

political affairs

SEPTEMBER 1958 • 35 CENTS

JAMES WEST

[28] **The Coming Illinois
Elections**

NATIONAL EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT, CPUSA

[38] **On the 39th Anniversary
of the CPUSA**

THE EDITOR

[40] **"Ideas In Our Time"**

ALBERT J. LIMA

[58] **Labor and Political
Action**

THE PARTY PROGRAM

THE AMERICAN ROAD TO SOCIALISM
By JAMES S. ALLEN

Page 1

PROGRAM QUESTIONS

Page 8

NEW BOOKS

THE GATES OF IVORY, THE GATES OF HORN

by Thomas McGrath

"Those who enjoyed *The Space Merchants* and such of Ray Broadbury's books as *Fahrenheit 451* will find *The Gates of Ivory, the Gates of Horn* even more pointed in its satire and even more grisly in its implications."—JONOTHAN FORREST in *People's World*.

MAINSTREAM, Cloth \$2.75; Paper \$1.00

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. Sweezey, setting forth their views on the political and economic shape of socialism in the U.S.A.

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

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

Vol. XXXVII, No. 9

SEPTEMBER, 1958

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

OPENING OF THE DISCUSSION IN
PREPARATION OF A BASIC PROGRAM:

The American Road to Socialism

By James S. Allen

For the Editorial Sub-Committee, Draft Program Committee

With the publication of "Program Questions," the Draft Program Committee of the Communist Party opens public discussion on the preparation of a basic program. All those interested in helping chart the American road to socialism are invited to participate.

The 16th National Convention of the Communist Party, meeting in February 1957, instructed the National Committee to proceed with the preparation of a basic written program, which will "define clearly and unequivocally the viewpoint of American Communists on all fundamental problems of the struggle for socialism in the United States." The present Draft Program Committee of twenty members was elected by the National Executive Committee in May of this

year.* At the same time, the NEC approved an "Initial Report on Basic Program," prepared by the present secretary of the Program Committee jointly with a sub-committee of the NEC, as providing a basis for beginning systematic work on program. Similar action on the Initial Report was taken independently by the Draft Program Committee (with one member against, and two abstentions).

The initial Report did not seek to present in advance a complete series of programmatic principles, or component parts of a draft program, nor even an outline for a program. Its purpose was to seek from the outset the basis for a unified view, or at least a community of thinking, with respect to some central concepts of the road to socialism within the present world context. It therefore set forth, as a basis for discussion and elaboration in the process of preparing a draft program, views on what is meant by "our road to socialism," by peaceful transition to socialism, and by people's government. Articles based on this preparatory document will be submitted for discussion in issues of *Political Affairs*.

* The members of the Draft Program Committee are: Charlene Alexander, James S. Allen (Secretary), Herbert Aptheker, Alexander Birtleman, Martin Chancey, Eugene Dennis, Betty Gannett, Simon Gerson, James E. Jackson, Claude Lightfoot, Hyman Lumer, George Morris, Burt Nelson, Pettis Perry, Al Richmond, N. S., Par Toohey, William Weinstone, James West, and Carl Winter. Subsequently, the Draft Program Committee designated an Editorial Sub-Committee on Publications, consisting of Allen, Aptheker, and Lumer.

The "Program Questions" herewith published incorporate the thinking of the great majority of the Draft Program Committee, with respect to procedure and general approach.

With respect to the latter, it is our view that the work of preparation must start from an examination of the problems of the present and of developments and trends now discernible. From such an examination, the program should provide a line of solution leading toward socialism. We do not propose to imagine what a Socialist America will be like under whatever conditions may prevail in the future. The socialist solution must be presented as a projection of the immediate struggles, class alliances and trends, in their development. It will be necessary to define clearly the meaning of socialism as a system of society. We should speak of the *potentials* of a Socialist United States, of how socialism, where it exists, has solved the key questions we confront, and of the meaning of our historical epoch, the world transition to socialism. However, the major part of the program, in the opinion of the Committee, must deal with the preliminary aspects along the road to socialism, with the minimum objectives rather than with the ultimate, starting from the specific conditions and trends at the present level of development of the class forces.

Secondly, the Committee considers that there is no model program for us to follow. We should learn what we can from the programs of other Communist Parties, from how they solve problems similar to our own, and from their theoretical treatment. But the program will have to be distinctively our own product. The work of

preparing a basic written program, therefore, is to be seen as a really major undertaking. If we are successful, it will be the first written basic program for this country produced by any Marxist group or party. It is quite true that from the earliest pioneer socialist groups to the present time, Marxists have grappled with the problem of charting the road to socialism in the United States. But outside of such programmatic statements as appeared in election platforms, policy reports, preambles, and convention resolutions, no basic program for the road to socialism in the United States has yet been produced in authoritative written form. Our main concern should be to provide such a solid base and framework to our proposed program that it will prove to be of more than passing interest. If approached in this fashion, the program can become a powerful instrument for raising the socialist consciousness of the workers, revitalizing the entire Left, and building the Party.

Thirdly, with respect to general procedure, it is the view of the Program Committee that, under present circumstances, a draft prepared in advance by itself and handed down for discussion would be ineffective and perhaps totally inadequate. The Program Committee is charged with the task of preparing a draft of a basic program, to be submitted by the National Committee to the membership for discussion and for final action at a Party Convention. It could have proceeded immediately to prepare a draft for discussion, without violating any of the requirements of democratic procedure, since the draft would have been subject to full debate and basic alteration. But it was the judgment of pr-

tically the entire Committee that it was not ready to do so, in view of the complexity of many of the problems that have to be dealt with in a basic program, and also because of the continuing divergence of views on some fundamental questions, as well as lack of clarity with respect to other problems.

Therefore, the very process of preparing a draft program must also become a process of clarification, of mutual study and discussion, of enlightenment of each other and of others. The effort must be collective on a broad scale. It has to be the outcome of an expanding wave of serious study and discussion at all stages of preparation. The best Marxist-Leninist thinking in America should be "mobilized" and brought to bear upon the problems of program. The real and potential "thinking" strength that is resident within the Communist movement and in circles around it has to be aroused to the task. It is for these reasons that the Committee chose the rather unusual method of involvement of the Party ranks and of the opening of public discussion *in preparation* of a draft program, rather than proceeding immediately to the writing of the draft.

The Committee is well aware that the program cannot be an eclectic document, containing contradictory views and approaches, nor can it be a series of compromises in principle.

Obviously, we do not start with a "clean slate," in the sense that we set out to discover a new set of basic principles. We start from the premise that the principles of Marxism-Leninism are fully applicable to our economy and our time, and serve as the most potent ideological weapon of the working

class in the struggle for socialism. For purposes of program work, we adopt the basic approach as set forth in the 16th National Convention, which emphasized the necessity for a critical application and further development of the basic Marxist tenets, as they are applied to changing conditions and to the concrete characteristics of our country and of our times. The very process of application of Marxist principles to concrete conditions is of necessity also a process of reexamination and elaboration of these principles.

The real differences of view that develop are not over this proposition, but revolve around the direction in which the reexamination and elaboration proceed. In this respect also, the Program Committee adopts the position of the 16th National Convention that it is necessary to guard against opportunism of either variety, be it Right opportunism (revisionism) or "Left" sectarianism. A critical application of Marxist-Leninist principles to our conditions should not be equated with revisionism, which is a departure from these principles. Nor should the defense of the basic tenets against revisionist tendencies be equated with dogmatism, which obscures the many real problems of program with abstract schemes devoid of any relation to time and place.

In the work of preparing a draft program, it is particularly pertinent to fight against both these tendencies. Which will prove to be the greater obstacle will be seen not in the abstract, but in the very process of debating out the concrete questions of program. While guarding against prevailing pulls and tugs in a revisionist direction, we should avoid falling into dogmatic positions, and we should encourage and

welcome fresh and exploratory thinking about our problems.

As the Convention said, the program must define the position "clearly and unequivocally." In order to achieve this, the Committee agreed, the style of work and procedures must be such as to facilitate full and free discussion, with the right of each member to present his views fully safeguarded. It will be necessary to strive for the best informed and most lucid statements of divergent views, when these occur, so that basic decisions on substance can be made effectively. As regards its own work, the Draft Program Committee is adopting procedures that will allow for the full presentation of views, for systematic discussion, and for decision.

While realizing the need for a free discussion, the Committee also is aware that such a discussion might become aimless and even futile unless it is directed toward specific programmatic questions, and is carried out in an organized way. As the initial step in this direction, the Committee has prepared a series of questions and topics covering the entire range of program, to serve as the basis for organization of program work and discussion.

The Program Questions open a wide field for examination, study, exploration, discussion and debate. Their central focus is upon the struggle against monopoly, which is seen as the main obstacle to the efforts of the working class and its allies to assure peaceful co-existence, economic security for all, the defense and extension of democracy and Negro rights, and the extension of social and cultural frontiers. Many problems necessarily enter into such a fundamental examination, which must assess

recent changes and must also view the entire field in the light of the socialist perspective.

Perhaps some may feel overwhelmed by the scope of the undertaking, and wonder how we are going to answer within a reasonable time the many problems posed in the Program Questions, some of them of great complexity. As we have already said, the preparation of a basic program is a major effort, requiring much work. But the project may not appear too formidable if we make a number of things clear.

In the first place, the Program Questions are not intended as the outline of the draft program. This would emerge further along in the preparations. They merely pose the problems that have to be considered, in one way or another, in connection with the preparation of a program. A definitive answer will not be found at this time to all the questions which are posed. On some it may have to prove sufficient to delineate the direction in which an answer will emerge; some questions now raised may not even figure in the draft program. But all the material and viewpoints presented in the process of examining and discussing these questions will have to be taken into account in drafting a program. The program itself, which preferably should not exceed 32 to 48 printed pages and which should be written in a popular and lucid style, will incorporate the conclusions reached, and the necessary argumentation to sustain them, but without the vast amount of material produced and used in its preparation.

Secondly, it should be kept in mind that the basic purpose of the Questions is to harvest the substantial thinking and knowledge that already exist in

Communist and Left circles, and to induce further exploration and thinking along programmatic lines. It will no doubt be noted that a veritable encyclopedia of Marxist-Leninist science could be prepared on the basis of the Program Questions. If work on the Questions inspires long-range Marxist studies all the better; we are in great need of these. But in connection with the program, it is not our purpose to launch vast research projects. Research will be essential to establish the pertinent facts in certain areas of program, particularly those dealing with recent changes, and this will be organized by the Committee. *The Committee takes this occasion to invite people specially versed in certain fields themselves to offer their analysis and conclusions for our consideration. Such efforts will be heartily welcomed.*

With full recognition of the necessity and merit of specialized, scientific research, we also view research in the broader sense. This is the research carried on collectively by Communists active in the working-class and progressive movements with a view to summarizing experience, and drawing programmatic conclusions. It requires the gathering in of the facts, their analysis and assessment, especially at the local and regional levels where such experiences are more commonly had at first hand. In most places this would mean that practically all programmatic questions would have to be studied in connection with those areas of program dealing with the labor movement, the Negro freedom struggle, and political action. But it would be insufficient merely to gather together and assess the raw material of experience on a local or regional basis. It will also be

necessary, where such Program projects are set up by the Party in the various states and localities, to relate the sectional experiences to nation-wide problems and trends and to study them in the light of basic principles and perspectives. It is this kind of research, carried on by people who have shared experiences in struggle and are now seeking by mutual effort and a sincere exchange of opinion to discern the "line of march," that is most essential in the preparation of a draft program. Even at the expense of considerable overlapping and perhaps undue length, the Questions attempt to provide the necessary programmatic elements for this kind of research in all the major divisions of program.

Third, close examination of the Questions will reveal that they are not all of the same type. Some merely raise a question for discussion, others single out an area or topic for research and study. But perhaps the majority of the questions already embody a line of thinking in the way they are posed, including an answer or the direction in which the answer is to be sought. The Program Questions as a whole are therefore somewhere between the mere raising of pertinent problems and the statement of a position. The Committee has no desire to hide the fact that the document as a whole does have an intrinsic direction and line, based in the first place upon Marxist-Leninist premises, and seeking to extend these basic principles to new problems, in some cases presenting new formulations which may themselves be open to question. Clearly, the mere act of choosing the questions thought pertinent, and the way they are posed, must of necessity reflect a direction of basic

thinking and approach. Furthermore, since the central focus of the Questions is upon the struggle against monopoly in all its economic, social and political aspects, many new problems, arising from recent economic changes, have been presented.

Care was also taken to include all questions which might be considered within the controversial area, although it must also be stated that in most cases such questions were formulated in accordance with a single viewpoint, the one developed in the Initial Report. The question on the "welfare state," for example, or various propositions with respect to peaceful coexistence, clearly embody a definition and a characterization, and other examples of a similar kind can be cited. However, this does not mean that the presentation and discussion of any other viewpoint is thereby excluded. In other words, the viewpoint embodied in the way a question is posed is itself open to discussion in connection with the examination of the substance of the question.

A few members of the Draft Committee have indicated basic differences with the views expressed in some of the questions. There are also shades of differences among the members of the Committee on this or that proposition. One member views the entire approach and procedure as a mistake. However, the Program Questions as a whole reflect the prevailing approach in the Committee. In the course of the preparations and discussions, members of the Committee with divergent views or different shades of opinion will have every opportunity to present their position.

It should also be clear in this stage

of preparation that nothing presented for discussion can be considered definitive, and this applies to the Program Questions as well. As work on program proceeds, no doubt it will be found that elements not included in a question as now formulated, or indeed entirely new questions, may have to be introduced. And as conclusions and viewpoints are presented, we can expect that certain questions will be singled out as more important than others. In any case, the Committee feels, the Program Questions as now formulated offer a solid beginning for inquiry and work.

In the present undertaking, the Committee feels, it is inadvisable to set a fixed target date for the completion of the first draft of the program. We share with many others the desire to have a basic program as soon as possible. But the Committee is also guided by the thought that the determining consideration has to be the achievement of the necessary clarity, community of thinking, and common perspective which will make possible an essential unity around a precisely formulated basic program. Provisionally, it is thought that perhaps an adequate draft can be prepared within a year, but much before then it should be possible to formulate mutually agreed upon approaches to various fundamental aspects of the program, going beyond the beginning made in the Program Questions. We envision a step-by-step procedure. The Committee has set November 15, 1958, as the target date for a first round of papers by those who have undertaken program projects. At that time, we will be in a better position to ascertain the central questions upon which there is agree-

ment, the most important problems that still need to be debated, and the program tasks that should be given priority. It may be possible at that time to set more definite target dates leading toward the completion of the Draft.

As the organizations of the Communist Party set up special projects and study groups for work on program, it is expected that the Party membership will be involved broadly in the preparation of the draft program. But everyone, Communist and non-Communist, who is sincerely interested in helping chart the American road to socialism is invited to participate. They are asked to comment on the substance of any of the questions, to send in material, and to offer answers. If they wish, they may prepare papers for the consideration of the Committee, or, if they choose, they may offer their comments for publication.

The Draft Program Committee must, of course, itself assume the responsibility for the drafting of the program. It must also reserve for itself the right to supervise the publication of all material pertaining to program. A special section of *Political Affairs* will be offered each month for this purpose, and the Committee will seek to issue such special publications as may be needed on a national scale. Basic materials prepared under the auspices of the

Committee, or other materials submitted to it, will be made available for general discussion by decision of the Draft Program Committee. It is the intention to make every effort to assure the best informed and clearest presentation of divergent views, and to guarantee that the discussion proceeds in an organized way, leading to clarification and toward decision. All participants are asked to substantiate their conclusions with relevant material and cited sources, especially on matters that may be considered controversial or original in concept.

We are aware that the approach and procedures adopted by the Committee might raise the danger of a formless and aimless discussion. But we are confident that the participants themselves will guard against this danger, without sacrificing anything in the way of fresh and challenging interpretations. Far overshadowing whatever shortcomings there may be in the method which we have chosen are the benefits to be obtained from a serious canvass of the accumulated thinking and experiences of a broad segment of the American Marxist and progressive movement. We look forward to the fraternal and mutual clarification that, we are sure, will contribute to the revitalization and unity of the Communist and progressive movement.

All contributions to the program discussion should be sent to:

JAMES S. ALLEN, *Secretary*

NATIONAL PROGRAM COMMITTEE

23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y.

Program Questions

A. THE CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF OUR SOCIETY AND THE SOCIALIST GOAL

1. *The Crisis of American Society.* A crisis of general proportions: the economy is inherently unstable and proceeds through recurrent economic breakdowns, our foreign policy is catastrophic, democracy is basically threatened by reaction, cultural and moral values are undermined. By curbing the power of monopoly, labor and the democratic forces can take steps towards alleviating aspects of the crisis. But socialism offers the only fundamental solution; the road to socialism has to be charted as we fight against present dangers.

2. *Production for Profit.* (a) Why is the exploitation of labor for private profit the essence of capitalism and the root of the injustices of our time? (b) how it is the base of the class struggle in our society and leads to the historic role of the working class in the abolition of exploitation of man by man; (c) how in the monopoly stage of capitalism the drive for maximum profits accentuates the general crisis of the capitalist system, confirming the analysis and prediction of Marx and Lenin; (d) why the science of Marxism is a reliable guide to social progress and the socialist goal.

3. *Science and Society.* (a) Why the vast potential for social welfare opened up by atomic energy, automation and other scientific and technical advances cannot be developed freely and placed in the service of humanity by monopoly, and why socialism can do so constantly and permanently; (b) how the revolutionary advances in technique deepen the basic contradiction of our society: between the growing social nature of production and the appropriation of a growing share of the social surplus by ever more concentrated groups of monopolists; how this contradiction is deepened to the point of becoming a great social crisis.

4. *Monopoly and Democracy.* Why the concentration of economic power leads to (a) greater exploitation of the workers and the rise in the number of wageworkers, while restricting the economic freedom of the working farmers, professionals, and the smaller capitalists and reducing their number; (b) monopoly control of the government; and (c) restrictions on the democratic rights of the people, the undermining and subversion of the Constitutional guarantees contained in the Bill of Rights and the Civil War amendments, and the constant efforts to undo advanced social legislation; (d) how throughout our history progressive people's movements have always fought the special interests and entrenched privilege, and how this is expressed today in the fight against monopoly.

5. *Monopoly and War.* (a) The drive of monopoly for maximum profits

and its crusade against socialism and the colonial liberation movement, as the root cause of world tension and the danger of war; (b) the tendency to a prolonged war economy and militarization of the economy, and to the interlinking of monopoly and the militarists; (c) the misuse of our skills and technology for destructive purposes to perpetuate the power and privileges of monopoly at home and abroad; (d) the power for world peace of socialism and its peace policy, of the national liberation movement and the rise of the neutralist bloc, and the new possibilities for averting war.

6. *World Transition to Socialism in Our Epoch.* (a) The tempo of the transition since World War II; (b) the relative strength—economic, political, ideological—of the socialist world within present global relations; (c) how the new world relations favor the struggle for democracy, national liberation, peace and socialism; (d) how the superiority of socialism as a system of society is historically established, and the concrete aspects in which this superiority is manifest today; (e) how socialism will prove superior for the United States as well.

7. *What is Socialism?* (a) The essence of the socialist system in its initial stage, as shown by the Socialist countries, with respect to working-class rule (the dictatorship of the proletariat), public ownership of the basic means of production, social planning, democracy, abolition of national oppression and race bias, and the struggle for permanent peace; (b) how should we define our socialist goal, in view of our concrete conditions and of world experience and in terms of scientific Marxism as distinguished from other concepts? (c) How define the relationship between what is similar and what is different in the road to socialism for various countries, the relation between the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism and the concrete characteristics of each country, between a multiplicity of form and a common content? (d) What is the full promise of socialism in its higher stage, communism, with respect to universal well-being, the attainment of permanent peace, culture and the human personality, the withering away of the state, as well as other potentials?

8. *Our Road to Socialism.* (a) A socialist America as the outcome of the inner conflicts of our society; the effects of the competition between the two world systems, as these develop and interact, on the struggle for socialism; (b) the distinction between the long-range perspective and the shorter range program; (c) the role of a people's government of anti-monopoly coalition, led by labor, in the period prior to the basic shift to working-class power and the beginning of the transition to socialism; (d) the necessary emphasis in the basic program upon the problems and tasks associated with developing working-class understanding of its role as the leading force at all stages along the road to socialism, beginning with the struggle of the present against the dangers of mass unemployment, of reaction and of war to which is opposed the program of economic security, defense and extension of democratic, labor and Negro rights, basic social reforms, and peace; (e) the concept of strategic anti-monopoly alliance, built up in the course of struggle for common demands, between the working class, as the leading force, and the Negro people, the farmers, the professionals, and other middle strata.

9. *The Vanguard Party.* (a) The role of the advanced party of the working class, basing itself on Marxism, and representing the immediate as well as the long-range interests of the workers and the people; (b) the historical antecedents of the Communist Party, from the Utopians and the pioneer Marxists in this country to the Socialist Party of Debs; (c) the need for the Communist Party today, carrying forward the century-old American revolutionary and Socialist traditions under present-day conditions in everyday struggle and in pioneering the road ahead.

B. THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

1. *Peaceful Coexistence between the Two World Systems.* (a) How the possibility of peaceful coexistence derives from the new relations of world forces; is the very horror of thermo-nuclear weapons a final deterrent to war, or does peaceful co-existence have to be realized by the American people in the constant fight against the expansionist policies of monopoly and for a national policy of peace? (b) Is the growing all-round competition of socialism a "threat" to the American people, as charged by the cold-war propagandists, or does it increasingly present the American people with new opportunities to reverse the direction of our national policy towards one of world co-operation for peace? (c) Does peaceful competition by itself alter the nature of capitalist society? Can it force certain tactical and policy changes; if so, in what way? (d) Is relative stabilization of capitalism necessarily a corollary of a protracted period of peaceful, competitive coexistence? What are the principal factors that should be considered in relation to this problem? (e) How does peaceful competition between the two systems benefit labor, the Negro people, the working farmers, and the colonial liberation movement?

2. *World Expansion of U.S. Monopoly.* (a) Emergence of U.S. as the prime imperialist power as a result of World War II, and its consequences; (b) the main characteristics of postwar expansionism, by areas, with respect to economic penetration and to military aid and bases; (c) the main lines of U.S. foreign policy—from the Truman Doctrine to the Eisenhower Doctrine—as a reflection of the objectives of monopoly. (d) What are the basic contradictions of U.S. foreign policy, at home and on a world scale?

3. *U.S. and the Colonial Freedom Movements.* (a) The sweep of colonial liberation struggles in Asia and Africa since World War I, the trends in Latin America towards a Bandung position, the collapsing colonial structure, the consequent weakening of the world position of the colonial powers and strengthening of the world peace forces; (b) how the double-edged U.S. imperialist policy of support to the colonial powers coupled with encouragement of the feudalist or other elements in the colonial nationalist circles seeks to further the aims of U.S. monopoly at the expense of rival powers and of the peoples concerned; (c) how this policy contradicts the anti-colonial traditions of our coun-

try and also leads to the isolation of the American people from the vast majority of mankind, especially in view of the new world relationship of forces. (d) Is it possible for labor and its allies to impose a policy in the direction

of aid to the industrialization of the under-developed countries and non-intervention in their internal affairs, instead of the present policy which serves the profit and strategic aims of monopoly? (e) Does Lenin's concept of the "buying off" of a sector of the working class by imperialism, serving as the source of opportunism in the labor movement, hold for the U.S. also? If so, how does this manifest itself with respect to the specific world role of the U.S. and the concrete policies of the labor movement? With respect to the Negro people and the farmers? (f) How does monopoly use the super-exploitation of labor abroad to undercut the wages and standards of American workers?

4. *The Conflict over Foreign Policy.* (a) Are there differences between the two major parties? What differences exist within them, and how important are they? How estimate the variations on foreign policy within the ruling class, what is the source of such variations and what is their significance? (b) Is a different line of policy possible within the present world framework, as an outcome of both internal popular pressures and the operation of world anti-imperialist forces? (c) How assess the dominant policy and the various currents in the trade unions on foreign policy, and how are these related to the pressing problems of labor? (d) What are the elements of a positive peace policy in the existing policies of the labor movement, the NAACP, the farm and other people's organizations?

5. *For a Policy of Peace.* (a) What are the basic elements of a policy of peace for the period of coexistence, with respect to the implementation of the Bandung principles, abolition of nuclear weapons and disarmament, disengagement and dismantling of the war blocs, trade with the Socialist world and with all countries without discrimination, aid to the under-developed countries, and co-operation to maintain world peace? (b) The requirements of labor and popular action to curb monopoly control over foreign policy and to make the popular will for peace felt; steps to overcome secret diplomacy, to make foreign policy decisions the concern of both Houses of Congress instead of the Senate only, to change the composition of the foreign service now largely confined to the rich, to transform the present practice of foreign policy as the handmaiden of big business into a foreign policy that serves the people and peace.

6. *Internationalism and Patriotism.* (a) American working-class and anti-imperialist traditions of solidarity with the struggles of other peoples for national and social emancipation; (b) definition of the relation of working-class internationalism to love of one's own country and to the national interests. (c) Is defense of the gains of socialism anywhere in the world unpatriotic or an offense against the national interest? (d) How state the Marxist attitude, under present world conditions, towards the difficulties and mistakes of those countries already on the Socialist road?

C. TO END WANT, FOR A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING

1. *Distribution of Income.* (a) Is it true that an "income revolution" is reducing the wide gaps and inequalities and that capitalism in its latest phase is proceeding toward equalitarian economic standards? (b) Has labor's share

(wages) of the national income increased or decreased in the period after World War II; since 1900? What is the trend with respect to capital's share (profits)? (c) To what extent, if any, has the fight for the shorter work week, compensation for increased productivity, higher wage rates and fringe benefits increased the share of wages at the expense of profits? (d) Has the national income of independent producers, professionals and small and medium enterprise increased or decreased since 1900? How about the share of the monopoly enterprises? (e) What are the factors affecting the present trend, the probable course? (f) What is the nature of the income revolution under socialism?

2. *Can Capitalism Assure Full Employment?* (a) The course of the economic cycle since World War II, the concrete factors affecting it, and the specific characteristics of the present economic crisis, in the light of the Marxist theory of crisis. (b) Can arms production as well as the so-called built-in stabilizers and other Keynesian devices avert economic crisis? In what way do they affect the course of the cycle? (c) In what direction is the course of the cycle affected by the growth of monopoly and monopoly-controlled government "regulation" of the economy? (d) Can the labor movement affect the course of the cycle? In what sense and in what manner can it protect the wage-workers from the burdens of the crisis? (e) Why socialism has proved to be the only guarantee of permanent full employment.

3. *The American Standard of Living.* Its trend and its disparities for different sectors of the workers over recent decades, analyzed against the background of the role of "impoverishment" in Marxist theory. Among the questions to be examined: (a) Does Marxism consider impoverishment an unrelenting law of capitalism; theoretically, does Marxism allow for contrary and offsetting tendencies or forces, and to what extent? (b) What are the concrete factors in recent U.S. development that affect the rise or fall of the standard of living, taken in its broadest sense, such as special domestic and world factors influencing the course of the economy, Southern and colonial superprofits, wars and imperialist expansion, immigration, labor's own strength and program? (c) How may recent changes in the American economy (like automation, the polarization of classes, the extreme peak of monopoly), and in the world economy (such as the limitation of the world capitalist market by the growth of socialism and of colonial independence), affect the standard of living? (d) How does socialist society determine the standard of living and what are its potentials in a Socialist America?

4. *The Special Problem of the South.* (a) How assess recent economic changes affecting the plantation and the sharecropping system, the urbanization of the Negro land worker, the nature and extent of industrialization, the role of monopoly in the region and in relation to the Southern middle capitalists? (b) To what extent has the composition of the working class in the South changed, with respect to Negro and white and with respect to various categories of industry? (c) In what concrete aspects does the South remain an underdeveloped, poverty-stricken, super-exploited region, requiring a special program of basic social reform to overcome the lag and to reach the level of national development? (d) How has the attitude of whites (especially women and youth) toward the

Negro changed in recent years? What has been the impact of recent developments and of the leadership of the Left in theory and in life, upon racism? The role of the churches?

5. *Chronically Distressed Areas and Industries.* (a) Why have textiles, mining, and other industries been "ill" for a long time, and why do new symptoms of illness constantly arise? (b) How this affects the workers of entire areas; how the problem is aggravated by "runaway" plants. (c) What government action should be taken, and how can labor influence it? (d) How does socialism overcome underdevelopment of regions and industries?

6. *Productivity and Social Welfare.* (a) How reconcile the recent significant advance of technical innovation with the inherent tendency of monopoly to obstruct such growth and toward stagnation? (b) Why a lesser rate of growth of productivity as compared with the socialist countries; (c) the short and long-term effects of automation on employment, methods of wage-payment, multiple shifts, composition of the working class; (d) how the social product resulting from increased productivity is distributed as between profits and wages. (e) In what sense and manner can the trade unions influence the utilization of automation in the interests of labor? (f) What is the role of automation and other technical innovations under socialism?

7. *The Burden of Taxes.* (a) Is it true that our present system of taxes is having the effect of equalizing income, or is the burden placed primarily on those least able to pay? How is the load distributed as between the wealthy, the medium, and the low income groups? Between big, medium, and small business? (b) How taxes are being used—the budget, Federal, State, and local. (c) What tax reform is needed to shift the burden to the rich and Big Business? (d) Can the government tax power be used to compel monopoly to lower prices, and follow certain investment and production policies in the direction of the national interest? Under what pressures and circumstances?

8. *Old-Age Security.* What further reforms are needed to provide a decent and healthy standard of living for the older people and retired workers?

9. *Health.* (a) What is needed to assure proper medical and dental care for the great majority of the population now unable to pay for it; how far do we fall short of decent standards? (b) What are the requirements of a national health insurance plan, of the training of health personnel, of medical research, provisions for mental health, for child care?

10. *Housing.* (a) What are present estimated needs for an adequate housing program that will meet decent health standards, urban and farm? (b) What reforms are needed to provide the lower income groups with the major types of housing—owner family homes, rental properties, multiple housing projects? (c) what provisions should be made against segregation and any form of discrimination? (d) How should such a program be operated and financed? (e) How can small homeowners be protected against foreclosures? (f) Is capitalism able basically to solve the housing question?

11. *City and Suburban Planning.* (a) In view of recent technological changes and their potential, what is possible and desirable in the relocation of industry to overcome city overcrowding, to provide employment to displaced farmers in

rural areas, to raise the standard of living in distressed areas? (b) What is required to provide proper highways, adequate utilities, fuller entertainment and cultural facilities, and proper provisions for housing in the cities and in the suburbs, residential and industrial? (c) How could such a program be operated and financed?

12. *The Young Generation.* (a) What special steps are required to meet the problems of the youth labor force with respect to employment, job training, wages, and conditions, and provisions for education? (b) What are the particular problems of the Negro, Puerto Rican, and other people of the minorities, and how should they be met? (c) What is required for all-inclusive amateur participation in organized sports? (d) The nature and extent of juvenile delinquency, its root causes, and the steps required to meet the problem.

13. *Women.* (a) The special problems of the working mothers—the double job, the wage differential, un-unionized occupations—and the additional burdens of the Negro working women. (b) What government and union programs are needed? (c) Relationship between class exploitation of women and other social aspects, such as the degradation of women, glamorization of sex, breakdown of moral values.

D. FOR BROAD CULTURAL ADVANCE

1. *Education.* (a) In what does the present crisis in education consist? What is the underlying philosophy of our present system of education? (b) What are the obstacles in our wealthy country to the supply of adequate school-room space and equipment, properly trained and paid teachers, and provisions for a high standard of universal education in the lower and middle schools? (c) What is needed by way of a special program to raise the level of free and universal education in the South? (d) What needs to be done to offer the opportunity for higher education to those unable to pay? (e) What reforms are needed in the present educational system to meet the cultural needs of the people? (f) The aim of socialism to develop to the full the capacities of the individual through universal education from the lowest to highest level, and why socialism offers such an opportunity to everyone, as a necessity of its existence and development.

2. *Mass Communications.* (a) Control of TV, radio, movies, newspapers and periodicals as a function of monopoly, for its own profits as well as for the direction of public opinion and ideology; (b) the disastrous effects upon the standards of culture and artistic appreciation, upon public morality and upon the thinking and interests of youth; (c) the function of advertising as a medium of control of the organs of public opinion and mass culture; why it is necessary to monopoly for the promotion of mass products, often needless to the individual, but indispensable for the realization of monopoly profits. (d) In what sense and by what means is it possible to make inroads into the monopoly of mass communications, and to establish democratic controls over them? (e) In what way would socialism in this country alter this situation?

3. *The Arts.* (a) Why the general atmosphere of anti-intellectualism and lack of public sustenance to the creative arts—in all branches of writing, the

drama, music, the dance, the plastic arts? (b) What government assistance might do, as indicated by the New Deal projects; did they stifle the arts or lead to an upsurge of the arts and of public appreciation? (c) What public program is needed to provide art training, aid to the gifted, and general public education in the values of the arts? (d) The problem of art and society under capitalism and under socialism.

4. *The Sciences.* (a) The inherent tendency of monopoly to retard and misdirect basic research and to utilize its application in technology for maximum profit instead of the public welfare; (b) the retarding effects of militarization, extreme compartmentalization due to military secrecy, and of McCarthyite limitations, upon basic research and its utilization. (c) In what respect can the trade unions affect the policies of the monopolies in research and technological applications? (d) What kind of Federal program is needed to advance basic and technological research, and assure peaceful utilization of the results? (e) What should be the responsibility of the scientist and scientific worker with respect to military uses of great discoveries, like atomic energy?

5. *The Cultural Heritage.* (a) Basic struggle for democracy in our cultural heritage, as expressed by our greatest writers, by our folk music, by the Negro contribution; (b) the role of the intellectual in our present-day society, how it is distorted by monopoly; (c) the intellectual and the working class, what is essential to bring about his identification with the aspirations of the people, and the contribution the intellectual should be induced to make to the development of Marxist ideology. (d) How the democratic heritage arose in the struggle against the deep-rooted reactionary traditions.

E. FOR DEFENSE AND EXTENSION OF DEMOCRACY

1. *Does the Monopoly Stage of Capitalism Extend or Restrict Democracy?* An examination of the basic trend since World War II with respect to: (a) monopoly control of government; (b) militarization of the state; (c) greater concentration of power in the Executive (including the administrative agencies, like AEC, CIA, FBI, National Security Council, etc.) at the expense of Congress and the Judiciary; (d) how the economic policies of government on the interests of monopoly have restricted the economic freedoms; (e) state regimentation of ideas in general, including the anti-labor and anti-Communist laws, regulations, investigations—at the Federal, State and local level. (f) Is there a danger of fascism in the U.S., and if so, how does it manifest itself?

2. *The Monopoly State and the Democratic Heritage.* (a) How the monopoly state runs counter to and undermines the basic democratic gains won by the American people since the birth of the nation and throughout its history. (b) What is positive and permanent, from the point of view of the deepening and extension of democracy and human liberty, in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the separation of powers into three branches of government, the Federal structure, the separation of church and state, the Civil War Amendments? (c) What structural reforms of government should be advocated, within

the general Constitutional framework, that will strengthen and enhance those institutions most responsive to the popular will?

3. *Social Classes and Democracy.* How the class leadership of the battle for democracy has changed in the course of American history, with the change in its content and aims: (a) the era of the Revolution—Jefferson; (b) the era of Civil War and Reconstruction—Lincoln and Douglass; (c) the rise of the trusts—the Populists and the trust busters; (d) the era of imperialism and the monopoly state—the emergence of organized labor nationally and of the Socialist and Communist movements. (e) Who carries the banner of democracy today?

4. *Historical Characteristics.* Aspects of our history that have left a deep imprint on the people's concept of and struggle for democracy; (a) the revolutionary heritage of the War of Independence, and the role of the American Republic as a beacon of world democracy over a long historic period; (b) the revolutionary abolition of slavery by the Civil War, the central role of the struggle for Negro freedom in the battle for democracy, and the necessity to complete the democratic revolution in the South, left unfinished by Reconstruction; (c) the popular struggles for the Bill of Rights, free land, public education, women's rights, the right of collective bargaining, labor and social legislation, the rights of racial, national, religious and political minorities; (d) the relative absence of feudalism or its embedded remnants, outside of the plantation South, and the expansion of a "pure" capitalism over a vast continent; (e) the significance of the frontier and of the prolonged existence of free land to American history; populists' struggle against monopoly and for political reform, like the initiative, referendum, recall and anti-trust laws; (g) the popular opposition over a long period to imperialist ventures, colonialism and foreign wars; (h) the impact of immigration and diverse nationalities and cultures; (i) the deep imprint of the war against fascism and of the democratic upsurge of the period; (j) the negative influence of deeply reactionary features—like racism and bigotry.

5. *The Government Bureaucracy.* (a) Its class composition—executive, legislative, judicial—Federal, State, and Municipal; (b) the Committee and Seniority system in Congress and the State legislatures, and how it generally serves entrenched interests; the special role of the Dixiecrats; (c) the growth of the military bureaucracy and of its role in government and in civilian life; (d) the present-day roots of corruption in government; (e) What structural reforms, backed by labor and popular political action, are required to obtain more democratic government?

6. *Socialism and Democracy.* (a) How the defense of democracy against reaction, and the leading role of labor in this struggle, is in the direction of deepening and broadening democracy for the people, and serves to build up the anti-monopoly alliance; (b) the basic limitations of bourgeois democracy established by the capitalist system of exploitation; the contradiction between the promise and the deed—"life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," for example; (c) socialism as the outcome of the struggle for democracy in all spheres, and why socialism will deepen and develop further the positive and permanent gains of democracy in the U.S., and by extending it into the economic sphere, with the elimination of class exploitation, provide the base for

the broadest, all-round development of democracy for the working people and for the nation.

7. *The Battle for Democracy and Social Change.* (a) The inherent resistance of ruling classes whose power is based on property rights and exploitation of the majority to necessary social change, as shown by history; (b) the two instances in our history when the American people, in the interests of democracy and social progress, deprived part of the ruling class of their property rights—expropriation of the American Tories during the Revolution and the Emancipation of the slaves; (c) instances of important social reforms which impinge on property rights without altering their base (like unemployment insurance, shorter work day), the mass struggle necessary to attain and defend them; (d) instances of juridical or legislative gains won in the struggle against entrenched Jim Crowism (like FEPC and school desegregation) and the necessity of continuing struggle for their implementation; (e) the role of such struggles in building the anti-monopoly alliance around the working class, and in keeping open and broadening the channels provided by our Constitutional democracy for social change up to and including the basic change in state power required for the transition to socialism. (f) In what sense may it be possible to begin the socialist transition by "coercion without violence"?

F. THE LABOR MOVEMENT

E 1. *Recent Changes in the Composition of the Working Class.* (a) Changes in the distribution of workers as between industrial (factory production workers), mining, transport and the various service industries; as between skilled and unskilled; as between production and "white collar" occupations. (b) What significance is to be attached to the growth of the number of workers in the service and auxiliary occupations as compared with the number in production? (c) Can the growth of the "white collar" sector be considered as evidence of a "new middle class," and how does this relate to the Marxist analysis of the polarization of classes? (d) Changes in composition with respect to Negro and nationality groupings. (e) In what respect do all the changes referred to above affect the unity and homogeneity of the working class, its capacity to fight monopoly, its capacity to forge alliances?

2. *Historical Factors Affecting Level of Class Consciousness.* (a) The "fluidity of classes" to the extent that it existed, arising from the expanse of available land and resources, the opportunities for free enterprise, the role of succeeding waves of immigration in the formation of the working class (while the Negro was virtually excluded from industry until World War I); (b) the role of a high level of bourgeois democracy, established long before the labor movement became a national factor; (c) the relatively high wage level for large sectors (with wide disparities) arising from the conditions peculiar to the development of American capitalism, and contributing to the traditional militant "economism" and "simple trade unionism" of the workers; (d) since the turn of the century, the favored position of U.S. imperialism, late on the scene, but with newer and advanced technology, remote from the areas of war, without

a large colonial empire but strongly expansionist economically; (e) resulting from the above, a broad base for opportunism within the labor movement and for a strongly entrenched form of class collaboration, feeding on the "New World" and "American Dream" ideology, and rooted over a long period in craft unionism at the expense of vast masses of unorganized and unskilled; (f) the wearing away during the Great Crisis of the 1930's of the dream of prosperity, its partial return as a result of World War II and the postwar boom. Do new domestic and world factors which tend to restrict the power of monopoly, render it more difficult to "buy off" labor sectors in the former fashion?

F 3. *The Traditional Role of the Socialist and Communist Left.* (a) As the initiator of advanced immediate objectives, as anti-slavery, the shorter work week, social insurance; (b) as the spur to trade union progress—organization of the unorganized, industrial unionism, trade union democracy, independent labor political action; (c) as educator in class consciousness—awareness of broader social issues like Negro rights and the struggle for peace, understanding of the class role of the workers and the socialist aim. (d) How is this role expressed under present conditions, and in relation to the historic tasks which lie ahead?

4. *Extent and Nature of Unions.* (a) Examination of unionization with respect to location in the economy of the 30 per cent of the labor force that is organized. (b) What are the most important sectors still to be organized? (c) The extent of industrial unionism, of the old-type craft unionism, changes in the latter; what is the direction of development in this respect? (d) What needs to be done to extend trade union democracy, involve membership, overcome "business unionism," bureaucracy and racketeering? (e) How can labor unity be deepened and extended, on what issues and on what basis?

E 5. *Trends in Labor.* (a) What differentiation can be made in the ranks of organized labor and in labor's officialdom with respect to basic trends—Right, Center and Left? Along what lines and on what issues is this proceeding? (b) In what respect is differentiation affected by craft vs. industrial, low-paid vs. higher paid sectors of the workers, attitude to the problems of Negro workers, long-organized vs. more recently organized, etc.? (c) Is there presently a basic influence on differentiation between some of the former CIO and former AFL unions? (d) What differentiation exists with respect to political action, the fight for peace, organization of the South, etc.? (e) How are the following trends expressed in the labor movement: Right or Left Socialist, Communist, Anarcho-syndicalist, Catholic?

F 6. *A Labor Economic Program.* (a) In what direction should the existing economic and legislative programs of the unions be developed, with a view to defending gains already won, and extending them? (b) A critical examination of guaranteed annual wage and similar proposals; what should be the line of labor in the fight for guarantees of employment from industry and from government? (c) What is the role of the struggle for the shorter work-week, and what would be its economic, political and social consequences? (d) What demands should be raised by labor to assure its voice in controlling use of automated and other labor-saving innovations? (e) In what way and on what issues should labor seek to have a voice in determining the use of the accumulated capital resources of industry? (f) Along what lines should labor seek to influence policy of management with respect to production, investment, prices? (g) What

is the relationship of the economic program to political action and to the emergence of labor as a consciously independent class force in the political arena?

G. THE NEGRO FREEDOM MOVEMENT

1. *Recent Changes in Class Structure and Economic Status.* (a) The effects of urbanization on the size and character of the Negro working class, its position in industry, its relation to the working class as a whole, and to trade unionism; (b) the status of the Negro worker—the wage differential, seniority rights and other discrimination in employment; (c) the effects of urbanization on the extent and character of the Negro middle class; what is the nature of the present limitations upon its various strata? (d) To what extent has the gap between various sectors of the Negro people and corresponding sectors of the white population been narrowed? Are there new differentiations as a result of recent changes? (e) To what extent has the role of the plantation-sharecropping system in the Southern economy been altered? (f) The effects of recent changes upon the concentration of the Negro population in the Black Belt and the location of Negro population in the rest of the country. (g) Does industrialization eliminate Jim Crow?

2. *The Role of Negro Rights Struggle.* (a) The movement for Negro rights as a central aspect of the defense of democracy and its extension, throughout our history and in the present; (b) the inter-relationship between the world struggle against colonialism and the Negro freedom fight at home; (c) the relation between the Negro's struggle for full rights—economic, social, and political—and basic social reform in the South; (d) the specific aspects in which the suppression of Negro rights, particularly in the South, is related to political reaction in the country as a whole.

3. *The Movement for Negro Rights.* (a) The main characteristics of the movement since World War II, with respect to how it reflects recent economic-social changes, its methods of struggle, and its program. (b) To what extent and how is class differentiation among the Negro people reflected in different or conflicting tendencies within the leadership? Along what lines, and on what issues, is differentiation taking place in policy, in methods, in perspectives? (c) What are some of the lessons from the boycott movement, school desegregation fight, the struggle for the right to vote? (d) What are the next steps? What issues should be emphasized? (e) What is the role of the working class within the all-class (national type) movement, as it is developing?

4. *Strategic Alliance.* (a) What is the significance of the leap forward of the Negro freedom movement, in relation to the present level of the labor movement and to the development of the anti-monopoly alliance? (b) What are the causes of the lagging behind of the labor movement with respect to the Negro freedom fight? (c) What are the obstacles in the labor movement to the overcoming of race bias in its ranks, to the recognition of the full equality of the Negro in the unions, to recognition of labor's responsibilities in the struggle for Negro rights, to organization in the South? (d) Is there a danger that the lag of the labor movement will increase the elements of separatism between it and the Negro freedom movement? (e) Is it correct to view Negro-white

working-class unity as the kernel of the alliance between the labor and Negro freedom movement? (f) Is it correct to view the alliance between the working class, the Negro people and the working farmers as the most important prerequisite for the development of the anti-monopoly alliance as a whole? (g) What are the self-interests of white labor and white common folk that can be advanced by Negro-white unity?

5. *Perspective for Negro Freedom.* (a) Can the nature of the Negro question in the U.S. be defined within the context of the nationality question, and, if so, what are its specific characteristics? (b) How assess the relative strength of separatist and integrationist tendencies, the trends and probable direction? (c) In view of recent changes, how is the basic task of uprooting the plantation-sharecropping system related to Negro freedom? To the democratic transformation of the South? (d) Do the Negro majority areas, the Black Belts, offer a long-term basis for the realization of some form of self-determination, or does the long-term historic tendency move in the opposite direction? (e) How would this situation be affected by extensive gains in the right to vote and by Negro representation at all levels of government? (f) In what sense and by what means can the objectives of Negro freedom be realized within the present social system? (g) What would socialism offer?

H. THE STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING FARMERS

1. *Recent Economic Changes in Agriculture.* (a) How estimate the trend toward capitalist concentration in agriculture and its relationship to concentration in the economy as a whole? (b) How does the present crisis in agriculture compare with previous crises? (c) What is the class stratification in U.S. agriculture today? How are these various strata being affected by the cost-price squeeze, technological changes, agricultural concentration, the growth of monopoly in the food and other industries, industrialization of the South, the state of the general economy, and federal farm programs? (d) What have been the effects of recent changes upon the size, composition, and economic status of the farm wage-workers, the migratory labor force, and the part-time farmer also employed in industry? (e) Is the farm surplus problem as serious as the Administration says? Can it be solved by the proposals offered by Big Business and the Administration to reduce the number of small farmers? (f) What has been the effect of the displacement of five million people from the farms since 1950 upon the farm and non-farm segments of the population? What is happening to the rural-farm youth? (g) In view of the present trends, how fast are we moving to overtake Britain as a nation almost exclusively of wage-workers?

2. *How are the Farm Workers, Sharecroppers, and Working Farmers Responding to these Changes, Organizationally and Programatically?* (a) To what extent are the proletariat and semi-proletarian elements in the countryside organized? How is the labor movement reacting to the call for organization of agricultural workers, such as the recent call by the NAACP, Catholic Rural Life, National Farmers Union, and other groups? (b) What are the class composition, programs and political activities of the major farm organizations in the

rural areas? What steps, if any, have the farm groups taken to overcome regional, crop, and organizational differences to achieve greater unity? To what extent have non-farm groups aided these activities? (c) What are the major struggles in the rural areas of the South, and how are Negro and white groups addressing themselves to these struggles? (d) Which strata of farmers are most important in the farm-co-operative and what has been the role of the farm co-ops in recent times? (e) What can be done to win existing farm and rural organizations to an anti-monopoly coalition? What is the attitude of these groups toward organized labor, the struggles of the Negro people, and the peace movement?

3. *Role of Rural and Farm People in Politics.* (a) Has the farm revolt been quelled, or does the traditional anti-trust position of the farmers still play an important role in national politics, and, if so, in what form? (b) What is the difference, if any, between the rural-farm programs offered by the Republican and Democratic parties? Is it true that the proletarian and semi-proletarian groups in the rural areas are more inclined to support the Democratic Party than the Republican Party? Are there major variations of a regional, racial, or class nature? (c) Are rural farm groups advancing their own independent candidates, within or outside the two-party system? To what extent are rural-farm groups ready and willing to participate in electoral coalition with Labor and the Negro people—on what terms, with whom, and in what regions? (d) What is the situation with respect to Farm-Labor united action in the chief industrial States where labor is strong and where there are also large numbers of farm laborers and poor and marginal farmers?

4. *The Communist Party and the Rural-Farm Population.* Does the rapid decline in the rural-farm population justify past or present attitudes of neglecting rural problems? Which strata of the farm population should the Party chiefly concern itself with? Should it concentrate on the rural poor? How can this be done, while at the same time defending the interests of the middle or family-type farmers? Is it correct to take the position that since socialism envisages large-scale agriculture, nothing can or should be done about the elimination of small and middle farmers?

5. *How Should Socialist Aims be Defined with Respect to American Agriculture?* (a) What should be the role of the farm co-operative under socialism? (b) What should be the aim with respect to factory and large highly-capitalized farms, plantations based on share-cropping and tenancy, the family-sized owner-operated farm, the marginal farms? Would all landholdings, large and small, necessarily be collectivized? (c) Could farmers be assured an unlimited market at fair prices for all they can produce, with adequate government production credit and supply of machinery? (d) How would the exploitation of farm workers and the super-exploitation of Negro sharecroppers be halted? (e) In what way can rural-farm people, young and old, be assured a better life under socialism?

I. THE ROLE OF THE URBAN MIDDLE STRATA

1. *Definition of the Problem.* (a) The difference between the evolution of the middle class in the historic sense, and the present-day middle strata as sec-

tors of the bourgeoisie under monopoly conditions; (b) the relationship of the middle strata to the process of stratification into two classes—the workers and the capitalists; (c) the determination of the categories of middle strata—self-employed professionals, small and medium merchants and capitalists, non-monopoly enterprise, high salaried scientific and managerial personnel.

2. *The Fate of the Middle Strata.* (a) Has the area of free competition expanded or contracted in the monopoly era? (b) How extensive are the middle strata in present-day American society, what is their relative role in our economy, and what are the present trends? (c) Is it in the interests of labor and is it consistent with Socialist objectives to defend the interests of the middle strata against monopoly? (d) Is it in the interest of socialism to defend the interests of the middle strata at all stages on the road to socialism, and to assure them a gradual and painless transformation under socialism?

3. *Their Struggle against Monopoly.* (a) The special situation and role of the Negro middle class and middle strata within the context of the Negro freedom movement and in relation to the problems among corresponding sectors of the white population; (b) existing government and other programs for the defense of small business; in what sense and in what way is it possible to defend their position against monopoly? The commercialization of the professions under monopoly, and the possible role of professional people under government social welfare programs; (d) how the middle strata carry forward the ideology of “equal opportunity” and “free competition” in an era of monopoly; is it possible to return to the pre-monopoly era of free competition or must we move toward socialism? (e) The important political role of the middle strata in our history, and how their political role is affected by recent changes.

J. THE FIGHT AGAINST MONOPOLY

1. *Main Aspects of the Monopoly Structure.* (a) Does Lenin’s characterization of imperialism as the “highest stage of capitalism” apply to the United States today? Is monopoly a superstructure on capitalism, or is it present-day capitalism? (b) What is the role of competition under monopoly capitalism, in what sense does “free” competition of the old-style persist, and what new forms of competition have arisen? (c) What is the relative weight of monopoly in the main branches of the U.S. economy, what has been the tempo of monopoly development during and since World War II, as compared with previous periods? How does the contradiction between the monopoly and non-monopoly sectors express itself? (d) What significant variations are to be found in the structure of U.S. monopoly, as compared with other countries, and what specific historic conditions gave rise to them? (e) What are the specific forms of state monopoly capitalism in the U.S., and how does the development here vary as compared with other highly developed capitalist countries? (f) What are the specific forms in which U.S. State monopoly capitalism operates on the world market and in world economic relations in general? (g) The monopoly stage of capitalism as

the objective, material preparation for socialism, and how in the U.S. it is laying an advance material base for socialism.

2. *The “Welfare State.”* (a) Can it be defined basically as a monopoly state, under conditions of the general crisis of capitalism and the growth of the labor and people’s movements, as shown by its major development during the New Deal period and its functioning during the post-war era? Wherein does the Marxist estimate differ from the many variations of the reformist view? (b) What is the level of the “Welfare State” in the U.S. as compared with the countries of Western Europe? (c) Is it correct to view social welfare measures and reform as products of mass struggles but taking the form of “concessions” forced upon monopoly, and utilized by it to safeguard the system? (d) Can “regulated capitalism” associated with social welfare measures eliminate the root cause of economic crises? (e) What is the Communist position with respect to “Welfare State” ideas current in the labor movement?

3. *The Problem of Curbing Monopoly.* (a) Why have existing anti-trust legislation and the operation of the government regulatory agencies failed to prevent the growth of monopoly or curb its economic and political power? (b) To what extent and in what manner is it possible to curb monopoly power as a result of labor and popular action? (c) Is it possible to establish a degree of democratic control through government agencies over the operation of monopoly, and by what process?

4. *Prices.* (a) The increased importance of monopoly price fixing in the economy, and its role in the wholesale robbery of the people. (b) What light does the regulation of prices under OPA throw on the problem of curbing monopoly price fixing? (c) In what way should labor, through collective bargaining, seek to control prices downward? (d) What kind of government control over prices should be advocated by the labor and anti-monopoly forces? (e) To what extent is it possible to establish democratic controls over monopoly price policies?

5. *Consumer Credit and Installment Buying.* (a) Their exceptionally important role in providing an additional provisional market for monopoly from anticipated purchasing power, and the serious consequences upon economic crises. (b) Should labor develop programs for the defense of consumers from foreclosures and repossession of installment goods, in connection with collective bargaining as well as by government action?

6. *Regulation of Utilities.* (a) How the government agencies have taken over the high-price policy of monopoly in all branches of public transport and home utility services; how can a low-price policy be imposed? (b) Can a degree of democratic controls be established by the unions and the community organizations over existing agencies? (c) Should regulation be extended over other areas of the economy involving public service, like all forms of fuel, non-interstate transportation, water resources, and others?

7. *Government Financial and Credit Policies.* (a) To what extent and how do existing Keynesian measures affect interest rates, inflationary movements, rate of investment and other factors of the economic cycle? (b) What is the role of the national debt? (c) How can the government power be used to prevent

small business bankruptcy, extend production credit to non-monopoly sectors for regional and local development, encourage the fuller utilization of economic and human resources?

8. *Conservation of National Resources and Property.* (a) What measures are necessary to guard against further Federal and State give-aways of natural resources and of publicly-developed industries? (b) What program should be developed for return of such properties to public ownership, and for governmental use of national property for purposes of regional development?

9. *Extreme Centralization of Economic Power.* (a) Is it inevitable that this should continue without effective intervention by labor and the people's anti-monopoly forces in the opposite direction? (b) Is there a meaningful historic distinction between the permanent value of well-integrated production units and centralization of control in the peak monopoly interest groups? (c) Does the working class have a present and long term interest to decentralize extreme economic controls, to overcome harmful regimentation of the economy at the expense of national and regional development? (d) Does the principle of planning under socialism entail "regimentation" in this sense, or over-centralization at the expense of regional development and popular initiative? (e) In what sense may it be possible to break up or dismantle the peak monopoly interest groups by government action, under popular pressure?

10. *Nationalization.* (a) A critical evaluation of different types of nationalization under capitalism and the basic distinction between them and socialist nationalization; (b) the attitude of the American labor and progressive movements, at various times, toward public ownership. (c) Is it feasible to advocate, in connection with the fight against monopoly, initial steps of nationalization of enterprises engaged in the exploitation of natural resources and of those providing public services? (d) Should the nationalization of "sick" enterprises which affect the public interest be advocated? (e) Should measures of nationalization be favored in connection with the democratic reconstruction of the South? (f) Should all branches of the atomic energy industry, and other enterprises arising from scientific innovations, be kept or placed under public ownership? (g) How should the small investors be protected in the nationalized enterprises and what kind of democratic controls are necessary over the nationalized sectors? (h) What should be the socialist aim with respect to nationalization?

K. POLITICAL ACTION LEADING TOWARD A PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT

1. *The Existing Political System.* (a) How assess the role of the two-party system historically, efforts in the past to break out of it, and the principal characteristics of the major parties? What are the contradictions between the two-party system and existing class and social relations? (b) Are there important differences between the two parties, or the class forces supporting them, that have a bearing on independent political action and the problem of political realignment? (c) What important state and regional variations, of more than temporary significance, should be taken into account?

2. *Assessment of Present Trends Towards Independent Political Action.* (a) Line of development in the trade unions, and significant variations with respect to program, organization, labor representation, labor-Negro and labor-farmer blocs, etc.; (b) the significance of the trends toward independent political action of the Negro people outside the existing parties; (c) independent tendencies among the farmers; (d) among the intellectuals and liberal middle forces. (e) What are the actual and potential bearings of these tendencies upon the emergence of people's independent third-party movements, local, state, and national?

3. *What Kind of Third Party?* (a) Judging from present trends, and objective possibilities, is the development in the direction of a people's party, containing the elements of anti-monopoly coalition, or toward a Labor Party of the British type? Can the door be closed to the possibility of more than one new party or form emerging? (b) Should the proclaimed aim of such a party be socialism, or would it have a common program centered on economic security, Negro rights, democracy and peace? (c) What should be the role of Communists with respect to such a party and towards socialist tendencies within or outside such a movement?

4. *Electoral Reform.* (a) What laws, practices and institutions exist today that limit political democracy? (b) What kind of electoral reform is most essential at the local, state, and federal levels to assure more democratic elections? (c) Should a system of proportional representation be advocated at all levels to allow for adequate minority representation and to overcome the fear of the "split vote"? What have been the experiences with proportional representation? (d) How can we overcome the wide gap often shown in national elections between the popular vote and the vote of the Electoral College? (e) What electoral reforms are necessary to guarantee and safeguard the Negro right to vote in all parts of the country, especially in the South? (f) Should the voting age be reduced to 18? (g) What reforms are needed at the state and local levels to overcome the difficulties encountered by minority parties of getting on the ballot? (h) What have been the experiences with the referendum and the recall where they exist, and should these reforms be advocated nationally?

5. *People's Anti-Monopoly Government.* (a) What should be the perspective with respect to the class composition of such a government, to the role of labor, and to the leading participation of the Negro people, and other anti-monopoly forces? (b) Can the development of such a government be seen as a process, as going through a number of phases, in which the relation of class forces within it change in the direction of a greater role by labor? (c) Would such a government correspond to a "new stage" of capitalism or would it operate within the existing capitalist framework but in the direction of curbing the power of monopoly? (d) What would be the program of such a government, seen as the expression of the aims and objectives of the people's party of anti-monopoly coalition? (e) What are the pre-conditions for such a government to come to power? How do we see the steps toward a people's government?

6. *Historic Role of the People's Government?* (a) How define the role of such a government with respect to capitalism and with respect to socialism? The possible relationship of such a government to the basic transfer of state

power to the working class, which opens the era of transition to socialism? (b) Is the establishment of such a people's government inevitable under all conditions? (c) Can a people's government and the measures undertaken by it, although not socialist, correctly be considered as facilitating the way for the working class and its allies to advance the struggle for socialism? (d) How a people's government can be attained through the established Constitutional process, within the framework of democratic legality; what basic social and structural reforms might be necessary to assure the defense of the people's government against reaction? (e) Can such a government stand still, or must it, in defense of the popular interests, move against the powers and privileges of monopoly and thus forward to socialism? (f) What lessons can be drawn, allowing for different historic situations, from the transitional character of the U.S. government in the Civil War era and the transfer of dominant power to the industrial bourgeoisie? What lessons can be drawn from world experience in the World War II period?

L. THE TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM AND THE SOCIALIST POTENTIAL

1. *The Nature of a Socialist Government.* (a) With working-class rule as its essential characteristic, what variation in form is possible and how is it related to the traditional institutions and national characteristics? (b) Is a single-party system given, or is a multiple-party system possible? (c) What is the relation of such a government to existing state institutions, to Congress, to basic democratic gains? (d) How and under what circumstances can it be expected to use the power of coercion against unreconstructed economic royalists? (e) In what sectors and to what extent would such a government take measures of socialist nationalization? (f) What factors would affect the tempo and extent of socialist measures in the non-monopoly sectors of the economy? (g) What would be its general line of policy with respect to raising living standards, with respect to Negro rights and race bias, colonial freedom, relations with Latin America and other areas formerly dominated by U.S. monopoly, and world peace?

2. *The Form of Transition to Socialism.* (a) The principal factors, judging from world experience, that determine the form of transition, and whether it is accompanied by violence or is peaceful; (b) the role of the world relation of forces; the role of the extent of democracy and of democratic procedures; the role played by the strength of the working class and of its alliance with the anti-monopoly people's sectors; the role of the vanguard party of the working class and of socialist consciousness of the working class and of its people's allies; the role of the former ruling class. (c) What are the basic differences between the Marxist concept of peaceful transition in the present historic epoch and the reformist concepts? (d) Is peaceful transition a given characteristic of the new historic epoch, or does its realization depend upon the existing correlation of forces in a particular country and in the world at a given time?

3. *The Socialist Potential.* On the basis of the present resources and productive power of the country, what could socialism do in terms of their full utilization for the welfare of the people, education, and culture, science, eradication of poverty, and world peace and development?

M. ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

1. *As the Vanguard Party of the Working Class.* (a) How define its relation to the present and future interests of the working class: What is meant by a vanguard party? (b) How is this role expressed in all aspects of the struggles of the workers, of the Negro, Puerto Rican and other oppressed minority groups, of the farmers and of the middle strata? (c) What are the organizational principles of democratic centralism as applied to such a Party? The role of criticism in the Party?

2. *As a Party Based on Marxism-Leninism.* (a) The universal scientific principles of Marxism, the relation between theory and practice: What is meant by the creative use of Marxism, in its application and development? (b) The American Communist Party and proletarian internationalism. (c) How define revisionism and dogmatism, as aspects of opportunism, in its present setting? (d) How does the world view of dialectical materialism and historical materialism apply to the perspectives of the American Communist Party, within our particular national and cultural setting?

3. *As an American Marxist Party.* (a) The American roots, historically (see Sec. A., Q. 9) and currently, of the Communist Party: What is its relationship to the democratic, labor, and socialist traditions of the country as now being carried forward? (b) What have been the principal contributions of the Communist Party since its formation to the labor movement, the Negro freedom struggle, the fight for peace, civil liberties and other major social and economic objectives? (c) Why has the Communist Party been submitted to extreme persecution during the recent period?

4. *Relation to the Trade Unions and People's Movements.* (a) How define the relation of the C.P. to the trade unions, with respect to program and objectives? (b) What is the essential role of Communists in the unions, in the Negro freedom movement and in other people's movements in the light of current development? (c) On what basis should the fight be carried out for full legality of the Communists within the trade unions and people's organizations? (d) What is the relation of the C.P. to the general objectives of labor independent political action leading to a people's anti-monopoly party, and its role in relation to such a party? Its possible role in a people's government?

5. *Relation to Other Socialist Tendencies.* (a) An analysis and an estimate of the various socialist-type groups and tendencies in the U.S.—their class base, program, and ideology; (b) within what framework should the objective of united front action be pursued? (c) What are the potentials for the unification of socialist groups and the formation of a united party of socialism? What are the essential prerequisites for such a development?

The Coming Illinois Elections

By James West

ILLINOIS LABOR finds itself more involved in political action in 1958 than it has been in many a year. This, despite the fact that there is no state-wide focal point comparable to the gubernatorial contest in California.

At stake this year are all U. S. representatives, all state representatives, state senators from odd-numbered districts, state treasurer and state superintendent of public instruction.

Some regard the contest for state treasurer, in which Cook County sheriff Joseph Lohman is running on the Democratic ticket, as having the potential of being a state-wide focal point.

This possibility arose before the primaries when it seemed certain that Governor Stratton's hand-picked machine candidate would become the GOP nominee. This would have pitted a Democratic candidate who has much labor and liberal support and who enjoys a reputed disfavor from the Cook County machine, against an open GOP machine man.

However, Republican voters handed the Governor's man a resounding defeat in the primaries. Today, the possibility for projecting this

contest into the center rests on combining a forthright, aggressive fight for the needs of the jobless, FEPC, housing, education, with a bold attack on the machine of both parties. It is doubtful, however, that Lohman will do this.

Whatever possibility there might have been for an independent socialist candidate for state superintendent of public instruction was recognized too late, especially in view of the extremely difficult signature problem in the land of Lincoln.

The general attitude in labor and liberal circles towards this year's elections is one of strengthening the pro-labor, pro-liberal bloc in Congress and the State Legislature while preparing the groundwork for the 1960 Presidential elections.

LABOR IN THE CAMPAIGN

Under the impact of the worsening economic situation (nearly a half million Illinois jobless; an acute housing problem; a deteriorating school set-up in many areas; a growing local tax burden; an extremely serious plight among Negro workers, over 25 per cent of whom are unemployed, etc.) and the growing anti-

labor offensive of Big Business,* there is growing in labor's ranks a new awareness of the need for political action.

The evidence is unmistakable: a mass conference of unionists in Chicago demanding emergency measures to provide for the unemployed; a 1,500-strong labor delegation to Springfield demanding, and winning, a special session to extend jobless-compensation payments; a demand from state and city NAACP leaders and many prominent AFL and CIO leaders to the governor that he place FEPC on the agenda of the special session; a new impetus to labor unity, now slated for consummation this October; a Midwest conference of the Committee on Political Education (COPE) attended by over 800 delegates at which Jack Kroll declared, "There is definitely a new force in the political life of America and that force is COPE."

Most particularly is it seen in the growing conviction among trade-union activists that labor's political-action organizations must be built on precinct, ward and congressional district levels.

But this conviction comes into collision with the covert but ill-disguised opposition of a number of key officials of labor on the county and state level.

Paying lip-service to national AFL-CIO policies on building COPE,

* For one facet of this offensive, the blacklist conspiracy, see series of articles by Sam Kushner in *The Worker*, July and August.

these officials in reality share the fear of the bureaucratic machines of the two old parties that COPE is a rival political organization. In some cases these labor leaders are tied to the Democratic machine, in others to the Republican machine. In either case they seek to confine labor's political action to subordinate dependence on the machine. They dread independent political action by labor like the plague.

Little wonder then that despite the growth of the Chicago and Illinois labor movements into the largest and most powerful organizations of the area (and among the strongest in the country), Chicago lags far behind other cities in labor representation, let alone labor political action in general. Through all the years of the New Deal not a single unionist sat in the City Council and this shameful situation continues to this day.

THE COOK COUNTY MACHINES

Supported by a section of the labor bureaucracy, the Cook County Democratic machine and to a lesser extent, the GOP machine, take on the surface appearance of being all-powerful. It is an open secret that both machines collaborate in a division of spoils and offices, and have effectively kept the city and state "sowed up" between them.

The excuse offered by labor leaders for their collusion with the machines is that "you can't get any-

where unless you play ball" and this attitude has infected a section of the electorate, demoralizing and immobilizing them.

The most powerful of the political machines is the Daley Democratic machine in Cook County. With strong precinct organizations built on patronage, it has blocked nearly every effort by labor's political action organizations to gain any foothold of influence at the grassroots level inside the Democratic Party and in many instances independently, outside the two parties.

The PAC-UAW in Illinois, seeking to emulate the "Michigan Plan," whereby that union has become a decisive factor in the Democratic Party, has been able to attain the election of scores of precinct captains in many outside cities, winning a majority in the Democratic Party in some towns, and even electing unionists as Republican precinct captains. But in Cook County it has run into a stone wall, getting nowhere at all.

That is why, among the enthusiasts of COPE in the ranks of labor in Cook County, the tendency is so strong for building independent labor political organization. But this enthusiasm often turns to anger and resentment when it is frustrated by the sabotage of AFL-CIO policies by certain labor leaders wedded to the old party machines.

Thus, whichever way labor political activists seek to advance labor's policies, inside or outside the two-party set-up in Cook County, they

run up against the roadblock of the political machine. The difference between some unionists as to where the major emphasis should be placed, on work inside the Democratic Party or on building independent political organization, pale into insignificance when it becomes plain that either road is pretty effectively blocked by the machine.

Increasingly, it becomes clear that if labor in Illinois is to emerge as an independent force capable of uniting and leading an anti-monopoly coalition, it must learn how to break the monopoly control of the Cook County machines, and how to break the political allegiance of some labor leaders to those machines.

BEHIND THE MYTH OF INVINCIBLE POLITICAL MACHINES

The secret of the power of the Cook County machines is really no mystery. Out of 102 counties in Illinois, 101 elect the precinct captains at primary elections by enrolled voters. In the 102nd, the County of Cook, they are appointed by the County Committees of the old parties. It is not surprising, therefore, that Cook County committeemen are beholden to their county committees, and to the County Chairman first of all. In the case of the Democratic Party, the County Chairman is Mayor Daley of Chicago.

The Cook County machines thus present a picture of tight top control

derived from a far-reaching patronage system on which thousands are dependent and for which they become willing hands on the precinct level. In this feudal-like political set-up, certain labor officials find their nooks as receivers and dispensers of favors, being "looked after," and in turn "looking after" loyal supporters by allocation of lush jobs.

Where the old-style machines dispensed jobs directly to a section of the voters at a time when the labor movement was small and weak, this modern prototype accomodates itself to the growth of labor's power and influence by allowing some labor leaders to dish out patronage. A chief purpose of this accommodation is to *prevent* labor from emerging as an independent political force as much as it is to secure labor support for the Democratic Party itself.

The use of labor by the Daley machine extends to the appointment of a number of unionists as precinct committeemen and to other posts in the Democratic Party. Once appointed, however, they practically cease to function as trade unionists and become, in effect, Party wheel-horses.

This is as much a fault of the policies of labor leadership as it is of the machine. Labor's officialdom, in the main, has no outlook for utilizing positions won in the two old parties to advance trade-union objectives. The winning of unionist-precinct committeemen to the fight for labor's political objectives would mark a

very important step toward challenging the machine from within. This is also related to the larger problem of deepening trade-union consciousness to the point where large numbers of union members come to recognize the special role and responsibility of labor in relation to community organizations and problems, to the activities of its members and their families in all aspects of social life.

The fight against the machines in general, and the Daley machine in particular, is no simple or quickly accomplished task. The Daley machine will certainly not be smashed this year or even next. The mere detailing of the problems involved make that quite plain.

A complicating factor is that the Daley machine is no mere replica of the old Kelly or Kennelly machines. Daley is in position to point to numerous accomplishments in the city which set him off from his predecessors. The labor-liberal coalition forces have fought him on occasion, but have also supported him on even more occasions. In the future, too, these forces will find it necessary, on specific issues, to support and work with Daley and other machine forces, even as they continue the longer-run struggle against the machine itself and machinism. This calls for a combination of adherence to principle with highly flexible tactics.

The selection of precinct committeemen from above stands in stark contrast to the practice in scores of

other large cities throughout the country. (Seattle, for example, where leadership in the old parties is constituted from the bottom up, starting with voter election of precinct captains, conventions of the latter to elect county committees, and so on to the election of the state committees. During the Thirties, this democratic procedure facilitated the ability of labor and liberal forces to play a decisive role in the Democratic Party of Washington State, giving it, for a period of time, a strong anti-monopoly, progressive current.)

It would follow from this that he who would break the hold of the machine on political life in Cook County and Illinois must strike a blow at the feudal political system of county committee appointment of precinct committeemen.

He who would build labor's independent political organizations and advance the fight for labor representation on all levels of government must face up to the reality of what it will take to smash the political machines which block these just aspirations of labor. He who would advance the fight for civil rights and Negro representation on *all* levels must likewise strike a blow at the machines which seriously limit and hamper the fuller, freer fulfillment of this worthy goal. And he who would have Chicago labor give a forward-looking lead to the whole state of Illinois must face the fact that the Cook County machines—due to the overwhelming preponderance of

the state's population living in Chicago—are in a position to, and often do, nullify the will of the other 101 counties (just as the GOP machine, with some outstate bases, at times teams up with the Daley machine to frustrate the will of the Cook County electorate).

The right of the voters to elect precinct captains must be won for the citizens of Cook County. The great metropolis on Lake Michigan must be brought into line with the 101 outstate "backwoods" counties.

Foremost in this fight should be the powerful labor movement of Cook County. How could any labor leader in Chicago or Illinois justify his refusal to take up the cudgels to give this elementary right to the voters of Cook County?

This fight is but one of a number required to smash the stranglehold of the machines on Cook County political life.

Alongside the fight for democracy within the two old parties, it is necessary to build labor's independent political organizations at all levels and to stimulate the development of other forms of independent political expression, such as the Democratic Federation of Illinois, the Independent Voters of Illinois, etc.

Against the myth of invincibility of the machines it is necessary to develop an awareness of the overwhelming power of labor and the people, of self-confidence among the people that they have the capacity for surmounting machine-control by win-

ning such electoral reforms as indicated above, by political self-expression through mass action on the issues and effective political action organization in the communities.

MOVEMENT ON ISSUES

The tendencies and movements for greater independence in political action express themselves in a variety of ways.

In Chicago, the 9th and 12th as well as 2nd Congressional Districts provide a number of positive experiences in recent years.

In the 9th, represented in Congress by pro-labor Sydney R. Yates, Labor's League for Political Education (AFL) and the PAC-CIO have cooperated for a number of years in building precinct organizations, carrying through joint actions in elections, teaming up on issues and in maintaining headquarters under the banner of COPE. They have formed alliances with liberal, Negro and small-business organizations and are generally moving in the direction of a people's coalition.

Labor's political action organizations have played a decisive role in the political life of this district. As they grow and consolidate their positions, they will reach a new status requiring a new set of goals in keeping with their growing strength and influence. Indicative of this new potential is the fact that Congressman Yates' reply to a flood of letters from his constituents stated his op-

position to the invasion of Lebanon.

In the 12th C.D., the labor and liberal supporters for the re-election of pro-labor Congressman Charles A. Boyle have opened up another avenue of mass expression with a large-scale street poll under the heading, "Your Congressman Wants to Know." Highlighting the fight against the depression and for peace, the poll solicits opinion on what Congress should do about tax cuts, public works, liberalizing unemployment compensation and social security, and asks should we "work for immediate summit meeting with Russia," "immediate ban on A- and H-bomb tests," "work with Russia for disarmament," "work out reciprocal trade agreements with all nations including Russia, China, Poland," etc.

Thus, while top labor officialdom continues to support the cold-war policies of the State Department, labor at the grass roots is prepared to cooperate with liberal and other forces to advance the easing of world tensions and promote peaceful co-existence. One need not belabor the significance of such activities on the issues of the day in helping determine the direction and character of people's coalition movements in general and of labor participation in them in particular. Certainly the merit of such mass activity in breaking through machine control of political expression here and now is self-evident.

NEGRO INDEPENDENT POLITICAL EXPRESSION

Of particular interest is the growing mood of political independence among the Negro people. Historically the fight for Negro representation has invariably taken the form of independent movements inside and outside the two old parties, with many victories coming in the form of old party concessions to these insurgent political movements.

A new stage in this fight is ushered in by Congressman Adam Clayton Powell's fight to prevent big-city machine imposition of choice of Negro candidates upon the Negro voters.

The campaign of Dr. Roy T. Howard, of heroic fame in Mississippi, on the Republican slate against the entrenched machine of Democrat William L. Dawson in Chicago's First C.D. takes on some of these new features.

Dr. Howard's candidacy offers the first really serious alternative to Congressman Dawson in years. It particularly has the effect of helping to unfreeze the situation, opening up new opportunities for independent, anti-machine political expression by the people, for building labor's political action organization in an area where it has seriously lagged, as well as for building other forms of independent political organization.

In the 2nd C.D., which is one of a number of northern areas which should be represented in Congress by a Negro (acknowledged even by

the incumbent, pro-labor Barrett O'Hara), the labor-liberal coalition supporting Congressman O'Hara has still to be won for these principles. In these circumstances, the independent socialist candidacy of Reverend Joseph King could serve to help create conditions for a movement strong enough to compel one or both old parties to nominate a Negro for Congress in the near future.

The Left in this case, committed to supporting and strengthening the labor-liberal coalition, and also committed to the fight for Negro representation, finds itself working to bring about the eventual unity of both principles and both movements. This independent position of the Left will, with consistent work, in time become the independent position of the majority of the coalition, if not of the coalition itself.

The movement for Negro representation has already resulted in the election of a Negro to represent the 24th Ward on the West Side, for the first time, in a special by-election this year. It is opening new possibilities on all levels.

UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT OF LABOR POLITICAL ACTION

The experiences in the 2nd, 9th, and 12th C.D.'s are indicative of what can be done. But they are by no means typical. In most of the remaining ten Cook County districts, as well as in much of out-state, labor's political activities don't yet ap-

proach these advanced districts. A number of decisive working class and Negro areas remain without effective labor or liberal political-action organization, including congressional districts embracing large areas of the West Side, Southside, Southeast, Southwest and a number of working-class suburbs.

One of the objectives of the 1958 elections is to start overcoming the gap between the advanced and backward areas. No class-conscious worker can afford to stand aside from this development.

If there are tendencies to despair among some of labor's political action proponents over the obstacles placed in their way by some machine-tied labor officials, one reason for it is the absence in sufficient force of *the clarity of perspective and the will to overcome difficulties* which a large body of active Left forces could bring to this movement. But the door is wide open at the grass roots level and the cry for help is rising among LLPE and PAC forces in the congressional districts. The opportunity is there and the possibilities are great.

A big difficulty in the way of building labor's political action organizations is one for which the labor movement itself is responsible. This is the practice of relying solely on a small handful of paid workers limited to a flurry of activity on election eves, and sometimes in short registration campaigns.

To the credit of the leaders of the Mid-West COPE Conference they

lashed out against this practice, calling for far more attention to building up a large corps of volunteer political action workers. They particularly stressed the role of women, hundreds of whom have been doing voluntary work for a number of years in a score of Mid-West cities.

With the large numbers of unemployed unionists, with youth in growing numbers joining the ranks of the jobless, the labor movement has a ready-to-hand potential army of political action workers and fighters for their needs. As in the memorable days of the great organizing drives, the Communists and Left have a new opportunity to provide leadership-by-example in the arena of voluntary organization for independent political action on a year-round basis, on the firm ground of day-to-day struggle for the needs of the people and the community.

OTHER INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENTS

The tendencies toward independent, non-machine and anti-machine political expression assume varied expressions. There is the development in some nationality groups of language Democratic Clubs which incline to progressive policies and activities. There is the continued existence and growth of the Independent Voters of Illinois, the local affiliate of Americans for Democratic Action.

Most notable is the rise of a new

movement, the Democratic Federation of Illinois. Emerging but a comparatively short time ago as an anti-machine organization, it was born, significantly, downstate where the machine is weak or non-existent. Claiming the traditions of the New Deal, and avowedly aiming for mass political participation by the people as the antidote to machine-controlled politics, it has spread rapidly throughout the state and into Chicago itself where a number of community clubs have been established. It is led by liberal intellectuals, professionals and small manufacturers. Stephen Mitchell is generally credited with inspiring it.

Its first state conference, held in May and addressed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, affirmed its independence to the point where, while operating within the Democratic Party, it asserted its right to endorse Republicans where they offer an alternative to old-line Democrats.

If the forces represented by COPE, the DFI, the IVI, the NAACP and the movements for Negro representation can prove equal to the task of concerting their efforts, then at long last the people of Chicago and Illinois will have found that power capable of bringing the era of machine politics to a close and opening up a new period of fuller, freer political expression by the people leading to realignment, and arraying against monopoly a grand people's coalition led by labor.

The experiences of the DFI and of

UAW-CIO serve to emphasize that one of the keys to unlocking machine-controlled Cook County is downstate Illinois. The Communist Party must find the means for rebuilding itself downstate, for helping to develop the independent political movements of labor and the people in and out of the old parties as an important lever for moving Chicago.

SOME FEATURES OF THE PARTY'S ROLE

One of the chief tasks of the Party in the 1958 elections is to draw the lessons of the various foregoing developments, helping to bring to the labor and people's movements a perspective of independent political action leading to a new people's, labor-led party; and a sense of self-confidence that they have the power and the capacity for successfully reaching this goal. We must gear our mass work in industry and community towards these objectives and be prepared to innovate whatever organizational forms and methods are required by this historic task.

Actually, for a number of reasons which space prevents going into at this time, the Party was caught napping with respect to an independent socialist candidate, not only on a state-wide scale, as mentioned above, but also locally. The candidacy of Reverend Joseph King was consummated as a result of the initiative of the Trotskyites, who then presented the Party with a fait accompli.

For a period, the Party's view of the real significance of the King candidacy was obscured by the anti-coalition as well as anti-Soviet aims of the Trotskyites. Intense study of the issues involved, together with knowledge of the positive character of the candidate himself, brought forward the issue of Negro representation as a chief factor in this campaign, and the possibility of the King candidacy making an important contribution on this score, as well as in projecting a socialist viewpoint.

Reverend King himself had already brought about the elimination of Trotskyite-injected anti-Soviet slogans and met the view of the campaign held by the Party with understanding and sympathy. Stressing the positive merits of this independent candidacy, the Party is working to minimize and eliminate the anti-

coalition features injected by the SWP.

At the same time, the Party is faced with the need for a more aggressive policy towards the role of independent Communist and socialist candidates which, learning from California and other experiences, not only do not collide with the coalition-in-the-making, but also contribute to shaping the direction and character of the coalition. Another opportunity for developing such policies comes up in the 1959 Spring municipal elections, preparatory work for which must be undertaken even before the November elections this year. In the meantime, the Party can make an important contribution in the '58 elections by boldly projecting its policies as indicated above, and through a big expansion of *The Worker* and local mass materials.

The October issue will contain an important article by James E. Jackson on theoretical aspects of the Negro question.

On the Thirty-Ninth Anniversary of the CPUSA

By National Education Department, CPUSA

SEPTEMBER, 1958, marks the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party in the United States.

Its formation grew out of the split between Right and Left wings in the Socialist Party over such basic questions as opposition to World War I, attitude toward the newly born Soviet Union, and approach to the sharpening class struggles in the United States. This split culminated in the expulsion of the Left wing in 1919. On August 31, 1919, in Chicago, one Left-wing group met and formed itself into the Communist Labor Party of America. A day later, on September 1, 1919, a second, much larger group organized the Communist Party of America.

The Communist Labor Party elected Albert Wagenknecht as its executive secretary, and the Communist Party elected Charles E. Ruthenberg to the same position. In June, 1921, the two organizations were merged to form a single Communist Party of the United States of America.

Contrary to the slanders of reactionary elements, the Communist Party is no foreign importation, but is deeply rooted in the history and struggles of the American working class. As Robert Minor said, in a speech in May, 1944:

"The forces that brought the Communist movement into existence are the deepest, the most permanent forces in American history. This land of the most highly developed economic system and correspondingly the most powerful capitalist state—the largest and strongest capitalism the world has ever known—has within it more compelling social causes for a Communist movement than any other country."

In the nearly forty years of its existence, our Party has been deeply identified with the battles of the workers, the Negro people, the poor farmers, and of every exploited, oppressed group. It pioneered in the fight for industrial unionism and gave yeoman service in the building of the CIO. It conducted brave and victorious battles against labor racketeering. It led the momentous struggles of the unemployed in the Great Depression of the thirties, and fought for unemployment insurance when the AFL branded it as "communist."

From its very inception, our Party took up the fight for Negro rights. It led such memorable battles as the Herndon and Scottsboro cases, and in later years such struggles as the Willie McGee, Martinsville Seven, Rosa Ingram and other cases. It has fought unceasingly against all forms of discrimination and has crusaded for Negro-white unity and against white chauvinism.

Our Party pioneered in the struggle against the fascist menace and in the fight for peace. We gave everything for victory against fascism in World War II. Following the war, we fought staunchly against McCarthyism and particularly against the Smith Act persecutions—a fight which has culminated in major victories. And we continued, even at the height of the cold war hysteria, to uphold the banner of peace.

Today our Party is emerging from a severe crisis, both ideological and organizational. It has firmly re-established its Marxist-Leninist bearings and is beginning, slowly but surely, to resume its place in the economic and political life of our country. It has begun a process of rebuilding and consolidation of its ranks. Its influence is beginning again to grow.

The Party's anniversary is an occasion for stepping up and advancing the process of strengthening and consolidation. We call upon the Party districts to utilize it as the starting point of a three-month campaign:

(a) to promote study and discussion of the history of the Party and of the lives and work of its founders and leaders; to circulate and use such books as William Z. Foster's *History of the CPUSA*; as well as such recent works as Oakley Johnson's biography of C. E. Ruthenberg, *The Day Is Coming*, and the numerous other books and pamphlets available.

(b) to revive and extend the study of Marxist theory and the use of the Marxist classics; to organize classes and schools on an expanding scale, with special attention to classes for youth;

(c) to build the circulation of *The Worker* and *Political Affairs*;

(d) to increase the tempo of Party registration and the establishment of functioning clubs in all areas.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE MID-EAST: PEACE OR WAR (PART II)*

SECRETARY OF STATE Dulles, speaking at the recent London meeting of the Baghdad-Pact powers, said that President Nasser of the United Arab Republic did not represent "true Arab nationalism." Apparently, Mr. Dulles, who behaves as though he thinks he is God's Regent on earth, was offering himself as the bona-fide representative of Arab nationalism, or, at least, as its most authoritative judge. Since he was speaking to the Baghdad Powers, minus Baghdad, and since none of the others is an Arab state, and since all of them are his junior partners or office boys, it is not surprising that no one in London contradicted him.

Mr. Dulles was wrong, again. Nasser epitomizes Arab nationalism and this is the source of his strength. He stands for Arab independence, unity, social reform, and neutralism; these represent the content of Arab nationalism. His limitations also reflect accurately that nationalism, dominated and guided as it is at this period, by the bourgeoisie.

By and large, the American press has ignored or grossly distorted the nature and significance of the Egyptian Revolution which began in 1952. That press notoriously is unfriendly to genuine mass revolutions; in addition, its chauvinism makes its reportage of events in Africa—Nasser would be jim-crowded in Alabama—especially suspect. When to this is added the specifics of the influence of the billions of the oil corporations, and the fierce hatred of Arabs characteristic of Right-wing Zionism, one understands why the Egyptian Revolution has been as misrepresented in the American press, as was and is the Russian.

THE EGYPTIAN REVOLUTION

In 1952 was overthrown the Egyptian monarchy—as foul a government as has ever existed. This marked the termination of an inherited, divine-right, Church-State royal regime that had had six thousand years of continuity; its destruction is one of the epochal events in human history.

Nasser is the product, as well as the present leader, of the national-liberation movement of Egypt—itsself a part of the larger movement of Arab nationalism, and of the world-wide struggle against imperialism. The Egyptian struggle, as is characteristic of such efforts, in seeking independence also sought democratization—the question was not only home rule, but also, who shall rule at home?

* The first part appeared in the August issue.

As Professor Hans Kohn remarks*: "The nationalist struggle in Egypt was in no way directed against only Britain. The Court was in bitter opposition to the Wafd [the independence party] and to its democratic demands."

Many commentators and editorialists in the United States identify Nasser with Hitler; in a recent communication, the President of the United States made a similar comparison. The equation is without substance and is made demagogically with the purpose of justifying a policy bulwarking reaction and geared toward war-making. Michael Adams, Mid-East correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian*, directly gives the lie to this comparison in a volume just published (*Suez and After*, Beacon Press, \$4.50):

There is no suggestion in Nasser's approach that Arabs or Egyptians are better people than anyone else, and no search for scapegoats among his own people. . . . The Egyptian Revolution was achieved without any bloodshed, and the only lives lost for political reasons in its first year were those of two ringleaders of a riot near Alexandria. . . . And just as there have been no purges, no pogroms, none of the sadism and brutality which degraded Nazi Germany, so the Egyptian revolutionary leaders have steadfastly avoided the outward pomp with which Hitler and his associates surrounded themselves, as well as (and in contrast to the preceding Egyptian regime) the libertinism which so often accompanied it.

More significantly, in the case of Egypt one is, of course, dealing with a markedly undeveloped country in the throes of a revolution against colonialism and feudalism; in the case of Hitler Germany one dealt with a highly industrialized, monopoly-capitalist country, possessing a numerous and ultra-modern army, which terrorized and slaughtered a large proportion of its home population and then, with arms, set out to conquer the world. And, while Hitler, epitomizing fascism, destroyed bourgeois democracy in Germany, and furthered the interests of the most reactionary financiers, industrialists and Junker landholders, Nasser, epitomizing a revolutionary nationalism, has destroyed an entrenched monarchy, significantly democratized Egyptian life, opposed the interests of the nobility and the largest landowners, and taken the lead in an Arab-wide battle against imperialism.

Since the content of the Egyptian Revolution has gone largely unreported, so far as the majority of the American people are concerned, it may be well to spell out in some detail the accomplishments of that Revolution in the past six years. First, the monarchy was destroyed and a Republic established; second, the special status and privileges of the nobility have been eliminated and with the title of King went the titles of Bey and Pasha; third, the most significant land reform legislation and action in the history of the Arab world have been instituted.

In this connection, let it first be noted that the former King Farouk person-

* In an essay, "Nationalism" in Ernest Jackh, ed., *Background of the Middle East* (Cornell Univ. Press, 1952), p. 156.

ally owned one-third of the cultivated land of Egypt. His lands have been confiscated and nationalized. In December, 1952, the Land Reform Law forbade individual ownership of over 200 feddans (207 acres) of land. Landowners were to be compensated, rather generously, and implementation was to be spread over a five-year period. The reform certainly is partial and its implementation has left much to be desired; nevertheless, 2,200 owners of 1,167,000 acres of land have been forced to give up 727,000 acres and one-tenth of the landless masses of Egypt have been given some land.

The bourgeoisie, dominating the Egyptian Revolution, tend not to really battle for significant social reforms, even where these are directed against their traditional class foe—the great landowners. As Charles Issawi, of the Department of Economics of the United Nations, writes, in explaining this timidity*: “Still more important is their common fear of social revolution, the prospect of which restrains the industrialists from pressing the landowners too hard.”

Before the Second World War, there was an income tax on commercial and industrial profits, but not on land rents; in 1953 this discrimination in favor of the landowners was terminated. Under the King, the formation of trade unions by agricultural workers was forbidden; in 1953 this prohibition was ended and there are today in Egypt more than fifty trade unions of farm workers. Under the King, the formation of a national federation of trade unions (of urban workers) was forbidden; since the Revolution, this prohibition was ended and a National Federation of Trade Unions exists in Egypt today. Under the King, minimum wage laws were non-existent; today they exist and even include minimum wage provisions for farm workers. The minima are very, very low, it is true, and the Left in Egypt seeks to remedy this as it seeks to carry through completely the revolution on the land; but the fact is that the principle of minimum wages for all working people has been established. Furthermore, a recent enactment forbids employers from firing workers, without the approval of a court of law; Stephen P. Dorsey, Deputy Director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs in the State Department, has remarked**: “This provision is of particular concern to foreign investors . . .” and one can well believe him.

Church and State have been separated in the new Egypt, and the revolutionary Constitution guarantees full equality for all citizens regardless of their faith. The revolutionary Egypt has embarked on the effort to equalize the position of women—in 1957, for the first time in history, Egyptian women cast their ballots. And, also for the first time, secondary education has been made compulsory in Egypt.

It is within this whole context that one is to place the nationalization in 1956 of the Suez Canal. Despite all the dire predictions, Egypt has kept the traffic flowing through the Canal—with Egyptian technicians and pilots, who, it was said by the Europeans “could never do it.” And she has reached an amicable settlement with the former stock-holders of the Canal Company, to the

* In an essay, “The Entrepreneur Class,” in S. N. Fisher, ed., *Social Forces in the Middle East* (Cornell Univ. Press, 1955), p. 136.

** U.S. Department of State Bulletin, May 9, 1955.

tune of compensating them with \$81 millions. (By the way, if this has been the result with the canal, why could it not be with oil?)

The fact is, of course, that the vast majority of the Egyptian population still live in the most dire poverty. It will take many years of major effort—with more thoroughly revolutionary undertakings—to eliminate that in Egypt. Certainly, it cannot be eliminated where fluid capital is scarce and the nation depends, as it does today, on a single crop—cotton—for its economic viability, and where that crop is subject to the desires and manipulations of world capitalism. There is more than coincidence to the precipitate fall in the price of Egyptian cotton since 1952, and the fact that the Revolution dates from that same year. It is this economic dependence, and the promise and action by the Socialist world—in purchasing cotton and in extending long-term credits at low interest rates, in signing advantageous economic agreements (like the 12-year agreement signed with the USSR in January, 1958)—that are central factors in the West's attitude toward the Nasser government.

Even so, it is important to note that real wages, for the approximately two and a half million Egyptian city workers, have gone up ever since 1952. According to the latest findings of the United Nations (*Economic Developments in the Middle East, 1956-1957*, Columbia University Press, \$1.75), taking 1953 as the base year (100), the real wage level in Egypt in 1950 was 83.3; in 1954: 113.8; in 1955: 118.7; and in 1956: 126.5.

The reality and the significance of the Egyptian Revolution may be summed up in the words of Elizabeth Monroe, director of the Middle East Division of the British Ministry of Information during the Second World War, and for the past fourteen years Middle East correspondent for *The* (London) *Economist*. Very recently, Miss Monroe stated:

The Egyptian social revolution, the most important phenomenon of the 1950's in the Middle East, attracts the people of the region much as the French Revolution once attracted liberal Europe. The people of the Middle East are caught in its spell for a number of reasons—not merely because it put an end to rule by a self-interested oligarchy and offers new openings to commoners, but because it has transformed years of Arab talk into deeds of daring; because it has placed the Arabs on the map and obtained a world hearing for their point of view; because it has thrown off the last shackles of perennial foreign domination (*New Republic*, June 16, 1958).

THE WAR UPON EGYPT

Foreign intervention was used in an effort to destroy the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the Chinese Revolution—and the Egyptian Revolution. The attack upon Egypt, participated in by Israel, France and England, after months of secret planning, cannot be understood unless it be seen in terms of the meaning of the Egyptian Revolution for the Arab world from North Africa to Syria.

Today we are assured that this combined assault "had Nasser whipped in days" (*U.S. News and World Report*, July 25, 1958); that "two more days of fighting would have brought down Nasser's regime" (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, July 17, 1958). And Max Lerner, with the special venom that drips from his pen when he writes of the Arabic world, tells his readers that "President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles picked Nasser up out of the mud of the Nile, and brushed him off and gave him back his power and prestige" (*N. Y. Post*, June 25, 1958).

Related is the report by the syndicated Washington columnist, Robert S. Allen, that at the emergency meeting between the President and leaders of Congress held July 14, 1958, "a House leader" asked the President: "Don't you think it would have been infinitely better to have allowed Britain, France and Israel to have finished off Nasser a couple of years ago? Wouldn't that have saved a lot of trouble and expense?" To which, writes Mr. Allen, the President replied: "On second guess, yes."

To such widespread opinions, certain facts must be juxtaposed, vital to an understanding of the present Mid-East crisis.

First, the Egyptian crisis, so far as this was reflected in the nationalizing of the Suez Canal was caused, as Michael Adams states, by "the precipitate action" taken by the U.S. government in July, 1956, in reversing its promises on the Aswam Dam project, and doing so in a blatantly arbitrary manner spiced with gratuitous insults to the government of Egypt. Second, the Egyptian action was entirely legal, and her Government's attitude so embarrassingly reasonable and accommodating that the British and French governments found themselves repeatedly in the position of one who advances demands with an intention to fight and then, finding the demands met, has to concoct new and more severe demands. Indian proposals, accepted by Egypt, were rejected by England and France. United Nations proposals, accepted by Egypt, were rejected by England and France. Throughout this Anglo-French capriciousness, Dulles offered firm support.

By July, 1956 there was firm—though then secret—agreement between France and England to seek the destruction of the Nasser government by arms; and both governments were led to believe that this would not meet United States objection. The Israeli attack was sponsored (and partially provisioned) by France, and its timing and scope were pushed ahead at French insistence. Immediately after the Israeli assault, France and Britain announced ultimatums to *both* combatant powers; both, attacked and attackers, were warned to cease firing within twelve hours, and the attacked power was required to withdraw its own troops, at once, from its own territory, in and around the Canal! "It was," said an unnamed western diplomat—quoted by Paul Johnson,* assistant editor of the (London) *New Statesman*—"the most brutal ultimatum in modern history."

Of course, the ultimatum was rejected, as it was meant to be. At once, on

* In his valuable book, *The Suez War* (Greenberg Publishers, N. Y., 1957), p. 94.

October 31, British and French planes bombed the cities of Cairo, Alexandria, Port Said, and Ismailia, bringing wholesale death and destruction. These bombings continued day and night for five full days; on November 4 several thousand French and British paratroops landed at Port Said and Port Fuad, to be followed the next day by 30,000 British and French commandos, with scores of tanks.

Far from the war being nearly over, or Nasser being in the mud of the Nile, effective Egyptian resistance was just beginning, especially with the wholesale arming of the civilian population, starting on November 4. Indeed, the Western announcement of the surrender of Port Said was a fraud; for though it appears that the officer in command there did desire to surrender, the men refused and the city had to be taken by storm, the Egyptian troops not moving out until they had lost one thousand dead and fifty-five hundred wounded*—and then they retired in good order.

The evidence is plain that the penetration of the main populated regions of Egypt had barely begun when the UN cease-fire was acceded to. When one remembers that the ten million people of Algeria have held their own against several hundred thousand French troops for over four years, it is absurd to believe that the forces of England and France could have destroyed the Egyptian Revolution—which was their purpose—in days or weeks or ever.

The thwarting of the imperialist plans in Egypt and the stopping of the attack was due to Egyptian resistance, to an outraged and articulate world opinion, to the might of the Soviet Union and the Socialist world which plainly expressed its determination to stop the attack. It was by no means United States action—as Max Lerner and Mr. Dulles like to pretend—which was decisive. This action played a part, and was itself the result of the forces already mentioned. It appears, too, that the sanctimonious Secretary of State double-crossed Eden, but as Paul Johnson writes: "Surely Eden knew Dulles well enough to realize that nothing he said could be relied on—even if it were down in writing." And the double-cross sought to accomplish one of the central purposes of American diplomacy for the past dozen years—namely, to displace Britain as the dominant power in the Mid-East. This failed because the Egyptian government did not buckle or yield, and because its Revolution was strengthened, not weakened by the attack.

This explains why the noble Eisenhower government froze forty million dollars in Egyptian assets in the United States, during the Suez crisis; why it rejected an Egyptian request that it release \$14,000 (fourteen *thousand* dollars) of the millions frozen so that medicines could be shipped at once for the wounded of Cairo and Port Said; this is why it refused to sell any surplus wheat to the Egyptian government desperately striving to halt starvation in the wake of the bombings and the invasion.** (Incidentally, both medicines and wheat came from the "barbarians" of the USSR.)

* In addition to the Johnson book, see on this point, Guy Wint and P. Calvocoressi, *Middle East Crisis* (Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1957).

** On this, see the article by R. E. Nolte and W. R. Polk, in *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1958.

A prime lesson, then, from the Suez War is not that extracted by President Eisenhower—i.e., it is too bad the War was not continued until Egypt lay prostrate. The lesson rather is that the days of 1830, when battleships could easily take over Algiers and 1882 when battleships could easily take over Alexandria are gone and done with. Today one-third the world is Socialist, and colonialism is dying.

THE MASSES ARE IN MOTION

Immediately upon the news of the revolution in Iraq, when the extent of American military involvement in the Middle East was unclear and the possibility of U.S.-backed war there was great (it is still far from remote) the *New York Times* was careful to explain to its readers that in that part of the world there "cannot be a real, popular, mass uprising." This was because, the editorial (July 15) went on to explain, "the majority of the country . . . is politically apathetic."

If what one has now among the masses in the Middle East is apathy, then the Dulles Brothers are really freedom fighters. The great fact is quite the opposite of the *Times'* assertion—as is normal. On this, experts agree. Thus, George Hakim, writing in 1952:

The poverty-stricken, disease-ridden masses of the Near and Middle East are slowly awakening to the misery of their condition and gradually are realizing that it is not unalterable. . . . They are coming to realize that they can be rid of diseases and epidemics and that their work need not be painful and strenuous. Their right of education is being affirmed, and they have come to believe that they need not remain illiterate and ignorant (Ernest Jackh, ed., cited work, pp. 163-64).

Elizabeth Monroe, writing in the *New York Times Magazine* itself (Aug. 30, 1953), said of the Arab:

Today he is as unlettered as he always was but he knows what he does not want. He does not want the life he has been used to leading in squalor and disease without hope of a living wage and he does not want rulers who promise him better standards and then fail to alter his lot. The key to his change of outlook is his sudden grasp of the fact that misery is not inevitable.

Emil Lengyel, returning from the Mid-East in 1953, reported the same observation:

What did the people want? They wanted to live, of course, and not merely to vegetate, worse than animals. Bread, that's what they wanted, and occasionally a little meat. They wanted to have a piece of land, and some work paying wages on which they could live.

Business men, writing for and to each other in their organ, *Business Week*, sometimes inadvertently let out imperialist truths. Thus, in that magazine for April 2, 1955 there is a run-of-the-mill article on "Keeping Reds Out of the Mid-East," and here one finds the ordinary muck about positions of strength, and Dulles' wishes and the need for powerful pacts, etc. But right in the middle of the conventional twaddle appears a little time-bomb—the really dangerous thing in the Mid-East, one learns, is that the masses there "for the first time in their history, believe that their life of misery and poverty isn't inevitable."

T. Cuyler Young, chairman of the Department of Oriental Languages at Princeton, puts the point more centrally in discussing "The Crisis in the Near East":

One of the paramount changes in the area is the conviction of the masses that an economy of scarcity and their own poverty are no longer necessary nor inevitable, but rather it is possible—and their right—to share in the world's plenty. (S. N. Fisher, ed., cited work, p. 253).

Greater than any energy yet released in our atomic age, is the energy contained in the mass apprehension of the new fact in the world: Poverty, though afflicting some six out of every ten human beings, is no longer necessary; now technological and industrial and scientific advances have reached the point where everyone may have a rich, full, healthful, and cultural life. This new capability and, above all, the fact that its essential import has been grasped by the overwhelming majority of mankind make inevitable the elimination of all exploitative-based obstacles to its realization.

In light of the geographic and climatic problems of the Mid-East the reader may wonder whether in that region too the real possibility of eliminating poverty exists. The answer is yes, it does.

This is the answer made by the *Final Report of the United Nations Survey Mission for the Middle East* (1949). There it was demonstrated that, for example, while there were ten million acres of cultivable land in northern Iraq, only 15 percent of that actually was cultivated; in southern Iraq it was held that the present acreage of 3,200,000 could be doubled. In Syria, out of the total available cultivable land, only 12 per cent was then being used; Lebanon could double its present 110,000 acres of irrigated land; Jordan was using but 6 per cent of its cultivable land, and enormous possibilities existed there with modern usage of its two rivers, the Jordan and the Yarmuk.

An Arab scholar, writing in 1956, stated*:

There is little doubt that the potentialities for development are tremendous. Agriculture can be expanded many times in every Arab country, thereby providing a stable groundwork for greater industrial expansion, higher living standards, and improved social conditions.

* Hazem Zaki Nuseibeh, *The Ideas of Arab Nationalism* (Cornell Univ. Press, 1956), p. 197.

Of course, this will take careful, overall planning, Arab unity, the extirpation of feudalism, and the elimination of imperialism—and peace. Hence one finds in the requirements for the elimination of impoverishment exactly the program of the Arab revolution now shaking the world. Old Canute Dulles may rant and rave, tie himself to sheiks, landlords and kings, and throw together ten thousand military pacts, but in trying to sustain a status quo that has run out its time and evoked the universal hatred of the masses enduring it, he has undertaken a hopeless as well as amoral task.

“MUNICH” AND “APPEASEMENT”

It is the height of irony to find defenders of imperialist aggression in the Middle East insisting that its existence prevents a new “Munich” and proves opposition to “appeasement.” One finds Max Lerner, for example, in advocating aggression into Lebanon, under the guise of U.N. auspices, in his column of June 25, 1958, actually insisting that the defense of the Chamoun regime in Lebanon would be the equivalent in our day of the defense of the Spanish Republic back in the 1930’s.

And Joseph Alsop—who read himself out of civilized society (but not the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*) recently by defending the wholesale use of torture in Algeria—felt (July 18) that if the landing of troops in Lebanon were not followed by the invasion of Iraq with the purpose of restoring a monarchy there and undoing the revolution of July 14 we would witness the “Munich” of our time.

A few days later (July 25) one had the extraordinary experience of seeing the President of the United States lecture the Premier of the USSR on the foreign policy of the Soviet Union during the thirties, when Stalin pointed out that acquiescence in the rapes committed by fascist Japan, Italy and Germany upon neighboring weaker powers was paving the way towards general war. Stalin, said the President, was right, and failure to adopt the collective security proposals of the USSR did, in fact, result in world war. The United States was not going to follow this path again, said Eisenhower to Khrushchev, and therefore had sent troops to Lebanon, and welcomed Britain’s dispatch of troops to Jordan!

But, of course, appeasement was the policy followed by the bourgeois democracies towards fascist powers because the Western capitalists profoundly sympathized with the fascist “solution” at home and ardently desired the implementation of the fascist promise abroad—namely, to attack and to destroy the Soviet Union. This is why the *Herald Tribune* and Mr. Dulles, personally, were among the leading appeasers of the 1930’s and the foremost Munichers of that era. Their policy then as now was support of worldwide reaction and the stimulation of war; their policy then as now was that of anti-Communism, and then as now that policy is one pregnant with the danger of fascism and war.

We will offer just two quotations from prominent Americans of the so-far-away 1930’s to recall to the present reader the spirit and the content of Munich and of appeasement. Here is General Hugh S. Johnson, onetime top figure in the “New Deal,” speaking in 1938:

There is only one comforting thought in the whole dark future—Hitler, at least, seems to be headed in the other direction—toward the East and away from Britain, France and, eventually, us. . . . If Hitler continues his chartered course as advertised, sooner or later he must collide with Russia. . . . It might possibly be that the salvation of the democracies will be the tactics of the Chicago police when ganghood was in flower, to let the mobsters kill each other off. It saved trouble . . . and was much more effective than police intervention in ridding the world of rats. (*N. Y. World-Telegram*, Oct. 11, 1938).

Early in 1939, Roy Howard, of the Scripps-Howard chain, was cabling from Europe of how “rational” Hitler’s speeches were, particularly where he complained “of the injustice of the Versailles treaty” and “against Anglo-French attempts to throttle Germany’s economic growth and commercial outlets.” Support of these “rational” proposals ought to be, said Howard then, the basis of U.S. foreign policy; as for the Soviet Union, it “is an exploded hope—it is washed up as a factor in any immediate alignment against fascism.” (*N. Y. World Telegram*, March 29, April 3, April 6, 1939).

Those are typical expressions of Munich demagoguery; its essence was the defense of ultra-reaction, anti-Communism, and the preparation of war upon the Soviet Union. This is the essence of brinkmanship, and to defend Dullesism on the grounds of having learned the lessons of Munich—and even to evoke the sacred memory of Spain’s martyrdom—is to “come in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly to be ravening wolves.”

LEBANON, JORDAN AND HUNGARY

One finds it commonly argued in much of the American (and some of the European) press that the American and British interventions in Lebanon and Jordan were like the Soviet intervention in Hungary—only very much “better.” The nature of this argument is summed up in a letter from Ferenc A. Vali, identified as a one-time Professor of International Law at the University of Budapest, published in the *N. Y. Times*, Aug. 6, 1958. Professor Vali finds the American and British military actions better from a legal, social, moral and political standpoint, for in the Anglo-American case the interventions came as the result of the proper requests of legal governments; in the other, it did not. Further, in the Anglo-American case the interventions were meant to serve peace and freedom; in the Soviet case the intent was to crush freedom and so threaten peace.

Professor Vali is wrong on every ground. The Soviet Army in 1956 prevented the destruction of socialism in Hungary; its action nipped in the bud an effort to establish an extremely reactionary regime in Hungary, which, if successful, would have threatened the existence of Socialism throughout eastern Europe and would have most seriously enhanced the danger of world war. The Anglo-American armies are in the Mid-East in order to curb the development of a

democratic, national-liberation movement; their presence there affronts freedom and endangers world peace.

But what I wish particularly to point out is that which is strangely missing from Professor Vali's analysis, and goes unmentioned in all the equations I have seen between Lebanon-Jordan and Hungary. This is the fact that the Soviet Army did not enter Hungary in October, 1956; the Soviet Army was stationed in Hungary at that time. It was stationed there in accordance with the provisions of international treaty approved by all the Allies who together had defeated the fascist forces in World War II. The Red Army was in Hungary under identical provisions and (ostensibly) for the same purpose that explained the presence of American and French and British (and Russian) troops in Germany. These were occupation troops, present in enemy territory, as a result of victory in war. And the essential function of those troops, according to the solemn treaties closing the Second World War, was to see to it that the defeated powers never again threatened the peace; above all, to see to the accomplishment of that basic task by extirpating the last vestige of fascism and by guaranteeing that fascism never reappeared in any shape or form.

Of course, the Western Allies have taken this solemn obligation so lightly that the Supreme Commander of the Ground Forces of NATO is now General Speidel, the Nazi butcher in charge of Hitler's occupation of Paris! But surely this is not a good demonstration of what Professor Vali calls the superior moral right of the Anglo-American forces! But the main point is that the Soviet Army in seeing to it that fascism did not have a chance to reappear again in Hungary was performing exactly its legal (as well as social and moral) duty, as prescribed by international treaty, a treaty won after oceans of blood had been expended.

LEBANON, JORDAN, AND IRAQ

It is now generally admitted, even by the American press, that the main purpose of the Anglo-American military interventions in Lebanon and Jordan was to crush the Iraqi revolution of July 14. The purposes of maintaining the wobbly regimes of Hussein and Chamoun were of course offered as the official explanations, and they were not without consequence; but the main intent at the time was to launch an armed attack upon the new Iraqi government, with the assistance of troops from Iran and Turkey. Since this is so generally admitted now, perhaps only one quotation—from dozens available—may be offered to substantiate it. This comes from C. L. Sulzberger's column, in the *N. Y. Times* (Aug. 6, 1958):

When we dispatched troops to Lebanon it was apparent this was more in order to be in place to move against a new Iraqi regime than to protect President Chamoun, who had requested such a force for weeks.

I would like, however, to offer some information on the nature of the Lebanese and Jordanian governments which American and British soldiers are guard-

ing—in the name of freedom!—and on the nature of the former Iraqi government, to restore which Mr. Dulles very nearly plunged the world into the ultimate catastrophe of general war.

The two which still exist, and the one eliminated by revolution, are (was) as corrupt, tyrannical, backward, brutal, and popularly despised as any governments in human history.

Under Chamoun, Lebanon alone of all Arab states did not break off relations with France and England after their attack in 1956 upon Egypt. Lebanon ratified the Eisenhower Doctrine, and it did this, in March, 1957, actually before it had been approved by the U.S. Senate! On April 5, 1957, Chamoun asked Parliament to approve his policy. By pure coincidence, on April 4, Washington announced the allocation of ten million dollars to aid Lebanon; and to add to strange coincidences, on that very April 5, the *U.S.S. Forrestal*, all 60,000 tons of that largest aircraft carrier in the world, together with its full complement of scores of planes and 3,500 crew members, was steaming outside the harbor of Beirut, while an attendant American helicopter buzzed fishing vessels in the same port. Chamoun's Parliament approved.

During the month of June, 1957, Parliamentary elections were held in Lebanon, and Chamoun's pro-Dulles stand was the central issue. It was despised by the population, but the vote returned 46 out of the 66 deputies for Chamoun. How? First, 45% of the population did not vote, according to the government. Second, fifty opposition leaders were killed during the elections, twenty-three of them at one time. Third, the Government was openly buying votes, and, as the correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian* reported at the time, "The prices of votes were being freely quoted." Added to this, according to the same on-the-spot reporter, were intimidation of officials and the falsification of returns. In addition to the \$10 million officially allocated by Washington in April, as already mentioned, Bushrod Howard, writing in the *New Republic* (June 30, 1958) reports very large expenditure of money during the elections in Lebanon by "an unnamed United States agency."

Thus, Chamoun won a decisive victory. Having the necessary two-thirds majority in Parliament needed to amend the Constitution, Chamoun let it be known that he desired an amendment to make possible a second term for himself, for another six years, after his term was to end in 1958. However, this was too much—rigged elections, and fifty corpses and the *Forrestal* notwithstanding. For, as Bushrod Howard notes, in the cited source: "When this plan became known, not only the vast majority of the Moslems but the majority of the Christians announced their opposition." From then on, Chamoun's government descended ever more rapidly into a quasi-fascist form, and all pretense of seeking popular or even Parliamentary approval was dropped. Cabinet Ministers, beginning with the Attorney General in April, 1957, began to resign at a furious rate and to be replaced with acquiescent lackeys. Organized opposition among the intelligentsia, merchants, students, urban workers and farmers took on more and more of a revolutionary flavor. A climax came when, in April, 1958, eighty

of the most distinguished citizens of Lebanon—Moslem and Christian—signed a manifesto warning the country against an impending attempt by the President to foist himself for a second term upon the country.

Among the signers of this truly national manifesto was Nasib el Mitni, owner-editor of the *Télégraph*, the most respected of Lebanese newspapers. On May 8, 1958 this beloved figure was assassinated, and the crime was universally ascribed to government-hired thugs. Demonstrations protesting the outrage swept the country, and on May 9, in Tripoli, troops fired upon one such mass outpouring, killing fifteen people and wounding one hundred and twenty-eight men, women and children.

The next day, Chamoun clamped martial law on the country, sent regular army units to all main squares; within another two days nationwide insurrection gripped the country, and has continued, somewhat sporadically, ever since. And ever since, the Lebanese army has become more and more unreliable, until by June, 1958, as was notorious throughout the world, it in fact refused to prosecute any serious hostilities upon the numerous and varied rebel forces.

Chamoun himself became a more and more isolated figure, so that by June his only friend, quite literally, seemed to be Mr. Dulles. This is why, as the *New Statesman* reported (July 5, 1958) the President of the country was forced to an "increasing reliance on armed Fascist irregulars." At the same time—June 14—Chamoun announced, quite illegally and arbitrarily, the outlawry of the three leading opposition political parties.

That was the government and this the "freedom" that U.S. troops intervened to secure—after the Iraqi revolution.

The Jordanian government of King Hussein is, if possible, more rotten than that of Chamoun. Created by Britain, it is a prime example of the so-called "client states." For a dozen years its treasury depended upon British subsidy; for a short time it was paid off by Saudi Arabia; today it is kept in business by U.S. grants, most recently in July when \$25 millions were given the King. Its Army was British-trained, armed and officered; today 3,000 British troops occupy the country and maintain Hussein on his throne. In addition, the United States supplies tanks, machine-guns, ammunition and fuel.

When Hussein moved, early in the spring of 1957, to ratify the Eisenhower Doctrine, a general strike swept Jordan. The King turned loose his British-trained Royal Guard and slaughtered scores, while hundreds were arrested. The Government itself was dismissed by the King, as being insufficiently energetic. The *Manchester Guardian* correspondent reported the installation of an "ultraconservative Cabinet" on April 23; two days later martial law was declared throughout Jordan. Meanwhile, units of the U.S. Sixth Fleet paid its respects to Jordan, and the Eisenhower Doctrine was approved. The U.S. had "won," through, quoting the same reporter: "the suppression of political parties, the banning of public meetings, the suspension of Parliament, the arrest of potentially 'subversive' individuals."

Nevertheless, as the *Wall Street Journal* (July 22, 1958) confessed, though "an

armed camp atmosphere" prevailed, the "fortress Jordan still is shaky." Partially to bolster further this murder and plunder racket, troops were sent from the confederated Iraq in the spring of 1958. Later, as the insurrection in Lebanon gathered power, reinforcements were ordered into Jordan from Iraq, with the clear intent to suppress the popular movements in Lebanon with a Jordan-Iraqi army. But this move boomeranged, because the troops and their officers refused to obey the order to leave Iraq, and rather used the opportunity given by appearing to fulfill the order to overthrow the Iraqi Kingdom itself. Having done this, in a matter of hours, the new revolutionary government of Iraq then ordered its troops home from Jordan, and they returned, every last man and officer among them, without a moment's hesitation.

The Iraq monarchy was overthrown and crumbled without a friend inside the country to say nay, because its anti-popular, pro-imperialist, corrupt, and brutal conduct had lost it all semblance of support.

The Big Business weekly, *U. S. News and World Report* (July 25, 1958), told its readers that Iraq was a model of enlightened government and that, "All Iraq needed to continue its progress was peace and stability." The Big Business daily, the *N. Y. Herald Tribune* (July 15, 1958) editorialized in the same vein, asserting that King Faisal and Premier Nuri es-Said were men "who did more than any other in the Middle East to help their people."

But on the same day, that same paper published a report from Beirut written by its Mid-East correspondent, Joe Alex Morris, Jr., declaring that the elections held in Iraq in May, 1958 "were a farce." And, continued Mr. Morris:

The discontent [in Iraq] ran deeper than political considerations, however. The poverty-stricken and landless farmers, particularly in the south, have benefited little if at all from a land reform program that has gotten virtually nowhere in the last five years.

As for Premier and General and Pasha Nuri es-Said, he "put his country's democracy in cold-storage," wrote J. H. Huizinga some time ago in *The Reporter* (May 17, 1956). In 1954, "he dissolved all political parties and muzzled the press" and his government exercised the right to disband any party or association, "such as a trade union" that, citing his decree, "sows discord and dissension among the public." This Premier and General and Pasha, this model statesman of the *Herald Tribune* and *U.S. News*, "ruled," said the *New Statesman* of London (July 19, 1958) "through an alliance of top Army commanders (placated by large-scale donations of British tanks, artillery and jets) and the feudal landowners . . . there were 10,000 political prisoners, torture was regularly employed and Nuri spent three times as much on the police as on public education."

Yes, indeed, there is the model ruler for American Big Business!

But, the *London Times* (Feb. 23, 1955) reported worry lest Nuri "may have been too thorough"—for the man dissolved his own Party, and reduced the number of licensed newspapers from sixty to seven, and dismissed thousands

of students and teachers and civil servants. All this was in honor of the signing of the Baghdad Pact in February, 1955.

Demonstrations and rebellions occurred regularly—on June 18, 1958 a battle lasting three hours occurred in Baghdad itself; there were 500 arrests, 120 were wounded and 43 were killed. These demonstrations were the result of organizational work by the National Unity Front, formed early in 1957 and consisting of the National Congress Party, the Baath Socialist Party, and the Communist Party. That Unity Front was Iraq; and when the Army turned against Faisal and Nuri, they were finished and the revolution succeeded. The Republic of Iraq stands now for a foreign policy based on Bandung, for democratization of life, and for social reform. Its revolution was intensely popular; its source lay in the intolerable tyranny of Nuri and in the courage and strength of the Iraqi people, not in the Dulles-concocted myth of "indirect aggression."

It is very important to note, as was admitted by the entire commercial press here and in England, that the United States and Great Britain were seriously planning armed intervention to put down this new Iraqi Republic, and that this was to be undertaken jointly with Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and Iran. *The greatest danger persists that some such intervention will yet take place.* Surely Admiral Hollowell is absurdly wrong when he says that the continued build-up of American forces in Lebanon has "neither military nor political significance." Perhaps its significance is religious?

Meanwhile, the British reinforce their troops in Jordan, in Aden, in Libya and in Cyprus. Armed intervention in Iraq did not occur in mid-July because of world public opinion, the stern warnings of the Soviet Union, and the absence of any force or body whatsoever in Iraq with which such intervention forces might work. But, I repeat, the ensuing weeks and months will see the sharpening of such dangers, unless Dulles brinkmanship meanwhile is significantly leashed.

THE FUTURE OF ISRAEL

The further to the Right one moves in Israeli political life, the more fanatical does one find devotion to an aggressive foreign policy, based upon contempt for the rights and the lives of Arabs. The further to the Right one moves in Arabic political life the more intense does one find anti-Israeli feeling; the more fully does this move in the direction of being anti-Jewish; and the more intently is it desired to war upon Israel in order to put off the accomplishment of necessary social renovation.

On the latter point, it will be well to read the last testament of Nuri es-Said as published, posthumously, in *Life Magazine*, July 28, 1958. Here this staunch Western friend, bulwark of the Eisenhower Doctrine and of the Baghdad Pact, makes clear his intense hatred for Israel and his belief that its extermination is necessary. Similarly, Dr. Fadhil Jamali—for whom John Cabot Lodge delivered so moving, and premature, an obituary in the United Nations—former Foreign Minister of the Iraqi monarchy, "was fanatically anti-Israel." We are quoting

John Cogley of the editorial board of the liberal Catholic weekly, *Commonweal* (August 1, 1958). Mr. Cogley reports on his own conversations with Jamali, who explained that he "thought the Jewish State should be utterly destroyed and said baldly there would be no peace in the Middle East until it was only a memory."

From the Israel Right comes the view that the Arab national revolution must be thwarted, else Israel will die. G. F. Hudson, writing in *Commentary* (August 1958), the organ of the American Jewish Committee, says flatly that "Arab unity is the condition for crushing Israel."

But to thwart the national revolution of the Arab peoples is not possible, let alone moral. Mr. Hudson himself admits this, wherefore he urges that Western (and Israeli) foreign policy gear itself to the "loss" of most of the Middle East, forge a firm unity with Turkey, and continue to exist as an armed camp, bristling with enmity in the center of one hundred million united and liberated Arabs.

For Israel to depend for its continued existence upon an alliance with the Right in Arabic life, tied to Dulles and Macmillan, is doomed to failure for the same reason that the Arabic Right is doomed to defeat, as are the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower Doctrine. For Israel to depend for existence, after the demise of the Arabic Right, upon friendship with a reactionary Turkey (and how permanent is that?), and the goodwill of Dulles and Macmillan, is for Israel to certify its destruction. If Israel is to march into the future under the banner of the Baghdad Pact, with Dulles in the front and Macmillan in the rear, it will march to certain and to bloody destruction.

Israel as an entity in the Middle East will live and can live in accordance with Bandung. It can and will live by action which rectifies the unforgettable atrocity of tearing one million innocent Arabic men and women from their homes and hurling them into fearful suffering, and by action which bases itself upon Arab-Jewish friendship and equality at home and outside its own limits. Should Israel continue to pursue the policy of being a tail to the kite of France or England or Dulles, nothing will save it from the disaster that is manifestly imminent for the Dulles-Macmillan line.

The line of reaction is the line of national catastrophe for Israel as for every other state in the world.

CONCLUSION

Anglo-American imperialism has evolved a foreign policy which, in the modern world, represents moral and political bankruptcy. The pursuit of that policy threatens mankind's annihilation.

It is a policy that seeks to end recession through war scares; that thinks in 19th century military terms and sees the Mid-East as a great strategic center for war-making; that fears and hates all progressive social change and bulwarks feudal and quasi-fascist regimes, whose time has run out; that aims at the destruction of Socialism and the curbing of national liberation movements, neither of which is possible; that aims at securing fantastic rates of profit made by giant monopolies (especially in oil), but the days of such exploitation are clearly drawing to a close.

For all of these reasons, despite the enormous power of the Anglo-American combine, the Dulles policy meets one disaster and one great setback after another. Its bankruptcy is so glaring that it is seen and shouted by the entire world, including the majority of the American people.

The opposition to this policy at home is gathering momentum. Publication after publication—from the *Wall Street Journal* to the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Christian Century*, the *Reporter*, the *Progressive*, the *Commonweal*, the *Chicago Daily News*, the *N. Y. Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Lorain (Ohio) Journal*, the *Denver Post*, the *Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic*, the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, the *Nashville Tennessean*, the entire Negro press—have taken strong stands against Dulles' policies, and particularly against the intervention in the Middle East. Individual after individual have so expressed themselves; readers by the hundreds and thousands in the publications named; people like the Republican diplomat, Nicholas Roosevelt; columnists like Walter Lippmann; labor leaders like Walter Reuther, Carl Stellato and Harry Bridges; Democratic Party leaders like Senators Fulbright, Morse, Neuberger, Humphrey, etc.

Even the Gallup Poll of "Free World" public opinion reported (July 23) that only 42 per cent of those polled said they approved U.S. intervention in Lebanon. When the *N. Y. Herald Tribune* said, editorially (July 16) that, "The whole country closed ranks behind the President," it is hard to believe it did not know it was lying; but whether it knew it or not, it certainly was mis-reading public opinion.

And what I have said above leaves out the deluge of world opinion against the interventions. This was true, not only, of course, in the Socialist and colonial areas—where live about two-thirds of humanity—but it was also true of Canada, Great Britain, West Germany, Greece, Italy, Sweden, Japan, and all Latin America.

It was, indeed, this storm of world opinion that stopped the interventions short of wholesale shooting and further advances (especially into Iraq); that resulted in the recognition finally by Great Britain and the United States of the Iraqi Republic; that led to trial balloons about emphasizing "indirect aggression"; and that, now, have resulted in the bursting of even those balloons.

Humanity outside the United States is disgusted with Dulles' foreign policy; and, increasingly, the American public is penetrating the dense fog of Big Business propaganda, appreciating the existence of this world-wide hostility, and beginning to move, with massive force, in the direction of demanding an end to brinkmanship, an end to besmirching the American flag by wrapping it around tyrannical and sadistic political gangsters like Hussein and Batista, Rhee and Chiang, Trujillo and Chamoun.

Never was the opportunity so great as it is right now to:

- 1) *Remove Dulles.*
- 2) *Remove U.S. troops from Lebanon, and British troops from Jordan.*
- 3) *Forbid any further intervention moves.*

- 4) *Repudiate American commitments, arbitrarily made by Dulles, under the Baghdad Pact to serve as policeman for corrupt and brutal regimes.*
- 5) *Meet in a summit gathering with all major and involved powers for agreement on minima required to guarantee that war does not break out.*
- 6) *Stop atomic-weapons testing and agree to forward movements on general disarmament.*

The majority of American people, I am convinced, support such a program right now. With argument, that majority can be made into an overwhelming and irresistible political force. The Dulles foreign policy is bankrupt; many people in our country know it; many more sense it. In the ensuing weeks, and especially with a climax in the November elections, that policy can be decisively reversed, and the peace of the world made secure.

On Labor and Political Action

By Albert J. Lima

THE LABOR POLICY STATEMENT adopted by the June meeting of the National Committee establishes a general line for our trade union policy. It will be necessary to study and elaborate on some of the sections of the policy statement in order to spell out a more definitive application of the general line.

Among these are: peace and the labor movement, including the cold war economy; the Negro-labor alliance; the perspectives for independent political action; and our tactical line on coalitions and program within the labor movement. We should encourage studies by committees and individuals, articles and debates based on an examination of the trends and developments in labor.

The perspectives for independent political action have received some attention in articles in *Political Affairs* last year, and in Gil Green's book, *The Enemy Forgotten*.

The *Political Affairs* articles were in the January issue of 1957 by Merle Brodsky of Northern California, and in the September issue by Jim West of Illinois.

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

PREVIOUS ARTICLES

Both articles dealt with our vanguard role in the labor movement. Brodsky attempted to analyze the trends and developments in the labor movement, while West approached the question from a Marxist-Leninist theoretical viewpoint. Both writers came to the conclusion that our vanguard role in labor should concentrate on contributing to the development of independent political action and consciousness in the labor movement. They, in effect, propose that this stage of the development of the class consciousness of labor should receive concentration and attention comparable to that given to the task of organizing the unorganized in the 30's.

Brodsky's article goes into some detail on the organized strength of the labor movement and its level of political expression. It concludes that the labor movement has achieved an elementary state of organization as a class. He points out that it is now no longer a question of whether labor should participate in political action, but rather of what type should it be, and in what direction it will lead. That the main trends in labor

are on one hand that of a monopolist ideology which tends to reflect the interests of the monopolists and, on the other hand, an independent trend, lacking consciousness and adequate understanding, but capable of becoming the dominant trend. He concludes that this development is essential for an anti-monopoly coalition and for the development of mass socialist consciousness.

He indicates the probability of the political expression of labor reaching at most the level of an anti-monopoly stage—the curbing of the economic and political power of the monopolists. In this case the process of mass socialist consciousness would be fought out within the framework of the new political alignment or party.

The article by Jim West points out that at the heart of the question of socialism is the problem of the working class coming into the leadership of the nation. He states that all signs point to the next stage in the step-by-step advance to leadership of the nation as being the emergence of the American working class as an independent political force in the life of our country.

He compares this situation to that faced by the workers and the party in the thirties when the Party overcame its isolation by setting forth its vanguard tasks based on the tasks facing the working class at that time.

Both articles conclude that the main content of our work should be to contribute to organized labor solv-

ing this as the key task for our Party with regard to the next stage of labor's development.

Since the articles were written, many things have taken place to lend weight to the idea projected by both writers. What we need to try to establish is the following: Is the labor movement such, and are the objective conditions such, that this question can be singled out by our Party as concentration for the entire Party, namely, to help labor achieve the goal of political independence from the monopolists? Can this task be singled out from among the many tasks and issues as was done in the thirties when the task of building the labor movement in the basic industries—organizing the unorganized workers—became the main theme and content of the work of the entire Party? The comrades have posed the question, and the development of our labor policy requires an answer.

ASPECTS OF CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS

Lenin dealt with class consciousness as having three aspects: first, the development of trade union consciousness; second, the development of political consciousness; and third, the ideological stage which results in the workers seeing the need of a new social system and how to go about the job of achieving socialism.

Lenin pointed out that the history of the labor movement indicates that the first two aspects are achieved

by it as a result of the experiences of the workers, flowing from the contradictions of the capitalist system. The growth of industry and the exploitation of the workers lends itself to the achievement of trade union consciousness.

As the unions grow and fight for their place in the world, they are forced into the political arena. The control of the state by big business enables it to throw the weight of politics against the workers. Laws are enacted, the courts hand down rulings, and labor is forced into the political arena of struggle much as it is forced into the economic arena by the challenge of the ruling class.

Of course, the trade union leadership has always been part and parcel of politics, but eventually the needs and demands of the class transcend the tenuous political ties of the leadership with corrupt bourgeois politics.

The fierce struggles associated with the building of the CIO in the basic industries, the emergence of a new stage in the struggle for Negro rights, and the fierce resistance of the workers and farmers and middle class people against the effects of the depression moved labor into the political arena as a major force in American politics. By 1937, John Strachey was predicting that the United States labor movement had reached the stage where the immediate emergence of a labor party was inevitable.

In fact, there developed many forms of independent political action

in various parts of the country which clearly indicated that labor was on the verge of achieving political independence. These forms developed in various states where Farmer-Labor coalitions and parties emerged, in the Epic movement in California, and in the building of the American Labor Party in New York.

The American Labor Party had sufficient base in labor and enough mass support, especially from class-conscious workers and the Negro and Puerto Rican communities, as well as sections of the Jewish community, that it was able to carry on vigorous activities in New York political life until 1950.

Our Party had agitated during this entire period for a Farmer-Labor Party and many unions adopted resolutions in support of this demand. Nationally, Labor's Non-Partisan League conducted vigorous campaigns on issues and candidates. Certainly the stage was set for the U.S. labor movement to follow the path established by labor in the countries of Europe—the forming of their own political party.

However, the outbreak of World War II, and the flexibility of the two-party system, plus some peculiar electoral methods which retard the development of third political parties in our country, combined to head off this development.

The next period in which the possibility of breaking with the political control of the monopolists

emerged was 1947-48. Once again there were many factors present which indicated the possibilities of such a development.

The end of World War II, which unified all anti-fascist forces to smash the military power of fascism, gave way to the divisive effects of the cold-war political and economic tactic of the imperialists of the United States and all other capitalist countries.

Roosevelt had died and the New Deal period had come to an end.

The need was present, but the willingness and determination of decisive sections of the labor movement was not. The move toward a third party was premature and abortive and the two party system was more secure than ever, because of the split in the labor movement and the expulsion of the progressive unions from the CIO. From that point the decisive influence of the CIO on the political and economic life of our country began to wane.

Thus, we have examined the question twice before at ten year intervals and it is being posed once again.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

What are the developments which have lent weight to the ideas proposed by Brodsky and West? The labor movement is today faced with a combined judicial, legislative, and economic drive which is of mounting seriousness. The use of the Taft-Hartley law under the Eisenhower

Administration is becoming more and more menacing to organized labor. The present NLRB board is increasing its full utilization of this law as a major weapon against organized labor. It is one of the main factors which has blocked the organization of the unions in the South. Recent rulings present labor with very dangerous precedents which can enable scabs and strike-breakers to bankrupt the unions through damage suits.

The McClellan Committee has provided a forum for a propaganda attack on organized labor which has paved the way for a raft of anti-labor bills. If these bills become law (and because of the capitulation of Meany and the top leadership of the labor movement, many of them will be adopted), the labor movement will become the most government-controlled labor body in any industrial country in the world. On the economic front, the fact that the United Automobile Workers are today without a contract, for the first time since 1937, indicates the serious situation which confronts organized labor.

So today we find that the situation which confronts labor on the judicial, legislative and economic fronts has drastically changed, and that the perspectives are for a sharp and difficult struggle on all of these fronts.

To be confronted with this danger will not of itself guarantee that labor will rise to the challenge. If one judges solely by the actions of the most important leaders of the labor

movement, the answer will be negative. But what trends are beginning to emerge?

There is a definite trend which indicates the possibilities of winning important sections of the labor movement to organize and act independently of the two major parties. For example, in California, the labor movement is not relying on the Democratic and Republican Parties to guarantee the struggle against the Right-to-Work threat. It has plunged into independent political action in a major way and in a more aggressive manner than for many years.

When labor was faced with the joint threat of Knowland and the Right-to-Work, it met this challenge and moved as a class. It had the impetus of the economic depression to impel it forward. But labor moved as one against the basic and fundamental issues of the anti-labor drive and the economic depression.

What are the perspectives for labor in regard to these two issues? Is the anti-labor drive going to recede and is the economic picture going to reach again the level of the post-war boom? The answer is no on both counts.

The anti-labor drive is being impelled by the monopolists and will grow. The ability of the system to pull itself up by the bootstrap method of war economy has reached its limits. Labor will be faced with increased anti-labor attacks and economic problems. The outlook is for

labor to begin to rely more and more on its own strength to solve and meet these problems.

We have also witnessed, in California, labor reacting to the needs of other classes. They have supported the initiative to eliminate the sales tax and boost the income tax on middle and upper brackets. They have more recently voted to support the initiative to write the 160-acre limitation into the State Constitution for farms using water from public dams.

This measure has the wholehearted support of the family farmers of California. When the state AFL executive committee made public its support of this measure, it stated that it did so to help the farmers with the hope of winning their support to defeat the Right-to-Work.

The labor movement is reportedly organizing committees to bring the Right-to-Work issue to the Negro and Mexican-American communities. Involved in this move is the recognition that this anti-labor measure can win some support in these communities because of the discriminatory practices in California.

These developments are yet a long way from establishing the political independence of labor in this country, and a long hard road remains to be travelled. But for us, and for the entire Left, it is necessary to try to determine the potential and the eventual outcome in order to map out tactics and activities.

BRITISH EXPERIENCE

G. D. H. Cole in his *History of the Second International* has a section dealing with the development of the Labor Party in England.

In 1900, a conference was held with representation from unions with some 400,000 members. It was decided that a "Labor Representation Committee" be established. Its role was to popularize the idea of Labor members running for Parliament, and it functioned in cooperation with the Liberal Party, with which Labor was identified.

In 1901, a court injunction was issued against the workers on the Taff-Vale railroad in South Wales. This decision destroyed the legal rights of trade unions and made strikes for all practical purposes illegal.

Labor became more active politically, and in the 1906 elections some 29 labor candidates were elected to Parliament. In 1907 another court injunction was adopted which legalized the use of union funds for political purposes.

From 1910 to 1914, there was an upsurge of labor political action, and a final split with the Liberal Party. Following the war the Labor Party emerged as the major electoral challenge to the Conservatives and the Liberal Party became a minority party in British politics, which it has remained to this day. In 1906, the Liberal Party had won an overwhelming victory with labor support.

But as it became clear to labor that the Liberal Party was not capable of serving its interests, the shift away was very rapid.

The Labor Party emerged with a strong, but very minor, socialist sector. It was not until the Labor Party had existed for some time that as a party it adopted a socialist perspective.

In our country the labor movement is essentially tied to the Democratic Party. While it has developed COPE and LLPE, legislative committees and other such forms, it continues to use the Democratic Party as the main form for supporting candidates.

Gil Green in his book concludes that the period ahead for labor will be determined by whether it will be possible for the ruling class to consolidate differences to the same degree as in the past, and by the level of understanding reached by the popular forces making up the coalition. In other words, first, they have nothing to lose by striking out on their own; and second, they have the potential strength to make their own bid for political power with a good chance of success.

In the chapter on "Process of Political Realignment," he goes into detail on those peculiar factors which retard the emergence of third parties in our country.

AMERICAN PECULIARITIES

The first has to do with the electoral college system of electing a

president and vice-president at large. This requires winning a majority of electoral votes—not a majority of popular votes. If there are three candidates, with no majority of electoral votes, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives. They must choose from among the highest runners-up, but each state casts a unit vote of one, and a majority of all the states elects the president.

Thus, the election of president and vice-president at large tends to strengthen the two-party system. In Europe, Parliament elects the premier and it is to the advantage of labor to have its own representatives elected to form coalitions in Parliament to influence the voting for premier and cabinet.

Also, in the European countries some form of proportional representation exists and minority parties have a chance of being represented in accordance with their strength. Here, the winners are determined by majority or pluralities, which excludes even strong minority parties from having any representation. So the idea of not throwing away your vote had a strong acceptance among the American workers.

A second major obstacle is the sectional differences in our country. The white workers in the South are made to feel a kinship for the white supremacists. The farmers of the Middle West have been made to feel a close tie to the big capitalist farmers in their own state rather than to the small farmers in the South or the

workers in the industrial areas.

Green makes clear that the most formidable block has been the objective situation, the ability to overcome the economic depressions, and the break-up of the developing anti-monopoly coalitions.

But the particular factors of our electoral system, the size and make-up of our country, and the elasticity of the all-class two-party system, has up until now prevented the emergence of a political vehicle which could combine the labor movement and its allies to establish political independence.

Labor, without an independent political party, has tried in one way or another to make up to some extent for this lack. It has formed COPE and LLPE, and previously Labor's Non-Partisan League, as pressure groups to express its independent political needs within the framework of the two-party system. This is akin to the large body of independent voters in our country, many of whom register "Decline to State" in primaries, and who shift their support from one party to another. The middle class and professional people have organized ADA which is another form for independent political action.

In other countries, where labor has formed an independent political party, welfare issues are adopted as national laws. In our country, the labor movement has pressed for "fringe benefits" which embody many elements adopted as national laws in

other countries. This has been particularly true in recent years and has been a further expression of the U.S. workers' attempt to take up the slack of a lack of a political party of its own.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union on the West Coast has been discussing this question and formally adopted a general program for an independent political grouping. Their role in the Right-to-Work fight in California has been a positive contribution to the entire labor movement, while maintaining a sharp and critical attitude toward the slowness of the top leadership of the AFL in California.

There is no need for the labor movement in the United States to follow the pattern of the British labor movement, but it is interesting that the experiences of the labor movement there followed the general pattern summarized by Lenin on the three aspects of the development of class consciousness.

Whether labor adopts a socialist perspective in connection with a new political realignment in this country

is not pertinent to this discussion. What is pertinent is that there can be no perspective of a development of mass socialist consciousness without decisive sections of the labor movement achieving the level of political consciousness. Lenin considers one of the necessary elements of achieving political consciousness is that the working class will become the champions of the needs of other classes of people. Essential for an effective anti-monopoly coalition in our country will be the emergence of the working class, moving as a class and achieving a level of understanding which elevates it above its own narrow class interests to the recognition of the needs of other classes.

This can be a key question for our Party. It is a question for full examination and debate. The correct answers can be a major factor in re-establishing our role in labor. Our participation in full-fledged discussion and debate can make a contribution to establishing clarity in the entire left. We should, therefore, give it major attention.

DAMNED . . . AND BANNED . . . BUT GROWING! WHY?

Marxism has been damned incessantly and banned repeatedly—but *it has not been refuted*. Eighty years ago the butcher of the Paris Commune announced: "*Now we are finished with Communism!*" He was wrong. Twenty-five years ago, Hitler, taking power, shouted: "*We have destroyed Communism; we shall rule for a thousand years!*" In his first assertion, Hitler, too, was wrong; in his second assertion, he missed by 988 years.

While all this has been going on, disillusionment with and renegacy from Marxism have also proceeded. The disillusionment and the renegacy were always proclaimed as decisive evidences of the obsolescence or fallacy of Marxism. Yet, somehow, Marxism persists; and today has more numerous adherents than any other philosophy in the world.

In the United States there is one monthly magazine which is a partisan of that philosophy, which seeks, with the light it affords, to illuminate the domestic and the world-wide scenes. That magazine is *Political Affairs*; there, and only there in the United States, will one find the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism conveyed every month. There, and only there, each month, will the reader be able to find what the Communists think—not what George Sokolsky or Walter Lippmann or Max Lerner say the Communists think, but what they think in fact and as expressed by themselves.

We believe these thoughts are more profound, more revealing, and more truthful than any others. Be that as it may, they are significant and must be weighed by any person who wants to understand the world in which he lives. To get those thoughts first-hand, quickly and regularly, you must read *Political Affairs*.

Subscribe to
POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Single copy: 35c Subscription: \$4

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3