the skilled workers are European; the unskilled, paid a pittance, are Arabic. The Arabs are forbidden to form their own trade unions; they are banned, in actuality, from other trade unions, though some token membership is permitted. The greatest mass of the Arabs are farm workers, with sharecropping—for all the world, like Mississippi—the predominant form of labor relationship.

Although the French government insists that Algeria, which happens to be in North Africa, is an integral part of France, the social-security legislation of France does not apply to this southernmost "department." And, out of a total of nine million men, women and children, there is, declares Alexander Werth, a permanent army of wholly or partially unemployed amounting to one million adult men (*Lost Statesman: The Strange Story of Mendes-France*, Abelard-Schuman, N. Y., \$5). The average annual income of the Moslem farmer in Algeria comes to \$70; five-sixths of the Arabic children attend no school; in the entire country, only 6,000 Arabs are studying above the elementary level. According to John Gunther, 98 per cent of the Arabic population in the cities are unable to read or write; 99 per cent are in this condition in the rural areas (*Inside Africa*, Harper, N. Y.). Two-thirds of the country's arable land

is owned by the *colons*; seventy of the largest landowners possess 500,000 acres.

The results are what one would expect from these figures; they are the universal results of imperialism. Summarily put by Werth: "Many parts of Algeria are fairly near the starvation level"; Gunther: "Sixty per cent of the indigenous rural population is officially classed as 'destitute.'" Destitution and starvation are spelled out somewhat more graphically by a French officer participating in a "pacification" campaign. Looking about him, he observes the "enemy":

The wretchedness of the people in this area is almost unbelievable. Some of the *mechtas* [hovels of molded earth in which the "natives" live] are sickening to see. Most of the adults have lost the sight of at least one eye because of a kind of ophthalmia which turns the eyeball into a whitish protruding globe, while many of the children have lost all their hair and their heads are covered with green moss, dotted with scabs, which is eating into the scalp (*Lieutenant in Algeria*, by Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, Knopf, N. Y., \$3.50).

Imperialism does not mean only victimization; as we have remarked, it means, also, resistance. No people have forged a more glorious record of heroic resistance than the Algerians—it is, indeed, in the forging of this resistance, that they have forged their nation, the existence of which is denied by apologists for imperialism, but whose reality is being written in blood every day. A French chronicler, Vignon, wrote in 1888, of "how numerous are their revolts"; he added that "the repression of one was the germ of another."

Now, with capitalism in general crisis, the system crumbles within and disintegrates without, each blow reinforcing and stimulating the other. Now chronic discontent produces not only sporadic uprising but also full-scale revolutionary struggles and wars for national liberation. The greatest of these proceeding at this time is that of the people of Algeria—part of the breakup of the French North African empire, of the general rising of all Africa, of the renaissance of the colored peoples of the world, of the shattering of imperialism.

Of course, the official French explanation for Algeria is as idiotic as Dulles' explanation for the "loss" of China; *i.e.*, the Algerian war is the product of the activity of local bandits stimulated and armed by Cairo or the Kremlin. This explanation, devoid of reason, does possess for the ruling class the compelling virtue of relieving their own system from the condemnation which the rebellions epitomize. This explanation stems, too, from the basically anti-democratic outlook organic to imperialism. As a sympathetic observer summarizes "the argument of the responsible French authorities":

The Algerian people are ignorant and immature, and there is no limit to their capacity to be led astray. Leaving the fate of Algeria to their moods and impulses would mean handing it over to the most uninhibited demagogues and dervishes. The people do not know what is

good for them; they must be led by the hand, like children. (Herbert Leuthy, *France Against Herself*, N. Y., Praeger.)

Well, of course, they are not exactly children; and their overseers are not exactly "leading them by the hand." They are using other methods of correction, more in keeping with the real nature of the malady. That is to say, France wages war upon the people of Algeria. For forty-six months the might of France, reinforced by a good share of the wealth of the United States, has been hurled against these children, but their unruliness persists.

For two years France used 200,000 troops in this war; during the past two years, under the aegis of the Socialist, Mollet, she doubled her commitment—indeed, for several months now fully 500,000 French troops have been engaged in the war upon Algeria. This, by the way, is the most numerous and the mightiest array of force that France has sent beyond her borders in all her history.

Five hundred thousand soldiers—with planes and tanks, with flame-throwers and cannon—are hurled for months and years not against "bandits," but against a people aroused and inspired. The logic of this is historically-confirmed and irrefutable, yet it may not be out of place to cite briefly some explicit documentation. There is, for example, the work of Servan-Schreiber, already cited. This liberal French newspaperman, who fought for six months in Algeria, wrote in 1957, "the entire Arab population is joining the resistance against us." And: "It is estimated that the rebels have got from the French army about three times as many arms as they have received from the outside. They are living off us." Alexander Werth, in Algeria during the summer of 1956, reported the French army "up against something new—a kind of national unanimity among the Algerian masses they had not known before."

Under these circumstances, and fighting in the service of imperialism, the French soldiers do in Algeria what the Germans did in France, or, better, in Poland and the Soviet Union, though, it must be stated, the wholesale, genocidal extermination of hundreds of thousands via gas chambers and crematoria has not been resorted to—at least, not yet. We add the saving phrase, because Thomas Brady reported in the *New York Times* (April 17, 1958):

There is a good deal of loose and unthinking talk in Algeria about how the best way to settle the problem is "to kill three million" Moslems with mass weapons. Why the figure three million is chosen nobody seems to know but it is a standard conversation piece.

Additional pause is justified over this "conversation piece" now that France has moved officially into the orbit of nations to be armed with nuclear weapons. Surely, with these in the hands of a completely reactionary France, faced with continuing resistance in Algeria, the possible slaughter of three million Algerians with five of six bombs takes on the dimensions of more than loose talk.

Meanwhile, with old-fashioned methods, the troops of imperialist France have chalked up a respectable total of maimed and slain men, women and children in Algeria.

Paul Johnson, assistant editor of *The New Statesman* (London), offers a good summary statement of the facts in this regard:

Villages known, or suspected, to be supplying the rebels with food were obliterated by jet fighter-bombers (supplied, incidentally, by American offshore funds for NATO defense against Russia); flame-throwers and gas bombs were used against mountain hide-outs. Torture was employed against prisoners; both *gonflage a l'eau*, the forcible injection of water by a reverse stomach-pump, and the notorious *ceinture electrique*, an electrical-shock device perfected by the Gestapo . . . some 40,000 Arabs were interned in vast, filthy concentration camps outside Algiers. Liberal Frenchmen were expelled or arrested. Arab lawyers, doctors, teachers, who had played no part in the rebellion were given long terms of imprisonment, schools were shut down, newspapers suppressed, hospitals were handed over to the military. With each excess, each act of violence, more Arabs drifted into the hills. . . . (Paul Johnson, *The Suez War*, Greenberg Publishers, N. Y., \$2.50).

Servan-Schreiber offers his eyewitness accounts. Thus: "Not a single house is standing in those groups of *mechtas* along the roadside"; "they open up with artillery against women and children because the whole tribe has gone over to the guerrillas." A lookout is caught by a patrol—he turns out to be a boy of perhaps 12 years; but he has information, or it is thought he has information, and the child is "persuaded" to talk. He is obstinate, but he is persuaded, though when the persuasion is done and he is seen asleep, exhausted in a ditch by the side of the road, his face is swollen beyond recognition.

Alphaeus Hunton, in his impeccably documented study, *Decision in Africa* (International Publishers, N. Y., \$4.00), tells of the torture of children as now common throughout the rebellious continent. He quotes Mendes-France, when Premier of France, admitting in the Chamber (Feb. 4, 1955) that he himself had seen in Algiers an 8-year-old victim of the civilizers—who had been in jail a full year! The Premier continued: "I am not telling you the worst, for there are some things that one does not dare say from a public platform"—let alone print in the *New York Times*!

A Moslem deputy from Algiers, the Socialist Benhamed—obviously one of the "moderates"—found it possible to be more outspoken at the rostrum of the French Chamber. Speaking there, also in 1955, he said, as quoted by Werth:

My fellow-Moslems know what is meant by "the bath-tub torture." They also know what is meant by the "water-pipe" trick. It is a way of pumping water into the stomach of people who are not even guilty but who have often simply been denounced anonymously by somebody. . . . Moslems living in the *bled* know at last what electricity means—they

know not from electric bulbs, but from the electric gadgets that are inserted into various parts of their body. I might also mention the "bottle-torture"; it consists in forcing quarter-bottles of Perrier you know where. I maintain that all these tortures are regularly practiced in Algeria today.

With the Premier himself having acknowledged the reality of this nightmare, it was hardly necessary for the Minister of the Interior (responsible, with fine irony, for Algerian affairs) to acknowledge the truth of the Moslem deputy's charges. He could only say: "Unfortunately this sort of thing continues to happen in Algeria despite an attempt to discipline the police." Werth himself added: "At present, the Minister of the Interior is unable to carry out an enquiry into torture and other police methods employed in Algeria—if only because certain police officials are in the service of the feudal lords of the North Africa lobby, much more than in the service of the French Government."

* * *

In the midst of the Algerian struggle for freedom—as has been true in every battle for freedom everywhere in the world for the past eleven decades—stand the Communists. One of the paradoxical benefits deriving from the imperialist fiction that Algeria was an integral part of France, was the fact that here (unlike Morocco and Tunisia, when still held by France), the Communist Party was not illegalized. And the Party of Algeria has been strong, solidly based and finely tempered; it is an important constituent of the revolutionary coalition, the *Fédération Libre Nord-Africaine*—the F.L.N. And, of course, in closest solidarity with the Algerian Communist Party and the entire F.L.N. stands the great Communist Party of France, which alone of French parties favors the independence of Algeria.

In the past three or four years the Party's influence, among Arabs and the Algerian-European workers, has been growing; the Mayor of Sid bel Abbas—fabled as the main garrison city of the French Legion—was a Communist, and in other elections in the coastal cities the Party's candidates polled as many as 100,000 votes. One source of its influence was its newspaper, *Alger Republicaine*, described in this way by John Gunther: "It is the only newspaper in Algeria that encourages Arabs to join its staff . . . it is probably read more by non-Communists than any Communist newspaper in the world, because the other Algerian newspapers, owned by *colons*, are so imperviously reactionary."

Most recently, as the terror campaign of the French masters intensified, Communists have in fact been outlawed, under the sweeping charge: "endangering the safety of the State." In the past year General Massu, of the paratroops, has been specifically charged with the task of smashing at all costs and no matter what the methods, the liberation forces within the city of Algiers itself. He has worked hard and thousands have been arrested, with hundreds upon hundreds having been executed—lately (May 26, 1958) the *New Republic* reported those slaughtered in the immediate past in this one city to number three thousand. In the course of this Free World operation,

the *Alger Republicaine* was closed, and its young editor, Henri Alleg, pursued and finally caught.

From the pen of this French-born leader of the Communist Party of Algeria has come a work to rank with Gabriel Peri's *Toward Singing Tomorrows* and Julius Fuchik's *Notes from the Gallows*. Alleg's contribution to the immortal literature of human selflessness, sublime courage and Communist clear-sightedness and steadfastness is entitled *The Question*; together with a long introduction by Sartre, it has just been published here (George Braziller, \$2.95). *The Question* is indispensable for anyone who wishes to understand the world in which he lives.*

Alleg was held one month, by the paratroopers, in their torture chambers in El-Biar, a suburb of Algiers. After the thirty days, having told the beasts nothing, he was transferred to one of the concentration camps dotting Algeria—this one at Lodi, where he wrote the present little volume. Some weeks later, he was brought for the first time before a magistrate, charged with "endangering the State" and is now confined in a civil jail in Algiers.

Alleg tells of the "enormous overcrowded prison" where hundreds were systematically tortured. In one sense, that it was overcrowded was a "blessing"; the torturers had so many victims that they hurried their work. One whole wing of this splendid NATO edifice was devoted to ministering to women: "There," writes Alleg, "are young girls, not one of whom has given way: Djilma Bouhired, Elyette Loup, Nassima Hablal, Melika Ghene, Lucie Coscas, Colette Gregoire, and many others. Undressed, beaten, insulted by sadistic torturers, they too have been submitted to the water and the electricity."

The details of the torture are overwhelming. After one especially excruciating ordeal, it is suggested to Alleg that he may wish to kill himself, but: "I suddenly felt proud and happy not to have given way. I was convinced that I could still hold out if they started again, that I would fight them to the end, that I would not help them in their job of killing me." He does hold out, and he never answers their "questions."

Of course, most of the prisoners are Arabs—learning civilized behavior; and when they see Alleg's festering naked body: "They understood that, like themselves, I had been tortured, and they greeted me in passing: 'Have courage, brother!' In their eyes I read a solidarity, a friendship, and such complete trust that I felt proud, particularly as a European, to be among them."

The editors of *The Saturday Review* managed to find a reviewer who would handle this book with the least embarrassment for the Dulles brothers. He is Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, recently Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the British Foreign Office. Sir Ivone accomplished this fabulous feat by giving Alleg's narrative exactly one paragraph (filled with errors, by the way), and devoting the rest of his "review" to criticisms of Sartre's introduction. What troubles the nobleman is Sartre's suggestion: "Disavowed—sometimes very quietly—but systematically practiced behind a facade of democratic legal-

* The first publication of portions of the Alleg work, in this country, occurred in *Mainstream*, October, 1957.

ity, torture has now acquired the status of a semi-clandestine institution." What really bothers mylord—so that he actually raises his voice—is Sartre's suggestion that this even applies to Great Britain.

Mylord is shocked. He has forgotten the British War Office's practice of selling blankets infested with smallpox germs to American Indians; the "Communist-hunts" in Malaya; the mobile gallows adorning Kenya. . . .

And an American, such as this writer, must not forget that the "water-cure" described by Alleg was used upon thousands in the Philippines by American troops; he must never forget the genocide against the Indians; the sadism of slavery and peonage and Jim Crow; the delights brought by Marines to Haiti and Nicaragua; the torture of imprisoned foes of World War I. He must not forget that police brutality is notorious, and that the third-degree is an American expression.

And a Communist, such as this writer, must not neglect the phrase in Sartre's introduction that "there are brutes East as well as West." This is true; it is awful but it is true. Yet, Sartre misses much when he tends to equate, and he is altogether wrong when he sees nothing but "opportunity and occasion" preventing the tortured from becoming the torturer. The equation is wrong, because it is only systems of exploitation that have institutionalized mass torture, and it is only the elimination of such systems which can eliminate such institutions. Such institutions and the creation of humans so brutalized as to keep them functioning are the hallmark of exploitation with its dependence upon violence and fraud, its contempt for human life, its elitism and its racism.

That any remnants and any aspects of such behavior persist after the elimination of capitalism, after the victory of working-class movements building socialism, reflects how tenacious is the filth of the centuries of class domination. Of course, nothing whatsoever—no danger, no provocation—nothing whatsoever, can justify anything approximating the torture of one human being by another. This is for capitalism and imperialism and fascism; they inflict poverty; they foster racism; they cultivate anti-Semitism; they breed wars—insitutionalizing torture befits them.

This has nothing to do with being "soft." One is not to be soft with a Franco and a Hitler; with a Mussolini and a Laval; with a Horthy and a Chiang; with a General Massu or such "socialists" as Mollet and Lacoste. One who really knows what these leaders and misleaders bring, and what more terrible horrors they portend, understands that to defeat them takes strength, persistence and even, at times, ruthlessness. But to move even the least bit in the direction of their methods, dignifies them, and weakens the struggle against them.

Alleg quotes one of the officers in charge of his torment:

What we are doing here, we will do in France. We will do it to your Duclos and your Mitterand, we will do to them what we are going to you. And your whore of a Republic, we will blow it up into the air, too! You're going to talk, I tell you.

This officer failed in his last threat. But he drew much blood from Alleg before he confessed defeat. He will fail, I think, in his other threats, too; but how much blood, how much damage will he and those he serves be able to inflict before they are defeated? Sartre in his introduction makes the point that the fascist-like behavior of the authorities in Algeria clearly was infecting the behavior of their fellows within France itself. "The gangrene is spreading," writes Sartre, "it has crossed the sea. It has even got about that the 'Question' is applied in certain civil prisons in the Metropolis."

Servan-Schreiber, in his already-cited volume, adds to this that with 500,000 Frenchmen serving in Algeria—"what with the reservists, the draftees and regular army men"—it is really "an entire generation" that is being conditioned by the abominations they are ordered to perpetrate. Hence, says one of the French officers: "We're turning them into moral failures, sometimes into monsters." This same author tells of the blackmail, beatings, torture and assassinations practiced within Algeria with the connivance of the highest officials upon French Army personnel who express opposition to the aims and methods of the murder-bund now running things. He writes of this as already, "the routine"—namely, "the intimidation, threats, kidnappings, and quiet little executions that have become part of everyday life"; the efforts to "liquidate the men in politics, in the press, or in the Army" who stand in their way. The victims here are Frenchmen; the victimization is organized and politically-motivated. Servan-Schreiber warned a year ago:

The swirling tide of corruption and hate which has already stripped so many of these young Frenchmen of their dignity, threatens now to engulf the army in Africa, and may one day, in the violence and blindness of this war, and amid a general indifference, sweep all France after it.

Yet the Algerian monstrosity is more a symptom of decay than a cause, though, of course, there is a dialectical interplay here. But what I have in mind is the experience of Vichy, and even more, the proneness of capitalist society to welcome Hitler and to adjust itself, in a suitable national form, to fascism. Here the adjustment was made even though the immediate impulse towards this came from the traditional national enemy.

Alexander Werth, in his earlier volume, *France, 1940-1955* (Holt, N. Y.)—commented upon in these pages in March—wrote of the general cooperation offered the Gestapo by the French police. "The net result," he said, "of the French police's activity during the Occupation and the Vichy regime has still been to make the *policier*, never greatly loved in France, a particularly distasteful character."

Not only that [Werth continued]; but since the war, third-degree methods learned from the Gestapo during the years of the "co-operation" have tended to ingrain themselves into the daily routine of the French police, not in North Africa only, but even in France itself. A leading jurist like Maitre Maurice Garcon has denounced in no uncertain terms,

notably in several articles in the *Monde*, the virtual legalization of torture since the war.

It is vital to bear in mind, also, that except for the working class and the Communist Party, most components of French life either warmly embraced or, at least, generally acquiesced in the fascism of Vichy. Werth makes the point that this was true of the intellectual elite as a whole; "the great majority" embraced fascism. Gide, Bertrand de Jouvenal, Andre Maurois, the poets Claudel and Valery, Sacha Guitry, "almost all painters and musicians" fell into line. Of course, the Church hierarchy enthusiastically supported Petain; so did practically the entire civil service. It is important to remember that the law of July 10, 1940, destroying the Third Republic and setting up the Petain-fascist state was approved by a vote of 569 to 80 (with 17 abstentions). By then the Communist Party was outlawed, though its position was made clear that same day in a manifesto signed by Thorez and Duclos denouncing this act; of the 175 Socialists in the Chamber, all but 36 voted "Yes," and a Socialist, Rene Belin, was Petain's Minister of Labor!

Werth, in discussing the groups backing Vichy, neglects the most significant of all—namely, the businessmen. Possibly he assumed awareness of this; but any reader who would like to refresh himself on the French bourgeoisie and their delight in fascism, will find important material in the just-published *Organized Business in France*, by Henry W. Ehrmann (Princeton University Press, \$7.50).

In the Resistance to fascism, "the Communists," wrote Werth, "were in the front rank of the Resistance, and received no reward for it"—30,000 of the most conscious anti-fascists were murdered by the Nazis and the Vichyites; of the 112,000 French women and men deported to Germany, only 35,000 returned alive, and many of them were physical and mental wrecks. Beginning in the summer of 1944, as the second front took shape, the struggle against the counter-revolution took on more organized and effective form. The French liberation forces, through emergency courts-martial and summary executions, eliminated about 4,000 collaborators and Gestapo aids. Later the *Comite d'Action de la Resistance* sentenced several thousand more to die. In France, in addition there were 39,000 imprisonments for fascist collaboration (this was quite low, relatively—in Belgium, Norway and Holland, there was a total of 150,000 imprisonments).

Yet the fact is that most of the leaders of Petainism went unpunished; by January 4, 1945, *Combat* was already warning: "A country that has failed in its clean-up is also liable to fail in its renovation." Meanwhile, safe, with his family, in England lived De Gaulle, being groomed in the first place by Churchill and somewhat grudgingly by Roosevelt, as the "safe and sane" savior of France. Certainly, much of the purest patriotism motivated the largest numbers of those who rallied to the Resistance under the legal, if absent, leadership of De Gaulle, but the presence around De Gaulle from the beginning of elements of the extreme Right, including Cagoulards, is just as certain.*

* Readers will find detailed evidence concerning this in the very interesting book by the French Right-wing nationalist, Henri de Kerillis, *L'Accuse De Gaulle* (Harcourt, Brace, N. Y., 1946).

The ecstatic praise of De Gaulle that has marked almost the entire American press—notably the *N. Y. Times* and the *Herald Tribune*—reflects that press' commitment to imperialism and its deep contempt of and fear for democracy. But it verges on the shocking to see Max Ascoli, the editor of *The Reporter*, declare (June 26, 1958): "De Gaulle remade France, literally as he said, starting from nothing." And "After the defeat, what was left of France if not a motley collection of real estate?" What was left of France were forty million men and women living not in England, but on that "real estate." They did not wait for De Gaulle to fight the Nazis; and it was they, plus the Red Army and the soldiers of the Allies, who made it possible for De Gaulle to set foot again on some of that "real estate."

It is relevant to touch, if only briefly, on what evidence exists concerning the ideology of De Gaulle. Despite the protestations of such sterling friends of freedom as Max Lerner and Seymour Freidin, the evidence all points to that ideology as being extremely reactionary, with clear fascist-like tendencies. We have in De Gaulle a megalomaniacal professional Army officer, steeped in the tradition of caste, elitism and anti-rationalism, and filled with the hatred of the French Revolution that characterizes so many upper-class and devout partisans of the Catholic hierarchy.*

When in the early '30's, rationalizations for fascism appeared throughout the capitalist world, De Gaulle produced one in France—*Le Fil De l'Epee—The Edge of the Sword*, published in 1932. De Gaulle's theme was that the edge has become blunted, but that it needed re-sharpening, for without the Sword—without Authority—chaos would descend. "Great men" were the makers of history, wrote De Gaulle, men who "could not be conceived except as possessing generous doses of egotism, pride, harshness and deceit." The masses of people were "political animals" whose greatest need was for "organization" and for "discipline" under the direction of these "chiefs."

"Our times" above all, wrote De Gaulle, "are hard for Authority." In home and in factory, "in the State as in the street" Authority "excites impatience and criticism rather than confidence or subordination." It doubts itself, and it is this doubt which must be overcome, by discipline, by order, and by the re-assertion of itself—of Authority.

Even De Gaulle's military theories—which later won praise as showing accurate prevision—were largely the theories worked out by those reflecting reaction's fear of mass soldiery and concentration upon an elite force. This, theoretically, is one of the cores of the Panzer-Luftwaffe complex of the New Germany—swift, highly-trained, manned by a select corps, and aimed at the civilian population with frightfulness and terror the heart of technique.

The first effort by De Gaulle to suggest a specific employment of this technique for French forces, came in his 1939 memorandum that France send a motorized expeditionary force through Norway into Finland, so that together with Mannerheim, they might "quickly put to rout the disorganized Russian hordes and march on Leningrad"—as De Kerillis writes. This was to be co-

* On this point the reader is referred to the article by Jacques Duclos, elsewhere in this issue.

ordinated, by the way, with an attack from Syria upon the Caucusus under Weygand, spearheaded also by tanks and by 200 bombers. In this way, France, then in a "phoney war" with Germany, might yet achieve military glory!

Not a little of the distrust felt for De Gaulle by Roosevelt stemmed from the latter's fears, as the *N. Y. Times* reported from Washington (July 7, 1943) that "the General is regarded by some who have known him as animated by dictatorial tendencies." That same month, Ernest Lindley published in the *Washington Post* (July 12, 1943) a summary of a recent British official inquiry, where it was held that De Gaulle "clearly has fascist and dictatorial tendencies."

But with the growing evidence of the triumph of the Red Army, and with the fact that leadership of the partisan armies throughout Europe was held by Communists, these tendencies became looked upon, more and more, by the Western Allies as virtues rather than liabilities. De Kerillis, whose sources of information were on top levels, flatly declares that, "After Teheran, the British government moved energetically in favor of De Gaulle as insurance against communism."

In the First Imperial Conference of Free France, held in Brazzaville, January, 1944, presided over by De Gaulle, the colonial outlook of the man and the movement he headed was affirmed. Herbert Leuthy sums it up this way:

The final resolution of the Brazzaville conference . . . announced imperatively "that the aims of the work of colonization which France is pursuing in her colonies exclude any idea of autonomy and any possibility of development outside the French empire *bloc*; the attainment of self-government in the colonies even in the most distant future must be excluded."

This in no way was contrary to the law of June, 1946, passed by France, that "all subjects of overseas territories, including Algeria, possess the quality of citizens with the same rights as French citizens in the home country and in the overseas territories."

The rights of these overseas "citizens" we have already discussed; the law is and has been a farce, a demagogic facade. This throws light upon the meaning of De Gaulle's promises of full equality and citizenship rights to "all ten million Frenchmen in Algeria," which he has just made this past June. What he is saying to people who for four years have been waging a struggle for national liberation is that he assures all Algerians of the "right" of—remaining French! What De Gaulle said in June, 1958 was what he said in Brazzaville in 1944, and what the law of 1946 said in life—that is, continued colonial subjugation forever.

A fascinating exposure of the ideology of De Gaullism appears in a little book entitled *The Case for De Gaulle: A Dialogue Between Andre Malraux and James Burnham* (Random House, N. Y., 1948). Burnham and Malraux agreed on almost everything. And what was it they said? The enemy at home is Communism; the enemy abroad is the Soviet Union. For "democracy"

to survive, Communism must be extirpated; how numerous are Communists and how significant a force in the national life, remain irrelevant to this necessity. In fact the more numerous and the more deeply entwined within the life of the nation the more necessary its extirpation. As for the U.S.S.R., Malraux says: "You know as well as I that there can be neither political nor national defense by a country whose government is incapable of choosing its enemy." The enemy is the Soviet Union—that is the basic program. The United States must and is expected to interfere in the domestic concerns of France and all other countries, so long as the problem of Communism exists—"from this necessity there follows a limitation on sovereignty," but that cannot be helped.

"What Gaullism stands for, first of all," says Malraux—now France's Goebbels—"is the restoration of a structure and vigor to France." He speaks with derision of "the ghost of Karl Marx"—having once gotten near Marxism, to denounce it becomes an obsession with Malraux, as with so many others. He has a substitute for the ghost, in addition to Authority and Vigor and Structure: "We said that we would unite the country around the idea of public welfare"; and the point here is that Malraux sees this "welfare" as offering a "choice between the idea of class and the idea of public welfare."

Naturally, Burnham concludes:

You describe a reality in terms of which many of the present institutional forms of French society are not so much inadequate as irrelevant. It does not seem likely that a solution can be found by the methods of the present government or any similar government.

Prophetic advice, is it not, from the American expert?

Additionally, Burnham suggests that if this Gaullism works in France, it will spread—"it cannot be confined within French borders." Burnham is really thrilled with Gaullism—"it is the first genuinely *new* political reality since Hitler." Yes, agrees Malraux:

In every country resistance to Communism takes on the color given it by the particular spirit of that country. In Germany, it was Nazism; and with us it is something which looks like the First Republic.

I had mentioned one point of disagreement between Malraux and Burnham. This was over Germany. Burnham was all for a powerful Germany fully integrated within the power complex of a "new" Europe; Malraux, being French, after all, was not so sure and could not help mentioning what German armies twice in the 20th century had done in France. Undoubtedly, this remains a point of difference today with De Gaulle and his NATO cohorts. It is important, especially in view of the sense of damaged national pride (the "loss" of Indo-China, Tunisia, Morocco; the presence of American troops) that forms an ingredient of De Gaullism's return to power. Yet, it is not to be overestimated: the French elite more than acquiesced in fascism even under the Germans. Moreover, several months ago steps were taken to integrate the military machinery of France and Germany (and Italy); some of this has been made public. Thus,

the former Premier, Felix Gaillard, when asked by the editors of *U.S. News and World Report* (Jan. 3, 1958): "Is it true that France, Germany and Italy have reached an agreement to undertake joint production of weapons?" replied: "Yes."

Of course, the basic test of De Gaulle's ideas is his practice. De Gaulle's resignation in January, 1946 came about, as Werth has written, "because he realized that the Left continued to hold the initiative." With De Gaulle then a failure, he was replaced with the Marshall Plan, which as part of the whole Cold War pattern moved the center of gravity of French politics toward the Right. This American interposition was, again citing Werth, "not a French solution of France's post-war problems; whereas the fundamental Socialism of the Resistance would have been." In the course of the ensuing years, De Gaulle's Party stood consistently with the Right in both domestic and foreign policies. Meanwhile a deliberate effort was made to destroy the viability of the parliamentary system of the Fourth Republic by barring from participation therein the Communist Party, which consistently has been the largest single French party and has gained the vote of one-quarter of the entire electorate.

With the largest Parliamentary bloc barred from participation and with five and a half million French voters read out of the bourgeois-democratic system; with the colonial wars eating up billions upon billions of francs and utterly distorting the economy into one devoted to war; with these wars bringing nothing but inflation, defeat and shame; with the Algerian War taking on major proportions, devouring scores of thousands in casualties and tying up 500,000 troops, and obviously going against France in any case; with the poison of the German occupation and Vichy never really eradicated; with the racist horror of Algeria intensifying that poison; with Big Business and the Church hierarchy actively seeking the end of bourgeois-democracy; with the Army elite anxious for Authority—the way was prepared for the effort to destroy that democracy and to begin the establishment of a French fascism.

Documentation of the conspiratorial and long-time nature of this counter-revolutionary stroke that brought in De Gaulle has been considerable; at this point it may be referred to very briefly. The conspirators range from multimillionaire manufacturers in France to fabulously rich colonial overlords to dozens of colonels and some generals of the Army to intelligentsia—like Soustelle and Malraux—and to top levels of several bourgeois parties, particularly that of De Gaulle and to Mollet, general secretary of the Socialist Party and certain of his key aids, like Lacoste, supreme civil officer in Algeria.*

That this conspiracy involved the active participation of De Gaulle at all decisive policy levels (if not at all "sordid" points) is perfectly clear. While

* Details so far available to the public may be found in the *N. Y. Times*, June 4, 1958; *The New Republic*, June 2, 1958, pp. 5-6; the column by George Herald in the *N. Y. Post*, June 9, 1958; the story on Delbecq in the *N. Y. Times*, June 14, 1958; the summary by Anne Bauer from Paris in the *National Guardian*, June 23, 1958. Important additional material will be found in the latest Werth volume already cited and in that by Servan-Schreiber. Very significant for the long-range Army plots is "Armee et Nation" by Alfred Malleret-Joinville, in *Democratie Nouvelle*, April, 1958.

there proceeds an "Operation Seduction" along with the "Operation Sedition"—as Duclos said in the Chamber, is true; it should, however, fool only the very naive.

Alexander Werth, of war-time France, wrote:

That America was on the side of counter-revolution, the Resistance knew only too well. Thus, in June, 1948, the clandestine Radical-Socialist *Aurore* wrote, under the title, "The American Card":

"These Vichy gentlemen have now found the Road to Damascus. They are playing the American card. It is their supreme hope. At Vichy they go on whispering all over the place that, being afraid of the USSR, America will facilitate the creation, in the West, of an anti-Bolshevik barrier composed of France and of a Germany camouflaged to look like a democracy. . . . These gentlemen imagine, above all, that if this marvelous stunt were to come off, they would have nothing to fear from the courts-martial of a Free France, and might even take their seats in the Government!"

In France, as throughout the world, it is American monopoly capitalism which is the basic supporter and promoter of reaction. To the French government, the United States government has given (not loaned) since World War II, \$3,921,000,000 for French military strength in Europe; \$1,619,000,000 for the late war in Indo-China; \$3,136,000,000 for additional military commitments (mostly in North Africa); and has loaned \$2,500,000,000—i.e., a total of over eleven billion dollars. Furthermore: inside France right now are 55,000 American military personnel, six Wings of bombers and troop-carrier planes, and a billion dollars' worth of American military installations. Through the heart of France runs the main American military convoy feeding the 250,000 American troops in West Germany; to the north of this, from St. Nazaire in the west to Metz in the east, runs a 12-inch military oil pipeline.

Within France itself, and to a greater degree, within the former French empire in Asia and in the Middle East (especially in South Vietnam and Lebanon) American finance capital has gained a significant foothold, and in some cases domination. In Africa, American (and West German) capital has made enormous strides in penetration during the past decade; this is notably true so far as Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria are concerned. Let us indicate something of the details so far as Algeria is concerned.

In Algeria, French and French-Algerian dominated companies and banks have made fabulous profits for generations not only from farm, public utility and communication enterprises, but also from the mining of iron, phosphates, coal, lead and zinc. In the Sahara sands (located in the Southern Territory of Algeria, legally a colony of Algeria, not of France) have been discovered recently oil reserves estimated to total at least one hundred million tons; very lately, a little further north (near Touggourt) a substantial oilfield has been tapped and pipe

lines moving north have been laid. Enormous deposits of natural gas have also been found lately, and one of the world's largest deposits of iron ore, as well as manganese, tin and copper have been uncovered. Intensive exploratory work is now proceeding for uranium; it has also been established that beneath the northern Sahara there lies a huge fresh water "sea," and the tapping of this marvel has started.

John Gunther, writing four years ago, reported that \$150,000,000 had been spent by then looking for oil in Algeria. He mentioned large-scale activity by Shell Oil (British) and the American Caltex corporation. He wrote: "All over the northern Sahara we saw teams of geologists and geophysicists, prodding into the desert sand, building camps, and waiting for the oil to flow." Alphaeus Hunton states that the *Societe Nord Africaine des Petroles*, is 65 per cent controlled by the Gulf Oil Company; the *Compagnie Algerienne des Petroles Standard* is dominated by Standard Oil of New Jersey. Of decisive importance is the fact that in November, 1949, according to the *N. Y. Journal of Commerce* (Nov. 30, 1949) a committee of leading American and French bankers was established "to stimulate and facilitate development of overseas territories of the French Union." On this committee were top officials of Chase National, Guaranty Trust, National City, Morgan Stanley, Kuhn Loeb, Dillon Read; on the French side, the Banque de l'Indo-Chine, Banque de Paris, Banque de l'Union Parisienne, Union Europeenne Industrielle, Banque de l'Afrique Occidentale, Banque Lazard Freres, and Banque Worms (See Victor Perlo, *American Imperialism*, International Publishers, N. Y., 1951, pp. 183f.).

When to all that has preceded one adds that the Sahara has been selected by NATO as the locale for the establishment of long-range missile bases, and for the development of atomic-weapons by both France and West Germany, one gets to the heart of the forces waging the Algerian holocaust, seeking the destruction of France and the re-establishment of fascism in the heart of Europe.

It was widely insisted by the American press that there was no alternative to De Gaulle. This is false. One of the notable facts about this coup was the persistent resistance to its accomplishment *within the Chamber of Deputies*. There is no doubt that much of the resistance was faked, to placate public opinion, but there is also no doubt that the Chamber's persistence in voting overwhelmingly for Pflimlin until the last moment of betrayal and usurpation, reflected deep splits among the French bourgeoisie as well as the overwhelmingly pro-Republican and anti-fascist sentiment of the French masses.

The fullest and most responsible non-Communist consideration of this matter came from K. S. Karol, the Paris correspondent of the London *New Statesman*. His dispatches (May 24, May 31, and June 7, 1958) leave no doubts on this question. Had Pflimlin "decided to take draconian measures against the insurgents, he would have had all France behind him." But Pflimlin and Mollet "are more afraid of a Popular Front in France than of the generals in Algiers." Later, Karol reported that had there been a "recall to the colours and the draft into the police force of the former resistance officers who were dismissed after the war as too Left-wing" and who were begging to be allowed to save the Re-

public, it would have been saved; and had this been backed up by arming the factory and dock workers, there could have been not a moment's doubt as to the outcome. And, reports Karol, the majority of the Socialist deputies throughout May "went so far as to express openly their willingness to make common cause with the Communists." But, "this is the simple truth: the French Republic is collapsing because of the treason of its leaders." Finally, there is the picture of the Socialist leader, Mollet, repeatedly going to De Gaulle, "in an almost hysterical condition, begging him after all to go before Parliament. He explained that he had done everything in his power to switch the Socialist vote and that he had only partially succeeded."

While the votes for Munich and for Vichy were overwhelmingly favorable, with only the Communist Party standing firmly opposed to both betrayals, this was not true of the De Gaulle *putsch*. Here, of course, the Communists voted solidly in the negative, but so did the *majority* of the Socialist and a considerable minority also of the Radical Party, including the former Premier Mendes-France. Indispensable, then, to the triumph of reaction, once again as so often in the past, was the betrayal by the Social-Democrats. But this time, the betrayal nauseated not only the rank and file, but also a very large segment of the leadership. As a result, in the opinion of K. S. Karol, of the *New Statesman*:

Whatever the next few months may hold, the old Socialist Party, the Party of Mollet and Lacoste, of the Suez War and the tortures in Algeria, the party which mistrusts the workers more than it does the extreme right, is dead.

The Communist Party throughout the crisis upheld the highest traditions of its magnificent history. It struggled to arouse the masses and to lead them to display their feelings and their power. It sought the widest possible allies; it welcomed all who desired the Republic. And it maintained its principled position in opposition to the Algerian War as catastrophic as well as unjust, and in favor of the ending of that war by recognizing the independence of Algeria.

At the same time, a notable sense of flexibility appeared, plus a determined effort to eliminate sectarianism. Thus, Marcel Servin reporting on the crisis and the tasks of the Party to its Central Committee, emphasized the "minimum common ground on certain questions" with other parties of the Left—civil liberties, secular education, a halt to the worst features of the Algerian war. And "above all," he said, "the people who follow these parties . . . constitute our closest and most necessary allies." "If we spurn all those who don't think like us on every point," asked Servin, "who is there to help us bring about a change?" And he concluded: "The fight against any tendency to narrowness is absolutely indispensable and sectarianism is not to be considered as a noble and excusable failing."

Meanwhile, the war continues and intensifies in Algeria and the France of De Gaulle will no more be able to crush it than were his predecessors. And the solidarity of the colonial peoples, and their strength accumulates. This is true of Asia and Latin America and is the meaning of Bandung. It is true of Africa and is the meaning of the recent (April 15-22) Conference of Independent African States held at Accra, the capital of Ghana, a conference singularly neglected by the American press.

But that neglect only underlines the importance of this unique and historic conference. Represented at it, for the first time, were official delegations from all the independent African peoples: Ghana, Liberia, Ethiopia, the United Arab Republic, the Republic of Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco, and Libya. None of these countries is socialist; most of them have been identified in the past much more closely with the "West" than with the "East." Yet, these delegates unanimously adopted resolutions in favor of disarmament and peace, world-wide economic and cultural cooperation, and in utter condemnation of racism which cut at the political and ideological foundations of imperialism. And specifically on Algeria, the independent African governments unqualifiedly condemned France for its continuance of the war and its refusal to grant independence to Algeria, and they affirmed their "determination to make every possible effort with a view to helping the Algerian people towards the attainment of independence."

Meanwhile, the billion peoples of the Socialist sector and their governments will exert their will and their might in opposition to the imposition of fascism upon France. Whatever may be the particular diplomatic and political developments, that truth remains; it is today a truth of such dimensions that it must give pause not only to De Gaulle but to those dominating him, including the whole NATO apparatus.

* * *

The crisis in France brings home the reality of the danger of fascism, and of war; it emphasizes again the truth that monopoly capitalism drives towards these expedients, and that only organized, conscious resistance will guarantee their defeat.

The French events emphasize the corrosive power of racism; the fact that enslaving one people vitiates the freedom of the slaveowners. They illuminate, too, the real nature of the bourgeois state, with its bureaucracy and its administrative machinery dedicated to the services of the monopolists and contemptuous of democracy or even legality. They show once again that it is reaction which is the source of violence in the modern world, violence both domestic and international.

The French events demonstrate that in the modern era it is the working class which bears the destinies of the nation upon its shoulders; that the interests of this class and of the people as a whole fundamentally are one. It shows again that the staunchest defenders of liberty—those in the forefront, those first arrested and tortured by reaction—are the Communists. In France only the Communist Party as a Party has emerged from the trials of May and June, 1958 with honor untarnished and with popular prestige enhanced. This great Party of the Martyrs, of the Resistance, of the Nation, once again carries forward the best traditions of France.

We salute the Party of Peri and Eluard, of Picasso and Aragon, of Thorez and Duclos. This Party of the Working Class of France—in the closest solidarity with the Party in Algeria—will succeed in the struggle for a France that is free, strong, democratic and peaceful.

The Coming Michigan Elections

By William Allan

THE EYES OF THE NATION will be on Michigan this fall when election results are tabulated. It is here that G. Mennen Williams will be making his try for a sixth term as governor and warming up for the 1960 campaign, when he hopes to be the Democratic nominee for President. Williams has been campaigning for President for a year, and speaks as much outside the state on national and international issues as he does inside Michigan.

A central issue in the 1958 Michigan election is the state's half a million jobless (which may rise to 600,000 by Labor Day), with 150,000 having exhausted their unemployment compensation and an additional 14,000 doing so each month. Another major issue is the 700,000 UAW members working in the General Motors, Ford and Chrysler plants without a contract for the first time in 21 years.

In the field of civil rights, a serious problem is created by the poisonous White Citizens Council operating an underground organization, aided and abetted by police, politicians and the ruling class, attacking Negro citizens and organizing hoodlum attacks on homes. And the manufacturers and their stooges are organizing to fight for the introduction in the next session of the State Legislature of a "right-to-scab" bill.

A paramount issue, which suffers from neglect by labor and the electoral coalition which it leads, is the fight to ban nuclear weapons and end nuclear tests. A Michigan Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has been set up, headed by the noted liberal Dr. Henry Hitt Crane. Over 60 prominent Michiganders, including UAW president Walter Reuther, signed a full-page ad supporting its stand. But the movement remains essentially middle class and church-led, with labor having little participation in it. And Governor Williams, evidently oblivious to this Michigan peace movement, continues to play up the cold war and to engage in Red-baiting.

What seems to cause Governor Williams much more concern is that the CIO bloc in the AFL-CIO on state and national levels may go for Senator Paul Douglas for President and Senator Robert Kennedy for Vice-President in 1960. Both men have been in Michigan lately. Douglas came in May, and shortly afterwards came out with his proposal that the government cut the excise tax on cars from 10 per cent to 2½ per cent and ask the Big Three to cut prices. He declared the UAW would "revise" its demands if this happened. Kennedy has long been rubbing elbows with the PAC strategists of UAW's Soli-

darity House in Detroit, in addition to seeking to build his standing through his role on the McClellan Committee. Men like Douglas and Kennedy see in Walter Reuther the next president of the AFL-CIO when George Meany retires.

* * *

In the midst of all this maneuvering and speculation, the labor-led Michigan electoral coalition has been Negro citizens and organizing hood-working diligently at the grass-roots level. In the ten years of the coalition's existence, it has elected 35 unionists and nine Negroes to the State Legislature. In the person of Williams, it has five times elected a pro-labor, pro-civil rights governor. All the state officials are pro-labor.

The Michigan State Supreme Court, once a legal rubber-stamp for the Michigan Association of Manufacturers, now is a 5-3 liberal court. It includes one former UAW sit-down striker, George Edwards, who studied law, became a judge and two years ago was elected to the Michigan Supreme Court by over 800,000 votes—the highest vote ever obtained by any candidate in a Michigan election.

The coalition also elected a labor senator, Pat McNamara, former president of the AFL Pipefitters Union. In Detroit, it elected six Democrats to the City Council in 1957, and backed the present mayor, Louis Miriani, as part of the coalition ticket.

Important advances have been

made in Negro representation. Detroit now has a Negro councilman, William Patrick, Jr. Three Negroes were recently elected to the city councils in River Rouge, Pontiac and Muskegon. And Michigan has one of the three Negro members of Congress, Charles Diggs, Jr. However, much still remains to be done in extending representation and democratic rights to Michigan's 350,000 Negro citizens.

As the state prepares to vote in the August 5 primaries, the labor-led coalition has raised its sights for the coming elections. At the precinct level, in preparation for selecting convention delegates in 1960, practically every precinct throughout the state has either a labor candidate or labor-backed candidate running. This year the Teamsters' Union is running candidates in many precincts, both Republican and Democrat, in some cases with the coalition forces and in others in opposition to them.

Also, for the first time, every one of the 110 seats in the Michigan House of Representatives will be contested by a coalition candidate. At present, the Democrats are seven short of a majority and are working feverishly to win it. In the State Senate, the Democrats hold eleven of the 34 seats. Gus Scholle, state AFL-CIO president, estimates that 100 labor candidates will be in the field, and at least 35 Negro candidates. Both are all-time highs. Some of the Negro candidates are also from the ranks of organized labor.

In the Congressional races, sights have been raised in two key spots so far. In Detroit's First Congressional District, Russell Brown, a leading figure in the Negro community, is running on the Democratic ticket against the white "liberal" incumbent T. Machrowitz. Two years ago, Machrowitz could have been beaten by Negro woman State Senator Cora Brown, had the electoral coalition even remained neutral in the primary. This time, Governor Williams has announced his neutrality, and labor is under considerable pressure to follow suit.

THE STELLATO CANDIDACY

In one of the biggest working-class Congressional districts in the United States, Michigan's Sixteenth, another Democratic Congressman, John Lesinski, is being challenged for the seat by Carl Stellato, UAW Ford Local 600 president. He has entered the race, Stellato says, because he believes it is time labor was represented by its own congressmen, not merely by politicians who "vote right." He states: "With close to six million unemployed, many of the politicians labor supported, while willing to vote right, do not get into the Congressional District and organize the workers to beat the depression. That's what Congressmen have to do and where they have to be, in the district helping their constituents."

Lesinski, though he has a good voting record, is a banker and the

darling of the white supremacist elements in lily-white Dearborn. He tells unionists he sees no need for FEPC laws, and declares he is "fighting the labor bosses."

Stellato, who has some substantial Democratic support, is known in the area as an advocate of a new people's party. He believes that labor cannot forever tail the present two parties, that it must fight to build its own machinery in order to elect labor people to office.

Both Brown in the First and Stellato in the Sixteenth are hitting on jobs and civil rights as the big issues. And Stellato declares that the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway should be the signal for ships of all lands, including socialist, to sail in bringing trade which will create jobs.

In this connection, Gus Scholle recently told newsmen that he has always favored trade with all nations, is for peaceful co-existence, and feels striped-pants diplomacy should be replaced by overalls diplomacy by sending unionists to meet with unionists on peace and co-existence. He said he would like to see an exchange of auto workers' delegations, and would like to be part of an American delegation.

This peace seasoning in Michigan politics needs to be popularized among the 2½ million workers in the state. And especially it must be brought home to Governor Williams.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party of Michigan

is at this point run by two retired big business tycoons—Don Ahrens, former vice president of General Motors, and Ernest Kantzler, former treasurer of the Ford Motor Company. These two have already raised a kitty of \$1,250,000 for the primaries. The money was raised at a gathering in Detroit Masonic Temple, where 500 employers paid a minimum of \$500 a seat to hear Walter Reuther hung, drawn and quartered by reactionary Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona.

Kantzler, when he was Ford treasurer, had his name on the checks paid out to former UAW president Homer Martin by Harry Bennett to split the union back in 1939. Now Homer Martin and a former Democratic congressman, Frank Hook, have set up a group calling itself "State Reform Democrats." Its aim is to split the ranks of the electoral coalition.

Martin is running for U.S. Senator on the Democratic ticket, where the incumbent Senator Potter and Lieutenant Governor Phil Hart are the leading contenders. He flays Reuther and Communism at every turn, and runs interference for Potter, who follows the Goldwater anti-labor line. He is also trying to win the poor farmers away from their alliance with labor, which has been growing in recent years. A couple of years ago, as a "dairy farmer," he split the 8,000-member dairy farmers' organization in the midst of a strike against National Dairies and Borden.

The Republican Party is paying great attention to the powerful Negro people's movement for increased representation. But despite white supremacist acts by white labor leaders and refusals to back Negro candidates, the Negro political action groups have not gone to the GOP, but have taken a strongly independent position while remaining within the coalition. The Negro people's movement is today a mature, well-organized, articulate body of people putting forward candidates and programs, and influencing 350,000 Michigan Negro citizens without whom the coalition could not win.

ROLE OF THE COMMUNISTS

In the light of this situation in the state, the Michigan State Committee of the Communist Party has presented a program for uniting the Party and moving it into the mainstream of the election struggle. The Party seeks to influence the elections in the interests of the people. Realizing that their outcome will be determined through the two major political parties, the Party is not indifferent to the struggles within them.

Carl Winter, state chairman of the Michigan Communist Party, told a forum on the 1958 elections recently that the Communist Party participates with labor in its struggles both in the economic and political fields. He said that it does not endorse the Democratic Party or its candidates,

but is not unconcerned about the struggles within that party brought on by labor's participation.

The Party, he stated, must join in directing the election campaign toward fighting for aid to the unemployed, a tax program in the interests of the working people (who now pay 68 per cent of the state's taxes as against 18 per cent by the big corporations), FEPC, peaceful co-existence and trade, and other such goals.

At the same time, he pointed out, people are questioning capitalism and talking about the need for changes in the social system. The fight for such changes must be led by the working class. The establishment of the electoral coalition in Michigan is a great step forward, though COPE and the coalition still

confine their support to the two major parties and do not challenge the profit system. Serious advocates of socialism must participate in elections among the people, and where labor is active.

The Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and the Socialist Labor Party, both viciously anti-Soviet, are on the Michigan ballot, from which the Michigan Communist Party is barred. The Party will issue materials in its own name during the election campaign, and will speak to people at meetings, rallies, picnics—wherever it can. It will issue a 1958 election platform for mass distribution in the state and will seek in every way to be part of the people's struggles for peace, security and democratic rights.

"FREE WORLD" MORALITY

"The use of a grim third degree was unavoidably necessary to extirpate terror in Algeria. Gen. Massu, in whose hands the decision lay, is a deeply religious man, who suffered a severe crisis of conscience before issuing the necessary order. But first he himself submitted to the tortures that he ordered, and he further commanded all other officers involved in the matter to do as he did, so that they might say they had inflicted no sufferings on others that they had not borne themselves."

Joseph Alsop in the Paris edition of the *Herald Tribune*, June 13, 1958

The Two Germanys and the War Danger

By George Lohr

Germany is in the heart of Europe; the problems of its people exert great influence upon all humanity. Moreover, the question of Germany and its policies have been central to the struggle against war for a century. From West Germany comes news of tremendous mass meetings, involving scores of thousands of people—as in Hamburg and Bremen—protesting Adenauer's decision to accept atomic weapons for the Bundeswehr; simultaneously, on May 13, Adenauer's government began a mass trial of twenty-three men and women charged with the "crime" of being Communists. It is believed that the article which follows—written for us by a resident of Berlin who lived and worked for many years in our country—will be found helpful by all who seek a deeper understanding of the nature of the two Germanys today, their relationship to the question of war or peace, and the knotty problem of German unification—Editor.

BERLIN IS THE CAPITAL of the German Democratic Republic. But it is also a divided city, and only a few feet beyond the crossings into the west, there is the Germany of Chancellor Adenauer and Nazi General Speidel. Here in the east, the workers rule, together with their democratic allies. There, power is in the hands of the multi-millionaires, mostly the very same ones as during Hitler's time. Here is the Germany that is the westernmost sector of the socialist world. There is the Germany whose leaders, as strongest allies of the Washington war crowd, threaten the peace of Europe and, with it, the whole world. Here is the Germany of socialism. There is the Germany of finance capital. Here is what is new and growing. There is what is old and dying.

In this basic contrast between two parts of the same country—the most highly industrialized in western

Europe—is summed up the irreconcilable conflict between two social systems. There is no doubt that in western Germany, as elsewhere, the future belongs to socialism.

The present reality, however, is that there are two German states, one socialist and one capitalist. The west German bourgeoisie, in line with its predatory class interests, refuses to accept this reality. As part of NATO's over-all aim, it is seeking to undermine the GDR. It is plotting to forcibly incorporate the GDR into a capitalist Germany and wage imperialist aggression east and west so as to establish its economic and political mastery over all of Europe. Such aggression would not only mean atomic war in Europe, but very likely would unleash World War III. That is why people everywhere, including those in the United States who want peace, have a most vital stake in what the diplomats

call the "German question."

Let us look at it this way. Supposing, after World War II, there had been no basic re-organization anywhere in Germany, that all of Germany was today ruled by Adenauer and his clique of Nazi generals and monopolists—would it then not be much easier for the Dulles-Adenauer imperialist cabal to hurl the world over the brink into the inferno of a new world war? But something did happen, the Potsdam agreement was carried out in one part of Germany, and the first workers and farmers state in German history came into existence. It is this state, peaceful by its very socialist nature, which today is waging a bitter and determined struggle against the atomic incendiaries in Bonn. In so doing, it is true to the national interests of all Germany and it is true to the highest principles of international solidarity, not only to its class brothers, but to all people who want peace.

GERMAN RE-UNIFICATION

This brings us to the much-debated issue of German unity. Here it should be said at once that, while Dulles and Adenauer keep talking unity with pious tongues they in fact are using the issue strictly as a whipping post to increase tension and even sabotage summit meetings.

These people do not want unification, and never did. They want the German Democratic Republic to commit suicide, the workers to return the factories to the former

owners, the small private as well as the cooperative farmers to give back the land to the former feudal landholders, and all the area of the GDR to become incorporated into an imperialist Germany. In other words, Bonn wants the working class and its allies to trade their socialist gains for the mess of capitalism. But the working class isn't going to act as its own executioner.

The 1945 Potsdam agreement called for the establishment of a democratic and peaceful Germany. But the government of the German Federal Republic is neither democratic nor peaceful. On the contrary, the development there has been in a direction diametrically opposed to the directives of the Potsdam agreement. In the German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, the Potsdam agreement has been carried out to the letter, and served as the guidepost of its whole post-war development.

Almost before the ink was dry on the Potsdam agreement, its directives, and with it the basis for the creation of a united Germany, were sabotaged by the West German ruling class, working hand in glove with the western occupation powers. Then came the creation of the separate German Federal Republic as an official divisive act, and on an economic, political, and ideological basis directly contrary to the Potsdam agreement. After that, the Bonn government continually refused, time and time again, the Soviet proposals for the creation of a unified, democratic and peaceful

Germany. Only last January, Bundestag member Dr. Gustav Heinemann reminded Adenauer that he had rejected, out of hand, a Soviet proposal in 1952 for free, all-German elections under four-power control, the only proviso having been that a unified Germany join no military alliances. Heinemann, formerly minister of the interior in Adenauer's cabinet, resigned his post because of basic disagreement with Adenauer's war policies.

But in 1952 Adenauer and his monopolists were looking toward future membership in NATO that would aid them in achieving their imperialist aims. Now that Bonn is part of NATO, is expecting atomic weapons for its troops and has consolidated the dictatorship of finance capitalism, there is this insistent demand for "unification"—by force. Evidently, this is nothing but provocative war incitement.

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE EAST

Turning now to the German Democratic republic, what has been the development there? There the Potsdam decisions, answering the basic democratic needs of the working class and the people as a whole, were put into practice. These decisions, it should be remembered, did not have a socialist but an anti-fascist, democratic content. There were the ideological demands that all Nazi influence in press, school, culture and all other phases of thought be rooted out, along with race hatred and national chauvinism. On the political front, the Potsdam decisions were directed to

the punishment of all Nazi war criminals and the removal of all Nazis from official posts. Dealing with German economy, the Potsdam decisions demanded the breaking-up of all the big cartels and monopolies.

All these anti-fascist, democratic decisions, which according to the Potsdam signatories were to prepare Germany to reconstruct its life on a democratic and peaceful foundation, were carried out in the east. In addition, a land reform, which was a long overdue bourgeois-democratic task, was carried out by breaking up the large feudal estates of the Prussian Junkers and dividing them among the landless, rural poor. This land reform and the Potsdam decisions, especially in the economic arena, found the full support of the great majority of the populace. The nationalization of the banks and big enterprises—without compensation—was considered just punishment of the monopolists who had established the fascist dictatorship to serve their class interests.

Here it is important to underscore that, while the Communists naturally provided the leadership in executing the Potsdam decisions, most of the leaders of the other political parties likewise gave this move their full backing. They also agreed with the Communists that the next logical step for Germany was toward a higher form of society—socialism. This national front, composed of non-Marxist parties, the trade unions and mass organizations, and led by the Socialist Unity Party, was

subsequently even further developed, and constitutes the basis of government.

This advance toward socialism therefore arose logically out of the anti-fascist democratic action to deprive the Nazi monopolists of their property. By passing out of their hands and into the common ownership of the people, the economic foundation of socialism was created. At the same time, with the complete smashing of the Nazi state machine in the wake of anti-fascist victory, the peaceful assumption of power by the working class and its democratic allies was not only made possible, but became a historic necessity.

For the first time there is a Germany which does not inspire fear in the minds of its neighbors. With its Polish and Czechoslovak neighbors, there are the closest and most friendly relations. These socialist countries appreciate what it means, especially with the west German NATO revanchists making ominous threats, to have this new democratic Germany on their side. But there are also people in high places of western Europe who at least indirectly pay tribute to the peaceful nature of the GDR when they offer the opinion privately that the division of Germany is a good thing because it reduces the threat of a new European war.

But the German Democratic Republic and its Socialist Unity Party, by no means satisfied with the status quo, rightfully consider the bringing about of unification as a historic

duty. Of course, this doesn't mean unification at any price, and a sharp struggle is being waged at present against certain individuals who caution a "go slow" policy in the development of socialist policy in order, so they say, not to widen the rift between the two German states and thereby impair the prospect of unification. Evidently, such an orientation would be a grave betrayal of the interests of the working class both in the GDR and in west Germany. Quite to the contrary, the government and party in the GDR are pursuing a policy of the most rapid building of socialism, in order to provide a higher living standard for its workers and people, and at the same time to demonstrate the superiority of socialism to the west German working class. By the same token, and of particular moment to the supporters of peace, the strengthening of socialism in the GDR means that it is continually better equipped to wage the struggle against the Bonn militarists.

This struggle is in the first place the responsibility of the German working class east and west. This means unity of working-class action against the enemies of Germany and of world peace, and the achievement of such unity of action the Socialist Unity Party has therefore made the cornerstone of its policy. Unity of working-class action means struggle against the atomic armament of west Germany, against west German membership in NATO and it means a fight to the finish against the whole gang of monopolists who

rule west Germany. It means a struggle for the creation of an atom-free zone in the heart of Europe, a demand that is daily gaining new support.

Such unity of working class action means also a struggle for the holding of a plebiscite in both German states as to whether or no either Germany is to have atomic weapons. This proposal, originally made by Otto Grotewohl, Prime Minister of the GDR, has found such a strong echo in west Germany that the Social-Democratic leadership has come forward with the same demand.

On a government level, the GDR has proposed to the German Federal Republic, as a first step to the creation of a unified, democratic and peaceful Germany, the confederation of the two states. Such a confederation, with an appropriate council as link, should start off, according to the GDR proposal, with a three-point agreement: no stationing or production of atomic weapons on German soil; withdrawal of both states from NATO and the Warsaw Pact; and an appeal to the Big Four for an early gradual withdrawal of their troops.

In other words, the GDR does not put as a pre-condition for unification the socialist transformation of society in west Germany. That decision, in good time, is up to the workers and their democratic allies in that state. But the interests of the German people, and of world peace, do demand that, before there can be any serious consideration of re-unifi-

cation, the conditions exist for the creation of a democratic and peaceful Germany. Not only are such conditions lacking today, but the decision to turn west Germany into an atomic base of aggression also puts into jeopardy the chances of realizing confederation.

The west German ruling class, with every step it has taken since 1945, has systematically moved away from Potsdam and toward its present position as NATO's most powerful and dangerous European partner. Now revanchist Nazi generals will place atomic weapons at the borders of the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia, ready for attack. Millions of west Germans are now fighting to reverse that Bundestag decision, and in their "battle against atomic death" they are striking a heavy blow against the whole Adenauer clique.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM IN THE G.D.R.

How does it go with the building of socialism when a nation is divided and when that sector which is building socialism has an open door to the sector ruled by imperialism, and by an imperialism, to boot, which is especially virulent and aggressive? Evidently, such conditions make for special problems, economically as well as ideologically. Keeping in mind these problems, however, progress is nevertheless extremely substantial.

Just to bring home the seriousness of one of these problems, it must

be remembered that the heavy industries of Germany are mostly in the west. This means that the GDR was faced with a huge expenditure in money and labor to build its own. The GDR has virtually no hard coal. Therefore it has to spend a fortune in developing its soft coal production and in constructing a cokery where, with a process discovered by GDR scientists, soft coal briquettes are transformed into a coal that can be used for low shaft blast furnaces.

The GDR now is second only to the Soviet Union among the socialist countries, as far as export is concerned. But export means harbor space, and the traditional German harbors are also in the west, and using their facilities costs the GDR tremendous amounts of foreign currency. Therefore it is necessary now to vastly expand the small harbor of Rostock at the Baltic Sea, and this again will require big expenditures.

These are only a few of the problems, of which there are many. In addition, the West has organized a big black market, operating via Berlin, in GDR currency and goods which also strains the economy.

In spite of these and many other handicaps, the GDR during the past two years was able to increase living standards by raising wages in various occupations and also by raising pensions. The state now pays farmers higher prices for certain products while at the same time there have been price reductions to the consumer. The 48-hour

work week has been reduced to 45 hours (at the same wages) and there have also been improvements in the payment of bonuses for good work performances.

This does not include such other benefits as an increase in the construction of dwellings, continually expanding health and vacation facilities and the steady growth of cultural institutions.

Just recently, the system of rationing has been abolished, and in the process care was taken to raise the income of lower-income groups by monthly subsidies for children and by one-time, fairly substantial, grants for each new baby. At the same time, the income of intellectuals has been reduced somewhat, in order to close the gap, at least to some extent, between their earnings and those of the average worker.

The GDR is now in the midst of its second five-year plan and the goals set for the past year were again generally met or even surpassed. But there is little patience with self-praise or resting on laurels. Rose-colored glasses, certainly among the leaders of the government and the party, are not the fashion. There is consistent criticism of shortcomings in central committee meetings and other party gatherings, and in the daily press.

One of the chief clues to the overcoming of difficulties is a still more thorough-going process of involving more and more of the working people in consciously taking and sharing responsibility in advancing so-

cialist production and eliminating bottle necks. Only recently there was a heavy public polemic with an economic expert and leading member of the central committee because of his undue stress on the role of managerial personnel in building socialism. While the discussion naturally did not detract one iota from the importance and need of highly trained managers, it was nevertheless emphasized that socialism cannot be built by managers simply giving orders to be carried out, but by mobilizing the full creative genius, and by continually developing the socialist consciousness, of the working people. In line with this, a re-organization was undertaken which, while retaining and strengthening central planning, will simplify the whole economic apparatus and transfer much more responsibility down below. In this way, among other things, the initiative of the working people will be able to unfold in a much better manner. In proposing this re-organization, Walter Ulbricht, first secretary of the Socialist Unity Party, called for a struggle against restrictive bureaucratism, formal administrative methods and against a philistine isolation from the workers.

This of course means coming to grips every day with old methods of work which spring from old methods of thinking, and this holds not only for economic questions but applies to every phase of the socialist transformation of society. Ulbricht said recently that the "building of

socialism is in the first place an education of peoples." This is a profoundly true statement, and one which American progressives ought to ponder in all its many implications in evaluating the day-to-day developments of the historical process going on in the socialist world.

In the GDR this "education of people" has its own special aspect which is also brought about by the division of Germany in two states that are politically, economically and ideologically in basic antagonism. They have a common heritage of a deep humanism and of a magnificent culture that have contributed much to the advancement of universal thought and to the world treasury of arts. But they also share the distortion and mutilation of this heritage by monopoly capitalism, long before and especially during the hell of fascist barbarism.

Now there are two German states. In one, the old ideological structure, somewhat refurbished and brought up to date to suit the obscurantist needs of such slogans as "People's capitalism," still serves German imperialism. In the other, the superstructure is being remodelled with great effort to give expression to the new society and to serve the cause of socialism.

It's hard for many people to make a break with the old, especially when it is right there on view across an open border, and when its proponents, by means of a varied and skillful propaganda machine, deftly weave millions of threads to old

habits, prejudices and concepts. The appeal of bourgeois nationalism is potent and insidious.

In this regard too, some voices among intellectuals want to proceed with caution, a kind of ideological peaceful co-existence, in order allegedly not to disturb the chances of reunification.

But such ideological peaceful co-existence in reality would mean capitulation to bourgeois society, when the job is to demonstrate the superiority of the new society. Therefore the Socialist Unity party is pressing for more polemic, not less, among the intellectuals of the GDR, in order to develop new thinking and to come to grips with the old ideology in every phase of life.

Much already has been done in that direction, and an observer of socialist construction in the GDR sees the interesting phenomenon that the very daily and even hourly clash of two ideologies, necessitated by the physical closeness of the class enemy, has produced an ideological struggle on a relatively high level.

There are those who think that the fight against dogmatism means conciliation with capitalist ideology. But in the GDR, the struggle to advance

socialist democracy proceeds in the front lines of the class struggle, and any concession to bourgeois influence would only retard and make more difficult the building of socialism. Socialist democracy is not an abstraction that develops in a vacuum. It develops relative to the conditions of the class struggle. It is quite revealing that the most ardent advocates of more "democratization" in the GDR are the same west German politicians who have outlawed the Communist Party and who want less and less bourgeois democracy for the working people of west Germany, so as to reduce opposition to Bonn's war plots, and who even refuse the right to a plebiscite as to whether or no the Bundeswehr is to have atomic weapons.

The German working class and its allies are building a new, socialist and peaceful Germany out of the ruins of fascism. By so doing, they are weakening the war camp and strengthening the peace camp. By so doing, they have linked their arm in friendship with all those in the United States and everywhere else who stand for peace and progress.

China's Great Leap Year*

By Hu Chiao-mu

A FEW DAYS AFTER the close of the second session of the 8th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, the *London Times*, on May 31st, published a leading article entitled "Great Leap Year." The article comments on Comrade Liu Shao-chi's report at the session in the following terms:

We may look in vain, amidst these pages of jargon, for anything lively, original or hopeful . . . but some galvanizing there has to be for a country that must be lagging a little from its efforts of the past eight years, so this year has been decreed as the year of the "great leap forward." There is no specific objective behind this slogan. The objectives, such as they are, remain arduously distant, with the 12-year agricultural program—now revised for the third time—and the "surpass the British" campaign—in which victory is promised 15 years hence.

Following snatches of the economic policy set forth in the report, presented according to his own viewpoint, the leader writer went on to say: "In some ways this may offer a little inspiration to these hard-working people. Though most of them must be working too hard to be

bored, and by now there must increasingly be visible signs of progress, yet the gaiety and the liveliness can hardly flourish in the bleak ideological soil of today."

What a striking contrast the commentary forms with the stirring activity that marks Chinese life today! This calls to my mind two lines of a poem written by Liu Yu-hsi, a poet of the Tang dynasty, which read: "Past the sunken boat, a thousand sails; beyond the diseased oak, 10,000 sap-green trees." The imperialist West is aged and decaying like the diseased oak and the sunken boat. But the socialist East is flourishing and hopeful like a thousand sails racing ahead and 10,000 trees turning green. The aged West can neither keep pace with her nor understand the youthful East. The Western bourgeoisie is drawing its last breath in its crumbling world. Really there is nothing lively, original or hopeful to be seen among the capitalist class. Therefore, the bourgeois diehards refuse to see, believe or recognize what is created by the working people.

It is natural that the leader-writer of the *London Times* should look at Comrade Liu Shao-chi's report so sulkily and regard it as full of incomprehensible "jargon." The bourgeois rulers in the imperialist countries have been using all sorts of nice

words to deceive the people and every kind of coercion to browbeat the people, so as to make them toil and sweat for the rulers' benefit. But the people always react with inertia, distrust and non-cooperation. A leader-writer sitting in the office of the *London Times*, observing the life of socialist countries by the yardstick of the experience of the bourgeois rulers, is bound to assume that the Chinese people "must be flagging from their efforts of the past eight years" and "working too hard to be bored" and that "gaiety and liveliness can hardly flourish."

An interesting contrast to the comment of the *London Times* is a dispatch sent on May 14 by Frederick Ellis, City Editor of the *Daily Express* from Peking, 8,000 miles from London. In that dispatch, he reported on the voluntary work of building the Ming Tombs reservoir as follows:

I suspected that for them all, soldiers and civilians alike, it was the old army method of volunteering. This, however, is genuine volunteering, and there is even a waiting list. . . . These Chinese were working with a fervor and enthusiasm I have seldom seen equalled other than by the university boat crews on the trip from Putney to Mortlake. It was a genuine enthusiasm of the people for Communism. It was a living example of the way the regime has captured the imagination of the people, harnessed and mobilized the nation's mind.

However, even if the British bour-

geois press publishes more such reports (which at most would reflect an infinitesimal fraction of the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Chinese people and must inevitably be tainted with various kinds of prejudice), the bourgeois mind in Britain and the whole Western world would not be changed. Historically, no reactionary class and political forces have ever been able to see the objective world as it really is. At all times they over-estimated their own strength and under-estimated the strength of the progressive class that was developing against their will.

The feudal ruling class thought their rule permanent, not believing that the peasants and the bourgeoisie had the strength to overthrow them. In the same way, when capitalism has already become an obstacle to the further growth of the productive forces, the bourgeoisie still believe that capitalism will last, and refuse to believe that the proletariat can shatter the capitalist system and establish the socialist system instead. When the Soviet Union emerged, they predicted that it could not long survive. When the Soviet Union put forward its first Five-Year plan, they said it was a mere dream. When the Second World War broke out, they waited for Hitler to conquer the Soviet Union. When the Chinese revolution appeared on the stage of history, they made similar calculations.

The reason why Chiang Kai-shek rejected internal peace in 1945 and launched the nationwide civil war

* This article originally appeared in the June, 1958 issue of *Red Flag*, a new theoretical journal published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.—Ed.

in 1946 was because he and his United States imperialist masters believed themselves to possess decisive superiority. When Chiang Kai-shek came to grief, the United States and other imperialist masters again believed that the Chinese people's government would not be able to solve its economic problems without American aid. In August 1949, Dean Acheson, then Secretary of State, wrote of the population of China in a letter to President Truman as "creating an unbearable pressure upon the land," and declared that no Chinese government could solve the problem of feeding this population. Disbelieving in the possibility of consolidating the victory of the Chinese revolution, he openly called on China's "democratic individualists" to rise and pull down the people's government. At that time, Comrade Mao Tse-tung refuted Acheson in a commentary, in which he said:

Among all things on earth, man is the most precious. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, all miracles can be created so long as there are men. We refute Acheson's reactionary theory. We believe that revolution can change all things. A new China with a vast population, rich resources, well-off livelihood, and flourishing culture will materialize before long. All pessimistic views are utterly groundless.

It is almost nine years since that time and who is right after all? Without American flour, the Chinese people, far from starving to death,

are living a much better life than before. We have a larger population now, but our progress is an incalculable number of times quicker than the growth of our population. There are in China still persons who persist in pessimism, but they are submerged in an ocean of optimistic people and the only thing to be worried about is their own future.

THE PEOPLE'S STRENGTH

Belief or disbelief in the strength of the masses of people is the basic dividing line between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as well as that between Marxists and anti-Marxists, between genuine Marxists and pseudo-Marxists. Whoever takes the standpoint of the proletariat, the standpoint of Marxism, is certain to believe that the outwardly powerful forces of reaction are nothing but a paper tiger which will sooner or later be demolished, is certain to believe that the masses of people are the only genuine creators of history and that they will undoubtedly defeat all oppression and perform all miracles. Nor will this belief be shaken no matter how colossal the difficulties facing the masses of people may be. Conversely, whoever takes the standpoint of the bourgeoisie, the anti-Marxist or pseudo-Marxist standpoint, is certain to mistake fantasy for substance, to believe that the dollars and hydrogen bombs of imperialism can decide everything, and to look down on the strength of the masses of people which appears for the time being relatively

weak.

The betrayal by Bernstein, Kautsky, and Plekhanov of the cause of the proletariat had its root cause in their disbelief in the strength of the masses of people. Similarly, that the Yugoslav revisionists dare not stand on the side of the socialist camp in the international class struggle, that they worship United States imperialism as a god which still looks powerful for the time being, is in effect due to their disbelief in the strength of the masses of people, whatever rhetoric they use. The revolutionary character which they once showed in the anti-fascist struggle gradually disappeared after their victory and now they seemingly do not know how to survive without United States flour and dollars. Consequently, they can only direct the spearhead of their attack against the socialist camp and the communist parties of various countries.

THE TASKS OF MARXISTS

The revolutionary ranks of the proletariat are not free from the influence of this bourgeois disbelief in the strength of the masses of people. Proletarians are not born with the ability to discern the false appearances from the essence of things, or the understanding that imperialism is bound to develop in the direction of negating itself. On Marxists therefore devolve the following tasks: To propagate the scientific truths of Marxism; to explain

things to those who overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people; to combat the influence of bourgeois ideas. It is because the Chinese communists have waged such struggles that they are able to put forward the general line for the construction of socialism; exert the utmost efforts and press ahead consistently to achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results; that they are able to put forward the heroic slogan of catching up with and overtaking Britain in fifteen years.

The strength of the masses of people is inexhaustible. When we really stimulated the energy of the people to the utmost, we soon found that the slogan of catching up with Britain in fifteen years was in fact a bit behind the times. Intentionally or unintentionally, the London *Times* did not mention that a modifying phrase "or in less time" had been added to our slogan at the recent session of our congress. Comrade Lin-chih, Minister of Coal Industry, in his article published in the *People's Daily* on June 6th, estimated that by 1959, China's coal output will reach or exceed 240 million tons whereas Britain's coal output in 1957 was only 220 million tons. The output of steel and iron and other major industrial products will also surpass that of Britain in much less time than fifteen years. For instance, it was reported in the *People's Daily* of June 7th that more than 10,000 medium and small blast furnaces will be built next year

alone and that these will have a capacity of over 20 million tons of iron annually, or over one-third more than Britain's iron output in 1957 which was 14,530,000 tons. We shall also realize the national program for agricultural development before 1967. As Comrade Tan Chen-lin pointed out at the congress, during the second 5-year plan, that is, before 1962, many provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions will reach the levels set down in the agricultural program.

Let the gentlemen of the bourgeoisie continue to dream their sweet dreams. "Beyond the diseased oak, 10,000 sap-green trees." At any rate, China is leaping forward to-

wards a not-too-distant and concrete goal. China will definitely surpass Britain and it will not take fifteen years. The world significance of this great struggle of the 600 million Chinese people is obvious. Here we only wish to make one point clear: the things that can be achieved by the Chinese people, a nation which was so terribly backward and which has been severely oppressed, can certainly be achieved by any of the backward and oppressed nations of the world. The only requirement for this is that the masses of people must have strong faith in their own strength, unite to fight for a new life, and never bow to the imperialists!

The Austrian Socialist Party Program

By Franz Marek

Member of the Political Bureau of the Austrian Communist Party

A DRAFT PROGRAM was put before the Congress of the Austrian Socialist Party held at Salzburg in November 1957—a program which had been elaborated by a small commission led by Benedikt Kautsky, the son of Karl Kautsky. The draft was not discussed at the Salzburg Congress. Discussion has been taking place in the various organizations of the Party since the beginning of this year, and is due to be completed by May 1958, when a Special Congress is to be held and a final program adopted.

The ideological outlook of the Austrian Socialist Party (A.S.P.) has a significance that goes beyond the limits of a small country. This Party is one of the strongest sections of the Socialist International, and its ideological influence within the International is traditional. During the years between the two world wars, Otto Bauer, the leader of Austrian social-democracy, was, without any doubt, one of the main leaders of the Socialist International, of which the Secretary was another Austrian, Friedrich Adler. After the Second World War it was yet another Austrian who was, until quite recently, Secretary of the Socialist International; and it is not by accident that its last Congress, in July 1957, was held in Vienna.

The ideas contained in the new

program of the A.S.P. can well be expected to find an echo in the other sections of the Socialist International. Benedikt Kautsky himself noted with pride the ideological importance of his Party, when, presenting the draft program, he emphasized with satisfaction that the A.S.P. was the first Socialist Party to elaborate a program since the Second World War.

The last program of Austrian Social-Democracy dates from the year 1926. It played a rather important part in the history of the Austrian working-class movement and is generally known as the "*Linzer Programm*" as it was adopted at Linz, capital of the province of Upper Austria.

This program was, quite rightly, considered as a classic expression of the trend known as Austro-Marxism, *i.e.*, of that particular trend adopted by social democracy in Austria which on the one hand loudly proclaimed its faith in Marx and Marxism, whilst on the other it justified a policy which led to constant retreat before reaction.

Thus when we Communists spoke at that time and after of the Linz Program we emphasized in our considerations and criticisms the typical weaknesses of Austro-Marxism: the distortion of the materialist conception of history transforming it into a fatalism which justified every

defeat as inevitable; indecision and vagueness on every question related to working-class power; a negative attitude to winning the peasants as allies—only to quote the more important points.

But as a result of developments since the Second World War and of the conceptions of the present principal politicians of the A.S.P., it becomes necessary to pay more attention to the other points of the Linz Program: the recognition of the fundamental ideas of Marxism, for example: the class struggle; the clear admission that capitalism is the source of the danger of war. Although in a vague and false manner, none the less the Linz Program recognized the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat after the victory of the working class.

It is precisely for this reason that the leaders of the A.S.P. made haste, immediately after the end of the war, to declare that the Linz Program had become out of date and that it was necessary to replace it by a new program. A program of limited and temporary action was adopted in 1947 as a provisional solution; and in this they still spoke of class war and the winning of socialism as the result of proletarian class struggle. At the time of the Presidential Elections of May 1957, the Socialist candidate, Dr. Scharf, was elected President of the Republic thanks to Communist support; and it was then that the leadership of the A.S.P. thought that the time had come to elaborate the

promised new program, declaring at the same time that it must be a program capable of winning electors from the petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie, and thus obtaining the 51 per cent votes of which the A.S.P. had dreamed for decades.

THE REVISIONIST CAMPAIGN

In this connection, and with this aim in view, already before the Congress, various intellectuals and office functionaries who had joined the Party after the war, demanded a total rejection of Marxism, the liberation from "archaic" forms of a class party, complete abandonment of "out-of-date" notions of the proletariat and the class struggle. In the course of this discussion, which preceded the elaboration of the draft program, open support was given to revisionism and the revisionist critique of Marx. Referring to new phenomena and new elements in society, ideas were put forward which were, in fact, the ideas that Bernstein had already put forward 60 years before, when he, also, proclaimed that there were new phenomena and new elements in society.

The slogan "Marx is out of date" is obviously just as old as the criticism of Marx, in fact as old as Marxism itself, and it is put forward along with notions and conceptions which are actually pre-Marxist.

The draft program that has been put forward shows all the marks of

this campaign. It is a contradictory document which in numerous passages "corrects" mistakes which it makes elsewhere; certain sections of it appear as a simple resume of a discussion with mutually contradictory theses. To the draft program, which consists of two parts—a fundamental part and a resume of immediate political demands—an additional section has been added which in numerous points contradicts the fundamental section. It is not without reason that the central organ of the main government party in Austria, the Popular Catholic Party, wrote concerning the draft, that an effort had been made "to break free from Marxism without offending the Marxist section of the Party's supporters." But the essence of the program, the main direction of its principles, is clear: renunciation of Marxism, of the Marxist class point of view, virulent anti-Communism.

The draft program begins by a series of effusions on the ideas of "Socialism" and "Democracy," copied almost textually from Bernstein's book, which appeared in 1899, *The Conditions of Socialism and the Tasks of Social Democracy*.

According to the draft program, socialism is nothing else than the "flowering of personality." Nothing else is said of this idea except that it represents "the completion of democracy."

Democracy soars above classes; there is no such thing as bourgeois democracy or socialist democracy;

there is only democracy in itself (just as in Bernstein's book), which is a state of society which already contains socialism within itself. Equally, there is an attempt made in the draft program to provide an historic justification of these conceptions. Since Marx, everything is said to have changed fundamentally: there are no more incompatible class contradictions; on the basis of democracy, modern ideological trends like conservatism, liberalism and socialism are coming nearer and nearer to each other. A part of the conservatives are said to have fallen for a period into the error of fascism but they were quickly cured by fascism itself. The socialist working-class movement is said to have succeeded in the work of re-education, with, as a result, conservatives becoming more liberal, and the liberals better understanding the necessity of government intervention. The three "communities of modern thought" thus merge into one fundamental idea of "the economy of a planned community." Sweet and tender as a breeze in spring is this world of "democracy" where there is no more class struggle, no more reaction, no more proletariat—all these ideas are absent from the draft program. And as the point of departure is that democracy has no class character, but is a sort of democracy in itself, there is not within the draft program the slightest reflection of all those problems of socialist democracy which in recent years have so much preoccupied the international work-

ing-class movement. How is the leading role of the working people expressed in the State and administration? How can you secure the steadily increasing participation of workers in the management of enterprises and control of the State apparatus? What role must the trade unions play in the building of socialism?

All these problems are ignored by the draft program, just as it ignores socialism itself. The draft speaks, in the section relating to immediate demands, of the necessity of an "economic community" which must embrace important enterprises like the private capitalist enterprises which will continue to exist. But you can look in vain for a definition of the rights of the working people in this "economic community," and, above all, of their democratic rights with regard to the management of this economy. You will find in the course of this hopeless search that nowhere is the demand made that these enterprises should become national property. This is the measure of the extent to which "the approximation of modern ideological currents" has apparently been achieved.

EAST AND WEST

In view of the fact that in the draft program the class outlook is outdated, both democracy and dictatorship soar above classes; the draft program operates rather according to the four points of the compass.

Untroubled by the "unfavorable geographic" situation of many South American countries or of that of Spain and Portugal or Turkey, liberty, democracy, the "approximation" of ideological currents are proclaimed as the West. The East, by contrast, locates "the reactionary dictatorships" where "an unrestricted despotism has reigned for thousands of years."

The East is, for the draft program, an ideological entity which embraces, without distinction, the U.S.S.R., the countries of the People's Democracies, along with the liberated colonial peoples. All these are considered as reactionary countries, of which the political and economic revolutions are equally to be condemned, the economy is based uniquely on war and armaments, the standard of life is ceaselessly falling, and democracy still has to be achieved since its decisive representatives, the individual capitalists and the workers, do not exist or are only beginning to exist.

These countries are said to threaten peace by their thirst for power. That is why "democratic socialism" regards them as its "mortal enemy." Moreover, "although in the West the contradictions between capitalism and socialism have evolved in a manner which makes possible a gradual shading off within the framework of the rules of the democratic game, and without it being necessary to have recourse to force," in the East, for these "reactionary dictatorships," the task still remains of creating the

conditions necessary for democracy through "democratic socialism." The draft program even declares that "revolutions, civil wars and even perhaps external wars will accompany this process."

The draft program here goes much further than the fundamental declaration of the Socialist International of 1951. Its rabid anti-Communism goes along with its reactionary conception of the decay of the colonial system. According to the draft, with the Eastern world there can be "no possible agreement or conciliation." The East is "the irreconcilable enemy" of democratic socialism in whose name all the revolutions of the Communist area—from Kronstadt to Budapest—have been carried through."

The authors of the new program would certainly cross themselves three times if one put under their eyes the book which was written by Otto Bauer shortly before his death and in which he wrote that "the road towards a perfect democracy, which will neither be dominated by capital, nor threatened by class struggle, is only accessible through the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is to say through the power of the proletariat which must be strong and durable enough, whatever form it assumes, to carry through the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society" (Otto Bauer, *Between Two World Wars*, p. 322).

They would cross themselves ten times if they came to read the statement, so often repeated, that "the

most important factor of post-war history . . . is the victorious development of socialism in the Soviet Union" (*op. cit.*, p. 356).

Today in the A.S.P., Otto Bauer is treated worse than a mangy dog, but even the first President of the Austrian Republic after the Second World War, Karl Renner, whom the leaders of the A.S.P. still celebrate as their ideological guide, and who was certainly no friend of the Communists, declared in his last book, which was published after his death, that the Communists "are the Left wing of the working-class movement"; and he added that, for him, the discussion with the Communists was "a quarrel within the fortress." For the authors of the draft program it is quite clear that Renner himself is outdated, since at times he acted according to a Marxist class point of view, and he was convinced that, without the victory of the Soviet Union over Hitler fascism, there would be no A.S.P. and no draft program of the A.S.P.

Starting from Bernstein's ideas, the draft program wipes out all class contours, and comes to proclaim the necessity of war and counter-revolution against the socialist countries and the liberated colonial peoples. It starts by the rejection of Marxism, declaring that Marxism is outdated, and ends with the slogan of violence against the country where triumphed the working class led by Marxists, and where victory came to those whose struggle confirmed in so striking a way the fundamental ideas of Marxism developed by Lenin.

CHANGES IN CAPITALISM?

The authors of the draft project justify the "outdating" of Marxism by referring to changes that have taken place in capitalism and to two errors of Marxism. Marx and Engels, they say, predicted a "division of society into proletariat and bourgeoisie," but instead of that there has developed "a multitude of classes and groups" and "a system of complex interests which combine in different ways." Moreover, the idea that through industrialization wage workers would become the majority of the population has been shown to be a false one. It would still be false if employees were added to the wage workers, though this cannot be done, given their differences in "mentality."

It is, in fact, a quite absurd simplification of Marxism to try to pretend that its founders stated that there would be only two classes under capitalism. Already Marx and Engels themselves, with regard to the capitalism of their day, described the different groups and strata outside these two main classes and those within the proletariat and bourgeoisie. As for the future development of capitalism, Engels bequeathed numerous counsels on the manner by which the working class after coming to power can convince the peasants of the advantages of co-operative production and the superiority of socialism. This advice would be totally deprived of sense if En-

gels had been of the opinion that the development of capitalism would bring about the disappearance of the peasantry.

What Marx and Engels really foresaw and predicted was the polarization of capitalist society into two decisive classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; and, moreover, the progressive proletarianization of sections of the petty bourgeoisie. This conception is not even contested in the draft program, though it specifies that this process is limited to periods of crisis. However, in years of prosperity, industrialization attracts to the factories sons of peasants and small exploiters, and in the west of Austria there are numerous factories where a large majority of workers have fathers who were, themselves, not workers. The following figures from the country, whose industry is the most developed in the world, show, without possibility of mistake, the direction of development:

In 1870, 40.4 per cent of all the working people of the United States were not wage workers (working on their own behalf); in 1910 these were only 27.1 per cent; in 1950, 14.4 per cent; and in 1954, 13.3 per cent. The actual development therefore, has confirmed the prognostication of Marx, and if there is error, it should not be looked for on his side.

THE ROLE OF EMPLOYEES

It is just the same with regard to the refutation of the theory that

wage workers will, as a result of industrialization, come to form the majority in capitalist society. The authors of the draft program of the A.S.P. drew their theories from the book *Marx and the Present* by Fritz Sternberg, a German Socialist, who is, at present, one of Marx's critics who is in favor in the U.S.A. It is true that Sternberg expressed himself with much more prudence and only claimed that the workers "often" did not form the majority of the population. But the draft program extends this theory and takes up the thesis of Sternberg that employees are not workers. As for the statement that the workers and employees taken together never form the majority, this is derived only from the authors of the draft program.

The fact that the number of employees is ceaselessly growing, both absolutely and relatively, is a real problem of the late-developing capitalism. The fact that employees exist, that they fulfill a specific function, and that they possess a particular mentality, was well known by Marx and Engels. Moreover, in *Capital* Marx analyzed the position of different sections of employees. He proved that the employees, in production and transport—just like the workers in production—created value and surplus value, and that commercial employees helped commercial capital to realize part of its surplus value.

But, in *Capital*, Marx emphasized specifically that, just as all employees, those who work in commerce are

"wage earners just like the others" because their selling power is always a source of profit.

Just as the bourgeoisie with its different strata and groups forms one class in relation to the workers, so the workers, despite their different strata and groups, form one class with regard to the bourgeoisie. And facts once again prove that error is not on the side of Marx, but on the side of Marx's critics.

In Austria the workers and employees together represent 62 per cent of all the working people, in France 65 per cent, in Western Germany 71 per cent, in the U.S.A. 82 per cent.

These two striking "proofs" of the "errors" of Marxism are, indeed, old reflections of the critiques of Marx. Sixty years ago Bernstein already used them; doubtless, criticism of Marx consists in copying out what other critics wrote about Marx, without the least critical sense while boasting of a critical spirit.

Benedikt Kautsky—without any reserve the least successful of the works of Karl Kautsky—has made a special argument about the "outdating" of Marx under the inspiration of Bernstein. According to him there existed two Marxes: one the ultra-radical, the other the careful thinker; the young Marx still influenced by the Jacobin ideas of the revolution, and the wise sage who had already adopted a calmer position with regard to capitalism.

To get out of the difficulty of the fact that it was the old Marx

who, for example, developed his theses of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Benedikt Kautsky pretends that the older Marx was from time to time subject to "moods" which threw him back into the errors of his youth. In fact it was Karl Kautsky, the father, who in his reply to Bernstein already refuted this nonsense about the "good" and the "wicked" Marx (*Bernstein and the Social Democratic Program*, 1899, p. 7).

Benedikt Kautsky recognizes that the one form of Marxism—the "good" or "democratic Marxism"—has a certain importance for the present period, but only for the East.

It is certain that in the modern welfare state in which we live, the theories and notions of Marx have little value. (But) for our young brother movements in India and Japan Marx is a living reality. If we do not wish to lose our links with these movements, we must not simply push aside the idea of democratic Marxism—I would affirm that all fruitful analyses of what is taking place in the East are based on Marx; not only the formation of new classes but also the formation of new revolutionary forces is taking place there according to the ideas which Marx held of such development.

This "democratic Marxism" is thus only of restricted value: for the East where the socialist parties could consider themselves friendly to Marxism, for the countries of working-class power, where—according to the draft

program—the class struggle, civil wars and revolutions are on the agenda. It is only for the "states of public welfare" of the "free West" that Marxism is outdated, for—and this is the affirmation of Benedikt Kautsky—the analysis of all that takes place here must be based on "other theories and rules." Thus this "genial" division of Marx and the value of Marxism correspond to this differentiated attitude to "West" and "East."

DISCUSSION ON THE PROGRAM

Without any doubt the draft program of the A.S.P. provoked a certain uneasiness, repugnance and even resistance amongst many workers and socialist militants.

The "warm" congratulations of the Austrian capitalist press at the throwing overboard of Marxism, and the hopes of foreign capitalist journals who recommended the Socialist Parties of their countries to copy the draft program of the A.S.P., had an alarming effect. The authors of the draft program were put on the defensive, and this is clearly shown in the articles and commentaries which they have prepared since the publication of the program in the central organ of the A.S.P. In trying to justify their draft in the face of the criticisms of militants—who include some leading members of the Party—they arrive at statements and definitions which are in contradiction with the draft, they often put the emphasis of their "fight on two fronts" on the anti-capitalist side, and they make repeated declarations according

to which they remain socialists and maintain their original aim. Although the written discussion is only carried in the monthly journal of the A.S.P., which has a small circulation, it nonetheless reflects the contradiction, rejection and resistance of many socialists who feel clearly that the unreserved renunciation of Marxism is linked to the renunciation of all struggle against reaction. It is already certain that in the final program its authors will be forced to leave out a number of points that were in the first draft.

Moreover, a phenomenon can be seen which is not a new one in the working-class movement. Lenin already wrote that during the discussion on Bernstein's revisionism, interest in theory was revived and stimulated. In the draft program the statement is made so often that Marx is "outdated" and that times have changed since Marx, that a steadily increasing number of people are be-

ginning to become interested in what Marx said in reality and in what really has changed since Marx's day. We Communists are trying to provide them with an answer. We are also carrying out a discussion on the draft program of the A.S.P., for we are not indifferent to the program of a Party which still includes the majority of Austrian workers. Our most important contribution to this discussion is a program on *The Austrian Road to Socialism* which we put in February 1958 before the Austrian working class. This constitutes an attempt to apply the fundamental ideas of Marxism-Leninism to the specific conditions of our country.

This provides, in our opinion, the proof that many things have, indeed, changed since Marx's epoch, but that these changes can only be understood in the spirit of Marx and on the basis of the fundamental discoveries of Marxism.

LABOR AND THE MCCLELLAN COMMITTEE

Chicago, Ill.

The merger of the AFL and CIO two years ago was a great threat to the power of the monopolies. Now, in the midst of an economic crisis, Big Business and its representatives in Congress need to launch an attack against the working class. Their objective is to isolate the organized workers from their allies—the mass of the American people.

On the surface, the objectives of this Committee were to expose corruption and racketeering in unions. Now, however, it is already clear that the attack is against the unions themselves; not for corruption, but because they are organizations which wield economic and political power which threatens the profits of Big Business. The Labor Relations Letter of the Chamber of Commerce, July 1957, states:

The real question is Union power. All the sparring about the financial report requirements has the effect of clouding the real issue. This is the power which resides in the hands of Union leaders. This is both economic and political. Economically it is the power to make union members toe the Union line, as defined by top Union officials; politically it is the power to throw money and manpower into political campaigns, free of any real limitations in the practical sense.

Events of the past few months have shown that the cry of corruption has already:

1. Split the unions.
2. Discouraged AFL-CIO organizing drives. The Negro people have conducted powerful struggles against the racists who seek to prevent integration. The labor movement has been silent and inactive in support of this struggle, it has been unsuccessful in its publicized "Organize the South" drive. The activities of the McClellan Committee have played no small role in hindering labor's participation in the struggle for Negro rights and organizing the South.
3. Loss of Union elections. (Last quarter of 1955 showed 30,986 for AFL-CIO; 33,335 for no Union.)

Why did the Committee single out the Teamsters as their first and main target? The most obvious reason is that there were and are important groups within the leadership vulnerable to charges of corruption. It was easy to spotlight the use of union funds for private gains; the use of racketeers to control locals by signing back-door contracts which prevent workers from getting appreciable gains; the use of union expense money for lavish living.

These practices are unfortunately widespread in the American labor movement and are part of the fabric of capitalist philosophy of "grab what you can" which infects every phase of American life and is not peculiar to labor.

For class conscious workers, it is necessary to expose the trick of using corruption to hide the basic problems that face the workers such as wages, jobs,

peace and union democracy. The basic source of corruption is not an individual here or there who has strayed from virtue. It lies in the rotten idea that workers and bosses have a "community of interest"; that the job of the trade-union leadership is to convince the boss that by throwing the worker a crumb he will produce more and make more profit for the bosses. *This is class collaboration.*

Corruption springs from the concept that the labor movement must be led by "labor statesmen" whose position entitles them to live on the same lavish scale as top business executives. *This is business unionism.*

Corruption is given a free hand because the rank and file is not encouraged by the "labor statesmen" nor do they themselves as yet see the need to participate in the life of the union.

Class collaboration, business unionism, the lack of participation by the union members in the life of their union is the source of corruption and costs the workers a thousand times more in wages and benefits than the pocketing of money from the sale of a union card for which Beck has been convicted.

Corruption and racketeering must be fought vigorously. But to expect it to be eliminated from the labor movement by the moralizing of bourgeois politicians, ethical codes enforced by labor leaders, themselves tainted, or by legislative fiat by a reactionary Congress is unrealistic.

The Committee also singled out the Teamsters because Big Business was disturbed by the potential strength in a united labor movement. They were aware of the differences that remained in the newly merged AFL-CIO. A great part of the differences lies in a struggle for power between those formerly in the leadership of the CIO and those of the AFL. The Committee knew that many of the jurisdictional differences were still unresolved between the craft and industrial unions. The Teamsters leaders were playing a major role among the craft unions in the internal struggle.

The Committee hoped that by attacking the Teamsters, the Reuther-Carey forces would bring enough pressure on the official AFL-CIO leaders like Meany to attack them in the name of "clean unionism." Reaction got from the AFL-CIO leadership the expulsion of 1,400,000 members of the Teamsters from the merged union. Reaction got from the AFL-CIO the official outlawing by the trade-union movement of the use of the Fifth Amendment by trade unionists, a right guaranteed by the Constitution.

The labor movement should have condemned the racketeering while defending the Teamsters and its members and launched a counter-offensive against the McClellan Committee exposing its objectives. It should have helped rank and file members to make their wishes felt at the Teamsters' Convention. It should have made clear that the job of ridding the union of racketeering was the job of the membership.

Even class conscious unionists fell into the trap of the Committee, for the line of the *Daily Worker* itself was not clear.

However, a few Communists working in the Teamsters tried to make clear the purposes of the Committee. They strongly criticized the AFL-CIO leadership in the early days of the Committee during the attack on Beck, Brewster and Hoffa. The stand against corruption was emphasized but fellow workers were

warned against the reliance on any outside force to solve the problem. And when the possibility of the candidates Haggerty and Hickey arose, that was used to broaden the base of the rank and file movement.

But once the convention was over it was our job to rally the members behind the Union, against the expulsion, Carey's threat of dual unionism, and to influence other Unions to defend unity.

It was our job to shift attention to the real problems facing the Teamsters: the pending contracts for hundreds of thousands of drivers in the Midwest and Central States which set the pattern for the whole country; to take a positive attitude toward Hoffa who headed negotiations and enjoys among the men the reputation of being a vigorous fighter for the demands of cartage over the road, dock and warehousemen.

It must be said that under Hoffa's leadership with the backing of an aroused membership these workers were the first to receive substantial wage increases, welfare gains, and succeeded in driving back the efforts of the Trucking Association to smash certain gains which would have taken the heart out of the Union advances previously won.

This is perhaps the *basic* reason why the Committee singled out the Teamsters' Union.

The Union is the largest in the country with a membership of 1,408,173—10% of organized workers. It is the fastest growing union; growing twice as fast as the Auto Workers Union.

It has won important wage gains for the trucking and warehouse sections of its union. Wages rose 31% from July 1951 to July 1956. The average income for the above workers was \$5,346 compared to \$4,368 for private industry as a whole. It has won large health, welfare and pension plans.

Despite Beck and Hoffa's ties with the Republican Party, it has played a very important role in political action helping to elect people like Morse and Magnusson.

Its officials were part of the leadership of every important central body of the AFL and played a very prominent part in the community.

The nature of its work brings a degree of unionism to almost every home, store, community and factory in the country. Its cooperation is invaluable in helping to organize and in strike. This is especially true in the South where they have used militant tactics to organize and help win strikes.

It is one of the most powerful unions in the country. That doesn't mean that none of the practices of its leaders stink to high heaven; this is true in the allied industry where many shops with large Negro and Puerto Rican workers are organized with back-door agreements in order to jump on rival unions. Also large sections of the Union are conducted undemocratically. The important point is that the Committee calculated using the corruption issue to put a brake on Union growth and perhaps lay the basis for destroying it altogether.

But even under severest attack the Union has continued to grow. The net gain of membership for 1957 was 40,000.

The members and their leaders have fought to stay in the AFL. Their representatives in many local bodies remain in the AFL-CIO by virtue of member-

ship given them by other unions and they have pledged to continue their cooperation with the rest of labor even if they are not in the AFL-CIO; and they have already proved this in several strikes.

It is the responsibility of class conscious forces in the labor movement, especially Communists, to fight for the reinstatement of the Teamsters; for labor unity and to rally the workers for a counter-offensive against the Committee.

In earlier years, at each period when the bosses attacked the workers, the great contributions by class conscious workers under Communist leadership were the result of the ability of the Communists to see the main danger to the working class at the given time and see the main link that would enable the workers and their allies to fight that danger.

The full significance of the dangers in this period have not been well analyzed; and no common program of action was developed by Communists in the labor movement. This is what stirred our group to prepare a critical evaluation of the Communist program on the McClellan Committee.

It is true that many articles in the *Daily Worker* and Fred Fine's article in *Political Affairs* (June, 1957) exposed the nature of the Committee, the anti-labor record of its members and the danger of anti-labor legislation resulting from its hearings. But this position was weakened by a failure to foresee the full effects of the Committee's work.

Many even welcomed the lifting of the curtain to reveal the skeleton in labor's closet, but forgot to see the club in the McClellan Committee's hands. This led many to *equat*e the danger of the Committee with racketeering. The result of such equation was that racketeering was in the headlines, the Committee was given tremendous prestige and publicity, and no struggles were mounted against the objectives of the Committee.

Our experiences with the anti-picketing and right-to-work law in Illinois show that the workers could have been rallied. Despite the claim by the newspapers that this was not meant to harm unions but only to curb excesses, it was possible to show the workers that the main aim of these bills was to break unions and hurt their contracts. The support of the bill from labor's worst baiters and the Chamber of Commerce was exposed. The low wages and lack of Union organization in the South was related to the "right-to-work" laws there. This wasn't done everywhere, but where it was done, many locals for the first time in a dozen years had delegations in Springfield, members were aroused, sent postcards and telegrams to lick the bills.

Can the labor leaders be relied upon to rally their membership against the anti-labor attacks of the McClellan Committee? Didn't they fail to give such leadership to a more militant and aroused membership at the time of the Taft-Hartley Act? Is it any surprise that the attitude of Meany was cooperation with the Committee, that Reuther and Carey are going to look over the legislation proposed to see if it can be made less "harmful"; that Carey already is counting the members he can raid from the Teamsters? What should concern us is our lack of foresight and our own errors in estimate and emphasis; failure to join with those members and leaders in unions who saw the real dangers and who must be pushed and supported into rallying the membership.

The Party's May-Day Statement (1957) made the main task facing labor not the economic struggles, not the new anti-labor attacks, but the "Fight for Democracy" in the unions. Many articles in the *Daily Worker* covering the hearings made Beck and Hoffa appear as the main enemies of the American worker. Our press omitted facts, testimony, quotations which we found that truly revealed the nature of the Committee and would have armed the readers with facts and answers to help workers recognize the real enemy.

The position we are most critical of as being incorrect and distracting from the main struggle is that of the *Daily Worker* main editorial: "It is inconceivable that the labor movement and its friends can defeat the plans of reaction unless at the same time, labor proves to the country that a drastic and sweeping drive is under way within the unions to democratize and cleanse them of corruption."

To follow this position means that instead of rallying our fellow workers and uniting with all forces in the union to fight this anti-labor attack, we would turn around to clean up the unions. That is not an overnight job, as we who have fought against corruption, racketeering and business unionism for twenty years can testify.

The job of cleaning out the corrupt influences and representatives of capitalism from the trade unions will be an important and continuing task from today until after we achieve Socialism. It is one of the most important tasks Communists must undertake. But the struggle against the bosses, against speed-up, against lay-offs, against discrimination; the fight against the "Right-to-Work" laws cannot and must not wait until the unions are cleansed. The unions will become honest and democratic not through the services of the Committee, the courts or the trusteeship of Meany and Reuther, but only when the membership, the rank and file, need and want the Unions as their instrument to win their demands. And the rank and file membership will want and need the unions when they are actively fighting the bosses, fighting the bosses' lay-offs and speed-up and the bosses' legislation.

The correctness of our estimate of the Committee can be seen in what is happening now. The labor leaders themselves, who talked of corruption to clean their skirts before the Committee, now do not appease with talk about cleaning up the unions. For today the same Reuther who stood by and rubbed his hands piously while the Teamsters were being given the works, sees his own union the main target of the union-busting Committee! Labor busting, not corruption, is the issue!

And that is why a clear, rounded-out approach is needed with emphasis on the main question: Defense of the Trade Unions! We need to work with all to beat back the attack on the unions, demanding an end to the attack on the UAW and the reinstatement of the Teamsters and Bakers in order to overcome the Committee's labor-busting and labor-splitting objectives.

Only in this way can labor achieve the strength necessary to defend its living standards, beat down the attempt to dump the burdens of increasing misery on its back, and use its political power to further its own needs.

ON GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Bridgeport, Conn.

I found Hyman Lumer's article on "The Economic Situation Today" (March) informative and interesting and there is much in it that I agree with. However, there is one area of economic activity of great importance that is inadequately dealt with. First, let me state that I believe that Marx's analysis of capitalism and capitalist crisis holds for the U.S. as well as elsewhere and that nothing can be done under capitalism that will remove the sources of the crisis.

However, I think we would be missing the boat if we did not see the almost 100 percent acceptance on the part of the U.S. capitalists (as contrasted to the 1930's) of the massive use of governmental deficit financing as a means of staving off a serious depression. Much to Foster's credit, he made a serious study of Keynesism a number of years ago. Today, when we seem to be on the verge of massive governmental spending in the next decade or two that will make the spending of the 30's seem puny, we need a further study. There is every reason to believe that we will see a national debt limit set in the next 10 or 20 years that goes as high as 500 billion dollars as contrasted to the present 280 billion.

U.S. capitalists seem to have a deep-rooted phobia about going through another depression of the 1929-1932 scale. Yes, they would like to have a few million unemployed around permanently, but anything bigger than this alarms them, particularly with the Soviet Union having full employment and constituting a serious economic challenge in many ways. I believe that one important weapon they still can wield, that is, massive doses of Keynesism, on a scale never before projected, gives them considerable maneuverability yet. And this spending is not confined to the military only. Witness in the past few weeks Congressional action amounting to almost 2 billion on housing and 5 billion on roads.

It seems to me that some of Lumer's analysis is too much like the analyses of Bittelman and others in the past that did not turn out to be correct. The theme that seems to run through it is that the capitalists are boxed in, they have reached the end of their rope, they have no maneuverability left and that a depression rivalling that of 1929-32 is likely—although Lumer does not say this outright. But he does say, for example, "The occurrence of another crisis of the magnitude of 1929 is therefore by no means impossible." And this theme runs throughout the article. At times it appears that we know this is bound to happen, and we know this because of our understanding of Marxism. At times there is almost a feeling that we want this to happen. It seems to me that a much more objective sentence than the above in view of Lumer's and our own uncertainty would have been, "The occurrence of another crisis of the magnitude of 1929 is therefore by no means impossible, although frankly we do not know because of the complexity of the factors involved."

Far be it from me to minimize the seriousness of the present decline, the over 5 million unemployed, the human suffering involved, etc., but I still feel

that our approach to Marxism despite the discussion of the past two years is still mechanical. I believe that the laws of Marxism have universal validity, but we have still not learned how to apply these laws to specific conditions prevailing in our country. One of these conditions may be the end of balanced budgets and an era of massive governmental deficit financing on a scale unknown until now.

JACK GOLDRING

A Reply

Comrade Goldring raises an important question which was only touched on in my article, namely the potential effect of large-scale deficit spending on the economy. However, I believe the views he expresses are incorrect.

He infers that American capitalism, through massive applications of this proposed Keynesian remedy for crises, is capable of drastically limiting their severity, at least for some time to come. As a preface, he declares that he accepts the Marxian analysis of capitalist crisis and believes that "nothing can be done under capitalism that will remove the source of the crisis."

But this is not an adequate statement of the Marxist position. Keynesians, too, believe that the *source* of crisis cannot be removed—that the tendency toward economic stagnation and unemployment is a built-in feature of capitalism. But then they also claim that "regulation" of the economy through appropriate fiscal and monetary measures can nullify this tendency and abolish crises. What distinguishes Marxism is that it regards the *boom-bust cycle itself* as inherent in capitalism, and hence argues that crises cannot be eliminated.

While massive deficit spending would certainly not be without considerable effect on the economy, I believe Comrade Goldring greatly exaggerates its possibilities. For one thing, his assertion that there is "almost 100 per cent acceptance" of such measures by American capitalists is clearly unfounded. To demonstrate this, one need only point to the stubborn resistance of the Eisenhower Administration (which speaks for a substantial section of American capitalism) to even moderate deficit spending, let alone more extensive outlays.

On this point, Vice President Nixon recently stated, in a speech before the American Newspaper Publishers Association on April 24: "I believe that there is no question but that the use of massive spending for new Federal activities to combat the current recession should be flatly rejected by the American people and our Government." And the newspapers and business publications are full of repeated admonitions by a great variety of business sources that any substantial rise in government expenditures must be rejected on the grounds that it will lead to serious inflation.

Equally unwarranted is Comrade Goldring's sweeping assertion that "there is every reason to believe" that the national debt limit will rise to \$500 billion in the next decade or two. To be sure, there is one set of circumstances under which the national debt would rapidly rise to this sum and more, namely the outbreak of a major war. But there is scarcely "every reason to believe" that

this is what faces us.

As for non-military outlays, spending on such a scale as to increase the debt by \$10-20 billion a year over an extended period is totally unprecedented, and the contention that this is now likely requires more in the way of proof than is offered in the letter.

The \$7 billion in recent appropriations which it cites is largely a speeding up of the expenditure of funds already appropriated. Moreover, the actual spending of these funds will be spread over several years. According to a recent staff report of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, federal spending will rise by only \$2 billion this year, most of it in military expenditures. And there is considerable alarm in government circles that even this increase, coupled with a drop in tax receipts, may produce an \$8-billion deficit.

Undoubtedly, a worsening economic situation will give rise to increased deficit spending. However, aside from military expenditures, it is highly unlikely that this will even remotely approach the scale which Comrade Goldring projects. Its probable extent, as well as its actual effects on the economy, cannot adequately be dealt with in this brief communication. An article on these questions is now in preparation.

True, American capitalists are extremely anxious to avoid another 1929. But it does not follow that they are *capable* of doing so. Of course they are able to maneuver, but this ability is far more limited than one would gather from the rosy pictures painted by Keynesian theoreticians.

Finally, Comrade Goldring reads into my article a number of things which are not there. Nowhere does the article say, or even imply, that a crisis of the magnitude of 1929-32 is likely. It says only that neither "built-in stabilizers" nor government spending render the recurrence of such a crisis impossible.

I fail to see any real difference between this and what he suggests. Nor does anything in the article indicate an attitude of welcoming a depression.

His comparison of the predictions which I made with erroneous ones made in previous years is, in my opinion, entirely unwarranted. My predictions erred, if anything, on the side of conservatism. I believe they have been generally borne out by the developments of the past few months. And they were based on the available facts, including the outlook for government spending.

HYMAN LUMER

Book Review

The Capitalist Manifesto, by Mortimer J. Adler and L. O. Kelso (Random House, N. Y.). 285 pages. \$3.75.

THE HOPE OF MANKIND lies not in socialism but in the attainment of a "pure capitalism" in which everyone becomes a capitalist. This is the theme of Messrs. Kelso and Adler in the volume under review.

"The *Capitalist Manifesto*," they declare, "is intended to replace the *Communist Manifesto* as a call to action, first of all in our own country, and then, with our country's leadership, everywhere in the world."

Why is such a call to action needed? Because the "people's capitalism" so widely hailed today as a triumph of the system of free enterprise is in reality an illusion and an ambush, a form of creeping socialism, whose deadly progress can be halted by nothing less than a "capitalist revolution."

The source of these conclusions is a curious amalgam of the ideas of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Thomas Jefferson. To these the authors apply the following process of reasoning:

1. What is commonly regarded as the rising productivity of labor is in fact the very opposite. With the growing development of machinery, the share contributed to the product by capital (that is, by the machine) rises while that contributed by labor falls. Today, it is asserted, capital contributes fully 90%, labor only 10%.

2. Different individuals may contribute to the process of production through the possession of labor power, capital or both. In a society based on principles of economic justice, each person should receive a share of the wealth produced which is "strictly proportional to the contribution that each makes toward the production of the national wealth by the use of his property."

3. The just share of the owners of capital today would be about 90% of the national product. Actually, however, they receive only some 30%, while 70% goes to the owners of labor power. We have a "capitalistic" system of production but a "laboristic" system of distribution.

4. In the "primitive capitalism" of Marx's day, the owners of capital did get a just share. But this reduced the masses of the working people to such abject poverty and misery that capitalism has been led, in various ways, to allot a greater share of the product to the owners of labor power. In this lies the essence of the welfare state. Such a distribution, however, is really largely charity, since the workers are not entitled to it by virtue of their contribution. Hence it leads to depriving the owners of capital of their property rights, to attenuation of the ownership of capital and so toward socialization.

5. To this, the only alternative is a system of "pure capitalism," in which the ownership of capital is so widely diffused that the average individual becomes the possessor of a "capital estate" from which he derives all or most of his income, supplementing it, if desired or needed, with income from his labor.

This would create (a) a just society in which each individual truly receives a distributive share of the product proportional to his contribution, (b) a classless society in which the capitalist and the worker are one and the same person, and (c) a society which allows everyone ample leisure for creative activity and reduces to a minimum the time spent by each person in mechanical labor.

Having presented their case, the authors devote the second part of the book to an exposition of the means by which this happy state of affairs is to be brought about. Stripped of all trimmings, these boil down chiefly to schemes for selling stocks to working people on credit and for limiting the amount of capital held by any one family. These are accompanied by proposals to outlaw retention of profits by corporations—that is, to compel them to distribute all profits as dividends and to finance expansion entirely through issuance of new stock. The citizen-capitalists created by these means would be guarded against the vicissitudes of business fluctuations and economic cycles by suitable forms of insurance.

Once all these things were accomplished, present welfare-state measures would become unnecessary and labor unions would become superfluous. Taxes on corporations could be abolished and the present progressive tax rates on personal incomes could be greatly modified. With these tax barriers removed, capital accumulation could proceed unhindered and everyone would benefit from it.

Such is the capitalist utopia which the authors portray.

To be sure, a classless society with high standards of living and ample leisure for everyone is a goal well worth striving for. But the "revolution" for which Messrs. Kelso and Adler sound their call to arms is scarcely the path to such a society. For the economic theory which they propound is sheer absurdity.

In their concept of productivity—the cornerstone of their entire argument—what they have done is to take a long-prevalent concept of orthodox economics and carry it to an unintended *reductio ad absurdum*. This is the notion that each "factor of production"—land, capital, labor—makes a contribution to the product for which its owner is rewarded accordingly, a notion designed to justify capitalist profits.

The idea that inanimate instruments of production as such "produce" anything is nonsense. It requires human labor to bring into being not only the products of machines but the machines themselves. Indeed, the expenditure of human labor is required even to keep machines in working order; without it they can only deteriorate.

The machine is an adjunct to human labor, a means of rendering it more fruitful. The more efficient the machine, the more productive each hour's labor becomes. Hence, a proper definition of increased productivity is that given by Karl Marx: "By an increase in the productiveness of labor, we mean, generally, an alteration in the labor process of such a kind as to shorten the labor-time socially necessary for the production of a commodity, and to endow a given quantity of labor with the power of producing a greater quantity of use-value." (*Capital*, International Publishers, Vol. I, p. 303.)

This is the commonly accepted meaning of productivity, which Kelso and Adler apparently confuse with something entirely different. What they mistakenly call the relative "productivity" of machines and labor is actually the relative proportions in which these enter into capitalist investment in production or, more precisely, the relative proportions of constant and variable capital. To be sure, the former has grown enormously, but this is itself a consequence of the tremendously enhanced productivity of labor.

In a capitalist society, the actual effect of rising productivity of labor is to compelled to wage a ceaseless struggle. And in this connection, the authors' reduce the share of the product going to the workers. Against this, they are contention that labor's share has greatly increased during the last century runs violently counter to historical fact. Even the most generous estimates claim no more than that labor has held its own.

The authors also paint the owners of labor power and the owners of capital as independent individuals, each contributing in his own way to production. What they omit is the fact that capitalism is a system of commodity production in which the worker's labor power is also a commodity, which he must sell to the capitalist in order to live. This is the real relationship between them.

Indeed, capitalist production is possible only if there exist individuals who possess nothing for sale other than their labor power.

Only such a "free" worker can be compelled to submit to terms of employment under which he provides the capitalist with the unpaid labor from which his profits are derived—in short, to terms under which he produces both for himself and the capitalist. Clearly, therefore, a "classless" capitalist society, in which capitalist and worker are one and the same person, is an absurdity.

Another basic feature of capitalist production which Kelso and Adler overlook is the fact that it is *socialized*, not *individual* production. Hence the only way in which workers can truly own the large enterprises in which they toil side by side is through *socialized ownership*—through *socialism*. The notion that ownership can be parcelled out among them as individuals is ridiculous.

The sale of stock to workers, to which the "capitalist revolution" ultimately boils down, is by no means a new idea. Nor is it one to which the big capitalists, who themselves repeatedly promote employee stock-buying schemes, will offer much objection. The diffusion of stock ownership serves the interests of finance capital in that it facilitates control of giant corporations, and extraction of the profits of control) through ownership of a relatively small part of the total stock outstanding. Further, sale of stock to employees is a well-worn device for creating illusions that they have become "part-owners" of the company and must therefore help keep it profitable by working harder. Finally, it is pure fantasy to think that out of the earnings of the average worker it is possible, even with the most liberal credit terms, to buy enough stock to make him a capitalist in any real sense of the word.

What Kelso and Adler offer is a futile proposal, under modern conditions of capitalist production, to return to the individual ownership of a bygone day. In an era when socialization of production has reached very advanced levels, they seek to hark back to the Jeffersonian ideal of a society of independent

owner-producers. The obvious impossibility of thus turning the clock back needs no detailed demonstration.

They are able to arrive at such conclusions because they approach the question of social development not by striving to ascertain the economic laws governing capitalist production and to draw the proper conclusions from them, but by setting up an abstract criterion of economic justice and fashioning an imaginary society to conform to it. Hence, in a society in which every capitalist is driven by necessity to accumulate capital at the greatest possible rate, they suggest in all seriousness that capitalists can be dissuaded from accumulation on the grounds of "enlightened self-interest."

The book contains numerous important assertions made without proof. Nowhere do the authors state on what grounds they place capital's contribution to production at 90% and labor's share of the product at 70%. Also, the labor theory of value is dismissed as false on no other grounds than that "we contend it is." Additional examples could be cited.

The authors' repeatedly-expressed fears that so-called "people's capitalism" is a highway to socialism scarcely need any comment. It is worth noting, however, that in their readiness to accept at face value the glowing claims of its proponents, they betray a callous lack of understanding of the hard realities of workers' lives.

Thus, they write: "Not only do we have high wages and full employment, but so great an opportunity for employment that a proportion of wives and mothers higher than ever before can find jobs in commerce and industry, in many cases to raise even higher an already high family standard of living." To the growing numbers of wives and mothers who are compelled to find work to make ends meet in the face of rising prices (and now of serious unemployment), this will undoubtedly come as quite a surprise.

Since its appearance, *The Capitalist Manifesto* has attracted a good deal of attention. Most reviewers, while sharply critical of various aspects of the book, have at the same time labored hard to find redeeming features. But whatever else may be said of it, one thing is certain. It will never replace the *Communist Manifesto*.

HYMAN LUMER

New Books

NO MEN ARE STRANGERS

by Joseph North

The absorbing story of the life and experiences of a militant progressive in a changing era, a Communist newspaper man who covered almost every central fighting front of the past three decades—the Great Depression, Spain, the founding of the CIO, World War II. His story is the story of our time.

INTERNATIONAL, \$3.50

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

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. Sweezy, 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