

political affairs

OCTOBER 1958 • 35 CENTS

- A. KRCHMAREK** [21] **The Crisis in Steel**
- JOHN WILLIAMSON** [30] **The Peace Movement in Great Britain**
- JAMES S. ALLEN** [40] **Some Key Elements of Party Program**
- JAMES E. JACKSON** [59] **Basic Data on the American Negro People**

THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA: PEACE OR WAR?

by **HERBERT APTHEKER**

[1-20]

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, N. Y.

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

Vol. XXXVII, No. 10

OCTOBER, 1958

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The United States and China: Peace or War?

By Herbert Aptheker

NEVER BEFORE IN THE history of the United States has its foreign policy provoked such widespread and intense opposition as at the present moment, and particularly as it relates to China. We shall have occasion, further on, to summarize some of the expressions of this world-wide response; at the moment consider the severity of the language occurring in American publications:

The Christian Century, a Protestant publication, “abysmal quality of our diplomacy” (Sept. 24, 1958); *The Commonweal*, a Catholic publication, “confusion, misrepresentation and irresponsibility” (Sept. 19); Roscoe Drummond, a leading Republican columnist, sees the United States placed in “intolerably disadvantageous circumstances,” and therefore, the “lonely defender of a very unpopular cause . . . [with] the hostility of the whole uncommitted world” (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Sept. 15); Max Lerner, a leading Democratic-Liberal columnist, who apologized for the rape of Guatemala and gloried in the military intervention in Lebanon, gags at this latest exploit in Asia: “the worst place, for the worst cause, with the worst ally . . . forlorn of promise, of hope, of meaning” (*N. Y. Post*, Sept. 5); *The New Republic*: “Disastrous diplomacy . . . impossible situation . . . appalling chasm” (Sept. 22); *The Nation* entitles an editorial on this question: “Deaf, Dumb, Blind” (Sept. 13).

A policy which evokes this kind of language from such varied observers naturally moves them and others to attempt an explanation for its existence. But while the characterizations are apt, the explications fail to satisfy; and without accurate diagnosis, we may be left only with the capacity to label symptoms rather than to effect a cure.

What explanations are being offered? One is to ascribe insanity to the policy's authors. This is done not in the largely figurative sense conveyed in: “Those whom the gods would destroy . . .” etc., but in a more literal sense, reflective of the malady and fate that overtook the first U.S. Secretary of Defense.

Max Lerner, for example, in the aforementioned column, felt able to ascribe the source of the unholy mess only to "insanity"; similarly *The Nation*, in its cited editorial, concludes that "one searches in vain for some rationale"; it can do no better than ascribe "the utter folly of our China policy" to an "obsession" suffered by Mr. Dulles.

Mental illness may indeed often afflict those responsible for pursuing a disaster-ridden policy; but the illnesses of individuals do not create the foreign policies of nations. Here, too, there is inter-relation, and in these days of the possibility of the accidental launching of catastrophic war this is no insignificant point. Yet the fact remains that explaining the sources of United States foreign policy on the basis of the "obsessions" or "compulsions" of individuals is altogether inadequate and misleading.

Vera Micheles Dean, in advocating some time ago a relatively salutary *Foreign Policy Without Fear* (McGraw-Hill, N. Y., \$3.75), found the operative foreign policy of the United States to be some kind of inexplicable paradox, also stemming from strange, if not psychopathic, obsessions. At one point (pp. 84-85) she commented:

The paradoxical result is that the United States, while leading a crusade for democracy against dictatorship, has come to the conclusion that the maintenance in power of General Franco in Spain or Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, of Emperor Bao Dai in Indo-China or Dr. Syngman Rhee in South Korea, is essential to the security of the United States.

Of course, the tenure of these "necessary" props to U.S. security is somewhat precarious and since Miss Dean wrote the above words, Emperor Bao Dai has faded away; but then one can easily substitute others (in power as these words are written) allegedly essential to American security—like Batista of Cuba and Trujillo of the Dominican Republic—and retain the "paradox." If, however, one rejects the premise that the United States is leading a democratic crusade, then he has eliminated the apparent paradox; and if one replaces Miss Dean's premise with another—that the United States is the leading imperialist power seeking therefore to restrain social progress and curb national liberation—then what appears paradoxical in the admitted facts becomes logical. Is not a purpose of science to place all the observable facts within the framework of causative explanation, rather than inexplicable paradox?

Louis J. Halle, formerly a member of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, and now a professor at the University of Virginia, in declaring faulty "Our China Policy" (*New Republic*, Sept. 15) finds "the mood of the country" to be responsible for it; the country was in "one of those periods of psychological disturbance." The bad policy, having sprung from this somewhat ill-defined source, was then persisted in "simply by force of inertia." Apparently one must wait for a change in mood that presumably must come about as unaccountably as did the original condition, which would then, I suppose, produce a period without psychological disturbance. Then one might hope that the inertia would be overcome—and a wise foreign policy would appear!

Behind Professor Halle's numerous verbal entrenchments, the only really operative cause explaining the admittedly disastrous foreign policy appears to be "public opinion." This comes close to the idea that the trouble with American foreign policy is that it is too democratic, too dependent upon "the man in the street." Others have not left this to be inferred from their writings. Marguerite Higgins, for instance, who has managed to stick with Dulles from brink to brink and still holds on to his coat-tails, is incensed at the widespread popular opposition to the Quemoy-Matsu junket, and wants to know "just when the canonization of the 'man in the street' in the Western democracies occurred"; she thinks, too, that he "was wrong about nearly all the milestones that led to both World War I and World War II" (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Sept. 15). It is Miss Higgins who is wrong; the milestones that led to both World Wars, while marched over through blood by the "man in the street," were laid out for him by responsible statesmen, by the elite, for imperial and exploitative considerations. And, of course, any consideration of "public opinion" which ignores the class ownership of the means of communication is superficial and demagogic.

We have spent some time on this idea because it forms an important feature of developing reactionary ideology. Faulty public opinion is blamed for political failures in many recent works—as Raymond Aron's *The Century of Total War*, Henry Kissinger's *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, Walter Lippmann's *The Public Philosophy*, Will Herberg's *Protestant-Catholic-Jew*, and Herbert Butterfield's *Christianity and History*. It forms a rationalization for the increasingly arbitrary and secretive manner in which public affairs in general are being administered in our own country; and for the outrageously bureaucratic and altogether unconstitutional manner in which Mr. Dulles has seen fit to conduct the foreign policy of the United States. An element helping to explain the abysmal failure of Dulles diplomacy is, in fact, its complete separation from any kind of democratic control, even the notoriously inadequate provisions for such control provided by our Constitution.

The most extensive attack upon current U.S. foreign policy to come from a significant national political leader, was that offered by the second ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas. It is reproduced, with some revisions, in *The Progressive*, for September, 1958. Senator Fulbright expresses complete disapproval of that policy; hence he calls for a thorough "reconsideration and reorientation." This is all to the good and is an important example of the growing popular revulsion against the Dulles line.

Yet, again, it is necessary to suggest—if we are to achieve that thorough reconsideration and reorientation that Senator Fulbright demands—that the Senator offers no explanation for what he himself calls an "incomprehensible" policy. He says we are too often aligned with reactionary governments abroad, but he does not even ask why; he says the United States spends too lavishly abroad for military purposes and too little for creative purposes, but again he does not ask why. He finds the government of the United States suspected or disliked in Latin America, Asia and Europe (the Senator forgets Africa, not

to speak of Arkansas) because it is the defender of a despised status quo, but why it is, he does not inquire.

The nearest the Senator comes to an explanation is to blame a poorly informed public opinion (again) for failing to exercise sufficient supervision over Congress! And he has one other suggestion as to cause:

If there is a single factor which more than any other explains the predicament in which we now find ourselves, it is our readiness to use the spectre of Soviet communism as a cloak for the failure of our own leadership.

And, he adds: "In the fear of the devilry of communism, we have cast ourselves indiscriminately in the role of the defender of the status quo throughout the world." Extremely important is the Senator's hint (it is no more than that, of course), that the whole anti-Communist ballyhoo has been a racket and a fraud. But again, the failure to ask why, makes exceedingly limited the illuminating quality of the remarks. Actually, it is not because of the fear of Communism that "we" have cast "ourselves" in the role of twentieth-century Metternichs; it is rather because of the Administration's devotion to reaction that its foreign policy has gone from one catastrophe to another. And it is because a reactionary line is catastrophic for our national interests that the Administration, and the whole ruling-class apparatus, has made anti-Communism its trump card. Standing Senator Fulbright's analysis on its head, improves it and brings it very near the real operating cause of why, as he says: "Our foreign policy is inadequate, outmoded, and misdirected."

An attempt at explanation having racist and Malthusian overtones is becoming more and more common, again as a component of developing reactionary ideology. A very recent example was the comment by Philip Wylie in *The Saturday Review* (Sept. 20) that American and European setbacks in Asia and Africa reflected the "Decline of the West," and the impending conquest of the world by its colored inhabitants—forming as they do a majority of the human race. Mr. Wylie's remarks not only reverted to Spengler but to the "rising tide of color" of Lothrop Stoddard and the "Yellow Peril" of William Randolph Hearst.

We are witness in this age to the decline of capitalism, not of the West. It is true that this decline brings with it degenerative phenomena, but just as the decline applies basically to a ruling class, so the degenerative aspects mark in particular that class' ethics, reasoning, and leadership. And we see in our time not the rising tide of color, but the rising dawn of socialism and national liberation. It is true that this dawn carries with it the elimination of the special oppression of people of color; but this means the achievement of human brotherhood.

Such worldwide equality may offend those who have assumed that Washington and London would be the centers of "civilization" and the arbiters of mankind's fate forever; that era is already over as everyone, except the Eisenhower Administration, understands. Its termination will mark the enhancement of the well-being of all mankind, including those who are white.

Ralph Matthews, the militant Negro journalist, falls into an opposite, though related, kind of error in a column in the *Afro-American* (Sept. 20). Denouncing the course of the State Department in its current China provocations, Mr. Matthews ascribes it entirely to the existence of white chauvinism in that Department, and makes the conflict one of white versus colored. It is certainly true that a large ingredient in the arrogance and blindness displayed by the State Department toward China stems from racism; but the arrogance and blindness are forms within which the policy is conducted; they are not the policy itself. Similarly, racism is a result of the system producing that policy; it is not the system itself. Capitalism breeds racism and imperialism intensifies it, and racism displays itself in an arrogance towards the "inferiors"; all these are inter-related. But the root is imperialism, and the stake is continued exploitation and oppression and power.

The distinction is vital, not academic, and it explains facts which the hypothesis of Mr. Matthews will not explain. It explains Dulles' colored "allies" (to the extent that he has any); above all, it explains why a predominantly non-colored state like the Soviet Union stands four-square as the immovable and mighty bulwark of the colonial and national liberation movements; why the white socialist states of central and eastern Europe similarly align themselves; and why radical and progressive whites elsewhere in the world, including in the United States, oppose American imperialism. It is on the basis of this unity that the national liberation movements have achieved the successes they have; the continuance and strengthening of that unity is a prerequisite for the great achievements that the future certainly holds.

THE EISENHOWER-DULLES LINE

Let us now turn to aspects of the argumentation and justification put forth by the Eisenhower Administration for its Chinese policy.

First of all, the Eisenhower Administration seeks to forget the Chinese civil war; it seeks to transform that civil war into some kind of an international conflict, either by constructing the myth of "Two Chinas," or by the myth of a Formosan nation.* At the moment it concentrates on the "Two Chinas" idea because this is the commitment of Chiang, because it fosters the "legality" of Chiang's usurping China's seat in the United Nations (and in the Security Council), and of Dulles' refusal to recognize China, and it tends to "justify" Chiang's (read: Dulles') refusal to relinquish the coastal islands. It sticks to this position very stubbornly, too, in the hope that if and when it is forced to move to the other position (as appears increasingly likely) it can pose as having yielded a great point quite sacrificially, and can the better insist upon the permanent severance of Taiwan from the Chinese People's Republic in return for its "sacrifice."

* It was interesting to see, in connection with this American propaganda effort, that a severe critic of the Administration line, Walter Lippmann, writes of the "Formosa people": "The American national interest in Formosa is not that it should masquerade as China, but that the Formosa people should have autonomy and that in a military sense the island should be strategically neutralized"—*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Sept. 11, 1958.

The fact is that Taiwan is as much a part of China as the Balearic Islands are of Spain, or Sicily is of Italy, or Gotland is of Sweden, or the Isle of Wight is of England, or Staten Island is of the United States. Says the *Columbia Encyclopedia* (2nd edition, 1950): "Formosa, Chinese *Taiwan*, province of China."

The island's settlement by the Chinese goes back to antiquity; its universal acknowledgement as a part of the Chinese nation goes back to the 17th century. Certainly it was seized through war by a rising Japanese imperialism in 1895. But it is relevant to know that the Chinese on Taiwan bitterly and seriously resisted, with arms in hand, the actual taking over of the island, and that from 1895 until the end of World War II, there was never a moment when the Chinese on Taiwan left the Japanese occupiers in doubt as to their desires and their nationality.

Of course the Cairo Declaration (1943) and the Potsdam Treaty (1945) found the Allies pledging the return of Taiwan to China with the defeat of Japan; this pledge was made good, and the return to *China* was acknowledged by Japan in its peace treaty. And the people who now live in Taiwan are in their overwhelming majority Chinese; descendants of the original inhabitants of the island going back to the middle ages constitute a very small fraction of the population, and Japanese, left over from the occupation, also constitute an insignificant fraction. Going back to 1924, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (14th edition, 1930) reports that of four millions then on Taiwan, the Chinese were "much the most predominant element," with two groups of aborigines totalling 140,000 people and with the Japanese totalling 180,000.

Taiwan is Chinese; it is Chinese legally, historically, ethnically. It belongs to China and until it is in fact returned to the effective and actual Chinese government, that government will not rest, the people on Taiwan will not be satisfied, justice will not have been done, and tranquillity cannot return to Asia.

The point is made that Taiwan in the hands of the actual Chinese government would threaten world peace, for it would serve as a base for "further" advances, just as in the hands of the Japanese it served that function. But, Taiwan was stolen from China as the first step in the expansion of Japanese imperialism; it was used by Japan to expedite the seizure of Korea, which in turn served as the base for the rape of Manchuria, and this served as the base from which to launch full-scale war upon China, and limited war (in the 1930's) against the Soviet Union. And today, the fact is that Taiwan is a major air and naval base for the United States, which simultaneously holds the Ryuku islands as spoils of war, has bases throughout Japan and dominates half of Korea. This is the physical fact, and this is true of the United States which is five thousand miles away from China. For the United States in this condition to charge China with aggression in seeking to regain possession of its own province Taiwan, ninety miles from its coast—remembering the past history of Taiwan—is manifestly absurd. Its very absurdity and the persistence in that absurdity make more suspect a policy dependent upon it.

The islands of Quemoy and Matsu are within the territorial waters of

China; they have been in the possession of the Chinese mainland government throughout the thousands of years of recorded Chinese history. They are held today by the United States Navy and Air Force, in conjunction with troops of the Chiang regime—a regime whose finances, foreign policy, armaments, and physical existence are absolutely and wholly dependent upon the support of the United States government. Those islands are held not because they are vital to the defense of Taiwan—Eisenhower, Chiang and Secretary of Defense Wilson have all testified to the contrary—but because they have made possible the blockading of Amoy and Foochow, the launching of harassing and spying expeditions onto the mainland, and because their possession symbolizes Chiang's announced intention to forcibly return to the Chinese mainland.

For China to remain indifferent to this would be as though the United States paid no attention to the blockading of its Atlantic coast from Norfolk to Philadelphia. For China to remain indifferent to this would be for it to permit the remnants of a reactionary civil war foe to continue physical attacks and avowed preparations for the renewal of full-scale warfare, with no counteraction on its part. Again the absurdity of the U.S. position which denounces the Chinese People's Republic as "aggressors" because it seeks to terminate this impermissible situation is clear to the entire world. It is clear, too, that the Eisenhower-Dulles persistence in this absurd posture in which the partners pretend to abjure violence while pursuing a policy of naked force, hides their own sinister aims, which at its present maximum seeks the destruction of the Chinese People's Republic and the return of China to the plundering, corrupt, sadistic, and utterly reactionary mercies of the Kuomintang, leashed (to use the significantly canine-like language commonly employed in this connection) to the Pentagon, or, as its apparent minimum, the achievement of some kind of Two-China deal.

TIBET AND KOREA

We wish to deal very briefly with two other components of the Dulles charge of "aggression" against the Chinese People's Republic. These are grouped around the names of Tibet and Korea. Dulles persists in repeating the lie that China forcibly swallowed up an independent country on its western borders named Tibet.

Tibet is and has been for centuries part of the sovereign nation of China. As for the recent period, one need do no more than examine the map of China appearing in the book published by the U.S. State Department itself, in 1949, entitled *United States Relations With China*. There, following page 409, one will clearly see Tibet designated as a constituent part of China. The nation, other than China, having naturally the greatest interest in Tibet is India, for Tibet borders it. India, in recognizing the Chinese People's Republic has acknowledged its sovereignty over Tibet. The Indian Ambassador to China who negotiated the recognition of the New China writes, in his recently published memoirs:

The only area where our interests overlapped was in Tibet, and knowing the importance that every Chinese Government, including the Kuomintang, had attached to exclusive Chinese authority over that area I had, even before I started for Peking, come to the conclusion that the British policy (which we were supposed to have inherited) of looking upon Tibet as an area in which we had special political interests could not be maintained. (K. M. Panikkar, *In Two Chinas*, London, 1955, p. 103.)

Mr. Panikkar, one of India's leading historians as well as a distinguished public figure, also refers (p. 113) to the "blood-curdling stories issued from Hong Kong by Taipeh agents" about the alleged Chinese military conquest of "poor little Tibet." It is impossible that Mr. Dulles does not know these facts; his persistence in charging the Chinese People's Republic with "aggression" on the basis of Tibet reflects his notorious disdain for the truth* while furthering aggressive aims of his own.

Another instance of alleged Chinese aggressiveness often cited by the Eisenhower-Dulles duo is Chinese intervention in the Korean War. The facts here again actually prove the opposite of Dulles' conclusions. Quite regardless of one's views on the origins of the fighting in the Korean civil war,** the fact is that China did not intervene until the UN (*i.e.*, the U.S.) forces, commanded by General MacArthur, crossed the 38th parallel and drove well up towards the Chinese border. This was done despite President Truman's earlier pledge that it would not be done; it was done despite advice against it by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff; it was done despite, as Walter Lippmann noted at the time, "the critical importance of Korea in the foreign policy of any Chinese government, no matter what its ideology"; he had added that "in its geography Korea is to China what Florida is to the United States."

The attack north of the 38th parallel was undertaken although the Chinese Premier had told the Indian Ambassador that China would not tolerate having American troops in force so near its own border. He had added that this warning did not apply to South Korean troops since China acknowledged the existence of civil war in Korea, but it did apply to American troops. This was conveyed through diplomatic channels to all the parties involved. Nevertheless MacArthur crossed the parallel; *afterwards*, under U.S. pressure, on October 8, 1950, the UN authorized such crossing. The Indian Ambassador in China wrote that day in his diary:

So, America has knowingly elected for war, with Britain following. It is indeed a tragic decision, for the Americans and the British are well aware that a military settlement of the Korean issue will be re-

* For other examples of his "laxity with the truth" see "The Lord and John Foster Dulles," by Charles F. Edmundson, in *The Nation*, Sept. 13, 1958.

** My own views were expressed at length at the time in *Masses and Mainstream*, July, 1950; additional evidence available since then has confirmed, I think, the opinions then expressed.

sisted by the Chinese and that the armies now concentrated on the Yalu border will intervene decisively in the fight. (K. M. Panikkar, cited work, p. 110.)*

"APPEASEMENT" AND "MUNICH" AGAIN

The Administration and its supporters insist that to yield on the question of Quemoy and Matsu—not to speak of Taiwan—would repeat the tragic policy of appeasement and would represent the Munich of our time. Since this September is the twentieth anniversary of Munich and since its image is pointed to as the basic justification for the Dulles foreign policy, it will be well to look into this matter.

It may appear remarkable to find the most conservative quarters, as personified by the U.S. Secretary of State, so vehemently opposed to a policy of appeasement and to another Munich, for both were associated originally with arch-reaction. The matter is not remarkable, however; it is altogether logical and proper. For today reactionary elements are raising demagogically the hated symbol of Munich in order, under present conditions, to accomplish what Munich accomplished for them twenty years ago.

Those pursuing an anti-Soviet and anti-progressive line; those fearful of colonial liberation movements; those sympathetic to ultra-reaction and fascism; those who despised socialism and desired the destruction of Communism—they were the appeasers and the Munichers. And they are today the same class (often the same people, notably Mr. Dulles, himself), who, in the name of resisting appeasement, seek the same ends.

Moreover, the essence of Munich was not yielding to the threats of fascist aggressors; the essence of Munich was the policy of *building up and encouraging* the fascist aggressors. The essence of Munich was the effort to use fascism to break the backs of labor and radical movements at home, and as a spearhead for what was hoped would eventually be a worldwide and irresistible military onslaught upon the Soviet Union.

Thus, specifically in terms of the Asian area, consider the fact that while Japan conquered Manchuria and Jehol and moved further into China in the 1930's, the United States was Japan's main foreign source of arms, supplies, and money. Thus, for example, the United States bought 85% of the raw silk exported by Japan in 1935; she bought one-fourth of all Japan's exports in 1936 and sold her one-third of all imports. From 1937 to 1938 the United States sold Japan over \$325,000,000 worth of war materials, including 75% of Japan's gasoline and over 30% of her steel.

Comparable activities were conducted by the United States and France and Great Britain in connection with Italy's rape of Ethiopia, with fascism's inva-

* Additional evidence of the provocative nature of the crossing of the 38th parallel and refuting the charge of "aggression" against the Chinese in the Korean case will be found in Kenneth Ingram, *History of the Cold War* (N. Y. Philosophical Library, 1956), p. 224; and in *U. S. Foreign Policy, 1945-55*, by W. Reitzel, M. Kaplan, C. Coblentz (Brookings Institution, Washington, 1956), pp. 272-73.

sion of Spain, with Hitler's advances into Austria and Czechoslovakia. *Munich was the climax of a whole program of encouraging reaction and fascism, not of grudgingly yielding to it.* And it was a climax which had the inevitable conclusion of world war—as the Soviet Union and the forces of the Left throughout the world had warned without letup for a decade.

John Foster Dulles as attorney for the international cartels responsible for this policy, was then a leading apologist for it, just as today, holding the same class position, he functions as the leading executor of an analogous policy. No book is more relevant to a comprehension of the present and especially the Dulles foreign policy than his own work, *War, Peace and Change*, published by Harpers in 1939. Its whole argument is an apologia for the expansionism of Japan, Italy and Germany. Indeed, this was so marked, that Dulles himself wrote in the foreword: "The reasoning of this study may be repellent to some, as suggesting a defense of those powers which are in rebellion against the present scheme of things."

In this work, the words fascism, imperialism, nazism, socialism, the Soviet Union are not present; but it is an elaborate defense of the policy of appeasement and of Munich itself (indeed, the preface is dated November, 1938, i.e., two months after Munich).

John Foster Dulles was personally a major architect of the Munich policy; his current cries of alarm lest we repeat the tragedy of Munich, are acts of demagoguery and deceitfulness in pursuit now, as then, of a policy dedicated to the destruction of the Soviet Union and of socialism, the thwarting of all national liberation efforts and the imposition on mankind of a fascist inferno.

THE THREAT OF ATOMIC WAR

The seriousness of the danger of war between the United States and China with all the implications that holds for further expansion of the conflict is admitted by everyone. None denies that this is the closest we have yet come to going over one of Mr. Dulles' brinks.

In this mid-twentieth century, with what full-scale war means to all humanity, such dangers are simply impermissible. It is imperative to understand that the United States Government moves more and more certainly not only in the direction of war-making, but also in the direction of committing itself to the employment of atomic weapons in war.

Since 1954, the United States has adopted the position of considering so-called tactical atomic weapons as being in the "conventional" arms category. In the past several years it has moved—together with Great Britain—in the direction of revamping its military tactics and strategy, and therefore its tables of equipment and organization, in the direction of atomic warfare. Once the huge military machine is committed, it develops a power and an inertia to change that are vast. The fact is that the reorganization of the American armed forces from the high-explosive base of World War II to the atomic and nuclear energy base for its projected World War III is so well advanced that it now plays a significant part in predisposing the Government towards atomic warfare

and opposing a ban on atomic-weapon development, let alone atomic-weapon disarmament.

On March 27, 1955, James Reston wrote from Washington, in the *N. Y. Times* (remember, this is 1955):

The situation is disturbing in the extreme. The U.S. is isolated from its Western Allies over Quemoy and Matsu. It is risking war for islands that are not vital to its own security or even—if we are to take the word of Secretary of Defense Wilson—to the security of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Moreover, officials in Washington are now talking about tactical weapons as if they were instruments of mercy that could knock out military targets more neatly and quickly than 'conventional' weapons.

Ever since then a campaign has been conducted to accustom the American public to expect the use of atomic weapons by its forces in any serious fighting. That is why one now finds the military expert for the *N. Y. Times*, Hanson Baldwin, writing (Sept. 7): "Attacks against Chinese mainland airfields—if made—might well have to be made with nuclear weapons." Mr. Baldwin explains that this "necessity" follows from the fact that such weapons would require only seven flights, rather than the seven thousand needed if old-fashioned high-explosive bombs are used. And Joseph Alsop, writing from Washington, (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Sept. 10), reports: "The highest Pentagon authorities in fact maintain that the U.S. armed services will be almost compelled to use tactical nuclear weapons." Two days later, the same person, writing from Taiwan, declared:

No one should forget for an instant that the American armed services intended to use nuclear weapons to defend Quemoy and Matsu. That is the present intention . . . certain key figures in the armed services . . . are not averse to having a nuclear showdown now.

A correspondent for the *U. S. News & World Report* (Sept. 26) writes from Taiwan that in various places on the island, "spotted at strategically located sites" are guided missiles, "their noses aimed at predetermined targets on the mainland." He adds: "Atomic warheads probably are here." The Seventh Fleet, patrolling the waters of Taiwan, and moving to within five or six miles of the Chinese mainland, has six aircraft carriers, three heavy cruisers, thirty-six destroyers, twenty service ships and four submarines—several of these vessels are equipped for nuclear warfare. This fleet is manned by 60,000 men and carries 500 planes. All this is in addition to the enormous buildup of airpower in the Pacific (especially South Korea and the Philippines) and about 2,000 U.S. troops now on Taiwan as instructors of the 500,000 combat-ready men under Chiang.

Most recently: "U.S. Air Secretary James H. Douglas said at Dallas the U.S. forces were in a state of readiness to use nuclear weapons in the China crisis" (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 28). And Madame Chiang, visiting our country, openly

advocated, via radio and television, the use of nuclear weapons upon China, "to get the war over with quicker."

The American public has been reassured many times that the decision to use atomic weapons could come only from the President. While this assurance is far from satisfactory, it has indicated some sense of responsibility about this most grave question. Lately, however, there has been a tendency to remain silent on this matter, and the only recent reference to it that I have seen tends to throw serious doubt as to the validity of the assurance any longer. Thus, in the President's news conference of August 27, 1958, the President was again asked: "If the U.S. does get involved in war, will military commanders at the front make the decision whether or not to use tactical atomic weapons?"

First, the President replied: "I think not." He then amended that to indicate that there was no doubt and that the use of such weapons did require "the specific authority of the President." When, however, he was pressed further, as to whether "in the case of an immediate threat to American troops," such weapons could not be employed "at the discretion of the local commander," the President then replied:

It has been a long time that I have gone through these, all these directives, and many of them go into tremendous detail.

I am not going any further than that, and, if it is possible, I will take a look again, because there is one exception, but I don't believe it mentions atomic weapons: that, if the United States itself or any of its armed forces are under attack, that they can use any measures necessary for their defense, but I would have to make certain. My memory is not quite that good this morning.

If the President did refresh his memory on this "detail", and if so, what he found, has not been announced, so far as I know. But from what the President did say, there appears now to be the gravest doubt as to whether or not atomic weapons may be used at the discretion of local commanders, or—as the American people had been repeatedly assured—only at the discretion of and with the authority of the President.

There was another significant statement made by the President at this press conference. The President was asked if it was expected or if it was policy for the United States not to open attack, not to deliver the first blow, and specifically the first nuclear blow. The President replied: "Now, *I don't see any reason, therefore, for saying we necessarily have to take the first blow. . . .*"

Given the catastrophic quality of nuclear weapons, and the fact that only the United States has used atomic weapons in warfare, thus slaughtering scores of thousands of civilians, it is likely that neither of these statements by the President won us many friends abroad.

DULLES' TREATY WITH CHIANG

The Secretary of State, in his best church-going manner, cites the "solemn obligation" imposed upon the "honor" of the United States to support Chiang

Kai-shek because of treaty commitments, notably the alliance of 1955, and the consequent Senate Resolution authorizing the President to use American military force to protect Chiang's hold on Taiwan and the Pescadores. He appears horrified if one suggests that the existence of the treaty and the Resolution do not put at rest all arguments opposed to his China policy.

We would first remind Mr. Dulles that in his 1939 book, already mentioned, he devoted several pages to explaining to his readers why treaties were not sacred, and were subject to change or even to repudiation. And he concluded his discussion, then, with these words:

There are doubtless many treaties which under any international system would be accorded the sanction of authority. There are others which would not. In the absence of any central authority to pass judgment, one cannot consider treaties, as such, to be sacred, nor can we identify treaty observance, in the abstract, with 'law and order.' (p. 47)

Of course, here Mr. Dulles' purpose was to apologize for the violations and repudiations of treaties which regularly marked the conduct of the fascist powers; then, in those circumstances, he found treaties far from sacred. Now, having signed a treaty of mutual military assistance with a bankrupt and repudiated counter-revolutionary—whom he owns body and soul—whose whole purpose in life is to destroy the Chinese People's Republic and who knows he cannot even attempt that seriously without the large-scale involvement of the United States in an attack upon China—now, under these circumstances and with these commitments, Dulles assures the American people of the sacredness and inviolability of treaties, and that treaty in particular.

Dulles' treaty with Chiang has no more moral and legal force than did the treaties Hitler made with the "Protector" of Moravia and Bohemia. Moreover, concerning that treaty, and particularly its invocation to justify the Quemoy-Matsu line, there is more than the suspicion of fraud and deception. Senator Wayne Morse (D., Oregon), a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, writing in *The Nation* (Sept. 20, 1958), in an article entitled, "How Dulles Tricked Congress," proves that the treaty ratification and the Senate Resolution of 1955, resulted in large part from "the deception and intellectual dishonesty of Dulles toward Congress and the American people." He proves that it was thoroughly understood at the time that the commitment specifically did not include the off-shore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and that any effort to include those islands would require a formal amendment of both the treaty and the Resolution. He proves, further, that it was understood, and stated in writing as part of the Resolution and treaty, that any major movement of troops by Chiang out of the immediate Taiwan vicinity would only be undertaken with the express knowledge and approval of the U.S. authorities. Yet, as Senator Morse writes, though one-third of Chiang's forces were moved almost ninety miles from Taiwan to Quemoy and Matsu, "neither the Senate Foreign Relations Committee nor the Senate Armed Services Committee has ever been officially apprised of the move, either before or afterward." These facts lead the

Senator to conclude, in measured words, which, from such a source, have very few precedents in American history:

As Dulles proudly treads the brink of war, he also treads the brink of unconstitutionality, for his commitment to Quemoy in the Far East, as in Lebanon, is his own and not that of Congress.

Nor is that all: When Dulles was questioned about the movement of 90,000 Chiang troops to Quemoy, he replied that it was done with neither the approval nor the disapproval of the United States, falling back upon his transparent myth of Chiang as an independent and fully sovereign "power." The first point to note is that the treaty with Chiang and the Senate Resolution specifically required prior approval for any such major military move of the "independent" ally; and the second point to note is that, in this instance specifically, once again, Dulles is not telling the truth. This follows from the fact that Chiang does not have the capacity to move 900 men, let alone 90,000, without the financial and logistical support of the U.S. Furthermore, Joseph Alsop, an ultra-reactionary columnist fittingly sympathetic with Dulles, wrote (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Sept. 7):

Even after the famous 'unleashing' [in 1953], Chiang himself saw that his regular troops and his political prestige ought not to be committed on the offshore islands, which he was then treating as entirely expendable. *He made the commitment on the islands under severe American pressure, which was applied to give substance to the unleashing.*

The Dulles-Chiang treaty is a moral monstrosity and a legal fraud and needs to be discarded together with its author; the Senate Resolution was obtained through deception and has been stretched to cover measures either never envisioned or specifically barred by that Resolution itself.

DULLES' ALLY AND THE NEW CHINA

To what has Dulles committed the United States, in the name of protecting freedom? And against what nation has Dulles joined in a war-making pact?

A decade ago, American Ambassador Stuart writing to President Truman characterized the Chiang government as "an unpopular regime which does not have the interests of the country at heart." This was the reason for revolution and this was the reason for the success of the Communists in China, despite the tremendous aid given to Chiang by the United States. The evidence documenting this is overwhelming; its truth is admitted today by everyone except Dulles and Chiang. We will offer one very recent reiteration of this truth. Our source is Y. Chu Wang, professor of Far Eastern History at Pennsylvania State Teachers College. Professor Wang wrote in *Foreign Affairs* (January, 1958):

When V-J Day came, all the evil symptoms [of the Chiang govern-

ment] reappeared with double vigor. Corruption in the government reached an all-time high. . . . When the regime was faced by a large peasant army, led by the Communists, with nothing to lose but a world to gain, it crumbled like a house of cards.

And what are the facts in Taiwan itself? The censorship there is exceedingly tight and very little gets through. Yet some things are available. Thus, the State Department itself, in its previously cited volume, *United States Relations with China*, wrote as follows (p. 308):

During the Japanese occupation the principal hope of the people had been reunion with the mainland. Instead of utilizing this highly favorable situation to its own advantage the Nationalist Government appointed to the governorship General Chen Yi, a long-time associate of the Generalissimo. . . . The new Governor arrived with an imposing retinue who proceeded with great efficiency to exploit Formosa. In addition the local population was ruthlessly excluded from any important role in public life and was made to feel that it was again under the rule of a conqueror.

The economic deterioration of the island and the administration of the mainland officials became so bad that on February 28, 1957, popular resentment erupted into a major rebellion. In the ensuing days the Government put down the revolt in a series of military actions which cost thousands of lives. Order was restored but the hatred of the mainland Chinese was increased.

Seven months after the repression of this uprising, General Wedemeyer, on an official mission to China, reported to the President, August 17, 1947, that in Taiwan the Nationalists were behaving "ruthlessly, corruptly and avariciously" and that its Army "conducted themselves as conquerors."

Somewhat later a civilian governor replaced the military, and for a year and a half, American officials reported some improvement in government, and stated: "Although it cannot be said that economic conditions improved, it can be said that the situation did not become measurably worse." But in January, 1949, the civilian governor was removed and replaced by General Chen Cheng, "who proceeded to restore military rule." Thereafter conditions deteriorated; "in summary," said the State Department late in 1949, "the island is badly and inefficiently run." This General Chen Cheng is today Prime Minister of Chiang's "government." Intermittent outbreaks have since occurred; Chiang's regime on Taiwan is comparable to Batista's in Cuba. Among the more delightful efforts of the free and democratic American press to demonstrate the amenities of life under Chiang, there was this paragraph in the *Saturday Evening Post*, Sept. 6, 1958:

There is little sign of dry rot or deteriorating morale among the tough soldiers. . . . There is a permanent 'Paradise House' run, curiously, by the Officers Moral Endeavor Assn., where officers and men alike find surcease from their loneliness. The establishment is supervised by a medical staff,

the girls are under contract to the government at the equivalent of 50 American dollars a month, and an atmosphere of strict propriety prevails.

But the New China—the China that threatens “us,” and against which “we” are ready to hurl nuclear weapons—has other kinds of Moral Endeavor, which trouble the pious Mr. Dulles. Its enormous achievements are astounding the world; they are a magnificent tribute to the creative capacities of the masses, and a thrilling confirmation of the liberating potential of Marxism-Leninism.

Professor L. C. Walmsley of Canada, for 27 years a missionary in the old China, returned to the new China for several weeks late in 1957. Remembering the poverty, filth, oppression of the old, he found the New “amazing” and almost incredible. He found a new pride, a new dignity; he found the working man and—what is more—the working woman, emancipated and working enthusiastically for themselves, collectively. He concludes: “I can be glad for the measure of progress they have made, and I rejoice to see hope replacing despair, and pride in achievement replacing fatalistic apathy.” (*The United Church Observer*, Toronto, March 15, 1958) That is Dulles’ enemy, whom he would treat to nuclear bombs.

The President of the Royal Bank of Canada, James Muir, visited the new China in the spring of 1958. He reports:

The growth in industry, the change in living standards, the modernization of everything and anything, the feats of human effort and the colossal impact of human labor are not within our power to describe and still give a worthwhile picture of the scene. All I can say is that it must be seen to be believed. It’s truly stupendous. . . . We think the vast majority of the people of China have a government they want, a government which is improving their lot, a government in which they have confidence, a government which stands no chance whatever of being supplanted. (*National Guardian*, Sept. 15, reprinted from the *Congressional Record*, July 15, 1958)

That is Dulles’ enemy.

A former official of the old Chinese government, who resigned after the Communist victory and now lives in San Francisco, Ping-Chia Kuo, in his book, *China: New Age and New Outlook* (Knopf, N. Y., 1956), commends the “remarkable progress” made by the New China. He says it is necessary “to recognize first of all that the new China led by the Communist government in Peking is here to stay”; that it has unified China as never before in her history; that “it has aroused new hope in the Chinese people”; and that it “represents an irresistible force, which cannot be stopped or checked.” Wherefore, says this non-Communist Chinese: “It is the responsibility of the statesmen of all nations to devise means within the given circumstances to find a way of living together, of minimizing the chances of war and strengthening the cause of peace.”

That is Dulles’ enemy.

The opposition to the Asian policy of the United States as expressed in Dulles’ antics is well-nigh unanimous. George Herald, surveying the European press “from Oslo to Rome and from London to Vienna” found “a rare unanimity” on several major points in direct conflict with the Dulles policy (*N. Y. Post*, Sept. 11). Drew Middleton, the *New York Times* correspondent in London, reported (Sept. 14) the most widespread hostility to Dulles’ policy throughout Great Britain, and stated that similar findings had been reported by the same paper’s correspondents in Paris, Bonn and Rome.

Eisenhower and Dulles have made much of their so-called “dominoes” theory, in which they put forth the idea that “giving up” Quemoy and Matsu would lead to the collapse of all the “free” or non-committed nations in Asia—such as Taiwan, South Korea, the Philippines, Malaya, Burma, etc. This concept—first put forward, by the way, to buttress support of France’s “dirty war” in Vietnam—is faulty not only because it is applied to nations and peoples who are not quite the same as dominoes; it is also faulty on its face because public opinion within the very countries Dulles seeks to “protect” is opposed to his protection.

The Dulles line is rejected in Australia and New Zealand. It is anathema in Malaya—the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent in Malaya said that the “dominoes” concept “has been received here with a mixture of amazement, hilarity and anger” (Sept. 15). The Prime Minister of Thailand has announced his country’s “non-intervention” beforehand in any war Mr. Dulles may precipitate; Defense Minister Vargas of the Philippines also questioned Mr. Dulles’ wisdom in connection with Quemoy and Matsu; and even the Deputy Secretary General, William Worth, of Dulles’ own concoction, the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) made a point of declaring that the commitment of that organization did not cover the Taiwan Strait nor the coast of China. In the UN itself the governments of Burma, Indonesia and Cambodia opposed Dulles, and a leading newspaper in Pakistan (a member of Dulles’ Baghdad Pact), the *Karachi Times* (Aug. 30, 1958), found Dulles’ “maneuvers highly provocative” and said that “U.S. armed intervention in the area would constitute an act of aggressive war.” So even among the “dominoes,” it appears that Dulles has only two certain pieces—Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek.

As for the hostility of public opinion in Latin America on this matter, nothing need be said; the same holds for the people (and the independent governments) of Africa; it applies to the Mid-East; and it has been vigorously expressed by the Government and the peoples of India.

That the peoples of the socialist world, and in the first place of the Soviet Union, stand foursquare with the Chinese people and nation is crystal-clear. The partisanship of the USSR is unequivocal, and history shows that its commitments in such matters are not to be taken lightly. The Premier of the USSR wrote President Eisenhower:

I have already told you, and I believe it necessary to re-emphasize it,

that an attack on the People's Republic of China is an attack on the Soviet Union. With People's China, our great friend, ally and neighbor, we have a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance, meeting the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples and the interests of peace. Let no one have any doubts about it; we shall fully perform all the assumed obligations.

The evidence leads to this conclusion: if it is the duty of the Secretary of State to achieve the utter isolation of the United States, in the face of serious international difficulties, then John Foster Dulles has performed so admirably that he is, as President Eisenhower insists, the greatest Secretary of State in American history.

AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION

As we have commented in these pages for many months, there is a rising uneasiness among the American people with the Dulles foreign policy. This has reached a crescendo during August and September; it pervades the land. The myth of bipartisanship on foreign policy has been smashed (in part due to Dulles' terrible arrogance) and Senators Fulbright, Cooper, Green, Morse, Mansfield, Kennedy, Humphrey, and Kefauver have spoken out, with varied vigor, against the Dulles line. The denunciations of the policy coming from Mrs. Roosevelt, former Secretary of State Acheson and former Senator Lehman are well known. An increasing section of the press, including the Republican press, is casting critical glances at the current foreign policy. The public, in the form of letters to the newspapers, to Congressmen and to the State Department, have been overwhelmingly—about 8 to 1—in opposition to the Asian adventures. Some old-line Republican figures, like Henry B. Cabot of Massachusetts and Hamilton Fish of New York, have spoken out in a similar sense.

Dana Adams Schmidt, writing from Washington in the *N. Y. Times* (Sept. 14), stated: "The only force likely to deflect the Administration from its course would be mushrooming domestic political opposition." I believe the other forces indicated above have also played a part in this deflection; but certainly a basic force is American public opinion and it has been speaking out in unprecedented numbers and vigor. No doubt it has helped to deflect the Administration from actually launching a full-scale "hot" war, at least to the moment of writing. Its continuance and acceleration will guarantee the permanent "deflection" of that Administration.

THE REALITY OF THE WAR DANGER

Dulles has led the country to so many brinks, that a mood is developing to the effect that it is all a game and that neither he nor anyone else really intends to produce war. People are becoming bored with the cries of "wolf"; but real wolves do exist. Added to this is the feeling that nuclear weapons have made war so catastrophic that it is inconceivable that any leaders would permit

a major conflict in which such weapons probably would be used, to ever break out.

Such feelings and moods are not in accord with reality and are most dangerous. They can contribute to a lessening of vigilance in opposition to war, and by that to the unleashing of the dogs of war. The Chiang lobby is powerful, and there are extreme Right-wing elements here and elsewhere quite capable of launching nuclear war.

One has from Mr. Dulles himself a statement like this:

I think we would win a hot war, and I do not know if we will win this 'cold war' or not. It depends on whether we have an adequate program. . . . But as far as the defense of the principles and ideals for which this country has stood from the beginning and to which it is dedicated, those are, I think, in greater jeopardy from a cold war than from a hot war. (*N. Y. Times*, June 27, 1958).

No, peace will not come of itself and it will not come because of the horrors of implements of war; it will come in our time only because the will for peace among the masses of mankind is made sufficiently articulate and organized so that it can muzzle imperialism's organic war-making drive.

CONCLUSION

We began our commentary by pointing to inadequacies in analyses of causation among those critical of the Administration's brink-of-war policy. We wish to conclude by underlining another, and a related, failing among these critics. True, from all of them, Walter Lippmann, Dean Acheson, Herbert Lehman, *The Nation*, etc., has come the proposal that the off-shore islands be relinquished, and that China be recognized and seated in the United Nations. These proposals are necessary ones and that they are brought forward is as welcome as is the criticism of policy which accompanies them.

However, in every case, it is simultaneously advocated that Taiwan be torn from the Chinese People's Republic, and either be "neutralized" in some way, or else established as some sort of "independent" nation, under UN auspices. *The Nation*, for example, urges (Sept. 20) that "The way out is to hark back to the declaration embodied in President Truman's executive order of June 27, 1950, when the 7th Fleet was 'interposed' between Formosa and the mainland." Or, Lewis Mumford wants "to establish Formosa as a self-governing nation" (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 28, 1958).

But the fact is that the tearing of Taiwan from China and its so-called "neutralization" in an ocean dominated by the U.S. 7th Fleet is precisely the basic line of the United States Government, both under Truman (after June, 1950) and under Eisenhower.

One wonders why *The Nation* wants to go back only to June, 1950. Why not go back to January 5, 1950, when President Truman declared that the United States accepted the fact of Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan, that the

United States had no designs on that island, that it would not give military aid or advice to Chiang on the island, and that it would follow a policy of strict non-involvement in the Chinese civil war. Or why not go back to President Truman's statement of December 15, 1945:

The U.S. government has long subscribed to the principle that the management of internal affairs is the responsibility of the peoples of sovereign nations. . . . U.S. support will not be extended to U.S. military intervention to influence the course of any Chinese internal strife. . . . The U.S. government considers that the detailed steps necessary to the achievement of political unity in China must be worked out by the Chinese themselves and that intervention by any foreign government in these matters would be inappropriate.

Taiwan is Chinese. There would be more reason to neutralize and internationalize Hawaii than there is to so deal with Taiwan. At least Hawaii—not appropriated until 1898—is over 1500 miles from California. Or perhaps, one should internationalize Newfoundland, only recently a province of Canada, and as far from the coast of Canada as Taiwan is from China.

Furthermore, the history of the imperialist rape of China has been a history of the carving up of that nation, with pieces taken by Japan and Czarist Russia and England and France, etc. The New China is the most stable and most firm central government in Chinese history; a fundamental drive of the Chinese Revolution has been a national one, one seeking the attainment of the full integrity and sovereignty of China over all China. Hence the Chinese People's Government could never agree to the permanent relinquishment of Taiwan, a province of China with ten million people.

Therefore, any solution of the Asian crisis which consists of tearing away part of the flesh of China is no solution. It cannot last: it can only be a source of international friction and a potential war danger. The Chinese people must settle their own problems in their own way and they must conclude their civil war without any interference from any Power, let alone one that is five thousand miles away from its borders.

In the name of the real national interests of the United States, in the name of its own good-fame, and in the name of the securing of peace in the world, it is necessary that:

*The United States recognize the Chinese People's Republic
The Chinese People's Republic be seated in the United Nations
and on the Security Council of that body
There be no outside interference in the internal affairs of the
Chinese nation, including its civil war
The United States withdraw its land, sea, and air forces from the
territory of China*

We need a policy of friendship with the 650,000,000 Chinese people, not one of hostility, which in turn isolates us from world public opinion. Such friendship would serve the best interests of our country and would enhance the welfare of the peoples of the world.

The Crisis in Steel

By A. Krchmarek

FOR MORE THAN A YEAR the steel workers of our country have felt the heavy impact of mass unemployment. Again they have been hit by a recurring cyclical crisis of capitalist over-production—and this has been heightened by widespread automation in the industry.

The magnitude of the problem can be seen in relation to the over-all production figures of steel. The annual production capacity of steel in 1958 is rated at 140,742,000 tons. However, the actual rate of production for the entire industry was down to 54.1% of capacity during the first six months of 1958.

While production in August and September rose to 65% because of orders from auto for the 1959 models and some pickup in construction, this is far less than had been anticipated.

Though in the first six months, production dropped to 54%, the steel corporations continued to make a comfortable profit amounting to 5.7% of their net worth, which is over nine billion dollars. As *Steel Labor* commented, the companies can make a good profit at a very low level of production; they

can make enormous profits when production is high.

The number of unemployed steel workers is now about 250,000, and an additional 350,000 are on part time. Most severely hit are the Negro, Puerto Rican, unskilled and young workers. The proportion of unemployed Negroes is at least double that of the white workers. Thus in a steel-town like Gary where 50 per cent of the population is Negro, working mainly in the mill, the layoffs are causing terrible privation.

Unemployment benefits have eased the burden of the crisis temporarily and for many steelworkers SUB has been an added help. However, for thousands these benefits have already expired and the number grows each week. The Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation reported that the number of such expirations had passed the 100,000 mark by July. The problems of providing relief for the needy are mounting while the local governments are unprepared, and the national government unwilling, to meet the needs of the workers.

In recent years, tens of thousands of white and Negro workers came

to industrial cities like Youngstown, Cleveland, Lorain from the South; many Puerto Ricans came, too. Now the tide of the white population is shifting back to the South. But the bulk of Negroes and the Puerto Ricans are staying—there is nothing to go back to.

In the steel towns the experiences of the "depression" of the 30's are being relived. The fear is growing that a new round of prosperity will be long in coming. Some still recall the report of the U.S. Steel Corp. in 1933 that it had no full time steel workers on its roster. While few expect the decline to go that deep, there is a growing feeling that there will remain now a permanent army of unemployed in steel.

The steel industry is the very foundation of the American economy. But, because of its concentrated nature, the impact of the lay-offs and of mass unemployment is concentrated in a few key areas of the Middle West and the East (Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Buffalo, Youngstown, Gary, Chicago, Philadelphia). Thus 70 per cent of the population of Gary (170,000) depends on the huge steel mills for their means of livelihood.

There is still another feature of reality and of class relationships that must be reckoned with—the company town. Despite all the changes that have been wrought in the past score of years by science, transportation, by radio and TV, by the mechanical wonders, as well as by

the emergence of trade unions, the main steel communities remain essentially company towns, dependent for their social and economic existence on the "mill." When the fires in the furnaces die down, the sickness spreads like a plague in ever-widening circles. This is the key feature of towns like Homestead, Aliquippa and McKeesport; of Gary and South Chicago; of Youngstown and Lorain; of Steubenville and Weirton.

There the class nature of modern society stands out sharp and clear. The worker is confronted with the giant corporation whose owners are unknown to him, invisible—but powerful, impersonal and always greedy. Many of the bourgeois frills, hazy illusions, "mutual partnership" concepts appear unreal, shabby and somewhat silly.

Very few workers harbor any illusions about escaping from the ranks of their class. The realities of life speak differently from the hucksters of bourgeois publicity. And the depression drives this lesson home even more emphatically.

But there is one basic difference from the company town of the past—the Union. Built in great struggles and at great sacrifice, and despite many of its shortcomings, the union towers as an enormous force in the steel areas. It is the main weapon for defense of workers' interests in the mill, and in a period of economic distress it is taking on new tasks to meet the problems of the unem-

ployed. Some beginnings have been made in some steel areas for the locals to concern themselves with the needs and problems of the unemployed members to get relief, surplus food, help in repossessions, etc. But only the smallest beginnings.

THE ANATOMY OF A STEEL TOWN

Lorain, population 50,000, is a steel town on Lake Erie, 35 miles west of Cleveland. The dominant feature of the landscape and of the town's life is the giant National Tube Co. (U.S. Steel) employing 11,000 workers. This industrial complex includes miles of ore docks, blast furnaces, bessemer converters, 400 coke ovens, two rolling mills, two skelp mills, buttweld mills, seamless mills, machine shops, warehouses, etc.

The Lorain mill, producing seamless steel pipe, was the last to be hit by lay-offs, but then it was hit hard. Eighty per cent of its product is sold to the oil companies, especially in the Middle East. The problems of that area had inspired the oil companies to solve oil transportation problems by building oil pipe lines. This created a big demand for steel pipe, and the Lorain mill had endless orders.

Employment was high; there was much overtime, and a shortage of labor. The company met the labor problem by "importing," after careful screening, some 5,000 Puerto Ricans in recent years. They are

jammed into abominable housing quarters at fantastic rentals.

As the liberation struggles of the Middle East mounted, orders for pipe were cut drastically, and the storm hit the town. Over 80 per cent of the Puerto Rican workers are now jobless. They cannot pick up even the jobs local workers occasionally find. They are trapped, stranded in a modern company town, and there is no place to go.

To a lesser degree this is also true of the D.P.'s, the rag-tail of social change in Europe. Some 10,000 were brought to the Cleveland area from Hungary alone in the recent period. They were given jobs in the mills and other industries. There are none at all left in the Lorain mill. In Cleveland, between 40 and 60 per cent of the D.P.'s are unemployed. Many yearn to go back and over 500 have already done so.

Nor are there any youth left in the mill; they too have felt the curse of the lay-off, as have the Negroes and women. The result is that the age level of those still working is strikingly high, since lay-offs have gone beyond the 15-year seniority level.

Also in the Lorain area are a number of new, modern plants of Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, Thew Shovel, the ship-yards, etc. All have had heavy lay-offs. The GM plant had employed over 2,000 workers; barely 500 remain.

The over-all picture that emerges is that of big industry owned and

run by absentee capital—by the giant monopolies that rule America. Even the food and other services are big capital: the A&P, Kroger Supermarkets, department stores, leaving almost no leeway for small enterprise, which consists of some tiny candy stores, garish beer joints and the like. The role of the middle class is negligible and escape into the middle class is sharply limited. This picture can be duplicated in the key steel areas.

Within this relationship, the position of the worker, face to face with giant monopolies, is stripped bare of all trappings. In a period of an economic crisis and rising hardship and privations it takes on new meaning. From this soil have emerged new moods of militancy and strong currents among the steel workers of our country.

AUTOMATION AND JOBS

A new and deeply disturbing problem has now further complicated the job security of the steel workers, namely, automation. It is not only displacing workers in the mills; it now threatens to create new ghost towns in a number of areas.

Up to World War II, technological developments in steel lagged far behind those in other industries. From 1920 to 1940 steel capacity increased by barely 20 million tons. Hardly any expansion or modernization was undertaken in the depression era of the 30's. When World

War II came the government had to build new steel plants, which it later turned over to steel companies, and it offered all kinds of incentives to the big corporations to expand production.

But in the postwar period there took place a tempestuous development in the expansion of steel-making facilities, in the introduction of modern, automated processes. From 1940 to 1958 steel capacity rose by 60 million tons; it has reached an annual rate of over 140 million tons.

It is reported that in the new mill of U.S. Steel at Morrisville, the capacity of open hearth furnaces has been raised from some 200 tons per heat to 410 tons with no increase in size of crew. President McDonald wrote approvingly in the July issue of *Steel Labor* that it now takes but 15 manhours of work to produce a ton of steel—while in 1919 it required 70 manhours of work.

Since 1940 the number of workers in basic steel has increased by a little over 60,000 despite the enormous increase in capacity cited above. Production of ingots and steel castings per man rose from 88 tons in 1940 to 230 tons per man in 1956.

The current economic decline has sharply reduced construction of new steel plants, since present capacity is far in excess of demand. However, the improvement of existing plants is proceeding apace. The J&L steel mill in Cleveland was closed down completely for five months for the announced purpose of moderniza-

tion. In other mills the open hearth capacity is being increased with no increase of crews. New methods are being applied—like the converter process of blowing oxygen into the bessemer, open hearths and blast furnaces, increasing greatly their efficiency.

In some areas the old mills are being closed down—never to reopen. In a number of mills in the Youngstown area, existing old equipment is being used up without regard to repair, deliberately permitted to go down in wrack and ruin, with the outlook of scrapping entire mills and transferring production to new automated mills. The spectre of ghost towns is shaping up.

The double-barreled threat of unemployment and automation is haunting the lives of steel workers. And a new phenomenon has appeared—strikes over automation issues. In July, the Timken Roller Bearing Co. of Canton, Ohio announced a nine million dollar automation program for its plant and began transferring work to its other plants. A strike affecting nine thousand workers was called by the steel local with full support by the District. Other steel locals in the area immediately responded with pledges of "moral, financial and physical" support.

The strike was called over one very simple issue—to guarantee that all workers with 15 or more years service with the company would not

lose their pension rights won by the union. (Such an agreement is already in effect with Republic Steel and others).

In another instance, when 600 copies of a pamphlet on automation, written by Hy Lumer, were distributed in a large mill, it received an extraordinary reception, and went from hand to hand. For some weeks it was the central point of discussion in that mill; the company finally gave the workers its own slick pamphlet on the meaning of automation, much to the amusement of the workers.

Once more the issue of the 30-hour week with no reduction in pay is coming to the fore in the steel areas. Even McDonald felt compelled to talk about the need for a shorter work week and for extended vacations to offset the effects of automation. This was during his campaign for re-election to the presidency of the Union in early 1957. After the election nothing more was said, until now.

DEAD-END POLICIES

The class collaborationist policies of the McDonald leadership are a major obstacle in developing a fighting program to meet the urgent problems of unemployment and automation. Parading around in the steel mills, arm in arm with Ben Fairless of Big Steel, he tried to sell the workers the "mutual trusteeship" concepts of labor and capital partnership. And he proclaimed his

devotion to and confidence in capitalism, and in its ability to prevent any economic crisis with the so-called "built-in stabilizers." Mass unemployment in steel has exposed the bankruptcy of these concepts, yet McDonald continues to cling to these straws.

Government intervention, which had been expected to solve the economic crisis, had not done so. But McDonald continues to plead with the Administration and with Congress "to end this depression." Following the lead of Wall Street, he puts heavy reliance upon a huge armaments program to bring jobs in steel. But steel production continues to lag in spite of the biggest armaments expenditures in peace-time history. Repeatedly, the question arises: "Must we have another war to provide full employment?" But war now would annihilate all mankind and provide the security of the grave.

Wistfully McDonald has now put forward the proposal for the President to set up a "Commission on Permanent Prosperity" to end the depression. Anything to avoid mass movements and mass struggles and to divert the workers' militancy. But the steel workers are becoming restive and are looking for a bolder program and more resolute leadership. All too slowly does McDonald respond to the pressures of the rank and file.

NEW MOODS AND CURRENTS

These new moods and pressures have been given concrete expression in recent months. The Dues Protest movement was a vehicle of this ferment and dissatisfaction among the steel workers. Loose in organization, narrow and limited in outlook, factional in its approach, with an inexperienced leadership, it nevertheless mustered tremendous support among the rank and file mainly on the issue of inner-union democracy. Don Rarick, chairman of the Committee, challenged McDonald for the union presidency and the official tally gave him 223,516 votes to 404,172 for McDonald.

Failing to take up other pressing issues, the movement subsided after the elections, and it was generally felt it had run its course. But in the local union elections in June of this year, slates of candidates appeared in some of the largest and most important locals to challenge the incumbent officers.

Again the temper of the steel workers was expressed in no uncertain terms. The opposition slates were swept into office in almost every case where they appeared. Rarick won the presidency of the Irvin local, Mamula of the giant Aliquippa local, O'Brien of the J&L local in Hazelwood. In Lorain's 11,000 member local, the old administration was swept out completely, for the first time in 20 years. Wherever an alternative was at hand, the membership utilized it to voice their

protest. This rank and file upsurge has taken place despite the considerable gains achieved in recent years in wages, pensions, and other benefits. But the grievances go beyond that.

In the Steubenville local of the Wheeling Steel Corp., the incumbent president, who had become a stoolpigeon in the Cleveland Taft-Hartley case, was defeated by an impressive majority as 75% of the members turned out to vote. Despite his entrenched position in office, and outright support for his re-election by the FBI and the Dept. of Justice, he was rebuked soundly.

In some areas red-baiting was resorted to. In each instance it was a dud and even boomeranged against those using it. There, too, was a noticeable acceptance and support of progressives, especially when they came forward with a sound program.

Noteworthy also is the warm response of steel workers to material issued by the Communist Party. In some areas a great deal of such material was distributed—pamphlets and leaflets dealing with problems of unemployment, relief, and the folder "Program for Jobs and Security." In some instances the impact was remarkable and there is no doubt that the Party's views and program are welcome, especially now.

The results of the national and local elections, and the moods they expressed, are having a profound effect in the giant Steel Union. They

are creating powerful pressures upon the union leadership at all levels to come to grips with the many urgent issues at hand. Shifts and realignments of forces are being speeded up; this is true not only at the local but also at the district and even national levels. The position of the McDonald "business type" administration has been deeply shaken. The tremors and repercussions have been felt by the bureaucracy of other unions. In view of this, even stronger and much broader currents are forming now to challenge McDonald even more boldly in the next election, two years away.

There are also many dangers involved in this essentially healthy development. There are strong tendencies toward factionalism, to make individual personalities the main issue, and to make of them the main enemy of the workers. The progressives must oppose all tendencies of such a narrow nature. The main enemy of the workers has been, remains and continues to be the giant monopolies, the steel corporations. They have launched a broad offensive against organized labor on the economic and legislative fronts to weaken, and ultimately to destroy the most powerful weapon the workers possess—their trade unions. It is not merely individual leaders who should be subjected to criticism, but even more important, the policies they pursue. In view of the approaching struggles this fact must be driven home emphatically.

1959 STEEL CONTRACT

On June 30, 1959, the present contract will expire. No one expects the steel corporation to agree easily to any substantial improvements. There will be no easy victories won by negotiators in a closed room. The steel workers recognize they are heading into sharp and possibly protracted battles. Gains from the corporation will be won in hard struggle—as they have been in the past. This is already proven by the difficulties encountered by the auto-union negotiations, followed with deepest interest by steel workers.

The nature of the demands by the union, now being considered, indicates this. Standing at the top of the list of demands is that of the shorter work week with no reduction in pay. The exact form—30 hour or 32 hour week, long vacations with pay, etc.—must be given much thought. But it is the substance of such a demand that will find violent opposition by the corporations. It touches the very heart of surplus value and capitalist exploitation.

McDonald has designated this to be one of the major goals of the Union, "accentuated at the present time by severe unemployment and the accelerated pace of automation." However, if this issue is not to be shunted aside, as in the auto negotiations, discussion, preparations and mobilization of the entire membership should receive widest attention.

The FEP as a contract issue assumes even greater importance than before. The situation of the Negro workers at the present time, the disproportionate number unemployed, flows from their exclusion from the skilled jobs, from opportunities for advancement. They continue to be limited to the lowest job classifications, at the lowest pay. It is also the Negro workers who have displayed the greatest militancy in past struggles. Today, the militancy is even more pronounced though at times misdirected as in running of all-Negro slates in some locals. But the formation of Negro caucuses around issues and candidates is a positive feature. They serve to point up special problems of the Negro workers, and also serve as a catalyst to win support of the white workers in the union. Unity of Negro and white, imperative in the days ahead, will be welded as the union mounts defense of the rights of the Negro workers as a basic issue, including election to top union bodies.

Another important issue is that of time and a half for Saturday and double-time for Sunday work. Only the barest beginnings have been made on this for the union as a whole.

The question of higher wages, improved insurance and pensions, and SUB will also occupy key places in the demands, as well as demands in relation to the unemployed steel workers.

The winning of real gains in the new contract will require utmost unity and mobilization of the entire membership. It will require the fullest support by the entire organized labor movement, and by labor's allies—the Negro people, youth, women, small business, etc. To the degree this is accomplished the steel workers will score success.

Together with this it is essential that steel labor move quickly into the electoral campaigns, as an independent force especially on such issues as the Right-To-Work bills. The election of pro-labor candidates is an important feature of the anti-monopoly struggles.

Within all this the progressives can make an enormous contribution to

the cause of the steel workers in helping to clarify questions, initiate activities around the main issues, and in bringing a deeper class understanding at each level of the struggles. There is a need to project a program of trade and peaceful co-existence as essential to the interests of the workers and the nation.

The steel union can make important advances in the days ahead. But it must be remembered that all important gains in the past have been won in the course of sharp class battles and after much sacrifice. The lessons of the Homestead Strike in 1892, the Steel Strike of 1919, the great organizing campaign of the 30's should be studied afresh to cast light on the problems of today.

The Plague of Peace

"We say the timing of the hot-war breakout in Quemoy has been nothing short of masterful. After a shock reaction to permit the weak-at-heart to get off the gravy train, the market will hurtle ahead for two years just the way it did in 1950-52 with Korea under way. . . . War games and peace threats have always been the prime tools for manipulating minds and markets. . . . To get copper up to 40 cents and zinc to 20 would be an unthinkable task in a world plagued with perpetual peace. . . ."

From an advertisement by Cronenberg Reports, a Detroit investment-advisory corporation, in the (Canadian) *Financial Post*, August 30, 1958.

The Peace Movement in Great Britain

By John Williamson

THE PEACE MOVEMENT in Britain is generally recognized as one of the largest and most influential in the capitalist world. In addition to the established peace organizations like the British Peace Committee and the National Peace Council—the former affiliated to the World Peace Council and the latter a pacifist center—a whole series of *ad hoc* movements sprang up. These include the Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, the Aldermaston March movement, the National Council for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons Tests, Mothers in Black, and the Stop the War Committee (attached to the Movement for Colonial Freedom). There are literally hundreds of local Peace Committees—some two hundred of which are loosely affiliated to the Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

In Britain, the Labor Movement—trade unions, co-ops., Labor Party, Communist Party—is a powerful force in the localities. When the leadership of the Labor Party and T.U.C. is pressed into action from below,

this force becomes decisive nationally.

Because of the role of the Labor Party and the decisiveness of the Labor Movement it is important to know their decisions, even though they were arrived at reluctantly as far as the Right-Wing leadership is concerned. The 1957 T.U.C. expressed the opinion that the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen bombs “should cease immediately and that no further tests should take place” and that the Government should aim at an agreement for “the immediate unconditional suspension of tests to the Government of other powers directly concerned as a first step towards the banning of all nuclear weapons.”

A month later the Labor Party Conference, after a bitter discussion, adopted resolutions that “implores the British Government to pursue a policy of conciliation with other Powers, through the U.N., to settle outstanding international problems and lay the foundations of a lasting world peace.” It further called upon the Government “to seek the support of all nations . . . for an end to H-bomb tests; a ban on nuclear

weapons and the destruction of existing stocks with international control and inspection; and for progressive disarmament. . . .” and that a moral lead to the world be given “by announcing that no further nuclear bomb tests will be undertaken by this country.”

In March 1958, after a most vigorous demand for action by the branches, a lengthy seven-point declaration of the Labor Party and T.U.C. urged the Government to make a “serious attempt to bring about Summit talks in the near future” and that it should “press now for an international agreement on the suspension of thermo-nuclear tests” and as an example “should at once suspend nuclear tests unilaterally for a limited period. . . .” It also urged that flights in Britain by American aircraft “carrying nuclear weapons be discontinued and that no physical steps be taken to set up rocket sites in Britain before a fresh attempt had been made to negotiate with the Soviet Government.”

On occasions, as the urgency of the situation and the current demands reflect the majority feeling of the people, the movement for peace has reached a high point and swept the country—involving many forces who have no organized attachment at all.

THREE HIGH POINTS

There have been three such high points in the last two years—the demand to withdraw the troops from Suez, to Stop Nuclear Tests and the

Building of U.S. Rocket Sites in Britain, and the movement for Summit Talks Now.

The movement to withdraw the troops from Suez, with the guns of the British-French-Israeli invasion troops already roaring, had the deepest roots among the common people. There was momentarily swept into action broad sections of middle class and professional people side by side with Labor. Teachers, university professors, students, church people, and many other related categories who seldom express themselves politically, called meetings, adopted resolutions and wrote letters to the newspapers.

The movement to Stop the Nuclear Tests, while broad in character, never involved to the same extent these fringe, though important, sections of the population. Significant, however, was an appeal to stop nuclear weapons tests by 680 British scientists, including 69 Fellows of the Royal Society. Nevertheless it was essentially a movement of action—local committees, collection of signatures on petitions, local and national marches, innumerable mass meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country and lobbies at Parliament.

In the midst of this and as an integral part of it was the bitter resentment against the Tory agreement that the U.S. should construct and install long-range and intermediate range missile sites in Britain, as well as the accidentally disclosed information that U.S. bombers were flying

overhead with loaded H-bombs.

In Parliament, Bevan referred to the situation as "a state of mobilization one step short of war" although he shrank from proposals to refuse the American missile bases and declared the Labor Party was "not in favor of disbanding the NATO alliance."

In Scotland, where it was originally announced that three of these missile sites would be located, there was aroused a real majority protest movement. This united the Scottish Council of the Labor Party, Scottish T.U.C., the Nationalists, Communists, Co-ops., churches, every single Town Council of any size except Edinburgh and hundreds of trade union branches and leading personalities in all walks of life. The subsequent Government declaration, that no American rocket bases were now planned for Scotland, was a tribute to the unprecedented all-Scotland unity on this issue. Clearly, the transference of these rocket bases to the East Anglia coast of England did not fundamentally solve the problem.

Of significance also was the announcement of an agreement between the British Electrical Trades Union and the French Federation of Unions in Electrical, Nuclear and Gas Industries. It declared that "they undertake to take all the measures necessary to stop the installation of rocket bases in our countries" and declare boldly "that the interests of humanity lie now in a Summit conference."

These activities against Nuclear Tests and U.S. Rocket Sites helped to stimulate a widespread public debate in the press, Parliament and among the people on the relative positions of the Soviet Union and the Western capitalist powers on nuclear policy. Highlight of this was the correspondence in the *New Statesman* by Lord Russell, Khrushchev and Dulles.

The fight for Summit Talks started already months ago at the time of the Paris NATO talks, when Dulles received a serious set back. Macmillan and the Tories were placed on the defensive, compelled to pay lip service to Summit Talks, but together with Dulles sabotaged the idea and deliberately continued their own tests, and the arms drive generally.

The Tory *Daily Telegraph* printed a highly significant dispatch, from its leading political writer, declaring:

One could not be in Paris without being deeply aware that public opinion is in search of a new world, which it believes Mr. Khrushchev somehow holds in the palm of his hand, only waiting to impart it in one long clasp of friendship with Mr. Eisenhower.

No wonder Mr. Tom Dryberg, Labor Party national chairman, wrote that he was in receipt of hundreds of letters from Labor Party members demanding it organize a nation-wide protests campaign for Summit Talks. Poor Tom, boxed in with Gaitskell, Brown, Wilson, and

others, could only lament "you can't start a campaign overnight . . . it needs most careful preparation . . . we couldn't have started it at once because of Christmas."

The recent military aggression in Lebanon and Jordan by U.S. and British imperialism and the preparations to invade Iraq with the threat of war in the Middle East endangering the entire world, together with the forceful initiative of the Soviet Union proposing immediate talks by the Heads of State, served to set in motion the third wave of a popular mass movement.

The already present peace sentiment and the latest anti-American feeling resulted in an almost unanimous demand that the Government accept the Khrushchev proposals. The *Daily Herald* wrote that "British public opinion is massively united in favor of a speedy summit conference with Mr. Khrushchev to try to remove the danger in the Middle East." The *Daily Mail* said, "to refuse might be fatal" while the *Daily Express* said "there are no good grounds for rejecting the Soviet invitation." *The Times* cautiously advised that "the worst reply would be a flat rejection," while the *Manchester Guardian* said the proposed conference "ought to be accepted at once."

The Parliamentary Labor Party, after a shaky start, also pressed for a British response to Khrushchev's proposal, but they—like the National Council of Labor—failed to lift a finger to organize mass

action on a national level. In fact, the actions in Parliament of both Gaitskell and Brown, have tended to dampen down the mass movement by giving the impression that there was almost national unity in support of Macmillan's proposal, instead of alerting the people to the danger (which occurred) of the Tories yielding to Washington's pressure to either delay or prevent the Heads of Governments talks.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

The maintenance and development of the Peace Movement, with its ups and downs in levels of activity, is a constant struggle. Empire jingoism and a variety of modern-day confusionism is constantly being developed by the Tories and their mouthpieces. Right-wing leadership influence in Labor contributes its own forms of confusion and division which dampens down the movement. Initiative and leadership by the Peace forces, the Left in the Labor movement, and above all by the small but influential Communist Party, has time and again been the difference between action or passivity.

The Communist Party and the *Daily Worker* has consistently mobilized for action on the immediate issues as well as pointed the way ahead. This has been particularly striking on the occasions when the Right-wing labor leadership have at first given support to the Tory policy, as at the time of Egypt's nation-

alization of the Suez Canal, the partitioning of Cyprus, etc. or when it has given lip service to the demands of the movement without mobilization of mass activity.

However, there do exist a number of factors that contribute to the deep-growing feelings for peace of the British workers and people generally. The effects of the last war, with its loss of life, its aerial blitz destruction that can still be seen today, the evacuation of all children, the necessary mobilization and assignment of all able-bodied men and women to industry and the severe economic deprivations the people suffered, are not easily forgotten.

Furthermore, before their eyes are 40,000 U.S. troops and 18 U.S. bomber bases scattered throughout Britain. It is not easily forgotten that General Bradley, when he was U.S. Chief of Staff, said that Britain must serve as a "foothold from which you can attack Russia," and an unnamed American general said that "while London and most of Britain would be quickly destroyed" if war came, that nevertheless "Britain would remain useful as an aircraft carrier for American bombers." And to cap it all Defense Minister Sandys says, "American forces will remain here . . . we certainly have no intention of asking them to leave," and concerning the generally grave situation of threatened nuclear warfare, says "There is no reason why all this should not go on almost indefinitely."

The post-war subordination of and interference in Britain by U.S. im-

perialism and its cost to Britain—as well as the ever recurring Anglo-American contradictions—creates a reservoir of resentment and discontent against America. To the American ruling class, with its policy of reducing Britain strictly to the status of junior partner on all fronts of the alliance, Britain is viewed as expendable. This reaches the boiling point when the Tories openly expose Britain and the people to the consequences of this island serving as a missile rocket base that becomes America's first line of defense. This resentment spills over many times to sections of the ruling class and their hangers-on. At the time of Macmillan's last visit to America the *Financial Times* bluntly cautioned Washington to appreciate that it was only the richest member in an equal society. America must learn this quickly, it said, if the Western allies were not going to be split.

MILITARISM'S COST

The total financial cost to Britain and its people of this U.S. domination is not fully known. Up to 1954 the cost of U.S. troops in Britain was in the neighborhood of £203½ million, of which Britain paid 40% plus giving the land for the bases rent free.

The cost of constructing four U.S. rocket-missile launching sites has been estimated from £40 million to £32 million. The former sum could build over 100 primary schools; the latter is more than the cost of the

most expensive New Town accommodating 30,000 people. Another £10 million is to be poured out to instal 60 Thor intermediate missiles.

The armaments production bill for the current year is £1,525 millions. This compares with £741 million in 1949. Today the arms bill is 34.3% of the total Government expenditure. The single biggest item is "production and research," amounting to £534 million. Another £140 million is spent on what is called the "nuclear deterrent."

£140 million is more than the Government spends on family allowances each year (for the current year it is £125 million).

Britain spent last year 9.3% of its national income on defense, compared with its European NATO partners: France (7.8%), W. Germany (5.3%), Italy (4.7%), Holland (6.5%) and Belgium (4%). Macmillan, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer in May 1956, said on this same question:

Suppose our figure was 5%, not 9%. I think this particular piece of speculative arithmetic is illuminating—indeed tantalizing. It would mean a saving of £700 million and if only half of that were shifted into exports, it would completely transform our foreign balance.

But Macmillan quickly added that this was only "a pipe dream." With his eye fixed on America and the threat of retaliation, he said mournfully, "We know we can't have it. We are not going to behave in an irresponsible way."

With this one speech he punctured all the Tory fairy-tales about excessive home consumption and high wages being the cause of the deficit in the balance of payments—the ever present worry of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The imperialist policies of the British ruling class combined with its subordination to U.S. imperialism and its adventurist war policies lead to further great costs as far as the people are concerned. It is estimated by the Government that the Suez adventure alone cost £40 million, but everyone recognizes this is a gross understatement.

Thousands of young men have been killed or wounded in wars against the colonial people in Cyprus, Kenya, Malaya, etc.

The armaments spending program has crippled the re-equipping of British industry and put Britain in an unfavorable trading position; diverted production for trade to the bottomless pit of redundant armament; diverts manpower from industry to the armed forces and with its new mad policy of diverting more production to export purposes creates unemployment in non-export and construction industries.

It also leads to the Tory policy of cuts in the investments in the nationalized industries, to the building of fewer houses and schools, and to the determined policy of no wage increases and attacks upon the trade union movement. In 1958 at least 5½ million fewer workers have had increases than a year ago, and such

increases as have been won are running at the rate of £2½ million per week behind last year's increases.

In a word, the war and armaments policy of the Tory Government jeopardises the right to live and work of the British people.

Despite the development of the Peace Movement in this and other countries, as well as the unparalleled series of peace initiatives by the Soviet Union, culminating in the Soviet decision to unilaterally stop nuclear tests, and the reverses suffered by U.S. and British imperialism, the basic line of Tory policy has not been changed. The successes of the Peace Movement are only partial. As the imperialists are exposed, and as their capitalist economy experiences convulsions, they become more desperate and adventurist.

Because of the seriousness of the situation the Communist Party has declared: "Today the need is for *more*, and not *less* action for peace."

WEAKNESS OF THE MOVEMENT

To achieve more action, especially more effective and consistent action for peace, it is necessary to know what are the chief weaknesses of this Peace Movement. They can be grouped under 5 headings:

1. Not enough effective propaganda to clarify the deliberately created confusion.
2. Its lack of unity.
3. Its confusion on the issue of unilateralism and an attitude of go-it-alone.

4. Failure of Labor Movement to play a leading and unifying role.
5. The absence of a large, permanent and consistent British Peace Movement.

Undoubtedly the key weakness is the lack of united action by the Peace Movement. It is understandable that there are a variety of loosely functioning local Peace Committees and Ad Hoc national movements, with emphasis on different issues. However, because they have not been able to agree on a common policy, either between themselves or with the Labor Movement, their full potential power is not being effectively felt.

The Communist Party has supported the activities of all these movements and many times its contribution was the difference between success or failure. Its attitude has been "more power to you," but let us all unite against the war-makers and keep our eye on the central issue that will advance the fight for our common aim—a world at peace. At the same time it has offered friendly criticism when it thought wrong policies were being followed.

The projection of the idea that the central issue of the peace fight should be the unilateral renunciation of the manufacturing and testing of H-bombs by Britain has created the greatest confusion and divisions. While respecting those who sincerely project this idea, the Communists point out it is a dividing, and not a unifying issue—especially as it affects the Labor Movement.

While the Communist Party has been rejected on a local scale, the only one in the last General Election to denounce the manufacture of the H-bomb by Britain, and remains today the only Party that calls for stopping the manufacture and testing of nuclear weapons and arriving at an international agreement on same, it nevertheless points out that unilateralism:—

is not the real basis for ending the threat of nuclear tests, war, or the consequences of both; does not settle what to do with the existing stock of H-bombs; does not affect the American stocks of H-bombs which are on British soil in the U.S. air bases and carried over British cities in American aircraft.

From the viewpoint of practical political reality, this issue alone, in isolation, is not the basis for building an effective movement to really end the tests or the consequences of nuclear warfare. In fact the Tories and Right-wing labor leaders welcome the fight on this issue because it helps them to avoid the real issue—reaching an international agreement to ban the manufacturing, testing and stockpiling of all the bombs. The Right-wing leaders use it as an excuse to evade carrying out the positive decisions on this issue of the Labor Party Conference and Executive Committee as well as the T.U.C.

Some forces in the leadership of the Nuclear Disarmament Movement have tried to impose political bans against Communists in the local committees. In most cases this

has been rejected on a local scale, recognizing that it is contrary to the spirit of the movement and harmful.

In this same movement some leadership voices have called for an "anti-political" attitude towards all parties. This go-it-alone attitude, unfortunately encouraged by the actions of some of the top leaders of the Labor Party and T.U.C. towards the Nuclear Disarmament Movement and the middle class and professional forces in its leadership would immediately cripple the Peace Movement. It is necessary to understand, as the Communist Party Executive has stated, that "the fight for peace is a political fight. Governments decide foreign policy. The fight to influence governments is a political one. The peace movement should not be anti-political-party, but should aim to embrace people of all political parties . . . with a special effort to associate with and influence the Labor movement."

As at the time of Suez, it was only after the most vigorous pressure from the members that the leadership of the Labor movement finally responded on the issue of stopping the H-bomb tests and Summit Talks. They adopted the 7-point program referred to earlier in this article. Despite some obvious weaknesses and anti-Soviet slanders, the Communists and the Left generally called for support and maximum activity in support of the demands.

However, simultaneously, John Strachey wrote a pamphlet, with an

introduction by Gaitskell, that developed the argument for British retention and use of nuclear weapons. He continued the slanderous anti-Soviet attack, writing, "With neither nuclear weapons nor American support we could not possibly resist Russian pressure nor, ultimately, Russian occupation." A completely false alternative was presented; the consistent actions of the Soviet Union were ignored; and the cold fact of U.S. occupation of Britain and interference in its affairs is also ignored. This is in accord with the support of nuclear weapons and warfare of Strachey, Brown and Shinwell in Parliament—in violation of Labor Party policy.

With no conviction on the part of the leadership, the Labor Party-T.U.C. campaign was practically stillborn, aside from one poorly attended Trafalgar Square demonstration and a series of delegate conferences throughout the country. In many of the latter more time was spent denouncing the Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, the Aldermaston March and the Communists than in mobilizing the workers against the war policies of the Tories.

While many trade union branches and shop stewards committees have played an active role in local peace committee activity, the failure of the Labor Party Executive and T.U.C. to give a fighting lead in support of its own decisions has seriously weakened the entire movement.

To be most effective the Peace Movement requires a rounded out

policy and certain main features of activity. The latter are: consistent campaigning, development of local committees, maximum unity of all peace forces and no bans or proscriptions, close links with the Labor movement and relations with the World Peace Movement.

Only the British Peace Committee measures up to these standards. As yet, however, it is too limited in the number of local committees that collaborate with it and it needs building. The British Peace Committee has not only organized effective petition campaigns, conferences and mass lobbies at Parliament, but it recently demonstrated the possibility of collaborating with all sections of the peace and Labor Movements when it launched an appeal to the Heads of State of Britain, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. on the basis of the following four proposals:

1. To bring to an end all tests of nuclear weapons.
2. To renounce the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons.
3. To end the arms race and bring about a general reduction of all armaments.
4. To establish a nuclear-free zone in Europe which could lead to an overall European Security System.

Among the many sponsors were 17 M.Ps, 12 trade union national leaders; the Bishops of Manchester and Birmingham; scientists Earl Russell, Bernal, Burhop, Offord; authors Sir Compton MacKenzie, Sir Herbert Read, Sean O'Casey and Douglas Golding; and many others.

THE PARTY'S ROLE

Guided by its 1957 Congress decision to secure peace the C.P. fights for:

1. Stopping all further tests of atomic and hydrogen bombs.
2. A European security system, leading to the withdrawal of foreign troops from both East and West Europe and to a settlement of the German problem and the end to aggressive war pacts.
3. A Middle East settlement based on an end to imperialist interference in the area and respect for the national sovereignty of the Middle East countries.
4. International agreement on disarmament, including a ban on atomic and hydrogen weapons, and an immediate cut in the call-up to twelve months, to be served at home.
5. Ending all colonial wars, the immediate withdrawal of British troops from Cyprus, Kenya, Malaya, and Northern Ireland. The freeing of political prisoners in all colonial possessions; the support for national independence movements and the encouragement of democratic movements in these countries. Solidarity action to raise living standards and to defend trade union rights in the colonies. The outlawing of racial and religious discrimination.
6. Strengthening the United Nations by the admission of People's China.
7. The withdrawal of all American forces from Britain and an end to all foreign bases and of NATO, SEATO and the Bagdad Pact.

The Communist Party has consistently propagated its program and won support for it in the factories, trade union branches and neighborhoods. It has fought for unity with

the Labor Party and Trade Union movement at all levels, given support to the activities of all peace organizations, although emphasizing the need for permanent peace committees that fight consistently; and organized its own activities as contributions to the general fight for peace.

By its March 1st demonstrations at six U.S. air bases—attended by almost 10,000, although in all cases they were far removed from the industrial centers—it pin-pointed U.S. occupation and went beyond the rest of the peace movement. In its great national demonstration for Peace, Work and British Independence, held in London's Trafalgar Square on June 29th, 15,000 participated, of whom 5,000 had travelled from all parts of Scotland, Wales and the Midlands of England. One million leaflets, as well as pamphlets, posters and letters to the Labor Movement were widely distributed. Its slogans were symbolical of the burning issues before the British workers and people. It was not just "another peace demonstration." Its special character, distinct from all the other movements, was its uniting of these three burning issues of domestic and foreign policy—all inter-related to each other. It helped to clarify, unite and advance the entire movement.

Whatever the situation may be when this is printed the British people and Labor Movement has demonstrated its determination to fight for a world at peace.

PARTY PROGRAM DISCUSSION

Some Key Elements of Party Program*

By James S. Allen

THE MAIN PROBLEM of the program is to make the socialist perspective meaningful in American terms, to combine Marxist-Leninist theory with American reality. The problem is not new. But it presents itself in a new setting, since nothing ever stands still, neither the theory nor the American and world reality.

The growing crisis of our society and the tempo of world change—of the transition to socialism and the decline of imperialism—make it imperative for us, if we are fully to revive the Party and set it on its proper course, to tackle this problem with vigor.

In pondering the question of how and where to begin a systematic work of preparation, of how to find a start that will carry through to a successful conclusion, it seems appropriate to re-examine some of the basic concepts about the transition to socialism in the new world relation of forces. By the latter I mean the world shift in favor of socialism and the new possibilities for socialism in a period characterized by sharp competition between the two world social systems, the great upsurge of colonial liberation, and the consequent strengthening of the world peace

forces. In our discussion great attention will have to be devoted to these basic world relations, and particularly to the role of American imperialism in this period. We will have to give prime attention to the fight for peace—to realize the possibilities for extended peaceful coexistence which derive from the relation of forces to which I have referred.

But here I wish to turn to the problem raised above, since there would be little chance for success unless we were able to establish a unified view, or at least a community of thinking, with respect to the central concepts of the road to socialism in the present world context. This is necessary because the re-examination of some of the basic Marxist-Leninist ideas in the light of the new experiences of the past decade or so has led to a certain disorientation among us. There have arisen distorted and one-sided interpretations, either of a revisionist or dogmatic nature, which must be overcome if we are to achieve a clear and unequivocal programmatic perspective that will unify and reinvigorate the Party.

With this in mind, I propose to examine, in an introductory way, some of the key concepts that must enter into program, namely, what is meant by (1) the American road to socialism, (2) peaceful transition to socialism,

and (3) a people's anti-monopoly government.

NEED FOR A DEFINITION OF THE GOAL

The experience of the postwar years has shown a great diversity among various countries on the road to socialism. Much is to be learned from a study of this rich historical experience, for it provides many insights into the process of historical change. For one thing, it has shown that each country finds the road to socialism in its own way, in response to the specific needs and circumstances of place and time, and in accordance with its national characteristics, traditions, and institutions. The concept of "our road to socialism" challenges us to get down to a basic examination of the concrete American reality to a degree we have never before attempted.

When we speak of "our road to socialism" we must have clearly in mind the goal toward which we strive. For amidst all the variety and multiplicity of form, socialism as a system of society has an essence which distinguishes it from capitalism. What, after all, is meant by socialism? The question must be answered clearly, if we are to chart the road in the proper direction.

It is all the more important to provide a clear answer because, under the impetus of the new world changes and under the impact of the successes of the Socialist world, socialism is coming more and more under discussion in this country. All kinds of concepts are being brought forth. For example, in the recently published symposium, *Toward a Socialist America*, which contains some excellent contributions

and which is an important reflection of the new interest in socialism, there is, however, a preponderance of "evolutionary" and reformist approaches. Many of these were common to our old Socialist movement before World War I, while others can be classed with the "new phase" reformism, modelled after John Strachey.

Post-office socialism, municipal socialism, public ownership or public authority socialism, Christian or moral socialism, socialism by constitutional law, as well as the newer versions of capitalism growing into socialism, are to be found here. No doubt, this is a faithful reflection of the thinking among socialist-minded people in this country, with whom Communists seek united action on many questions, despite ideological differences.

Many of these views of what socialism means find a certain support in a rather loose or misleading interpretation of the new Communist approach in the present period. They are encouraged particularly by the "new" revisionism which interprets "our road to socialism" to mean a road different in essentials from all other roads to socialism, so unique because of peculiar national conditions as to lead off in any which way, ending up in some nebulous form of mixed society hardly recognizable in socialist terms.

DEFINITION BY OTHER PARTIES

The "road to socialism" was discussed at the 20th Congress and subsequently in the 12-Party Declaration in terms of the variety of forms of transition to socialism in different countries, depending upon their specific characteristics. What they referred to were the

* Based on "Initial Report on Basic Program," approved by the National Executive Committee as a "basis for beginning systematic work on program" and accepted in the same sense by the Draft Program Committee by a vote of 14 for, 1 against, and 2 abstentions.

different ways in which the working class was able to win state power, the variety in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the different tempo at which the socialist transformation of society may be carried out in the various branches of the economy. As a result of the radical changes in the world arena, new prospects for socialism were seen, and it was also thought that as socialism gained in various countries there would probably arise even more forms of transition, in fact, a great multiplicity of forms.

Implicit in this discussion is the idea that the basic features of the road to socialism are similar, although the forms vary greatly from country to country. This was brought out explicitly by various participants at the 20th Congress, and by other parties, notably the Chinese, after the Congress. The emphasis upon multiplicity of forms, however, directed attention to the new paths opened up by the shift in world relations. It tended to unfreeze fixed and dogmatic positions, and to remove subjective obstacles to the freer development of creative socialist forces everywhere. There had to be a break with the old rigidity, formalism and doctrinairism if the new opportunities for advances to socialism, presented by the turn in the world situation, were to be realized.

After the 20th Congress, events like the Polish crisis and the counter-revolutionary attempt in Hungary called for further assessment, particularly of the relationship between the common socialist road and what was different in the road to socialism for various countries, for a more explicit statement of this relationship. The break

with dogmatism and all manner of mechanical transference of forms and tempos from one country to another could not be permitted to serve as ground for the rise of revisionism, and thus facilitate the work of world reaction.

In this respect, the Chinese Party, which has operated within the greatest diversity of form and has added much that is new to Marxism-Leninism, made a major contribution in its estimates of the experiences of the dictatorship of the proletariat since its inception. Limiting ourselves to the question that concerns us at the moment, the Chinese formulated what they considered to be the common road to socialism, the basic features of this transformation, amidst all the variety of the actual historical experience. They developed the dialectics of the relation between the common road and the concrete national characteristics, which they showed to be a dynamic relationship, conditioned by both the world relation of forces and internal class relations as they were developing.

These concepts were given common expression by the governing parties of 12 socialist countries in their Declaration of last November, to which only the Yugoslav Communist League refused to adhere, instead proceeding to complete its own Draft Program along revisionist lines. It should be recalled that the 12-Party Declaration was drawn up in consultation with over 50 parties in non-socialist lands. The Declaration does not stand in contradiction to the basic approach of the 20th Congress with respect to forms of transition to socialism. What it does is to state more explicitly the re-

lation between the common road and the different forms, and in doing this the Declaration sets up safeguards against a reformist and revisionist interpretation of the new position of the world Communist movement.

The common path was defined in terms of the universal truths or basic laws to be observed in "all countries embarking on a socialist course," no matter how greatly varied the national characteristics. The 12-Party summation of the basic laws amounts to a definition of the common features of socialism as it has developed and as it is growing in the present-day world.

The experience of existing, living socialism should serve as an excellent basis for our definition of socialism, properly seen in terms of our needs and conditions. The United States is not among those countries embarking on a socialist course. Yet, in seeking to chart our road to socialism, we are in a much better position than the Marxists in the period before the Great Russian Revolution, which pioneered the road, or than we were before World War II, before a number of countries took that road. We can define the socialist goal on the basis of a broad range of experience in various countries. That goal is not the specific form of the socialist state as developed, according to their conditions and needs, in the Soviet Union, China, or any other socialist country. The socialist goal has to be defined in terms of the essential characteristics of socialist society as it is developing amidst a great variety of experience. If future events reveal new elements or variations in substance of the old, there will be time enough to take them into account.

TOWARD OUR DEFINITION OF SOCIALISM

For purposes of our program, the essential elements of a definition of socialism as a system of society should include:

1. A government led by the working class which is guided by a Marxist-Leninist party, with the participation in the government of the Negro people, the farmers and the various middle strata—truly a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

2. Public ownership of the basic means of production and the end of class exploitation, making possible production for use instead of for profit.

3. Social planning for full utilization of our resources and productive forces for the welfare of the people.

4. Development of the fullest economic and political democracy for the people, while safeguarding socialist society against obstruction and sabotage by unreconstructed capitalists.

5. Abolition of all forms of oppression and discrimination against the Negro people and national minority groups within the country, outlawing of all acts of race prejudice and anti-Semitism, and the abolition of all exploitation and national repression of other nations whether as colonies or as otherwise dependent countries.

6. Working-class internationalism in the interests of permanent world peace, mutual aid in socialist development, and special aid to countries formerly exploited by U.S. monopoly.

These would seem to be the indispensable elements of a definition of socialism, in its initial stage, that is, during the period of transition from capitalism to full-fledged socialism. Of

particular importance, from the viewpoint of current approaches and perspectives, is the attitude to the state, for here is to be found the central distinction between the positions of revolutionary Marxism and of reformism, in its various expressions. This applies not only to the dictatorship of the proletariat but also to the state under capitalism.

ON THE NATURE OF THE STATE

It might be well to recall that by the term "dictatorship" neither Marx nor Lenin meant anything approaching absolute personal power. They viewed the state as an instrument of class rule, and referred to the capitalist state, no matter what its form, as the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. By the dictatorship of the proletariat they meant the new kind of state which the working class would have to establish in order to begin the transition to socialism. This is the essence of the change in state power which is required to replace capitalism with socialism. Experience has shown that it is the indispensable prerequisite for a socialist transformation, although the way it takes place and the form of working-class government may differ radically from one country to another and from one period to another. Experience of those countries which have taken the socialist path has also demonstrated that for the working class to play this liberating role and lead the nation it needs a vanguard party, which knows how to use Marxist-Leninist principles to attain socialism.

In contrast, reformist socialists view the state under capitalism as the medium through which socialism can be

legislated from above. As we shall see later, revolutionary Marxists have modified their view on how the state is to be transformed to serve socialism, but this modification has nothing in common with the reformist concept of the state as an institution above classes and above society. The new-phase reformism, of John Strachey for example, sees socialism as a higher, democratic phase of some kind of organized capitalism, brought about by growing participation of labor in the present-day state. According to this view, there is not need for a dictatorship of the proletariat in any form, since no basic change in state power is envisioned, nor, for the same reasons, need there be a vanguard party of the working class. The view of the Yugoslav Draft Program that in the highly developed capitalist countries, particularly in the United States and Britain, socialism can be attained through state capitalism and the direct political role of the trade unions as such, comes very close to the Strachey position.

It is, of course, true that an important change in the bourgeois state has occurred with the emergence of monopoly capitalism. The state has increasingly come under the direct domination of a small sector of the bourgeoisie, being transformed, to use Engels' phrase, from the "executive committee of the bourgeoisie as a whole" into the instrument of the monopolies. This is perhaps no where more apparent than in the United States, and we will explore some aspects of state monopoly capitalism further along. Here, I merely wish to point out that the rise of the monopoly state, particularly as we see it in this

country, has meant constant encroachment upon the democratic rights of the people, the undermining of democratic institutions, and restrictions upon the rights of labor, rather than the broader democracy envisioned by the neo-reformists.

The essential change in the structure of society that is brought about by a socialist government is public ownership of the basic means of production and the end of class exploitation. The speed and the extent of such a change in structure is a variable factor, depending upon the specific correlation of forces. Small-scale production on a private ownership farms, for example, may continue for some time after the nationalization of the big monopolies by a socialist government. In fact, the way things are in this country, socialism can rescue the middle strata from obliteration by monopoly, and offer them a long period of adjustment and gradual, step-by-step socialist transformation. China provides a valuable lesson in this respect.

Here again we should distinguish between public ownership in the reformist conception and real socialist collective ownership. In this country, we have many forms of municipal ownership of public utilities and also Federal ownership of power dams, arsenals, and the atomic energy industry. In the reformist conception, these are already elements of socialism which will mature into full socialism. According to this idea, no class struggle is essential, no vanguard party, no change in the state. Every new government intervention in the economy, as in the organization of utility rates, the rate of interest or in price fixing,

is greeted as still another element of socialism.

Actually, under a monopoly state such as we have, all forms of government intervention in the economy are made to serve the interests of monopoly, whether they appear as concessions to the popular forces, as in the case of social welfare measures, or as direct giveaways of national resources to the corporations. A little thought will show that this is so, even in the case of welfare measures which are also of benefit to the people. Although such measures are won by popular struggle and are forced upon monopoly, the concessions thus granted are in turn utilized to bolster up and safeguard the system. This does not mean that for this reason labor and the popular forces should desist from the struggle for more and more social reform. On the contrary, they should constantly extend the struggle for social welfare measures and reform, for it is in the course of such struggles that the class and political consciousness of the workers grows and the anti-monopoly alliances are forged with the aim of curbing the power of monopoly and finally ending its sway entirely. Reformists see social welfare measures as elements of socialism which are supposed to remake and improve capitalism, turning it into a more perfect "welfare state." Revolutionary Marxists see this process not only as a means of bettering the conditions of the people but also as a means of nourishing and building the people's anti-monopoly coalition which will open the way to working-class government. Nationalization of the basic means of production by such a government assures the permanent

utilization of resources for the people, as the very heart of government, and not as concessions that constantly have to be fought for and always defended anew. For only such a basic socialist transformation can end capitalist exploitation.

Another trend is today arising among reformists and Social-Democrats. In the name of liberty and free economic activity, they are retreating from their traditional demand for public ownership, even in its accustomed "evolutionary" garb. The British Labor Party took this backward step when it retreated from the nationalization demand at its recent Congress, and the Austrian and West German Social-Democrats have followed suit. This may be a way to seek the good graces of American monopoly and its State Department, but it is sure to widen the gap even further between the Right-wing Social-Democrats and the working class. We should not dismiss the fight for various forms of public ownership and government controls, but under specific conditions in response to the needs and struggle of the masses, about which more later.

ON PLANNING

Social planning by a working class state, which has nationalized the basic economy, will make possible the maximum utilization of our resources and skills for the benefit of the people.

Reformists point to certain elements of planning which exist under capitalism, especially within our highly coordinated monopoly structure, to sustain their concept of socialism. But the essential characteristic of capitalism

is its anarchy, the sharp contradictions which generate economic crisis and the danger of war and make impossible the rational utilization of science and technology for the people's welfare. This is no where more apparent than in our country of great know-how, mastery of technique, high level of labor skills, and gigantic productive plant. At this level, planning by a socialist government can do away with poverty, unemployment, the great gap in income distribution, depressed and underdeveloped areas, almost overnight.

ON DEMOCRACY

The fourth element of our definition emphasizes that the limited democracy won under capitalism by the struggles of the people throughout our history will be expanded and deepened to include, for the first time, real economic democracy and people's government on a scale never had here before. At the same time, we would be ignoring the lessons of history if we did not allow for the necessary function of safeguarding socialist society from counter-revolutionary attempts. To what extent such functions will be brought to bear will depend upon the overt actions of the capitalists themselves against the new order of society. In time, the capitalists will be absorbed into the productive population, and with the disappearance of antagonistic classes the need for the coercive function of the state will also disappear. Our program must build upon the democratic gains already won. Those democratic guarantees which have proved their worth in our history should be retained and

strengthened under socialist democracy—such as Habeas Corpus, jury trial, right to strike, etc. Our program will have to develop the concept of socialist democracy in all aspects to show that in essence the people replace the rich in governing the country, in the work of local and state governments, in all the mass media of culture, and in the management of industry.

All these elements, taken together and developed over a more or less extended period after the shift to working class power, constitute the essential requirements of socialist society as we knew it, and, *as far as we now know*, would find expression also in socialism under American conditions. Any of these elements taken singly do not constitute socialism. For example, without working-class and people's government, public ownership and state controls over production could operate in favor of monopoly. And it is inconceivable that a socialist government could be gained in this country without the alliance with the working class of the Negro people, the farmers and all the middle sectors opposed to monopoly—an alliance which would be expressed in the Socialist government itself.

The inadequacy of many of the definitions of socialism now current stems generally from their emphasis upon one or more separate elements of socialist society, without seeing the development as a whole. This is the fault, for example, with the definition of socialism given in the credo of the *Monthly Review*, which sees only two fundamental characteristics: "first, public ownership of the decisive sectors of the economy, and second, compre-

hensive planning of production for the benefit of the producers themselves." It might be said that once these were obtained, the other socialist elements would follow; but it is precisely in obtaining these that the working-class government is decisive. Furthermore, the basic shift in state power cannot be achieved without the strategic alliance between the working class and all anti-monopoly sectors, which must be built up during the entire preceding period. It is often the failure to comprehend this that accounts for the remoteness of some Socialist groupings in this country from the actual class struggle.

Thus, it is necessary to have a comprehensive definition of what we mean by socialism, so that all other positions now current can be evaluated properly, in the interest of clarity of discussion and with a view to convincing other advocates of socialism that this is the correct approach.

THE ROAD IS AMERICAN

The definition of our socialist goal is not an abstract exercise but, as we have seen, involves many questions of current interpretation and policy. Our concept of the goal must of necessity also effect our concept of the road we want to chart. For, while defining the basic elements of socialism as a system of society, we need to maintain and develop the positive emphasis upon the concrete conditions of our country, which is so strongly implied in the concept of "the American road to socialism."

We should understand that this concept does not carry within it the rejection of what is common to all roads to socialism. It rejects only the mechan-

ical imitation of the forms and methods that proved successful in other countries, instead of critically evaluating their experiences in order to learn from their mistakes as well as their successes what may or may not be valid for us.

We must work in the context and the idiom of American history, tradition and experience of the class struggle. But doing this, in a country that remains the most powerful and expansionist center of world monopoly capitalism, we should be extremely sensitive to the constant internal pressures diverting us from an objective Marxist assessment of events and trends, particularly the constant pressure of opportunism from within the labor movement. This pressure increases as monopoly exerts itself to defend its power positions and privileges at home and throughout the world, as world imperialism declines and world socialism grows, and particularly as the internal crisis, economic as well as political and social, grows more acute. We cannot meet these pressures effectively if we fail to overcome dogmatic or doctrinaire attitudes. Nor, unless we do so, will we be able to provide the insights and creative guidance which are required to pioneer the path to socialism in a country such as ours.

II. PEACEFUL TRANSITION

The Preamble to the Party Constitution, which was approved at the 16th National Convention, states: "We advocate a peaceful, democratic road to socialism through the political and economic struggles of the American people within the developing constitutional process."

We take this as our essential start-

ing point in considering the concept of peaceful transition. For programmatic purposes, this needs considerable elaboration. To avoid ambiguities of interpretation, it is necessary to develop a clear idea of what is meant by "a peaceful, democratic road," by "the political and economic struggles of the American people," and by "the developing constitutional process."

The requirements of clarity on this question are these:

1. The clear-cut affirmation of the working-class interest, and the interests of the entire nation, in seeking to achieve the transition from capitalism to socialism, which is a social revolution, without violence.

2. To make clear the struggles required at all times, beginning with the here and now, to establish and safeguard the prerequisites for a peaceful transition. This is the most important link between the present phase of struggle and coming phases along the road to socialism.

3. To take fully into account the disposition to violent resistance to change which is present in our ruling monopoly circles and their arrogant defense of class privileges, as shown by our history and by current conflicts, and therefore the need of the working class and its people's anti-monopoly allies to build up their organized mass strength, so that the will of the people shall be realized.

Seen in this light, the concept of peaceful transition is dynamic, a concept of class struggles and strategic alliances aimed at monopoly and carried out in the interests of the entire nation. We cannot present the question as if the favorable world trend toward socialism or the possibilities

of extended peaceful coexistence amount to a guarantee of peaceful transition, as is sometimes done. World conditions may indeed enhance such a possibility, but the guarantee can only be established in the process of the struggle against monopoly and reaction at home. Therefore, when we project the perspective of a peaceful transition, even presenting it as an historic aim and duty, we should always begin with and return to the necessity of the struggle to win and preserve the prerequisites for such a development. The working class and its people's allies, in the process of building up their alliance and gaining the support of the people as a whole, will have to fight monopoly in order to keep open and broaden the democratic channels against the constant trend by monopoly to regiment our society and militarize the state. Without such a struggle, the aim of "peaceful transition" is meaningless; moreover, it may become deceptive.

What is of particular importance here and now is to guard against a sloganized concept of "peaceful transition" that ignores its revolutionary content, and has the effect of stifling the will to struggle which is so precious to the working class and a working-class vanguard party. Peaceful transition is a revolutionary process that requires revolutionary Marxist leadership, and a fine fighting mettle on the part of all anti-monopoly forces.

DISCUSSION OF THE QUESTION BY OTHER PARTIES

The development of this question by other Communist Parties, in theory as well as in practice, is extensive, and

we cannot here review the matter in its entirety. I will only touch on certain aspects of the question that are pertinent to our problem.

At the 20th Congress, the possibility of peaceful transition was seen as arising from the favorable world situation now developing—that is, the further growth of socialism and the decline of imperialism. It was discussed in relation to the probability that new forms of transition to socialism would make their appearance, as more countries take this path. And these new forms of transition, according to the 20th Congress, because of the shift in the world balance of forces toward socialism, "need not be associated with civil war under all circumstances."

The first thing to note about this approach is that peaceful transition is not placed as a law of social development. That is the significance of treaties of peaceful transition in the category of "form." The basic historic treating peaceful transition in the to socialism. This may take place in different ways, peaceful or non-peaceful, depending upon the specific correlation of forces.

As has always been the case, whether the transition is violent or not depends upon the methods used by the ruling classes to resist necessary social change and override the will of people. What is new is the correlation of forces on a world scale favorable to socialism, national liberation from imperialism, and peace. This relationship of forces sets up obstacles to imperialist intervention against nations taking the road to progress, while people's governments are able to count upon support from the socialist world. The freedom of action of imperialism has been seriously deli-

mitted by the rise of a world system of socialist countries, with the Soviet Union as one of the two great world powers, the accelerated crumbling of the imperialist colonial system, and the deeper stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Accordingly, if the working class is able to lead the people's forces for the historic task it may be possible in a number of countries to effectively forestall and prevent violence from the exploiting classes, and thus to remake society without civil war.

In the discussion of new forms of transition which may be carried through without violence the emphasis is upon the parliamentary road. But this is seen within the context of a revolutionary transformation of society, as distinguished from the reformist concept of this road. It is necessary to have this distinction clearly in mind, in view of the disposition in some Left circles to give a reformist or neo-revisionist reading to the 20th Congress. Considerable attention was devoted there, as well as in the discussion by other parties, to this distinction, particularly as it pertains to the leading role of the working class and of the vanguard party, the attitude to state power, class struggle and class alliances, the attitude towards reform and the maturing of socialist consciousness. As Mikoyan put it: "It should be remembered that revolution—peaceful or not peaceful—will always be revolution, while reformism will always remain a fruitless marking of time." And Togliatti, citing the record of reformism during the past four decades, made two points well worth emphasis in his report to the 8th Congress of the Italian Party:

(1) "It is the revolutionary struggle

and the victories won in this struggle that have opened a democratic way for the advance toward socialism."

(2) "Experience proved that even to follow the road of democratic legality, a revolutionary leadership is necessary."

What kind of perspective was developed by other Parties, some of them much closer to the goal, with respect to the parliamentary road? This is summed up in the 12-Party Declaration, which drew upon the extensive discussion in the various Communist parties since the 20th Congress. The prerequisites which they consider have to be fought for to open such a road and to keep it open, are as follows:

(a) a united working class, headed by its vanguard, which

(b) leads a "popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organization," which is capable of

(c) uniting the majority of the people for the winning of state power without civil war and with the aim of ensuring public ownership of the basic means of production, and also providing

(d) the working class is able to defeat the opportunist elements favoring compromise with the capitalists.

Given these prerequisite, the working class together with its allies can open the peaceful parliamentary road to socialism by

(a) defeating the reactionary forces,

(b) securing a firm majority in parliament, and then

(c) "transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people.

(d) "Launch a non-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces, and

(e) "create the necessary condition for peaceful realization of socialist revolution."

Further, these conditions can be won only by "broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism."

It will be seen, first, that they view the possibility of realizing the peaceful parliamentary road in terms of working-class leadership and of the fullest involvement of all the people's forces in the struggle against monopoly, and not merely as a struggle within a parliamentary body. Secondly, they allow for a wide range in the form of political coalition and popular organization in the struggle for a parliamentary majority. Third, they consider a high level of socialist consciousness necessary, as implied in winning the majority of the people to the aim of public ownership of the basic means of production, and the defeat of opportunist compromisers with capitalism.

We should also note the important modification with respect to the classical Marxist concept of "smashing" the former state apparatus as a condition of the transition to socialism. In the new concept, the parliamentary institutions are to be retained, although not necessarily without structural reform, but are to be transformed into institutions serving the working people.

We should also note that some kind of people's government prior to a

working-class state is not excluded, although, as is only correct, it is not presented as a necessity of the advance toward socialism. It is implicit in their concept of different forms of political cooperation, and may arise in the process of winning a parliamentary majority, as we shall discuss later.

OUR PARLIAMENTARY ROAD

This is necessarily a generalized statement, including the basic elements, the expression of which and the relative pertinency of each being different for different countries. In working on our program we have to keep in mind, first, the present level and aims of the struggle within the country for economic security, democratic rights and peace; and, second, the level of political maturity of the working class, not primarily in relation to the level in other countries but directly in relation to the general level of political maturity in the country as a whole. Furthermore, we have to examine for ourselves the particular traits, conditions, traditions, social and political formations, and pertinent peculiarities of our economic and state structure, which must enter into our consideration of a peaceful parliamentary road.

It will be necessary to devote a major part of our program preparation to an examination of the "developing constitutional process," having to do with our forms of independent political action, the structure and operations of the party system and government formations, historic and present trends in relations among the three branches of government, the relation of the Federal government to state governments, approach to the principles of the Con-

stitution and the struggle for Constitutional reform, and many other questions. We will have to draw lessons from the great labor struggles, popular anti-monopoly movements and the fight for Negro rights of the past, especially in the recent period.

However, we can set down certain preliminary observations:

1. The parliamentary road is a road of mass struggle, led by the working class, against monopoly, which starts from the present struggle against unemployment, reaction and the danger of war, and to which is opposed the program of struggle for full employment, higher standards of living, defense and extension of Negro and democratic rights, and extended peaceful coexistence.

2. To the extent that we advance this struggle, building up the necessary strategic alliances between the working class and all the people's anti-monopoly forces, to that extent will we approach the establishment of the prerequisites for a peaceful parliamentary road to socialism.

3. The struggle may go through a number of stages, with corresponding political formations related to the maturity of the working class and the status of its alliance with the Negro people and the class allies.

4. To realize these objectives an ever stronger, wiser, mass Marxist-Leninist party of the working class is required, which will unite in its ranks all believers in socialism.

III. PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT

For some time we have had the idea of a people's government, defined as an anti-monopoly coalition government,

led by labor, which would operate a program aimed at delimiting the power of monopoly, extending social legislation on behalf of labor and the people, defending and broadening full Negro rights and democratic liberties, and safeguarding peaceful coexistence. This would not be a socialist government, but would open the way to a working-class government and the transition to socialism.

We should retain this concept, but it needs to be elaborated further, particularly with respect to (1) the development of a program for curbing the power of monopoly, and (2) the nature of the alliances and political formations that are required for the attainment of such a government.

The main problem is to define the historic role of such a government in relation to both capitalism and socialism. If we try to place it in terms of a stage of social development, a government corresponding to some form of society in-between capitalism and socialism, we will make a serious mistake, such as is made by Alexander Bittelman in his "Welfare State" thesis.* For the concept of an intermediate form or stage of society obscures the basic social revolution involved in the transition from capitalism to socialism. Thereby, it also feeds various currents of reformist and revisionist thinking.

We should view a people's government as a high point in the political struggle against monopoly capitalism, and not as a stage of society. It is the

* For Bittelman's views see his articles in the *Daily Worker*, Oct. 1-16, 1957, and in *Political Affairs*, Feb., 1958. For a critique of his position see the articles by William Z. Foster in *Political Affairs*, Dec. 1957 and Jan. 1958, and by James S. Allen, *Political Affairs*, March 1958.

culmination of a stage of struggle against monopoly, a struggle democratic in content, which at the same time paves the way for the basic shift in political powers that open the transition to socialism. *At its full development*, such a people's government would be led by the working class, supported by a powerful gathering of all its allies, which would already have socialism as their common goal, although there might be a number of political parties with programs of their own.

If we view the matter in this fashion, people's government does not become a substitute for the struggle for socialism, but is a decisive step in that direction. It provides not a final goal but a main juncture along the parliamentary road to socialism where the working class can gather the people's forces, in an advanced stage of readiness, for the transition to socialism, within our established democratic procedures, improved as the people see fit. At this advanced stage of the struggle, the people will already have ousted the monopolists from political power, and themselves will have taken over the government. The government remains a sort of "transition to the transition" just as long as it may take, within the given relation of forces, for the working class to emerge as the leading governing force, ruling together with its people's allies. For then it would be ready to begin the realization of socialist aims.

This does not mean that a people's government which is ready to open the Socialist road would be reached directly, in one long trek. Or that once there, the leap ahead into socialism will necessarily be taken immediately or

at top speed. That will depend upon many things that we need not try to imagine or speculate about.

There may well be a number of way stations along the road before a fully developed anti-monopoly coalition government is attained. Such advances may be expressed politically in coalition governments of changing class composition, with different array of parties, and with a different relation of class forces within the coalition. Perhaps there will be a number of anti-monopoly coalition governments before the working class emerges clearly as the leading force in the government. Experiences somewhat along these lines were seen in Spain before the war, and in France and Italy immediately after the war, although the development was set back by imperialist pressures and intervention.

THE POLITICAL ROLE OF LABOR

The entire perspective of anti-monopoly coalition, led by labor and leading toward a people's government, necessarily raises as a central question the prospects of political realignment within the country. Our basic interest in this process centers on the emergence of the working class as an independent force in the political arena. Without this, it is impossible to foresee any development toward people's government, not to speak of the transition to socialism. This subject in its many aspects will require the most extensive and careful discussion. However, I would like to indicate a line of thinking that appears to correspond to our own political history.

Since the end of the last century, every serious people's movement against

monopoly has sought to break away from the two-party system and has striven for third party expression along the lines of a Farmer-Labor party. These efforts have been defeated and the popular revolts were more or less contained within the two-party system. In each case—the Populists, the 1912 progressives, the LaFollette movement of the 1920's, and the New Deal, to mention the major ones—special circumstances can be adduced to account for the turning aside of the third party tendency. The one factor that emerges as decisive, however, is either the total absence or the insufficient development of independent political action by labor. During the New Deal period, for example, such action by labor reached a relatively high level as compared with the recent past, but it was effectively channelized within the Democratic Party. The effort to break away in the Wallace campaign of 1948, while effectively raising the peace issue in opposition to both major parties, proved premature as a third-party effort because of its failure to attract substantial sectors of labor.

As a result, it seems to me, we have tended to subdue the third-party perspective in favor of the theory, strongly entrenched during the New Deal days, that the political role of labor and the anti-monopoly coalition will develop within the two-party framework. It seems to me that we need to revive the traditional farmer-labor party perspective, but in accordance with the internal changes which are having the effect of more rapidly turning the country into a nation of wage-earners, placing the Negro people in the posi-

tion of the most important ally of labor, reducing the relative national political role of the farmers although it still remains very important, and bringing other large middle strata into conflict with the growing monopoly power. I think this can be done in a way that will simultaneously encourage the various labor, Negro and farmer coalitions that still operate within the two-party framework and also give them the perspective of working toward a new anti-monopoly people's party. Furthermore, the electoral role of the Communist Party itself needs to be strengthened so that it can have a more direct influence in the building and shaping of electoral coalitions looking towards the emergence of a third, a people's party.

We should direct our attention to what is required to build up a people's anti-monopoly coalition on the basis of the issues keenly felt by millions, and for which they struggle. We must seek to work out a program of economic as well as political measures against monopoly which will express the aims of an anti-monopoly coalition, led by labor. But our approach to these problems will be effective only as we see them in relation both to the immediate demands and to the perspective of our road to socialism. In this respect, we must explore the kind of basic reform that can be won under present conditions and that will at the same time strengthen the anti-monopoly forces and undermine and weaken the power of monopoly.

ON BASIC SOCIAL REFORM

A similar perspective of anti-monopoly people's coalition has been raised

by a number of Communist Parties, in terms suiting their own countries, and a considerable debate has taken place among them on such questions. For the moment, let me single out some of the questions discussed at length by the Italians, which should throw some light on the kind of problems we face. Needless to say, I am not advocating for America the Italian Road to Socialism. However, some of their discussions are very suggestive of the line of reasoning we might pursue in our own way and in the light of our own problems.

The Italians propose a people's democratic government which they view as paving the way for socialism. The component programmatic content of this concept is (1) structural reform, and (2) democratic legality. The latter is attuned to the specific circumstances of the fight to enforce their new post-Fascist Constitution, which was won by the struggles of the people in the recent period, and which incorporates important basic social reforms. In this respect, our problem is different in content and form, and we will have to explore it along other lines.

I want to direct attention to their concept of "structural reform," for once we make due allowances for the wide differences between the countries and the level of the working-class movements, the ideas involved here can be useful to us. What they mean by "structural reform" is the kind of basic social reforms that might be associated with a government of anti-monopoly coalition, and the fight for such a government, in our country.

They have in mind essentially a gen-

eral land reform, the expanded participation of the workers in the management of industry, and nationalization or democratic control of the monopolies.

In the United States, the only kind of land reform that would involve basic social changes applies to the plantation regions of the South, and is tied in with a general democratic reform of the South that would raise the general level of this region to that of the rest of the country. We have advanced the aim of completing the democratic revolution in the South for some time, particularly in relation to the Negro freedom struggle as well as the advance of the South as a region. This is certainly a key part of any program of basic social reform that we would advance in connection with our concept of the government of anti-monopoly coalition, and we should pursue this question further along our own lines.

With reference to workers' participation in management of industry, the Italian Party has for some time advocated a trade union program which urges structural reforms in management of industry and also in government control of production that go beyond the simple economic demands of the workers. Here, too, I do not mean to draw mechanical parallels. But, under our conditions, it might well be worth exploring the idea along the lines of labor's intervention in the policies of industrial management, particularly with respect to guarantees of employment, utilization of automated and other new labor-saving machinery, the price policy of monopoly, and the utilization of the internal

capital resources of the big corporations.

The labor movement here has done some probing in this direction. Reuther, for example, in his own reformist fashion, has nibbled at some of these problems—as with the guaranteed annual wage, his recent proposal for price cuts on cars, and some proposals on labor participation in introduction of automation, while retreating on the basic demand of the shorter workday. We have to examine these questions carefully, with a view to seeing if we can develop a program that presents a perspective for the trade unions linking the fight for the immediate economic demands with measures aimed at controlling the operation of monopoly in the interests of labor and the people. In fact, it is useless to talk about labor leading an anti-monopoly coalition, unless we can show how labor through its own approach and methods of struggle can fight for measures aimed at curbing monopoly power.

In this approach, we can find a real meeting ground for labor and the other anti-monopoly sectors of the people. Labor has been reluctant to take up leadership in the broader fight against monopoly, in the past led by the middle classes and the farmers in the “trust-busting” campaigns. But monopolies have found numerous ways, especially through the tax system and price-fixing, to take back from the people much more than they are forced to give the workers in wage increases and fringe benefits. As a result, they have built up large capital reserves, which are the accumulation not only of profits from the direct exploitation

of the workers in their enterprises but also from the wholesale robbery of the people through the tax privileges they enjoy and through the pricing mechanism. If labor steps into this picture, with the demand to have something to say about investment, production and pricing policies, it will be able most effectively to forge and lead a broad anti-monopoly coalition, including the farmers and the middle strata.

ON CONTROLLING MONOPOLY

For some time we have grappled with the problem of the kind of measures that should be advocated to curb and control monopoly power. Today, in terms of current policy, this problem is uppermost with respect to the inflated price situation, for example, or wholesale bankruptcy of small producers, or repossession of installment goods, in the midst of the economic crisis. Something new is demanded in the way of anti-monopoly action, that will defend the people from the effects of economic crises and of the mounting concentration of economic power. Although we have come up with some elements of program, we have not solved the basic problem of approach to an anti-monopoly program which will be economic as well as political, and which will serve as a basis for alliance between the labor movement and the various middle sectors threatened by monopoly.

Here I want to call attention to two elements of the problem: (1) democratic controls over monopolies, and (2) the concept of “dismantling” certain backward and particularly pernicious

aspects of the monopoly structure.

We all know how government controls under the anti-trust laws, the various regulatory agencies, and government-owned projects like the atomic energy industry, have in practice redounded to the benefit of the monopolies and against the interests of the people. We also know that the idea of “dismantling” monopolies is the philosophy underlying the anti-trust laws, and was even tried on a big scale in Germany and Japan after their defeat in World War II. But despite all the “dismantling,” monopoly power has grown here and has been restored in West Germany and in Japan. Also, the regulatory agencies of the government, which are supposed to administer utility rates for the benefit of the people, have actually followed the monopoly-dictated policy of high prices, granting one rate increase after another.

It is obvious, of course, that as long as these controls are administered by government agencies under the complete domination of monopoly they will function exactly in the way they have—in the interests of monopoly and its policy of regimenting the entire economy to serve its aims. Are we therefore to conclude that nothing can be done to protect the people from wholesale robbery by monopoly? To adopt a negative viewpoint on this question would be a mistake, for we would forego the interests of the people as consumers as well as wage-workers, and the interests of extensive middle strata on the land, in business, industry and the professions.

The essential thing is to approach the problem from the ground of continuous mass struggle to impose the

kind of reforms that will allow for democratic controls by the unions and other people's forces over the operation of monopoly, much as labor and social reforms are won as a result of the pressures of the labor and popular movements. Furthermore, such a perspective should include prominently the defense of the middle sectors against extinction by monopoly. This is an indispensable requirement of an anti-monopoly coalition. We must, therefore, explore carefully and fully the kind of anti-monopoly reforms that should be advocated and the way the fight for them should be carried out.

The question is raised whether the “dismantling” of monopoly is in the long-range interest of the working class and of socialism. We know the basic Marxist distinction between the socialization of production, which is a positive outcome of highly developed capitalism, and private appropriation of the surplus value arising from the capitalist exploitation of labor. But it is argued that the dismantling of monopoly would lessen the socialization of labor, without making any significant change in the process of private accumulation. In this view, the demand for “dismantling” is considered retrogression, in the historical sense.

I would like to suggest for critical exploration a proposition that may perhaps clarify this matter and also help crystallize a basic approach on the problem of controlling monopoly.

The proposition involves a distinction between what is permanent in the structure of monopoly, and what is transitory. In other words, the distinction is between what cannot be changed in the present system, indeed

what we may not want to change keeping socialism in mind, and, on the other hand, what can and should be changed. What is permanent is the great concentration of production together with its advanced technology—now used to obtain maximum profits for monopoly, but which socialism would take over and utilize for the maximum benefit of the people. What is transitory is the system of control over this vast productive plant, leading to the extreme centralization of economic power in a few peak monopoly groups. Our Marxist studies of the question have very ably shown the specific form of peak control in the Rockefeller, Morgan, du Pont and other financial interest groups. But we still have to draw programmatic conclusions from this, beyond the obvious truth that it will be changed by socialism.

Now, what is transitory in the long run of history, is also subject to preliminary changes in advance. It is not a question of breaking up the vast and integrated production units, as big as they may be. We have to direct attention to the apparatus of control managed by the big groups of finance capital, which cuts across all industrial, financial and commercial lines. This centralized network controls huge investments, without any regard to their actual productive functions. It is in this area, the very center of monopoly control, that the process of "dismantling" might prove both possible and effective.

In suggesting this distinction, I do not want to imply that the intricate system of monopoly control, which reaches into all branches of the economy and dominates government, is something extraneous to monopoly

capitalism. It is a very decisive part of the monopoly set-up, the way of centralizing maximum profits, and the center of the political oligarchy. Monopoly will very zealously defend its positions in this sphere. But it is also the most changeable, the most sensitive, the most vulnerable part of the structure—with constantly changing inner relation of forces as the result of the competition of giants and changes in economic relations, here and abroad. One or another part of this area has always been the target of the popular anti-trust revolts—whether the bankers' control of the railroads and the food-processing industries, or more recently monopoly control of contracts for munitions production. Here also lies the center of the monopoly price-fixing mechanism.

This should be studied and explored. And we should do this not only with a view to a program for an anti-monopoly people's government. We should also elaborate the kind of demands that can be raised in the present situation with the purpose of developing anti-monopoly actions and alliances.

There is much in what I have said, especially in the third section, that is tentative and merely suggestive of lines of inquiry and discussion. As can be seen, I have not gone into many other problems that arise in the process of preparing a basic program, which are enumerated in the Program Questions [published in the September *Political Affairs*]. However, with respect to the concepts of our road to socialism, peaceful transition, and people's government I have tried to introduce for discussion a basic approach toward a program charting the American road to socialism.

Basic Data on the American Negro People

By James E. Jackson

(This article is based upon a portion of a Report on the Negro Question which will appear soon in pamphlet form. The Report also deals with a theoretical analysis of the question, and with the tasks of the Communists in respect to solving the Negro question.—Ed.)

Negroes in the United States number some 18 millions, or about 11% of the total population. Bureau of Census figures for July 1, 1957 count 18,766,000 of the population as non-white, of whom 95.5% are Negroes. Negroes were 10.8% of the population in 1955. As of July 1, 1957 the total U.S. population was 171,230,000. The Negro population has increased 19% since 1950 and the white population increased 13% over the same period. Negroes constitute the same proportion of the total population that they did in 1910 (11.1%), but have doubled their numbers since 1900.

The population of the U.S. is the most mobile in the world. The pattern of this movement is from country to city and from cities of low economic activity to cities of higher industrial activity. The large geographical shifts in the location of the Negro population and the characteristic trends indicated in the demographic pattern of the population distribution of the Negro people in the U.S. correspond to the general features of mobility for the population as a whole.

In 1900, 77.4% of the Negro population lived on the countryside. As late as 1940 only 47.9% of the Negro population was urban. But, by July, 1956, some 63% of the Negro people were urban dwellers comparable to the 64% of the population as a whole which was urban.

Between 1940 and 1950 the Negro population in the States of Michigan and California doubled. In the same decade the Negro population doubled in some 45 cities having populations of 50,000 or more. (Of these 45 cities, all but Baton Rouge, La., and Lubbock, Texas, are outside of the South.) Also, by 1950 there were 16 non-Southern and 11 Southern cities in which the Negro population was in excess of 50,000 and 10% or more of the total number of inhabitants.

There are now a dozen Northern and Western cities which count a hundred thousand or more Negroes in their population. The metropolitan areas of New York and Chicago embrace a million Negroes respectively and more than half a million reside in the Greater Philadelphia area.

Of the Negro city dwellers (64% of all Negroes) 74% live in some 50 major cities.

When the Negro population moves from the country to the city, and from the "job poor" city to the "job rich" city, it translates itself into a movement from the historic areas of Negro population concentration in the Southern plantation country (the rural "Black Belt" counties) to the Southern cities,

and, from the South in general to the North and West. This movement within the Negro population has resulted in (1) a radical decline in the absolute numbers and ratio of Negroes to whites in the traditional areas of Negro majority—the rural Black Belt area*; (2) a progressive increase in the size and proportion of Negroes in the population of the larger Southern cities**; and (3) a huge growth in the non-Black Belt and non-Southern sectors of the Negro population in the U.S.***

The changes in the location and redistribution of the Negro population in the U.S. as between the North and South are revealed in the following facts:

In 1870 Negroes living in the South were 92% of the total.

In 1910 there were still in the South some 89% of all Negroes in the U.S.

In 1940, of the Negroes in the U.S., 77% lived in the South.

In 1950 Negroes living in the South constituted 68%, which was one-fourth of the total Southern population.

The rate of migration sustained through the decade 1940-1950 has continued through 1957 with all prospects that it will carry forward into 1960 at least. This is to say that in 1960 the population distribution of the Negro people in the United States will be 57% in the South and 43% in the non-South.*

THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF NEGROES IN THE UNITED STATES

A. Occupational

The Negro is the most proletarian of the larger nationality components of the American nation. Both the class and special "racist-caste" features of the oppression of the Negro people in the United States are graphically revealed in even a cursory delineation of the salient facts concerning their economic status in our present-day capitalist society.

Negroes in the labor force are largely bound to the lowest rungs of the occupational ladder by a myriad system of racist prejudices, racist laws and caste-like prohibitions. As for the small percentage of Negroes who overcome the "caste" barriers to attain an occupational status at the level of the skilled cate-

* In 1940 there were 180 counties of absolute Negro majority with a Negro population of 2,600,000.

In 1950 there were 170 counties of absolute Negro majority with a Negro population of 2,200,000.

(Source: *Dun's Review and Modern Industry*, October 1957; *Statistical Abstract of U.S.*, 1957. ** In Memphis, Tenn., the Negro population increased from 37.2% in 1950 to 51.2% in 1955; in New Orleans from 29% in 1950 to 35% in 1955; in Washington, D. C., from 35.4% in 1950 to 42.5% in 1955. The percentage of Negroes in the population of other Southern cities are: Atlanta, Ga., 34.6%; Birmingham, Ala., 48.9%; Durham, N. C., 38%; Charlotte, N. C., 35%; Jacksonville, Fla., 35.2%; Baltimore, Md., 26.7%; St. Louis, Mo., 20.3%; Houston, Texas, 22.4%; Kansas City, Mo., 22%.

*** The Negro population increased in: Detroit from 16.4% in 1950 to 21.4% in 1955; Chicago from 14.1% in 1950 to 18.2% in 1955; Cleveland from 10% to 22% in 1955; San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area from 6% in 1950 to 13% in 1955; Los Angeles from 5% in 1950 to 12% in 1955; New York City from 9.8% in 1950 to 11.1% in 1955; in Philadelphia Negroes are 16.2% of the total population.

Source material for above data: *Current Population Reports*, Bureau of the Census for July 1, 1956. Nov. 12, 1956 Series P.25, No. 146; U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Notes on the Economic Situation of Negroes in U.S.*, Revised May, 1957; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957, p. 171-172.

gories or professions, they still face economic discrimination which limits their earning opportunity to half that of white professionals or artisans in the same category.

The average occupational status of Negroes has advanced very little relative to whites in the last fifty years. "In the North there was very little change from 1910 to 1940 and a 4% increase between 1940 and 1950; in the South there was a 6% decrease from 1910 to 1940 and a 4% increase between 1940 and 1950. Thus, in comparing 1950 with 1910, Negroes in the North had about a 5% higher relative occupational position and in the South about a 2% lower position." (*The Economics of Discrimination*, by Gary S. Becker, University of Chicago Press, 1957, pp. 113-114.)

"Almost all the improvement in the absolute occupational position of Negroes were caused by forces changing the position of whites as well." (p. 114, *op. cit.*) Therefore, the gap, the differential between Negroes and whites remains basically unchanged.

In April 1958 there were 7,364,000 Negroes in the civilian labor force. Of this total 5,582,000 Negroes were employed in (non-agricultural) industry; 758,000 were employed in agriculture. There were 1,024,000 Negroes who were totally unemployed. One out of seven Negro male workers was unemployed in April 1958. Of the total number of employed persons in non-agricultural industries, 24.8% of the Negro men and 38.9% of the Negro women worked only part time as against 14.4% of the white men and 27.8% of the white women. As of April, 1957, 85.2% of the employed Negro men and 95.2% of gainfully employed Negro women were engaged in urban occupations. This compares favorably with the prevailing percent distribution of employed white men and women, being 89.8% and 96% respectively.

In 1940 some 41.2% of the total of employed Negro men and 16% of the employed Negro women were working on farms (as farmers, farm managers, farm laborers, and foremen); currently only 14.8% of the men and 4.8% of the women are so engaged. The corresponding percentage for white men is 10.2 and for white women 4.0. Between 1940 and 1950 some 608,000 Negro men and 125,000 Negro women left farm employment. This represents a decline of slightly more than 50% in the number of Negroes engaged in farming or working on farms within a decade, and constitutes by far the biggest occupational shift in the recent history of the Negro people. It has resulted in a basic alteration in the class structure of the Negro nationality. It emphasizes the fundamental alteration in the class base of the Negro people from "peasant" to "proletarian."

Between April 1957 and April 1958 an additional 72,000 Negro men and women left agricultural employment (this represented a 9.9% loss for Negro men and 3.2% loss for Negro women from the farm population).

Today, the largest strata of employed Negro men and women combined are found in the class of industrial workers, the census category of "Operatives and kindred workers." They represent a ratio to the total Negro population considerably higher than that held by white industrial workers to the sum of the total employed number of white men and women.

There are 1,032,000 Negro men and 387,000 Negro women semi-skilled industrial workers (i.e., operatives and kindred workers). That is 25.2% of the total of employed Negro men and 15.1% of the total of employed Negro women. The corresponding percentage for white men is 19.4 and for white women 16.6.

As important as the rapid growth of the Negro industrial workers category is for the class composition of the Negro people and the international composition of the working class, it does not begin to counterbalance the massive economic discrimination manifested in the occupational differential, the imbalance in distribution of jobs as between Negroes and whites. Note well the following imbalance between Negro and white in the hierarchy of the employment categories as summarized below.

In the *middle class occupation groups*, the census categories of "professional, technical and kindred workers; Managers, officials and proprietors except farm," the percent distribution of employed persons by color and sex is as follows:

Negro men	4.9%	White men	24.2%
Negro women	6.9%	White women	18.2%

In the *White collar, skilled and semi-skilled* occupational groups, the census categories of "Clerical and kindred workers, sales workers, craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers," the percentages of the total employed Negro and white in this strata is as follows:

Negro men	14.8%	White men	34.2%
Negro women	10.2%	White women	43.0%

The bottom rungs of the occupational ladder still remain the special reservation of the Negro toilers.

In the classifications of "Private household workers" plus "Service workers, except private household" the job distribution between Negro and white in terms of percentages of their respective employment totals are as follows:

Negro men	14.8%	White men	5.6%
Negro women*	61.7%	White women	17.9%

In the unskilled employment category of "laborers, except farm and mine," the percentages of the total of the employed are:

Negro men	25.5%	White men	6.3%
Negro women	1.2%	White women	0.3%

Negroes who fall in the occupational and income category of small capitalists constitute less than a percentage point of the Negro population. Among

* 41.7% of employed Negro women are domestics as against 6.2% of the employed white women.

them are the heads of some 226 (relatively small) insurance companies with combined assets of about \$162 million, and an income of less than \$70 million a year. In July of 1957, 58 Negro insurance companies employed 9,200 Negroes. Their total assets amounted to about \$200 million. These Negro companies have 1 billion, 300 million dollars insurance in force. Total insurance in force held by Negroes is about \$15 billion dollars. Others own and operate some 14 small banks whose combined assets do not exceed \$37 million. And there are business enterprises in the services category—newspapers, funeral parlor, hotels, restaurants, beauty products companies. A few are home builders and real estate dealers.

They too are victimized by Big Business and race discrimination and limited to the bare fringe of the capitalist market. Their significance is small in terms of depicting the economic status of the Negroes although of considerable political and theoretical interest. We will not now deal further with this tiny economic category.

B. Income Status

The income of the average employed Negro reflects the fact of outrageous discrimination. He is confined primarily to the four lowest paid occupational groups, i.e., laborer, farmer, private household and service worker, and factory "operative." On top of this occupational caste system of discrimination is imposed a racist pattern of wage and job classification differentials within each occupational category. This economic robbery of the Negro working people is summarized in the following comparison of "Average (Median) Annual Wage or Salary Income of Year-Round Full-Time Workers by Color and Sex for 1955"*:

1955	White men	\$4,458	White women	\$2,870
	Negro men	2,831	Negro women	1,637
1956**	White men and women	\$3,506		
	Negro men and women	1,830		

The average income for Negro workers by 1956 was only 52% of the average for white workers. It was less than 40% in 1939. Over the past decade the gap has narrowed at a rate of less than 1% a year!

Below we have summarized pertinent representative data on the absolute and relative income status of Negroes in a table based upon the April 1958 Current Population Reports on Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 27.

* P. 61 of *Economic Forces in the U.S.A.* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.)

** Bureau of Labor Statistics, May, 1958.

FAMILY MEDIAN INCOME (1956)

Family Median Income	UNITED STATES			SOUTH		
	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Income	\$4,783	4,993	2,628	\$3,742	4,219	1,975
Urban	5,221	5,413	3,250	4,328	4,740	2,473
Rural Non-Farm	4,619	4,871	2,268	4,027	4,449	2,143
Rural Farm	2,371	2,648	1,104	1,725	2,074	1,075

Out of a national total of 3,994,000 Negro *families* approximately 545,000 rural farm families had a median money income in 1956 of only \$1,104. An additional 730,000 rural *non-farm* Negro families had an average income of \$2,268. Urban Negro family income was almost a thousand dollars higher, *i.e.*, \$3,250. The Negro farm family is 1½ times worse off than the white farm family and the white city family is 5 times better off than the Negro farm family.

Discrimination against Negroes in educational and job-training opportunities bears a close relationship to economic discrimination and contributes to depriving Negroes of their just share of the national income. There is a progressively increasing relationship between education and earnings. This is seen in the fact that in 1956 the average family income for families headed by an elementary school graduate was \$4,200, by a high school graduate, \$5,500, by a college graduate, \$7,600.

While it is apparent from the above that education and training are very important for securing employment in the higher income occupational brackets, the possession of the requisite educational background is not of itself a passport away from the pale of discrimination. On the contrary, "the income differential between whites and Negroes tends to be greater for persons with more, rather than less education." (Census Bureau, April, 1958, Series P-60, p. 10.)

Economic discrimination holds fast on all educational levels. For example, in 1956 among urban white men who finished high school their income was 19% higher than those who only completed elementary school. Among urban Negro men, on the other hand, their income was only 7% higher than those who did not enter high school.

"In the South income of white persons exceeded that of Negroes by 48% for grammar school graduates, 73% for high school graduates, and 85% for college graduates." (Senate Report No. 2830, 84th Congress, 2nd Session, *Selected Materials on the Economy of the South*, p. 32.)

C. Housing Status

As the Negro people are doubly exploited as working people—confined to the meanest jobs at the lowest pay—just so they are robbed as consumers, home buyers and tenants. No sector of capital enriches itself more handsomely from, and contributes more ruthlessly to, the maintenance of the all-sided national oppression of the Negro people than do the real estate magnates and their landlord leeches. They seize the lion's share of the Negro consumers'

meager income, exacting a high racist premium as a condition for permitting the Negro to satisfy his basic human need for shelter. What is the extent of discrimination in housing?

"It is estimated that some 40 million dwelling units in the U.S. are currently 'out of bounds' for purchase, rental or occupancy by non-white [95.5% of whom are Negroes] by virtue of segregation in housing. . . . Of the 3,293,406 dwelling units for non-whites, 1,082,128 needed major repairs and nearly 2,000,000 had no running water." ("The Housing Situation—1950," p. 40 as cited by Leo J. Linder in *Lawyers Guild Review*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, 1958, p. 2.)

Twenty-four percent of urban Negro homes had no running water, private toilet or bath as compared to 10% for all units.*

Further, in 1950 the U.S. Housing & Home Finance Agency reported that better than 27% of the housing occupied by Negroes was sub-standard and dilapidated. This was 6 times the sub-standard housing occupied by whites.

Overcrowding of land and buildings characterizes the areas demarcated for Negro occupancy. For example, a single block in Harlem held a population of 3,871 persons. In an area of Chicago's South Side, Negroes lived 90,000 to the square mile as compared with the most crowded white neighborhood of 20,000 to the square mile. ("Non-White Housing," *House and Home*, April, 1953, p. 44.)

In the area of housing discrimination and segregation, the situation continues to worsen. Charles Abrams (*Forbidden Neighbors*, N. Y., 1955, p. 243) has estimated that of the 9,000,000 new homes built between 1935 and 1950 less than 1% were open to Negroes and other non-whites and that only 50,000 out of some 3 million dwellings insured by FHA were available to non-whites. Yet in the 14 largest metropolitan areas where one-third of the total population lives, the Negro population increased 16 times as fast as the white over the past 15 years.

As a consequence of the systematic exclusion of Negroes from having access to "good" housing and their enforced restriction to the areas of sub-standard housing, there is continuing to develop within the larger cities of the country hard segregated residential areas of "white" suburban zones and "Negro" in-city zones. For example: "In Chicago, 79% of all Negroes in 1950 lived in areas in which at least 75% of the residents were Negroes; on the other hand, 84% of the non-Negroes resided in areas in which fewer than 1% of the residents were Negro." (M. Grodzine, *Scientific American*, Oct., 1957, p. 40.)

The real estate interests "who profit from overcrowding of Negroes on the one hand and the saleability of 'exclusiveness' to whites on the other staunchly support segregated housing.

"Weakness in any part of the system of segregation tends to be felt throughout the system; but it is equally true that one firm segment re-enforces all the others. Thus continued segregation in housing affects the whole pattern . . . it affects the whole framework of attitudes that influence the interaction of white and Negro people." (*Antioch Review*, Spring, 1958, p. 23.)

* Negroes living in dilapidated housing are proportionately five times that of whites. In rural non-farm areas ¾ of all Negro housing was without running water as against ¼ for whites.

JUST PUBLISHED!

MARK TWAIN
SOCIAL CRITIC

By Philip S. Foner

ALTHOUGH few American literary figures have been more discussed in biographies and critical essays than Mark Twain, this is the first time that a comprehensive study of his social concepts and criticism has been published. Because Dr. Foner has had access to a vast collection of unpublished manuscripts, he has been able in this valuable study, as never before, to trace Mark Twain's progress and development as a social critic of the highest calibre, to bring to the reader a deeper understanding of his great compassion for mankind, and to reveal him as a profound thinker rather than merely a simple, happy humorist and writer of children's books.

The first part of this book contains Dr. Foner's perceptive and illuminating biography of Mark Twain. The major part of the book, however, is devoted to an analysis of Mark Twain's writings on every important issue that arose during his lifetime: politics, government, democracy, monarchy, the Russian Revolution, religion, church and state, capitalism, the labor movement, the Negro question, anti-Semitism, imperialism, and many others.

An indispensable book for all who are interested in America's democratic traditions, past, present and future.

Dr. Foner is also author of the four-volume study, *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, and of the *History of the Labor Movement in the United States*, of which the first two volumes have been published.

An International Publishers book . . . Price \$4.50

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