

political affairs

NOVEMBER 1958 • 35 CENTS

**STATE COMMITTEE,
CP OF TEXAS**

[28]

**Recent Political Develop-
ments in Texas**

MAURICE THOREZ

[44]

**The Referendum Vote
in France**

LOUIS FLEISCHER

[56]

The Not-So-Affluent Society

[56]

Party Program Discussion

THE SUPREME COURT AND DEMOCRACY
by Arnold F. Robler [1-14]

AMERICANS VIEW THE SOVIET UNION
by Herbert Aptheker [15-27]

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. 11 November, 1958

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The Supreme Court and Democracy

By Arnold F. Robler

IN 1954, THE Supreme Court reversed its "separate but equal" rule and held compulsory segregation in the public schools unconstitutional. In a series of decisions since 1956, it has taken the initiative in beginning to restore the civil liberties whose suppression it had sanctioned during the post-war period that culminated in McCarthyism. What is required to promote the new trend and secure enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment and the Bill of Rights? This question, in turn, raises others. What brought about the reversals in the position of the Court? How far-reaching have they been? How permanent may they be expected to be?

The latter questions are not easy to answer. For the Court is a unique and highly sophisticated institution, and the forces that motivate it are complex and often obscure.

* * *

It is not enough to agree with Mr. Dooley that the Supreme Court follows the elections and let the matter go at that. Of course, the Court,

like every political institution, is sensitive to popular pressure. But it is less sensitive than Congress and the executive which are directly accountable to the electorate. Indeed, the life tenure of its members was expressly designed to re-enforce the fiction that its decisions are the product of hallowed principles of law, unaffected by the political considerations that motivate elected officials.

A recent article by Professor Dahl* suggests a fruitful approach to the role of the Court. Its primary and normal function, he writes, is not to make policy but to confer legitimacy on the policies of what he calls "the dominant national alliance" (*i.e.*, the political grouping currently in power) by giving these policies the sanction of law and constitutionality. He points out that it is only under exceptional circumstances and for brief periods that the Court exercises a policy-making function of its own. This

* Robert A. Dahl, "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy Maker," 6 *Journal of Public Law*, p. 277.

can occur when (as in the early days of the New Deal) there has been a decisive change in national policy resulting from a change in the make-up of "the dominant national alliance," while a majority of the Court is composed of appointees of the old alliance. Again, it can occur in the event of a major policy difference among the groupings that compose the alliance, in which case the Court can temporarily tilt the balance one way or the other. In either case, as the author shows, the policy-making role of the Court can only be transitory. For frequent vacancies permit the President to appoint Justices whose policies are congenial to his own. And in any event, pressure from the forces in the "national alliance" which come to predominate will compel the Court to adjust its policies to those of the grouping in power.

If we recast Professor Dahl's analysis by substituting class concepts for "the dominant national alliance" which he postulates, we shall come close to an adequate statement of the Supreme Court's role.

The Court, like every branch of government, is an agency of the capitalist class for the enforcement of the policies and perpetuation of the rule of that class. The special role of the Court is to obscure the class character of the state by certifying that the policies pursued by the other branches of government are not dictated by class interest but conform to the principles of right, justice and individual liberty

which are thought to be embodied in the Constitution. Hence, so long at least as there are no sharp differences within the ruling class with respect to the conduct of government, the Court acts as the endorser and not as a maker of policy.

When, however, a cleavage develops within the ruling class touching an issue which comes before the Court, the Court is compelled to make a choice of competing policies or to find an accommodation between them. The factors which shape its decision in this situation are, in most respects, the same as those which influence Congress or the executive: the balance of forces within the ruling class, the extent of popular pressure, and the ruling class affiliations of the individual Justices. And, as in other branches of the government, the Court may on rare occasions present an individual phenomenon, like that of Mr. Justice Black, whose attachment to Jeffersonian principles transcends his class loyalties.

Two additional factors, however, are peculiar to the Court. First, as already noted and as the history of the Court bears out, the life appointment of its members make them less responsive to popular pressure than elected officials. Second, the foundation of the Court's prestige is placed in jeopardy whenever by exercising its power to veto the policies of Congress or the executive it provokes a serious challenge to its judicial impartiality and the authority of its interpretation of the Constitution and

laws. The Court, always acutely aware of this risk, has always capitulated to a sustained challenge of its decisions by the other two branches of the national government. Recognition of this fact, however, does not minimize the role of the Court when it is at odds with the national administration. For its decisions provide a weapon of no small importance to the opponents of administration policy which, in some circumstances, may be sufficient to defeat it.

* * *

Before applying this analysis to recent rulings of the Court affecting civil rights and civil liberties, a few words of background are necessary.

V-J day (or, more accurately, the first nuclear explosion over Hiroshima) marked the abandonment of our war-time collaboration with the Soviet Union and the initiation of the drive of American big business for world domination based on its monopoly of the atom bomb and on atom-bomb diplomacy. Popular support for this reversal of policy and acceptance of the enormous costs of militarizing the nation which it entailed could be secured only by convincing the American people that the Soviet Union was an implacable enemy intent on their destruction. As the storm of disapproval evoked by Churchill's speech at Fulton, Missouri, the announcement of the Truman doctrine and—even as late as 1949—the establishment of NATO demonstrate, this was no simple operation. The fact is that it was

accomplished only by isolating the opposition, jailing its most militant leaders, and frightening others into silence.

The first step in the realization of these objectives was taken in 1947 with the passage of the Taft-Hartley Law which weakened the resistance of the labor movement, isolated the Communists and led to the ouster of the Left-led unions from the CIO. This was followed by such measures as the extension and intensification of the Congressional witch-hunt; federal and state "loyalty" programs; the deportation and denaturalization drive; the spy scares and spy trials that culminated in the execution of the Rosenbergs; the imprisonment of the national leaders of the Communist Party, and the long series of Smith Act prosecutions that followed.

* * *

In their totality, these repressive measures involved a violation of the liberties supposedly guaranteed by the Bill of Rights on a scale that is unprecedented in the history of the nation. Only a few years earlier, the Supreme Court had reinvigorated the First Amendment in a series of labor cases, reversed the convictions of two Communists (DeJonge and Herndon) under state sedition laws on constitutional grounds, and invalidated the denaturalization of William Schneiderman for lack of evidence that Marxism-Leninism advocates political violence. But these decisions had become a fetter on the

post-war policy objectives of American capitalism. Accordingly, the Court, in its most characteristic role, turned its back on the precedents and gave legitimacy to the whole gamut of repression by declaring it constitutional. In doing so, the Court wrote a series of opinions which not only sustained the legislation before it but, by their militant anti-Communist bias, provided an authoritative foundation for further acts of repression, and helped pave the way for McCarthyism.

But while American imperialism intensified repression at home, it suffered a series of set-backs in the international arena. Among these were the victory of the Chinese revolution, Soviet mastery of the "secret" of nuclear weapons, the stalemate in Korea, the French defeat in Indo-China, the rise of a powerful movement for national liberation and the emergence of a bloc of anti-imperialist nations in Asia and Africa, and the growing economic strength and moral prestige of the socialist states. These developments and pressure from a powerful world peace movement, diminished the war danger, led to a relaxation of tensions and compelled President Eisenhower to agree to the 1955 summit meeting. They were reflected on the domestic scene in November, 1954, when the voters administered a stinging defeat to the McCarthyite candidates which was soon followed by the political demise of the Wisconsin fuhrer.

While international developments in the three years since Geneva have been highly uneven, marked as they have been by repeated "brink of war" crises precipitated by American imperialism, the predominant characteristics of the period have been growth in the strength of the peace forces and further defeats suffered by the "positions-of-strength" policy. With few exceptions, the American ruling class continues to adhere to that policy. But it does so with increasing uncertainty, frequently expressed doubts, mounting criticism of Secretary Dulles, and groping efforts to find an acceptable alternative. Chief Justice Warren was not indulging in platitudes but voicing a trend of opinion within a section of the ruling class when he warned the American Bar Association in 1955:

We are living in a world of ideas and are going through a war of ideas. Everywhere there is a contest for the hearts and minds of men. Every political concept is under scrutiny. Our American system like all others is on trial at home and abroad. The way it works; the manner in which it solves the problems of our day; the extent to which we maintain the spirit of our Constitution with its Bill of Rights, will in the long run do more to make it both secure and the object of adulation than the number of hydrogen bombs we stockpile.

* * *

The emergence of this trend of thought within the ruling class has had an important influence on the

Warren Court, first manifested in the 1954 ruling in the school integration cases. When it rejected the sixty year-old "separate but equal" doctrine and held compulsory segregation unconstitutional, the Court stepped out of its characteristic role as an endorser of policy and became a policy-maker. It was forced into this position by the sharp division within the ruling class on the segregation issue.

On the one side were the Dixiecrats and their allies, prepared violently to resist any breach in the systematic, state-enforced oppression of the Negro people upon which their economic and political power is based. On the other stood a dominant section of the ruling class which, while it too profits handsomely from white supremacy, felt compelled to make certain concessions. The magnificent struggle of the Negro people for full equality and their balance of power position in key northern industrial states made them a political force that had to be reckoned with. Moreover, and Warren's remarks to the ABA indicate that this was decisive, state-enforced segregation had become an acute embarrassment to American imperialism in its bid for the support of the dark-skinned people of the world. It was these considerations that forced the Eisenhower administration to enter the school cases on the side of the NAACP.

Confronted with this division within the ruling class, the Court

moved with great caution. After hearing the cases in 1953, it ordered reargument the following year. Then, having declared segregation unconstitutional in principle, it deferred final action for another year. That action, when it came, took an unprecedented form. The Court had never before found a violation of the Constitution without ordering immediate compliance. But in the school cases it left compliance to be worked out by the lower courts and local authorities with the equivocal admonition that integration should be realized "with all deliberate speed."

The Court's attempt to find an accommodation acceptable to the Dixiecrats proved vain. It is beyond the scope of this article to review the attacks on the integrity of the Court which the school decision provoked and the so-far successful effort to nullify its ruling by state legislation and officially inspired mob violence. Nor can we here appraise the new chapter in the struggle for Negro liberation which the decision inaugurated.

What needs to be understood in analysing the role of the Court is that a decision which it doubtless hoped might ameliorate the division within the ruling class, in fact exacerbated the conflict and placed the Court at the center of a violent political controversy. Responsibility for this result lies primarily with the Eisenhower Administration which requires the vote of the Dix-

iecrat bloc for its legislative program and bases its hope of victory in 1960 on provoking a split in the Democratic Party. Accordingly, with the support of a bi-partisan majority in Congress, Eisenhower has temperized with the Dixiecrats, associated himself with their demand to "slow down" integration, refused to use the full enforcement powers at his command, and permitted the white supremacists to take the offensive and defy the Court.

Faced, in the Little Rock case, with the constitutional crisis that the Dixiecrats have precipitated, the Court forcefully reasserted its authority as the supreme arbiter of the Constitution and denounced the attempt to nullify its decisions as destructive of our system of government. However, it would be illusory to expect that the Court can or will long continue to occupy the exposed position in which it now finds itself. Either the constitutional crisis will be resolved by use of the full power of the executive and of Congress to prevent mob violence, punish its instigators and defeat the legislative maneuvers of the Dixiecrats, or the Court will be compelled to retreat. For it cannot stand its ground in the face of the nullification of its decisions without destroying its institutional character.

Thus, the decisions in the school cases, the product of a policy conflict within the ruling class, have armed the Negro people and their allies with a potent weapon to advance the struggle for full integration and to

promote a political realignment which will oust the Dixiecrats from the entrenched positions of political power that they occupy in the national government. But if the opportunity which the decisions present is not utilized, it will be lost. It can be utilized only by the mass intervention of organized labor and other popular forces, white and Negro, on a scale which will compel the President and Congress to deploy the full powers of the federal government for the enforcement of the school decisions. Unless this occurs promptly, there is grave danger that the Court will water down or reverse its rulings, with the most serious consequences not only to the Negro people's movement but to the struggle for the restoration of the civil liberties of all Americans.

It is to the recent decisions of the Court in the latter field that we now turn.

* * *

The international developments sketched above and the reaction against the extremes of McCarthyism which accompanied them were not immediately reflected in the decisions of the Court. In the winter of 1955, at the time it issued its final order in the school integration cases and eighteen months after Warren's accession as Chief Justice, the Court, with Justice Black alone dissenting, refused to review the second New York Smith Act case and thus again gave its stamp of approval to the long series of prosecutions that were

then in progress. Just a year later, however, the Court agreed to hear the appeal of the California Smith Act defendants. The new trend which this action foreshadowed manifested itself in two significant decisions in the spring of 1956. In *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, the Court for the first time withheld approval of a cold war measure to suppress civil liberties. Instead, side-stepping a decision on the constitutionality of the monstrous Subversive Activities Control Act, it reversed the order that the Party outlaw itself by registering under the law and sent the case back for further hearings because the Party had been denied an opportunity to submit proof of perjury by three of the government's professional informers. And in Steve Nelson's case, the Court upheld the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in invalidating twenty-year sentences for sedition on the ground that Congress had intended the Smith Act to supercede all state sedition laws.

These cases have been followed by a notable series of decisions. For present purposes, it will suffice to recall the action taken by the Court in the most significant of these without discussing them in detail. The California Smith Act convictions were reversed. Also reversed were the convictions of Watkins and Sweezy for refusing to answer questions of the Un-American Activities Committee and a similar state committee. The practice of the State De-

partment in denying passports to Communists and supposed Communist sympathizers was invalidated. The privileged position accorded F.B.I. informer witnesses was removed by the *Jencks* ruling which made their written reports available to the defense for the purpose of discrediting their testimony. Lawyers whose applications to practice had been denied because of past Communist Party membership or refusal to answer questions as to present membership were ordered admitted to the bar. The denaturalization of two formerly active members of the Communist Party was reversed for lack of evidence that, to their knowledge, the Party advocated political violence. Contrary to an earlier decision, deportation for former membership in the Communist Party was held unauthorized without proof that the deportee had had a politically "meaningful" association with the Party. The Attorney General was held to be without authority to require persons under orders of deportation to abandon their Communist activities and associations as a condition for their release on parole. The order of an Alabama court requiring the NAACP to disclose the names of its members and punishing it for refusal to do so was set aside. The armed forces were prohibited from giving dishonorable discharges to inductees because of their pre-service political associations. A California requirement that religious institutions sign a "loyalty

oath" in order to become eligible for tax exemption was invalidated.

These decisions have ameliorated some of the repressive measures of the cold war era. Furthermore, the lead given by the Court has been a primary factor in bringing about the overall improvement in the climate of civil liberties which has occurred in the past three years. But recognition of the important rôle which the Court has played in this sphere should not blind us to the limitations and shortcomings of even its best decisions. The fact is that, unlike the decision on integration, none of the rulings which we have reviewed are based on fundamental constitutional considerations, but have been decided on the narrowest possible grounds. In the main, they turn either on the evidence in the particular case before the Court or on its interpretation of what Congress intended to accomplish by the legislation in question. Since this point has important consequences, it will be useful to illustrate it with three examples.

* * *

The Court reversed the convictions in the California Smith Act case (acquitting four defendants and ordering a new trial for nine others) on the ground that the prosecution had failed to prove that either the defendants or the Communist Party had incited political violence or done more than teach violent revolution as an abstract political doctrine. Without coming to grips with the

underlying constitutional question, the Court held that Congress had not intended the Smith Act to punish such teaching. In one aspect this decision has an importance which has never been fully grasped or utilized. For if the prosecution was unable to prove in a prolonged trial that the Communist Party is a criminal conspiracy to destroy the government by violence, then the whole miasma of persecution, repression and thought control imposed on the country since 1946 is based on falsehood which the Court has now exposed.

The shortcoming of the decision, however, is that it was rendered within the framework of and purports to be consistent with the *Dennis* case in which the Court sustained the constitutionality of the Smith Act and refused even to consider whether the evidence was sufficient to support the convictions. Thus, the Court has left itself free, in some later Smith Act case, to find that the ingredient which was lacking in the California evidence has been supplied and, without even the appearance of reversing itself, to revert to the result it reached in *Dennis*. This, indeed, is what the Department of Justice is attempting to have the Court do. For it has announced its intention of retrying at least one of the Smith Act conspiracy cases and is pushing the trials and appeals in four of the so-called "membership" cases.

The opinion of the Court in the *Watkins* case is replete with state-

ments concerning the limitations on the power of Congressional committees to compel answers to their questions, criticism of the vagueness of the authority of the Un-American Activities Committee and warnings as to the unconstitutionality of intrusions by legislative committees into areas protected by the First Amendment.

Yet the Court never flatly states that the resolution creating the Committee is invalid or that questioning into the opinions and associations of witnesses is unconstitutional. Seemingly, the Court sought to avoid an open controversy with Congress on these fundamental questions and wrote what it did in the hope that Congress would voluntarily bring the procedures of its committees into line with the cautions of the Court. For the opinion is susceptible of the interpretation that the conviction was reversed solely because the Committee failed to inform the witness so that the witness could determine whether the questions were pertinent to this subject matter and whether the subject matter itself was within the scope of the resolution establishing the Committee.

* * *

In any event, Congress, ignoring the Court's admonitions, has taken the narrow view of the decision. The committees headed by Walter and Eastland continue to receive large appropriations and to operate as heretofore (except that they an-

nounce the subject matter of the inquiry at the inception of each hearing), and a substantially unanimous House and Senate vote contempt citations with monotonous regularity. Thus, the issue in the fight against legislative witch-hunts has yet to be determined and, as in the case of the Smith Act, the Court has carefully protected a line of retreat if it should find retreat politically necessary or expedient.

Similarly, the majority opinion in the passport cases contains some excellent generalizations about the constitutional right to travel. But the decision itself is narrowly based on the proposition that Congress has never authorized the State Department to withhold passports on political grounds. Accordingly, preservation of the freedom to travel must now be fought for in Congress. And while the decision of the Court provides a useful weapon in this fight, the Court has left itself free to sustain or invalidate any legislation which Dulles and his Congressional supporters may succeed in enacting.

Analysis of the other decisions enumerated above would yield a similar appraisal. In sum, and without minimizing their importance and usefulness, it must be concluded that they have by no means restored the erosions of the Bill of Rights which the Court sanctioned in the first post-war decade or established a firm foundation for the advances which have been made. Moreover, the progressive trend in the Court since 1956 has

been marred by a number of retrograde majority decisions. Space permits mention of only the most significant.

* * *

In contrast to its decisions in the Smith Act, disbarment and denaturalization cases, the Court refused to disturb a state court ruling that Communist Party membership warrants the discharge of a worker in private industry under the "just cause" provision of a collective bargaining agreement. In two other cases, it sustained the denial of public employment to workers who refused, on Fifth Amendment grounds, to inform their employers about their supposed Communist Party membership and associations. It affirmed the unprecedented three-year contempt sentences of Gilbert Green and Henry Winston, holding that, notwithstanding the lack of indictment and jury trials in contempt cases, the courts have unlimited power over the length of the sentences imposed.

Again, the Court ruled that Congress may provide for the expatriation of citizens who vote in foreign elections on the ground that the "embarrassment" to the conduct of American foreign policy which might ensue provides a reasonable basis for this draconian penalty. The decision establishes an extremely dangerous precedent by stripping the right to citizenship of any firm constitutional protection and by seeming to arm Congress with broad authority to re-

strict or punish any activity (including foreign travel) that might "embarrass" the foreign policies of the administration in power.

Of even greater immediate concern is a series of decisions restricting the rights of labor. Cases decided in the early days of the New Deal established that peaceful picketing for the purpose of organizing the unorganized is a constitutional right. The Vinson Court had hedged this right with numerous limitations.

But it remained for a 1957 decision to cancel out the right altogether. There the Court sustained a state court injunction against picketing which, although peaceful, was found to be for the "unlawful purpose" of "coercing" the employer to "force" his employees to join the union. In three further decisions last spring, the Court adopted extreme anti-labor interpretations of the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act.

The first of these held that the "hot cargo" provisions of the Act prohibit a union from demanding that an employer abide by his agreement not to handle the goods of a plant that is on strike. In the second, it ruled that the Taft-Hartley provisions empowering the Labor Board to order a union to make good the back pay of workers whom it "unfairly" excludes from employment does not bar such workers from recovering exorbitant punitive damages by suing the union in the state courts. And in the third, it found that an employer who distributes anti-

union literature in his plant may, nevertheless, enforce a company rule against in-plant distribution of literature by the union.

* * *

Despite the serious deficiencies in the work of the Court in the civil liberties field, the question which emerges from our survey is not so much why it has failed to go further but what accounts for the progressive steps it has taken. For as we have seen, the new trend manifested itself at a time when the Court was already deeply embroiled in the controversy over the integration decision and, as it must have anticipated, its rulings in the *Nelson*, Smith Act, *Watkins*, *Jencks* and passport cases sharpened the attack against it which has steadily mounted in intensity.

Plainly, the policies embodied in these decisions are at odds with those of the Eisenhower administration. Thus, Eisenhower joined J. Edgar Hoover in denouncing the *Jencks* ruling and sent a special message to Congress calling for legislation to nullify the passport decision. As we have seen, the Department of Justice has not abandoned the effort to secure a reversal of the Court's stand in Smith Act cases. No word of criticism of the Walter and Eastland Committees has ever issued from the White House. Nor has any administration spokesman supported the decisions of the Court on their merits but, at most, has defended its right to be wrong.

The situation is even more unfav-

orable to the Court in Congress where a solid line-up of Dixiecrats and Republicans dominates the scene, with only sporadic and lukewarm opposition from most Northern Democrats. In consequence, legislation was passed by thumping majorities watering down the salutary principle of the *Jencks* case as well as the so-called "Mallory rule" in which the Court had invalidated confessions obtained from accused before their arraignment. And it was only the adjournment of Congress that prevented Senate action on a bill, passed by the House, which would have nullified the Nelson decision. Similar bills with respect to the Smith Act, *Watkins*, disbarment and passport cases await action at the next session.

These actions by Congress and the executive reflect the fact that although the American people have unmistakably demonstrated their revulsion against the extremes of McCarthyism, there has been nothing approaching a mass demand to end political persecution. Initially, the Communist Party stood almost alone in resisting repression, and its warning that defense of the rights of Communists is the first line in the defense of the constitutional liberties of all Americans went unheeded. Even today, when McCarthyism has made this truth self-evident, the demand by non-Communists for such measures as an end to Smith Act prosecutions, abolition of the witch-hunting committees and the lifting of

passport restrictions has, in the main, been confined to a limited group of clergymen, professors and other progressive intellectuals. Organized labor, the necessary spearhead of a broad popular movement, has stood on the sidelines, hog-tied by its leaders' support of the Dulles foreign policy and by the militant anti-Communism which they practice in their own unions.

* * *

Accordingly, it is clear that, unlike the school decisions, the reversal of the Court's position in the Smith Act and other cases was not in response to popular pressure for the rulings that were made.

Nor can the changes in the composition of the Court since 1953 account for its new course. Happily, Chief Justice Warren and Justice Brennan have proved to be spokesmen for a more liberal section of the ruling class than were their predecessors. But that fact cannot explain why the same eight men (Justice Black dissenting) who denied review of the second New York Smith Act case in 1955 reversed their position in the California case a year later. Nor does it explain how Judge Harlan, who wrote the Court of Appeals opinion in the New York case in 1954 could, as Justice Harlan, author the California opinion of 1956. Obviously, though personalities play a part, it is the impact of events upon the men who compose the Court that has been determinative.

As Chief Justice Warren's remarks

to the ABA suggest, the primary factor which appears to have influenced the Court has been the failure of the "positions of strength" policy. This has led the more far-sighted representatives of the ruling class to recognize that America cannot hope to maintain its imperialist positions by force without winning the support of popular opinion in the non-socialist sector of the world. They have come to recognize, too, that the ugly and widely publicized realities of political repression in this country stand athwart America's claim to leadership of the "free world." Moreover, the cold war against civil liberties which was initiated in 1947, seems to them, for the moment at least, to have accomplished its purpose. The Communist Party, routed from its positions of influence in the trade unions and mass movements, has been driven into isolation, and poisonous anti-Soviet propaganda coupled with fear of the consequences of non-conformity have done their work among the people.

Thus, the policy of systematic political persecution, originally adopted to assure acceptance at home of an aggressive imperialist policy, has become an unnecessary fetter on the pursuit of that policy abroad. Some relaxation of the policy is therefore in order. So, at least, runs the thinking of a section of the ruling class, and it is this line of thinking that is reflected in the decisions of the Court. Opposed to this view are those ruling class circles which persist in the Dulles brink of war policy, and re-

ject the possibility of peaceful competition with the socialist countries. In defiance of world opinion, they count on bribery, blackmail with terror weapons and, if necessary, on war, to carry the day for American imperialism. On the home front, these circles denounce any relaxation of thought control and will press for further repressive measures as the American people in increasing numbers challenge a foreign policy, which they are coming to recognize, is suicidal.

The Court, aligned as it has been with the less aggressive and warlike section of the ruling class, is an ally of no little strength in the fight for civil liberties. But, as on the integration issue, the Court will not stand its ground, much less move forward, unless, at least, the pending legislation to override its decisions is decisively defeated. The popular movement necessary to secure this result is still to be organized.

* * *

A few words need to be added about the apparent inconsistency between the Court's generally favorable stand where Communism is the issue and its reactionary disposition of labor matters. If we have accurately identified the motivating factors in the first group of decisions, the result in the second is not an anomaly. For, today, the ruling class as a whole is less concerned with the internal "menace of Communism" than it is with the "menace" of a powerful labor movement, particularly in the

face of the uncertain economic perspective. To document this fact, it is sufficient to recall that the headlines have shifted from Eastland and Walter to the McClellan Committee and that no major piece of anti-Communist legislation has been proposed since the infamous Communist Control Act of 1954, while all sorts of anti-labor bills are on the agenda of Congress, and "right to work" laws are pending before the voters and legislatures of a number of states.

Furthermore, the increasingly stringent legislative and judicial restraints on labor have attracted little notice abroad. This is primarily because the AFL-CIO leadership has failed to take the offensive against many of these measures. Instead, intent on extolling the virtues of "American free labor" to the rest of the world, these leaders have concealed the existence of a drive to rob American trade unionists of such freedom to organize and bargain collectively as Taft-Hartley has left them.

Thus, neither of the considerations which underlie the progressive trend in decisions involving Communism is of weight in the labor field. Trade unionists who have refused to defend the civil liberties of Communists for fear of the consequences to their own organizations need to ponder this fact and take a fresh look at the Supreme Court scoreboard.

* * *

Much as some would prefer it otherwise, the inescapable fact is that the constitutional rights and liberties

of labor, the Negro people and the Communists will stand or fall together and must be fought for in unity as a single and inseparable whole. The new ground which has been won in the recent decisions of the Court can be held and further advances made only if this basic truth is recognized and acted upon. The elements of a program of action are clear:

Invoke the full powers of the federal government to enforce the school decisions and punish violators.

Defeat legislation to override the decisions of the Court.

Abolish the Eastland and Walter Committees.

Repeal the Smith, Internal Security, Communist Control and Walter-McCarran Acts.

Defeat federal anti-labor legislation and state "right-to-work" laws.

Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and restore labor's right of peaceful picketing.

The forces for the realization of this program are available. What is required is to arm them with the understanding that will unite their ranks and set them in motion with confidence that victory can be won.

Our December issue will carry the full text (11,000 words) of the critique of Pasternak's novel, *Doctor Zhivago*, written in 1956 by five Soviet writers, including K. Fedin and K. Simonov. This letter to Pasternak has been mentioned several times in the American press and was recently published in the *Moscow Literary Gazette*. It will appear, in translation and in full, in our next issue.

Americans View the Soviet Union

One Year Since Sputnik

By Herbert Aptheker

RECENTLY AN AMERICAN professor, addressing a gathering of his colleagues, said:

In just forty years of communist system they [the Soviet peoples] have literally harnessed technology to a star and galloped clear off the globe! Tell this to the starving masses who are hungry for industrialization. Evidently communism does not stifle all that is creative. We are caught with our propaganda pants down preaching a story which the simple "beep beep" of Sputnik so eloquently denies.*

To what measure were these "propaganda pants" cut? By and large, they were cut in such a manner that most Americans first visiting the USSR "expect to find," wrote Professor Harold J. Berman of the Harvard Law School, "barbed wire in the streets and people walking around with their heads hanging and their bodies bent" (*The American Scholar*, Spring, 1958). Professor Berman went on to tell of an American correspondent in Moscow in 1956 who described in a dispatch to his paper a May Day parade with the "people singing and dancing in the streets and enjoying themselves thoroughly." The editor of this paper, on the other hand, from his American office told his readers of "an embittered Russian people forced by their hated government to demonstrate in favor of a revolution which they did not want." When the correspondent remonstrated, and told his editor, "I was there—I saw it—they were not bitter, *they were happy, they were having a good time*," the editor replied in effect that the Russians may have appeared happy, "but that actually they could not have been happy, in view of the evils of the system under which they live."

It is interesting to find that Professor Berman agrees as to the fundamental evil of the Soviet system, but argues that evil systems may produce some good results, and that the USSR has done this; he argues further that because of the "Puritan" strain in Americans they cannot understand how good may issue from evil, and that this is the reason for the false picture which Americans have been given by "American newspapers, magazines and books."

Mr. Berman's values seem to me faulty, and his explanation rather bizarre. I hold that the Socialist Revolution in Russia—whose 41st anniversary is being celebrated this month throughout the world—was the greatest liberating event in human history, and that it is this feature of the event which explains the

* Urban Whitaker, of San Francisco State College, in *The Western Political Quarterly*, June, 1958, p. 202.

thrilling progress which the peoples of the Soviet Union have made since 1917. I think, further, that the American press, by and large, has consistently misrepresented this event (as Mr. Berman emphasizes) not because of some Puritan mystique, but because that press is an instrument of monopoly capital, and because monopoly capitalism loathes and fears social progress and above all detests Socialism.

The particular purpose of this article, however, is to describe and assess the body of impressions and data concerning the Soviet Union that have appeared in the American press in the year since Sputnik's launching astonished the world. That sensational event intensified a process already underway, among more responsible commentators, of an "agonizing reappraisal" of the Soviet Union. Not since the years from 1942 to 1944—when the World War II alliance and the tremendous resistance offered by the USSR to the fascist armies induced some change in the hitherto uniformly anti-Soviet bias of the American press*—have so many positive assessments of the Soviet Union been permitted to reach the eyes of so many Americans. It may be of some interest and value to summarize these assessments.

AMAZEMENT ABOUNDS

The most common single response announced by the recent intrepid American explorers of the USSR is that of amazement. Adlai Stevenson, surely not among our most backward compatriots, reported last summer that his visit to the Soviet Union had "shattered his preconceptions of Soviet life." Why? Well, he had found crowds of people in Russia at museums and parks, and boating and sunning themselves on beaches. It all "presented a rather festive picture; obviously, not all life here is dour" (*N. Y. Times*, July 14).

Many concentrating on specific areas of life, confessed similar reactions. Thus, the editor of *Popular Science* magazine motored through some 3,500 miles of the USSR. He reported (February) that he had started out with "standard preconceptions"—that the roads would be bad, no one would know how to repair an automobile and "the natives would be hostile." But this veritable Stanley venturing into reddest Russia, confessed at the end of his visit that "the preconceptions were wrong." The roads were good, skilled mechanics abounded, the "natives" were friendly (some were regular readers of *Popular Science*!) and "Russian drivers were different"—they were actually friendly and helpful and cooperative, not only to him, a stranger, but to each other!

Last March, the publisher and the editor of the *New York Journal of Commerce* visited the Soviet Union with the specific purpose of exploring the possibilities of increasing trade between it and our country. These gentlemen, responsible for the leading foreign-trade publication in the United States, actually had no real knowledge of what trading the USSR did, in what commodities, with what countries, under what conditions, nor, even, through what ports. Therefore, being granted an interview with Premier Khrushchev, they asked him

* For that story see my *History and Reality* (N. Y., 1955), pp. 167-83.

if the USSR would open its ports to Western shipping, and if so, what ports would thus be opened? Khrushchev replied that the questions surprised him, for apparently they did not know that the Soviet Union traded with 70 countries, that 40 per cent of its trade was borne by ships and that these entered through about two dozen first class ports like Odessa, Leningrad, Riga, Archangel, etc. Such information the publisher and editor conveyed to their readers (in their issue dated March 27) with an air of astonishment, very much as though they were announcing the discovery of flourishing commerce on the moon.

THE CONTENT OF THE DISCOVERIES

What is the main substance of the Sputnik-inspired "New Look" at Soviet reality? Overall, it is one which reports the Soviet Union not as an "experiment," with all the connotations of wobbliness and impermanence that word conveys, but as a firmly established and clearly viable social order.

In addition, and this is a more recent development, there is recurring use of the Soviet Union, by American observers, as a standard against which may be measured *American* accomplishment! As Mrs. Roosevelt expresses it, in terms of her own enormous range of experiences: "It seems inevitable in any meeting nowadays that someone will compare what is being done in the Soviet Union in any area of discussion" (*N. Y. Post*, Oct. 23). This represents, of course, the highest kind of tribute to the accomplishments of Socialism in the USSR; it reflects a growing awareness in our own country that the Soviet slogan—"to catch up with and to overtake the United States"—is becoming a reality.

Let us turn now to an examination of the content of positive American commentary on the Soviet Union during the past year. We turn first to the foundations of any social order—its productivity.

THE ECONOMY

Certain commentators have tried through summary statements to convey to their American readers some concept of the breath-taking economic strides that the Soviet Union has made in the past and is in the process of making today. Thus, S. L. A. Marshall wrote in *The New Republic* (Feb. 3): "The USSR is marching toward superiority in over-all productiveness while we move at a crawl." Walter Lippmann, in his column of June 10, confessed: "The fact of the matter is that the growth of the Soviet economy has been amazing." Marquis Childs, writing from Stalingrad (*N. Y. Post*, July 10), was manifestly greatly moved by the grandeur of the human effort which has led to the complete reconstruction of the Soviet Union despite "the wartime destruction of virtually all of the industry and most of the cities of Western Russia." Everywhere—in Stalingrad, Kiev, Rostov—he saw feverish rebuilding of apartments and industries; and not only apartments and industries, but a great conservatory of music in Kiev, a six-story academy of science in Kiev, theatres and opera houses, whole new towns

especially in Siberia, plus "the taming of 80 million acres of virgin land." Childs concluded:

It could well be that nothing on such a scale and so concentrated in time has occurred before. A second revolution is taking place inside this fantastic country, and it would be a rash prophet who would say where it will end.

The Russians say it will "end"—so far as things ever end—in Communism, and that it is towards this goal that they now are working. The sense of this new leap in the making—of this "second revolution," as Marquis Childs calls it—is in the report entitled "The Soviets Enter a New Economic Era," by Paul Wohl, *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent in the Soviet Union for many years. In this essay (appearing in *The Progressive* for September), Wohl reminds his readers that thirty years ago, "when pre-World War I levels had been essentially restored, the Soviet Republic ranked among the backward countries of the world, ahead of China and India, but on a level lower than any other major European nation." Then, with the era of the Five-Year Plans, began a collective effort "which has skyrocketed Russia from one of the most backward of countries to the number two industrial giant of the world." This era of the Five-Year Plans ends January 1, 1959; with that ending, as Wohl says, the Soviet Union "will move into a new economic era." Clearly, it is in preparation for this decisive event of the second-half of the twentieth century that the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is shortly to assemble.

Increasingly, in specific areas of economic endeavor, American readers are being informed that the Russians are offering serious challenges to U.S. supremacy; and that in some instances, that supremacy has already been overcome. This spring, the owners of the American steel industry sent a delegation to the Soviet Union for the purpose of comparing notes. Edward L. Ryerson, formerly head of the Inland Steel Company of Chicago, reported that the delegation "was greatly impressed by the resources, techniques and output of the country's steel production." Mr. Ryerson confessed to sharp surprise at what had been found; he was especially "impressed by the tremendous increase" in production in the past decade. He spoke with no trace of condescension, and even remarked: "Some Russian steel operations were superior to anything known in the United States" (AP dispatch, Moscow, June 13).

In aluminum, reported the magazine published by the Reynolds Aluminum Company (*Reynolds Review*, July), the challenge of the Soviet Union is becoming acute; to meet it this bulwark of "free enterprise" pleads for government assistance and subsidies! Soviet aluminum production is already second only to that in the U.S. says this trade publication, and it is "the fastest growing in the world." A leading Canadian industrialist, especially interested in uranium, reported the Soviet Union without a superior in this field, while again the rate of its development in uranium exploration and processing was without a peer. Another Canadian expert "praised Soviet engineering research as far ahead of any-

thing he knew in the West," while a third "predicted the Soviet Union would surpass the United States industrially within fifteen years" (*N.Y. Times*, May 25).

In whole categories of enterprise—many of them basic for future growth—the Soviet Union already leads the world. Mrs. Roosevelt, continuing her husband's intense interest in conservation, reports in her latest volume* that a technical expert in the U.S. Department of Forestry, studying Russian development, told her "that Russia was ahead in forestry research." In the major areas of river-development—irrigation, hydro-electric, flood-control, water-transport—the rate of Soviet advance is very much greater than that of our country. Senator James E. Murray, in his capacity as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had a memorandum on this subject assembled by experts for the use of his Committee. This memorandum, made public December 20, 1957, recorded that the Soviet Union was then second in hydro-electric power production, and that in each of the four main areas noted above it was moving ahead with such unprecedented speed that in some it had already caught up with the United States, and that in all it would, within about a decade, be abreast of this country or well ahead of it. Particularly noteworthy, states this memorandum, is the fact that:

There are now four hydro-electric stations either completed, in operation, or under construction in the USSR, any one of which will exceed the capacity of Grand Coulee on the Columbia River in Washington, which has long been the largest single hydro-electric producer anywhere.**

Of decisive consequence in the political and diplomatic fields is the export of capital to so-called underdeveloped countries. That the terms granted by the Soviet Union have far outstripped the capacities of American capitalists is well-known—the Soviet Union granting loans payable in local currency, for forty-year terms at interest rates not exceeding 2½%. Less well-known is the prodigious capacity of the USSR now to engage in such lending operations, but news of this, too, has begun to leak out to the American public in this post-Sputnik year. Chester Bowles, for example, in his just-published *Ideas, People, and Peace* (Harper, \$2.50) writes:

Since 1953 the Soviet Union has even provided more capital than we have to assist the economic development of Asia and Africa, not including Soviet aid to China. Soviet loans on generous terms have been flowing into Afghanistan, India, Egypt, Syria, Burma, Indonesia, and elsewhere, and trade is being rapidly expanded with these and many other countries.

* Eleanor Roosevelt, *On My Own* (Harpers, N. Y., \$4), p. 212.

** *Relationship of River and Related Water Resource Development Programs of U.S., Soviet Russia, and (Red) China* (Government Printing Office, Washington, 1957) p. 6. For additional material on this subject, see Senator R. L. Neuberger's article, "The Miracle of Rivers," in *The Progressive*, May, 1958.

The Soviet economic assistance program to Syria, negotiated in 1957, was larger than the current American-aid program for the whole Middle East put together.

This capacity alone, and its exercise by the USSR—leaving out of consideration all other factors—knocks into a cocked hat the basic assumptions of Dullesian foreign policy.

Moving in the direction of overall estimates of Soviet productive capacity, offered by eminently conservative and official United States sources, the following are typical examples: Edward L. Allen, economic adviser of the Central Intelligence Agency, in a “confidential briefing session” of leading American capitalists (later made public*) told his worried audience that in certain significant items—such as machine tools and cement—Soviet production was already well ahead of American. Calling his hearers’ attention to the even more decisive aspect of relative rates of growth, Mr. Allen said:

If you take a selection of six basic commodities—electric power, steel, trucks, tractors, machine tools, and cement—and compare physical output in 1928 with that of the U.S., you get a series of percentages which range from less than 1 percent to a maximum of 8 percent. And if you take the same series in 1956, the USSR’s relative showing had considerably improved. These same percentages range from 27 to 166 percent.

The gap was narrowing, Mr. Allen continued, not only relatively but also absolutely. “Even today,” he said

if you take Soviet productive investment in industry, in mining, and in electric power, and compare it with 1957 investment in these same categories . . . the Soviet figures in these three most important sectors are somewhere between 85 and 90 percent of comparable U.S. figures. We don’t have to move much further out into the future to realize the implications of this trend.

In the same volume printing Mr. Allen’s paper, will be found the text of an address delivered at West Point last November by William C. Foster, formerly Deputy Secretary of Defense. Said Mr. Foster: “A comparison of the rate of industrial growth of the Soviet Union over the last 25 years shows it to have been about twice our own rate over the same period.”

Extraordinarily revealing was the speech delivered before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce by the chief of the CIA, Allen W. Dulles, himself, on April 28. Here Mr. Dulles confirmed the estimate offered by Mr. Foster as to the period through 1956, and added:

Since 1956, Soviet output has continued its rapid expansion. In the first quarter of 1958, Soviet industrial production was 11 percent higher than a

* The proceedings of that session were published under the title, *Soviet Progress vs. American Enterprise* (Doubleday, N. Y., \$2).

year ago. In comparison the Federal Reserve Board index shows a decline of 11 percent in the United States.

Mr. Dulles was especially distressed by the altogether new fact in history: in the first quarter of 1958 the production of steel in the USSR and China exceeded the production of steel in the United States.

If Messrs. Allen, Foster and Dulles were to tell the American people, in addition, that these accomplishments were registered despite the devastations of World War II* they would more thoroughly convey the point that they seem to desire making—for their own reasons at the moment—namely, the great capacity of the Soviet productive plant and its unprecedented rate of growth. But these gentlemen face a harrowing contradiction: if they make their exposition too thorough, they will simultaneously call into question the superiority of capitalism as a system and convey the notion that Socialism lies at the root of the Soviet Union’s accomplishments.

EDUCATION

A generation ago, Dr. Frankwood Williams, a well-known American psychiatrist, after studying the Soviet civilization, wrote, with particular reference to its school system:

First, the child has a purpose and to carry out his purpose, he needs the school. Second, he is fully aware that he is wanted, even more that he is needed and there is a place for him in the social scheme of things. . . . Life does not confuse and terrify him for the reason that the principles upon which the social system is based—*no exploitation, mastery of the world through knowledge, united effort in the interests of all*—are easily comprehensible to him.

In the post-Sputnik year considerable progress has been made in terms of conveying to the American people some conception of the realities of the Soviet educational system. It is true that considerable falsification has accompanied this—especially in terms of presenting the system as one which stifles initiative, concentrates only on mechanical techniques, and seeks to smother all individuality—but nevertheless something of the miraculous achievements in the face of heart-breaking obstacles and catastrophes, has come through.

For example, one finds Claude M. Fuess, formerly headmaster of Phillips Academy in Massachusetts, commenting, after an examination of the subject: “The Russians have realized for some years the necessity of guiding every child

* The impact of the war is the most vivid single experience for the Soviet peoples; for the Americans, on the whole, it is a tenuously held memory. In World War II, twelve million Soviet citizens were killed; 47% of urban homes and 29% of rural homes were destroyed; 60% of coal stocks were destroyed; 87% of the locomotives; 71% of the hogs; 100 million books. Tens of thousands of schools and other public buildings were gutted, etc. The fullest information on this, in English, will be found in *The Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May, 1949.

as far along the educational path as he is qualified to go, of identifying talent early and cultivating it to the utmost, of rewarding scholarship and research, and making teaching a reputable, dignified profession" (*The Saturday Review*, Feb. 1). Again, Alvin C. Eurich, president of the State University of New York, reported: "Soviet education today combines the rigorous European system with the mass education of the United States—a phenomenal attempt. . . . The accomplishments of the Russian educational system are exceedingly impressive" (*The Atlantic*, April).

Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, testifying before the House Education and Labor Committee in April, stated that the "true reason" for the sweep forward of the USSR, was the Communists' "faith that cultivation of the human mind is the greatest single source of power." She correctly pointed out that while "to be sure the Russians emphasize science," they did so "against a background of history, literature, language and geography" that was quite as thorough. She even agreed with Khrushchev that the Soviet peoples were "marching in the vanguard of all mankind"; they were, she added, "capturing world leadership," and they were doing it by providing an educational system for all that was without a peer in the world. (Mrs. Meyer's quite remarkable testimony is printed in *The Congressional Record*, April 29.)

Marc Raeff, a professor of history at Clark University in Massachusetts, and now a Guggenheim Fellow pursuing research in Russian history in the Soviet Union, called attention, in an article in the *New York Times Magazine* (June 22) to the close rapport between students and teachers, and made the point that far from being lost in an impersonal mass system, in the USSR: "The teacher knows exactly the state of progress of each pupil. Every week he has individual or small group conferences with most of his students." Furthermore, reported Professor Raeff, he found the Soviet teachers expert at relating their subject matter of the moment to material presented earlier, so that the students get a sense of the interconnection of learning, as contrasted with a compartmentalized or disparate view. Noteworthy, too, he found, was the constant reference by the teachers and by the students—including mere youngsters—to "works of literature (novels, poems, dramas)."

This American teacher concluded his observations by commenting that: "Reading is the national pastime; everybody reads in great amounts; bookstores and libraries are always full, and books literally sell like hot cakes in the streets, in theatres, museums, stores, railroad stations." This was because, in the USSR, "Learning is highly valued, thirst for knowledge is great, seriousness of purpose universal."

No wonder Anne Kinder Eaton, wife of the Cleveland industrialist, Cyrus Eaton, was quoted in an AP dispatch from Leningrad this past October as saying: "Soviet Russia must be the closest thing to a teacher's paradise since the Renaissance. Everywhere the desire for learning is overwhelmingly evident."

Among the many delegations of American experts which went to the Soviet Union to study its educational system, was one consisting of ten educators headed by Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education. Dr. Derthick, upon

his return, addressed the National Press Club. The first two paragraphs of his speech were as follows:

What we have seen has amazed us in one particular: We were simply not prepared for the degree to which the USSR, as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education.

Our major reaction therefore is one of astonishment—and I choose the word carefully—at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished. For what it is worth ten American educators came away sobered by what they saw. (*N. Y. Times*, June 14.)

In particular, Dr. Derthick was impressed with the close participation of the Soviet parents with teachers in educational work; the quality of the teachers was very high; their prestige was great; their classes were not overcrowded; funds were available in abundance; evening courses and correspondence courses for workers abounded throughout the country; everywhere further expansion was going on; curricula were varied and of high quality. For the millions who read *Look Magazine*, Dr. Derthick repeated his findings, and though the editors dressed up his article (issue of October 14) with the title, "The Frightening Challenge of Russia's Schools," the contents itself could only have inspired rather than frightened any human being who might take pride in the accomplishments possible when encouraging surroundings and adequate facilities are provided.

A month later came the report of another group of American educators returning from the Soviet Union; this one was headed by Edward H. Litchfield, Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh and had focused its attention upon higher education in the USSR. Dr. Litchfield began his report with these words:

There are two things which deeply impress us all. First, there is almost universal belief in the Soviet Union in the value of higher education. Second, the Soviets are willing to pay the very high costs that are involved in money, in plant, in human effort (*N. Y. Times*, July 14).

The vastness of the undertaking, the fact that all education was free, that stipends came to the students, the enormous developments in higher education in Soviet Asia, particularly impressed the Litchfield group. Further, they were astonished at the fact that despite "some shortage of industrial workers," nevertheless "more than 800,000 [of them] are each permitted two full months of study with all expenses paid," and that "industry releases its employees at full pay for more than 250,000,000 man-hours each year in order to permit the workers to do work in universities or in engineering and other university level institutions."

Both Dr. Derthick and Dr. Litchfield found failings in the Soviet educational

system and both stressed that they did not feel it was applicable to our own country, but the essential point both made may be summed up in Dr. Litchfield's words:

The Soviet Government and its people have dedicated themselves to higher education to a degree which must inspire their allies and give very serious pause to any nation which finds itself in a competitive position.

None is so deeply critical of Soviet accomplishments, however, as is the Soviet leadership itself. There the question of criticism is a matter of principle, to be watered down at serious peril to the continued growth and dynamism of the Socialist society. Hence, though the Soviet educational system is recognized as without a peer in the world, there has been, nevertheless, a continuing public discussion of how to improve it further and to keep it abreast of the ever-growing needs of the surging Soviet society. In the past year, in particular, a discussion involving millions of teachers, parents, students, and Party and government officials throughout the length and breadth of the vast country has been going on: the aim is to bring education closer to the realities and the needs of Socialist society, to make it fully available to an even greater proportion of the population, and to make sure that the system serves to discourage bureaucratism, favoritism, or any trace of elitism.

It is these discussions and plans that have encouraged Dr. Maurice Friedberg of Hunter College to prepare for "Radio Liberation" an elaborate analysis "explaining" the breakdown of the Soviet educational system (this is published in *The New Leader*, Sept. 29); they have been the occasion for the *U. S. News and World Report*—chief ideological supporter of Faubus, Eastland, Byrd, and other supporters of democratic education—to herald "Russia's Plan Cuts Down on Schooling" (Oct. 3); they have served as the vehicle for a typical "think" piece by Max Lerner (*N. Y. Post*, Sept. 22) who announces that the discussions (of which he knows exactly nothing), represent "a vote of no-confidence in Russian youth, in sentencing them to a life of work-without-ideas."

All this represents conventional American press reportage—from the reactionary, through the conservative to the liberal—concerning the Soviet Union, and it is important to note that even during the post-Sputnik year easy reversion to this pattern occurs.

Actually the essential purposes of the discussions and the new proposals have been rather well summarized by the *Intelligence Report* on the matter put out by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the U.S. Department of State (No. 7719, dated May 13). This Report emphasizes that the reforms, experimentation and discussions now going forward in the USSR concerning education seek to bring more education to greater numbers, to make the education more appropriate to a socialist society by minimizing the difference between mental and manual labor (particularly as more and more intricate machinery becomes conventional) and by combining practice and theory; and to be cer-

tain that the children of officials and professionals do not, because of that parentage, gain any kind of advantage over other children in the society.

Premier Khrushchev, who is not noted for reticence in speech, has stated in a memorandum, approved by the presidium of the Central Committee (in September), that while the enormous accomplishments of Soviet education were known to all Soviet citizens, nevertheless that education needed sharp improvement. He addressed himself especially to non-elementary education and said: "The chief and root defect in our secondary and higher educational establishments is the fact that they are divorced from life." They suffered, he said, too much from the imprint of the pre-revolutionary *gymnasia*, where the emphasis was upon an abstracted kind of learning, separated from real life and useful mostly to an exploitative class. What he, and the Central Committee were urging (and the discussion is still continuing as hot as ever), was an effort to recast education more fully in accord with a Socialist state, for, of, and by Socialist workers*—one in which creative and productive labor is the most honored pursuit, rather than being thought of as an affliction or burden or fearsome necessity, as in capitalist society.

SCIENCE

Djilas, in that farrago of fraud and fantasy called *The New Class*, which fittingly has had so wide a vogue in our country, says that scientific development has been all but absent in the Soviet Union; that, indeed, in science the USSR is distinctly behind old Czarist Russia. This reflects a common bourgeois caricature of Socialism as a system that stifles individuality and ingenuity and creativeness and hence one in which science "could not" flourish. Quite apart from some of the misconceptions within this very idea of what makes science flourish—omitting as it does collective work, cooperation, sheer perseverance and a sense of dedication—perhaps the most severe jolt offered by Sputnik to the American ruling class and its ideologues lay in the fact that it represented such a major breakthrough in the areas of scientific theory and its technical application.

Since Sputnik, then, there has been in the area of science, perhaps as much as in that of education as a whole, a fresh appraisal by fully respectable Americans of Soviet reality. It is certainly true that Russian genius in science reflected itself despite Czarism—one need only recall the name of Lomonosov—but it is also true that with Socialism, and its passionate commitment to science, the scientific potentialities of the multi-national Soviet Union have really flourished for the first time. Specialists have been aware of this for years preceding Sputnik, of course; to cite one example, Solomon Lefschetz, professor of mathematics at Princeton, writing in 1949, remarked that in the Soviet Union, "soon after the Revolution, mathematical research experienced an almost explosive growth." Already at that time Lefschetz noted "that a growing number of young American

* A very revealing book on the nature of Socialist education is that by Lenin's widow, N. K. Krupskaya, *On Education*, published in English in 1957 by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.

mathematicians are endeavoring to learn scientific Russian with the sole object of being able to read the literature of their Soviet colleagues"; this was due to "the weight of Soviet mathematics," which involved basic contributions in topology, algebra, the general theory of differential equations, and the theory of probability and statistics. In other whole areas of science—like low-temperature physics, uses of oxygen, the separation of industrial gases—Soviet science has made outstanding contributions well-known to and fully appreciated by fellow scientists no matter what the nationality.

Now news of this, and of further swift developments, especially since the end of World War II, are becoming public property even in our own country. Thus, the Associated Press (July 8) carried extracts from the report of Jean Henley of Columbia University concerning the extraordinary advances being made in the USSR in the study of the nature of life itself, and the character of the state called death. Dr. Henley stated that "the Russians are carrying on thorough, highly systematized research" into these questions, with scientists specializing in a dozen different fields cooperating and pooling their findings. She added "that she knew of no comparable program in the U.S."

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, found the Soviet Union lagging behind no country in studies in the behavioral sciences; specifically in brain research, he said, "the Soviet Union led the world." (*N. Y. Times*, April 13). A. V. Bushkovitch, a professor of physics at St. Louis University, writing in *The Nation* (June 28) said it was an illusion to believe that the U.S. surpassed the USSR in physics. Among other outstanding Soviet figures in this field the professor mentioned Kapitza, Zavoisky, Cherenkov, Landsberg, Friedman, Landau, and others. That his listing and descriptions were far from exhaustive is indicated by the fact that he omitted such outstanding physicists as I. E. Tamm and I. M. Frank. In any case, he thought no country could surpass this record, and he added that it must be remembered that U.S. scientific contributions included the work of a very large European component—as Einstein, Fermi, Bethe, etc.

In the field of nuclear physics the work on particle accelerators (huge machines with which scientists can "see" fundamental particles of matter and create new ones) is decisive, and here the Soviet contribution has been outstanding. Robert R. Wilson, writing in *Scientific American* (March) pays tribute to this with the generosity characteristic of scientists. Referring to the work of V. I. Veksler and G. I. Budker in particular, and to Soviet efforts in general, he remarks: "It would seem that whatever we do, our Soviet friends can do too—and with a factor or two in their favor."

The universality of interest in science in the Soviet Union and the widespread degree of knowledge of it has also been remarked in American publications. This point is stressed, for example in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (September); at the same time, the magazine notes the general sweep of cultural interests and knowledge that distinguishes Soviet scientists from their American (or English) brothers. It finds this puzzling, in view of its own picture of the Soviet Union as a slave state; but while remaining puzzled, it admits the facts.

Perhaps the most sweeping post-Sputnik re-evaluation of Soviet science was made by Jerome Wiesner, a professor at MIT. He stated that in some of the widest areas of scientific investigation—like meteorology and oceanography—no nation was even in the same league with the USSR. Professor Wiesner's statements are the more weighty in that he prefaced them with the remark that he feared that after Sputnik there was danger here of "over-reacting" and estimating Soviet science at too high a level.

Nevertheless, he went on to say that there were in the USSR meteorological and metallurgical laboratories, computer facilities, radio and electronic institutes, and a space research center, "and many other institutes" the equals of which "we do not have in the Western world." In a quite remarkable pronouncement, Professor Wiesner said:

[The Soviets] have a view of science as an integral part of their society. They are pioneers. To the intellectual, the frontier is not the land but the mind, and the Soviet leaders seem to understand this. Because they appreciate the long-term implications of the development of science for the growth of their society, they are able to make determined, long-range commitments to train people, build universities, laboratories, and institutes on a grand scale.

Speaking somewhat nationalistically and perhaps aiming at rhetorical effect, Wiesner said that what worried him in particular was the trend—i.e., swift progress of Soviet science as contrasted with a certain stagnation in the West. Hence, he concluded: "When I really feel gloomy I think that in five years they will be obviously superior to us in every area. But when I am optimistic I feel it will take ten years for them to achieve this position."*

* * *

For reasons of space, it has been necessary to hold over until next month the concluding section of this article. It deals with: health and well-being, living conditions in general, provisions for children, juvenile delinquency, and culture; and some practical questions of co-existence.

* Wiesner's paper appears in *Soviet Progress vs. American Enterprise*, already cited.

Recent Political Developments in Texas

By State Committee, CP of Texas

THE POLITICAL STRUGGLES of the 1958 Democratic primary elections in Texas, held July 26, with run-offs August 23, were a most important development in the continuing conflict between the working people of the state and their allies on the one hand, and the millionaire oil monopolies and their allies on the other. The oil companies, the Texas Manufacturers Association, and the finance-capital interests had plans to capture not only a seat in the U.S. Senate, but even tighter control of Democratic Party machinery and elective offices in the state as well. These plans were defeated. And though monopoly capital won many important victories, the overall result of the elections was to strengthen greatly the position and prestige of anti-monopoly forces in the state.

At stake in the elections were a seat in the U.S. Senate, seats in the U.S. House, the positions of governor and lieutenant-governor, positions on the state Supreme Court, some state senate seats, all seats in the state house of representatives, and various other state and local offices. At stake in the precinct and country conventions, and in the

state convention held September 9, was control of the machinery of the Democratic Party. Greatest interest centered around the races for U.S. Senator and for Governor.

59% FOR YARBOROUGH

In the U.S. Senate race, Senator Ralph Yarborough, candidate of the labor and liberal forces, won over oil millionaire William Blakley with 59 per cent of the total vote. Blakley, in addition to his oil holdings, owns several insurance companies, a bank, ranches, and is the largest stockholder in Braniff International Airways. His personal fortune of \$100 to \$200 million ranks him the 19th richest man in the U.S. He had the support of all the most reactionary elements in the state—the old Shivers machine, the Freedom in Action organization, and the White Citizens Council included. His officially reported campaign expenditures were an unprecedented \$298,045. Over and over again during

* Readers are reminded of the following articles in recent issues: Albert J. Lima, "The California Primary Elections" (May, 1958); Arnold Johnson, "The 1958 Elections" (June); William Allan, "The Coming Michigan Elections" (July); James West, "The Coming Illinois Elections" (September).—Ed.

the campaign he accused Yarborough of being the candidate of the "CIO-Reuther-Hoffa group and the NAACP," who, he said, were trying to take over Texas politics. He attacked the U.S. Supreme Court, federal aid to education, and the trade unions. In conceding defeat, he said that he had just miscalculated as to what the majority of the voters wanted.

The people of Texas would not buy this blatant program of the big monopolies, no matter how embellished by a high-pressure advertising campaign. Yarborough based his campaign mainly on his Senate record, on his support of anti-recession measures, and on his support of measures to benefit the farmers. He launched an effective attack against Blakley for trying to buy the elections. He denied the charge of NAACP support, but otherwise managed to sidestep questions having to do with segregation.

Yarborough has been the main standard bearer for the liberal-labor forces in Texas for the last six years, and his victory over Blakley greatly advances the anti-monopoly movement in the state. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that Yarborough himself falls far short of a consistent anti-monopoly position. This is in part a reflection of weaknesses among the anti-monopoly forces; in part it goes beyond these weaknesses. Yarborough took the lead in Congress in fighting to re-

tain the present tax allowance for the oil companies, when liberal Senators from the North were seeking to reduce it. In his present campaign he made a strong appeal to the interests of the "independent" oil companies, as opposed to the interests of the majors; and he received some important financial support from them. When U.S. troops were sent to Lebanon, in the midst of the primary election campaign, Yarborough rushed to Washington with much fanfare to support the intervention. In so far as the struggle for Negro rights is concerned, he has been especially weak; and he has not yet publicly supported the U.S. Supreme Court decision against segregation in public education. *On the other hand Yarborough, along with Kefauver and Johnson, was one of the three Southern senators that voted against curtailing the powers of the Supreme Court. And he took a strong stand against our China policy, accusing Eisenhower of being "bayonet happy" in attempting to defend Quemoy and Matsu.*

Despite the serious weaknesses in his position, the people identified Yarborough as an anti-monopoly candidate. His election, in the face of the opposition of all the major daily newspapers, all the monopoly political machines in the state, and an opponent who spent several times what Yarborough himself spent, was a real victory for the liberal-labor forces that were his main support.

GOVERNOR'S RACE

In the race for the governorship the returns were as follows:

Daniel	799,107	60.7%
Gonzalez	245,969	18.7%
O'Daniel	238,767	18.1%
Irwin	33,643	2.5%

Incumbent Governor Price Daniel was the main candidate of the monopolies. He had the full support of the machine built up by former Governor Shivers—with whom Daniel differs tactically on a number of questions, the Shivers crowd preferring a policy of more open reaction—as well as support by the machine he has built up for himself while in office. Confident of victory, Daniel usually refrained from mentioning his opponents by name, but directed his main fire against the liberals. He stressed the need to keep control of the Democratic Party machinery in the precinct conventions, in the face of the possibility that the liberal Democrats of Texas, whom Daniel tried to brand as a “splinter group,” would win such control. He also refrained from open attacks on labor during the campaign and in the months preceding it, seeking to appear as inoffensive as possible in this regard, in spite of his anti-labor record in the past. And on the key question of segregation, though he bears the main responsibility for the passage of the race-hate bills at the special sessions of the legislature this spring, he sought to don the robes

of a “moderate.” In this he was aided by the candidacy of former Governor W. Lee O'Daniel, who made segregation one of the main planks in his platform and promised re-segregation in all areas where desegregation had been won.

The third candidate was state senator Henry B. Gonzalez. A believer in capitalism, Gonzalez nevertheless took an advanced anti-monopoly position. He based his campaign largely on “human rights above states rights,” stressing the need to end second- and third-class citizenship; on opposition to a sales tax; and on party loyalty.

HARRIS COUNTY

In addition to the governorship, the monopoly candidates—the so-called “conservatives”—won most other state-wide and legislative races. But there were many important exceptions that greatly weaken monopoly's hold on the state machinery. The most important exception was Harris County, the leading industrial area in the state, of which Houston is the county seat. Here liberal and labor candidates made a clean sweep. Not only was liberal

Robert W. Baker elected to the State Senate, but liberals won all eight seats in the State House.

The liberal candidates who received the Democratic nomination, practically equivalent to election, were Bill Kilgarlin, president of the Harris County Young Democrats; Joe Ed Winfree; Chris Cole, who was unopposed; Dean Johnston, a former state president of the Young Democrats and presently circulation and advertising manager of the liberal *Texas Observer*; Robert C. Eckhardt, labor attorney and president of the Harris County Democrats (D.O.T.); Clyde Miller, formerly state legislative representative of the Railroad Brotherhoods; Roger Daily, former campaign manager for Ralph Yarborough; and Charles J. Whitfield, a long-time member of the Harris County Democrats.

In Tarrant County, of which Fort Worth is the county seat, three liberal-labor candidates were elected to the state House: Yale Larry, Don Gladdens, and Howard Green. Another liberal, Franklin Spears, was elected from Bexar County, where San Antonio is the county seat. Reactionary candidates won all the state House seats in Dallas County, but liberal candidate Barefoot Sanders won nomination to the U.S. House.

ISSUES VARIED

Issues in the elections varied

from area to area, of course, but the big state-wide issues were opposition to monopoly control, opposition to a sales tax, and the question of future policy in regard to desegregation of the public schools. In the state legislative races a number of progressive demands were raised and received more or less widespread discussion in various areas—including abolition of the poll tax, the proposal of a state Fair Employment Practices Law, repeal of anti-labor legislation, and even the abolition of capital punishment. The results of the elections, of course, decided none of the big issues; but they did determine the positions from which future struggles will be conducted.

The people's forces, having defeated monopoly's plan to dominate the legislature with no effective opposition, are in a much better position than before the elections. It is significant that none of the monopoly candidates dared to espouse openly a sales tax; and largely as a result of Senator Gonzalez' candidacy, reaction was put on the defensive in regard to its policies of racial hatred and segregation.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY
CONVENTIONS

The same struggle between monopoly and anti-monopoly groups that was the theme of all the important election races was fought out in the precinct and county conventions of the Democratic Par-

ty and in the state convention held at San Antonio. These conventions give an insight into the inner working of the "democratic process" in Texas, and also an insight into the tortures to which this process is put by the agents of the big monopolies.

In the county conventions the liberal "Democrats of Texas" won control in Harris county, in Bexar county, home seat of Senator Gonzalez, and in Jefferson county (the Beaumont-Port Arthur area), also highly industrialized and an important oil-producing and shipping center. The Shivers "Freedom in Action" machine—supporting Daniel, but better organized politically than his own machine—won control in Dallas county, Tarrant county, and in Travis county (the Austin area).

The Dallas county convention illustrated the extremely reactionary character of the big monopolies' program for the state. Here the convention passed resolutions condemning weakening of the Texas Right to Work law, federal aid to education, F.E.P. and civil rights legislation, and Eisenhower for sending federal troops to Little Rock. The Negro delegates at the convention and some liberal whites who supported their position walked out when this last resolution was passed. The Shivers-F.I.A. people ran the whole convention with complete disregard for democratic procedure, refusing roll-call votes and refusing to recognize opposition speakers.

The result of the county conventions was to give the "conservatives" a plurality of votes at the September 9 state convention. There were enough uncommitted delegations from small counties, however, to swing the voting in either direction. At stake at the state convention was the question of state Democratic party platform policy, the composition of the State Democratic Executive Committee (S.D.E.C.), and the composition of the 1960 Democratic presidential electors, to be selected by the S.D.E.C.

Following his victory in the July primary, Senator Yarborough entered actively into the fight around the state convention as the main leader of the liberal forces. He directed his main attacks against the FIA forces, which he branded as "Fascism in Action." The Governor, though, by virtue of his control over patronage, such as the building of roads, had a heavy advantage over the Senator when it came to winning the support of the small county delegations. Also, he had the support of Senator Lyndon Johnson and House Speaker Sam Rayburn, who, though they did not attend the convention, used all their prestige and connections to influence its results.

The role played by Johnson and Rayburn was basically determined by their position as "liberal" leaders of the national Democratic party. Both owe their repeated elections and tenure in Washington to the

support they receive from the big monopolies. They had no other course but to line up on the same side in Texas politics, against the main forces fighting the monopolies. But in order to maintain their reputation as leaders of the "liberal" alternative that the monopolies put before the masses nationally, they had to keep from being identified with the extreme Right-wing of the Democratic Party in Texas. The result was a coalition of "moderates"—Johnson, Rayburn, and Daniel—whose power rested largely on the organized strength of the Shivers- and FIA-controlled delegations! The maneuvers sometimes became complicated. Rayburn, for instance, was forced publicly to endorse Yarborough during the election campaign, when the Blakley forces became louder and louder in their boasts that "Mr. Texas" had already voted for Blakley by absentee ballot. Yet at convention time Rayburn had to do an about-face and fight against Yarborough and his program.

The adopted state platform condemned "unconstitutional encroachments" on states' rights and federal aid to education; opposed "the use of force, military or otherwise, to overrule" local decisions in school matters; and praised Governor Daniel. One resolution approved by the convention called for legislation to curb the U.S. Supreme Court. Another blasted the D.O.T. and demanded it change its name. A Johnson-for President resolution was de-

clared approved over the opposition of both the D.O.T. and the F.I.A. delegations. The F.I.A. program is more in line with the candidacy of a Faubus than a Johnson, and some of the F.I.A. delegates wore "Faubus for President" badges.

Following the convention, Yarborough denounced Daniel's refusal to seat Senatorial District Caucus nominees as "an act of infamy." Both Johnson and Rayburn, anxious to protect their "liberal" reputations, also criticized Daniel.

ANTI-MONOPOLY ALLIANCE

The anti-monopoly forces that exerted such an influence in the election campaigns and at the Democratic Party conventions are composed of all the main sections of the people that suffer from monopoly rule: labor, the Negro people, the Mexican-Americans, the small farmers, and small businessmen. The greatest weakness of the anti-monopoly forces is that, on the whole, the different groups worked for common goals separately, without being united in a stronger coalition. Greater unity in action—and the building of a more effective coalition—is one of the main prerequisites for a democratic solution of the issues left undecided by the elections and for greater victories in the future.

The main and most effective force in the anti-monopoly alliance was the trade-union movement. The AFL-CIO, through its Committee

on Political Education (COPE), contributed money, manpower, and organizational know-how, particularly around Senator Yarborough's race. And although COPE on a state level made no endorsements, it distributed a comparison of the voting records of candidates that left no doubt as to its preferences. Local COPE organizations in all the major industrialized areas of the state published slates of candidates and worked actively to support them. Yarborough was endorsed everywhere. In some areas, such as Bexar county, the slate was headed by state Senator Gonzalez for governor. In other areas, such as Harris and Dallas counties, Gonzalez' name was omitted—in spite of his perfect voting record on labor issues—as a concession to pro-segregation and anti-Mexican prejudices. A few local labor leaders sought to make deals with Daniel, exchanging support of him for his promise that he would not encourage new anti-labor legislation in the next session of the legislature, and tried to palm off on the membership the view that he was "inoffensive" to labor.

The Negro people constitute about 11 per cent of the state's 9,127,000 population. Organizations of the Negro people were unanimous in their support of Senator Gonzalez. And the votes of the Negro people overwhelmingly went to Senator Yarborough, though Negro leaders and organizations were divided as to whether to endorse him, because

of his weak position on civil rights. In Bexar county there was a Negro candidate for the state legislature, who, though decisively defeated by the monopoly candidate, came out second in a four-man race.

The Mexican-American people, who constitute approximately a sixth of Texas' population, have in recent years been taking an increasingly important part in the state's political life. In Dallas county, for instance, poll-tax payments by Mexican-Americans numbered only 300 five years ago; in 1958 they numbered 1600. The Mexican-American people contributed heavily in money and manpower to the campaign of Senator Gonzalez, particularly in the southern and southwestern parts of the state. Spanish-language newspapers supported Gonzalez enthusiastically and devoted much space to combating the ideology of white supremacy.

Small farmers, both Negro and white, are an important part of the anti-monopoly forces. The Texas Farmers Union, 6,000 members strong, follows a pro-labor policy and is an important political force in the state. Its effectiveness is weakened, however, and the unity of the anti-monopoly forces is impaired, by its exclusion of Negro farmers from membership.

Important sections of small business and professional people also contributed heavily in money and manpower to both Yarborough and Gonzalez, as well as to liberal legislative candidates. An example is

the endorsement by the San Antonio Independent Retail Grocers Association—as distinguished from the chain grocers—of a complete slate of independent candidates for the state legislature, with the exception of their support of one incumbent, who had done certain favors for them in the past.

THE DEMOCRATS OF TEXAS

The liberal "Democats of Texas," whose state chairman is Mrs. R. D. (Frankie) Randolph, Democratic Party national committeewoman, includes elements from all the above groups. The D.O.T., a successor to the Democratic Organizing Committee and the Democratic Advisory Council, came into being in May, 1957, over the struggle around party loyalty. D.O.T. people were the main organizing force behind Senator Yarborough's election in 1957, and the D.O.T. was also a very effective force in the 1958 elections. Most of the D.O.T. membership worked for Gonzalez as well as for Yarborough, though Gonzalez was not officially endorsed because of fears of some leaders that such an endorsement would lose the D.O.T. support in East Texas, where Jim Crow reigns nearly supreme. For the same reason the D.O.T. on a state level has never endorsed the U.S. Supreme Court decision outlawing compulsory segregation in the public schools. Some local D.O.T. groups, however, have taken an anti-

segregation stand. In spite of all its weaknesses, the D.O.T. remains a very important component of the anti-monopoly forces in the state, and its role should become more important in the future.

Daniel's betrayal at the state Democratic Party convention will undoubtedly serve as a real stimulus to D.O.T. organization. And with Yarborough removed from direct participation in intra-state political struggles for the next six years, because of his election victory, the unifying role that only the D.O.T., among present political organizations, can play in the future is obvious. In order to play such a unifying role, the D.O.T. must take at least a minimum position supporting the law of the land in regard to the rights of the Negro people, and also more advanced position than it has in the past in supporting the demands of other sectors of the anti-monopoly alliance. For only insofar as the anti-monopoly forces are united among themselves can they guarantee that Yarborough, and other candidates they back, will follow a more consistent anti-monopoly policy. Otherwise there is danger that the oil money will have its way.

The importance of D.O.T.'s role is further emphasized by the campaign now being waged to "draft" Lyndon Johnson as a "favorite son" candidate for the presidency in 1960. Such a candidacy would have the support of all the most reactionary monopoly forces in the South—in spite

of the "Faubus for President" diversion by some F.I.A. and White Citizens Council forces—as witness the newspaper stories that the Faubus victory in Arkansas furthered Johnson's chances. And there is even conceivable the possibility that important monopoly forces nationally might support Johnson's candidacy in an attempt to "unify" the Democratic Party. At the present time the D.O.T. is the main organized center of Johnson's political opposition within the state.

The *Texas Observer*, liberal weekly newspaper published in Austin, deserves special mention as a part of the anti-monopoly forces, for it has been the only newspaper of state-wide circulation that has had a continuing pro-labor policy, as well as a continuing opposition to racist ideology. It conducted a strong editorial campaign for both Yarborough and Gonzalez, as well as for other anti-monopoly candidates.

CHANGES IN POLITICAL SCENE

The election campaign effected several important changes in the political scene in Texas. Among the most important new factors are: 1) growth in effectiveness and prestige of the liberal-labor forces as a result of the re-election of Yarborough, the house victories, and the county convention victories in the most important industrialized areas; 2) the active participation of the Mexican-

American people in the political struggle with a very vocal demand for greater political representation and an end to second-class citizenship both for themselves and for the Negro people; and 3) a changed psychological climate in regard to segregation, as the result of a gubernatorial campaign in which one of the main candidates took a strong position in denouncing all forms of second-class citizenship on moral and democratic grounds.

This was the first election in the post-World War II period in which any liberal candidate was elected in a state-wide race in Texas by a majority vote. A strong blow was dealt the practice, so effectively used in the past by monopoly candidates, of using labor and the NAACP as bogeymen. Labor's new prestige is illustrated notably by Daniel's efforts to make deals and appear in-offensive; but even Pappy O'Daniel went to the trade unions and adopted into his platform strong pro-labor demands that they suggested!

GONZALEZ' CANDIDACY

The Mexican-American people in south and southwest Texas have traditionally followed the political machines. In this election the machines endorsed Blakley and Daniel, both of whom lost in south and southwest Texas by margins of two and three to one. The candidacy of Senator Gonzalez for the governorship, unprecedented in Texas his-

tory, inspired mass participation in politics by Texans of Mexican descent. Especially noteworthy was the participation of youth in great numbers, as was also true for other sectors of the anti-monopoly coalition.

It was Senator Gonzalez' candidacy that brought about the changed psychology in regard to segregation. Thousands consciously and publicly identified themselves with Gonzalez in a campaign in which the "unifying ideal," to quote the Senator, was the proposition that "every man is equal before the law, regardless of race, creed, or color." There are consequently new possibilities for victories in the struggle against the oppression of Negroes and Mexican-Americans.

Gonzalez entered the race for governor after all other liberal potential candidates had refused to run, both because the chances of substantial financial backing seemed very slim, and because the chances of being elected, in the face of the strong tradition of granting the incumbent a second term, also seemed very slim.

Prior to the campaign, Gonzalez' chief claim to state-wide fame was his participation in two filibusters—in each of which he talked for more than twenty hours—against bills aimed at preserving segregation in public education. For his activities in promoting civil rights he received the "Man of the Year" award of the Texan NAACP in 1957. Not only was he a defender of Negro rights at a time when anti-Negro sentiment

was being spread broadcast by White Citizens Council elements, but he was of the Catholic faith, where the Catholics are in a minority and where anti-Catholicism is widespread. Any one of these characteristics would spell sure defeat according to the ordinary politician's manual of standard operating procedure. Any one of these characteristics was unprecedented on the modern state-wide political scene in Texas. Yet Gonzalez campaigned vigorously and tirelessly over the entire state. Attacked as the "dimpled darling" of the NAACP and the labor unions, he counter-attacked with strong defenses of the rights of the Negro people and of labor. "Since when do we curl up our lips with scorn when we talk of laboring people?" he said. "Isn't it on the backs of laboring people that democracy has been built?"

Though he had no support from monopoly sources, contributions came in from individuals inspired by his candidacy, and from groups and organizations of the Mexican-American and Negro peoples. The hat was passed at all rallies. Gonzalez himself estimated that altogether more than six thousand individuals contributed financially. A trio of Mexican musicians volunteered their services and accompanied him over the state. Everywhere volunteer campaign headquarters sprang up.

Yet with all the enthusiasm generated around his candidacy, there was precious little organization,

largely because of Gonzalez's own typical individualistic way of campaigning and opposition to organization. As the *Bexar Democrat*—campaign organ of the liberal-labor forces—put it, liberals had to learn "to work around and in spite of him." Organizational weaknesses cost thousands of votes.

WHITE SUPREMACY

The main reason that Gonzalez received only 18.7% of the total vote, however, compared with 59% for Yarborough, is not the weakness of his organization nor the tradition of a second term for the incumbent. *The main reason is the persistence and strength of white supremacy in the state*, directed against both the Mexican-American and the Negro peoples. One of the greatest ironies of the election was that the D.O.T. and the state A. F. of L.-C.I.O., on record as opposing both Daniel and O'Daniel, refused to endorse Gonzalez because of fear of a split in their ranks over the question of segregation. That the poison of white supremacy was responsible for the election of the candidate of the oil monopolies as governor is borne out by an analysis of the election returns.

The returns show both the strength and the weaknesses of the anti-monopoly forces in the state and point up the main tasks for the future. Yarborough won all of the twelve largest urban counties in which 52% of this year's qualified voters reside. The 12-county vote was 284,629 for

Yarborough, 216,338 for Blakley. Yarborough carried every one of them but Dallas, his home town.

Gonzalez carried ten border counties, areas heavily weighted in Mexican-American voters, and ran second in 44 of the state's 254 counties. His vote represents the most ideologically advanced sectors of the anti-monopoly coalition. He received substantial votes in Harris, Jefferson, Galveston, Tarrant, Dallas, and Bexar counties—the big city areas, most of them with a heavy industrial population.

A survey by the *Houston Post* pointed out that the greatest contrasts in voting in Harris County were between predominantly Negro precincts and River Oaks, an exclusive and very wealthy residential district. The Negro precincts voted 95% for Yarborough and 86% for Gonzalez. River Oaks voted 87% for Blakley and 89% for Daniel.

Gonzalez lost heaviest in East Texas, which is the old plantation section of the state, the area of greatest Negro oppression.

TOTAL VOTE SMALL

Only about 59% of the qualified voters participated in the primary elections. This is a low rate, since Texas is practically a one-party state. The low vote reflects both the failure of all candidates to deal concretely with some of the most pressing problems confronting the people, such as unemployment, and

the beclouding influence of the ideology of white supremacy.

The total potential vote was small—some 2,000,000. The poll tax, in particular, especially in East Texas, keeps down voter registration. Unity between the Negro and Mexican-American peoples is undeveloped. This is illustrated by comparing the results in two legislative races in Bexar country. In one race, one of the candidates was Thompson, a Negro, endorsed by the liberal-labor forces. In the other legislative race, one of the candidates was Casillas, liberal Mexican-American. In eight precincts where Thompson received his largest vote, 2058, Gonzalez's vote was only 682.

In 19 precincts where Casillas received his largest vote, 5035, Thompson's vote was only 3128.

MAIN TASKS

The main tasks that progressives, face in the fight for a greater political voice in the affairs of the state were made clear in the process of the election struggle and by an analysis of the returns. These tasks are: 1) to strengthen the role of organized labor; 2) to increase voter participation in the electoral struggles, particularly among the Negro and Mexican-American people; 3) to achieve a much greater unity between labor, the Negro and Mexican-American peoples, small farmers, and all others who suffer from monopoly's domination of the state; and 4) basic to all the above, to wage a sustained and

effective campaign against the ideology of white supremacy. One should also add to the above list, of course, the need to struggle for a world at peace; for the horrors of an atomic war would be the greatest of all setbacks for the people of Texas, as well as for the people of the rest of the world.

The organized labor movement, being the central and leading anti-monopoly force in the state politically, the first job of progressives obviously is to strengthen labor's role and influence in every way possible. The key to strengthening labor's role is an effective campaign to organize the unorganized. The trade-union movement counted 375,000 members in the state in 1953—16.7% of the labor force. This compares with 59% of the labor force organized in Washington, 47% in Oregon, and 40% in California. Texas now ranks 39th in the nation in percentage of organized workers! There has been a significant advance over 1939 in the number of workers organized in the state, for at that time there were only 111,000 or 10.3% of the labor force. But there has been no significant change in the last five years.

Basic to a real organizing campaign is the need for the trade-union movement to throw its full weight behind the struggles for the rights of the Negro and Mexican-American peoples, particularly the right to vote and the right to an education not restricted by segregation. There should be a much higher level of co-

operation between the trade unions and other organizations fighting for these objectives. And first of all, labor must wipe out of its own ranks all vestiges of segregation. There should be a much higher level of co-operation between the trade unions and other organizations fighting for these objectives. It would be the height of folly to imagine that the labor movement would receive the support of Negroes and Mexican-Americans if it, in turn, did not support their rights. Insofar as labor fails to fight for the rights of these two key segments of the working population, it plays into the hands of the big monopolies and their program of keeping the people divided.

ABOLISH POLL TAX

In 1952 Texas ranked 41st in the turnout of the adult population at the polls; 43% of the adult population turned out—compared with 70% or more turnout for half of the states. Let us use estimated 1957 population figures and 1956 poll tax figures for the sake of comparison, for these are figures that are readily available. Poll tax payments for the state as a whole in 1956 were 23% of the total population. In the metropolitan areas of Houston, Dallas, San Antonio, and Fort Worth, poll tax payments amounted to 34% of the total population. The poll tax is one of the main mechanical devices used by the big monopolies and their political servants to frustrate a strong

coalition of the organized labor movement in Texas with the Negro and Mexican-American peoples. Such a coalition would create a force of irresistible strength for political and social progress. The demand for the abolition of the poll tax is already supported by several liberal groups in the state, including the Young Democrats of Texas. A strong and successful movement to abolish the poll tax in Texas is a precondition for really giant political advances by the labor movement, the Negro Mexican-American peoples, and their allies.

* * *

Some day the anti-monopoly forces in Texas will have a mass political party that they control and that really represents their interests. In the meantime, the need is to build an ever greater unity between these forces. The racist lies against Negroes and Mexican-Americans, that have for generations been used so effectively by the "powers that be" to divide the people among themselves, must be continually fought against. Unity must be built in the struggle around issues, and the common interests of all working people must be constantly and patiently stressed. There is no other way to victory. Among the most important issues facing the people of Texas today are:

1. Desegregation of the public schools; repeal of the shameful racist

laws enacted by the 1958 legislature; and enactment of a state Fair Employment Practices law.

2. Repeal of the Right to Work law and other anti-labor laws; enactment of a state labor relations law; and enactment of a state minimum wage law for all workers, including agricultural workers.

3. Defeat of proposals for a sales tax and enactment of a tax according to ability to pay—that is, a tax on the big monopolies that have been milking the people dry.

4. Enactment of a program to relieve the burdens the economic crisis has saddled the people with; including a program of increased rates and duration of unemployment compensation and an expanded public welfare program.

* * *

Almost every month this year capitalist economists have proclaimed the economic decline to be at an end. During all this period, however, unemployment has been increasing in the state's largest cities.

The *Texas Business Review* shows that in July, the latest month for which figures are available at this writing, four Texas cities had an unemployment rate greater than 10%: Beaumont, Port Arthur, San Angelo, and Texarkana. And in addition to these, there were the following cities with unemployment greater than 7%: Abilene, Arlington, Raytown, Corpus Christi, Galveston, Pasadena, and Texas City. While it may well be that more recent figures will show

some decrease in unemployment, there is no indication that this decrease will be very substantial or permanent.

The liberal and labor forces in Texas have a special responsibility in the fight for peace; for it is the billionaire oil monopolies, with their dominant influence on U.S. foreign policy, that are largely responsible for Eisenhower's brink-of-war foreign policy. Texas produced in 1956, 42½% of the total U.S. oil output, and the same companies that grow rich exploiting the natural resources of our state reap fantastic superprofits from their exploitation of the oil resources of foreign countries. Consideration of the sufferings that an atomic war would bring to the people of Texas, as well as to the whole country, do not in the least deter them in their drive to protect these profits at any cost. Nor are the billionaire oil monopolies deterred by the fact that Texas would certainly be a prime target in any atomic war—not only because of the strategic importance of its oil refineries and ports, its airplane manufacturing plants, but also because of its concentration of military installations and air bases. A war would undoubtedly bring greater demand for Texas oil, and more profits for the millionaires; but for the common people of the state it would mean only greater inflation, higher taxes, a drive for new anti-labor legislation—reaction all down the line—as well as death.

OPPOSITION TO WAR POLICY

There have recently been a few notable expressions of opposition to a foreign policy that serves only the interests of the big monopolies. Such was the petition campaign of University of Texas students, supported by some liberal townspeople in Austin as well, for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon. Too, the *Texas Observer* has spoken editorially against U. S. intervention in the Near East. On the other hand, these expressions by liberals have been especially notable because of their rarity, and labor has been completely silent. The sending of U.S. troops to Lebanon, coming in the middle of the Democratic primary election campaign, was opposed by none of the candidates. Both Yarborough and Blakley made use of U.S. intervention to demand restrictions on oil imports from abroad and greater use of Texas oil. And both supported the intervention. The myth of "Soviet aggression," so effectively propagated by the big monopolies to further their own predatory foreign policy, is still widely accepted. It is this lie that has kept the labor movement from challenging the role of the big monopolies abroad—a failure that has weakened their fight against the monopolies on the home front.

Ultimately, the struggle of the working people against the political, economic, and social policies of the big monopolies will end in the victory of socialism: that is, ownership

and operation by the people as a whole of the basic resources and means of production of the country, and their utilization—under a government led by the working class—to enrich continually the life and advance the standard of living of all. Socialism will bring an end, once and for all, to the exploitation of the many by the few, to economic crises and insecurity, to racial and national oppression and antagonisms, to the recurring threats of war.

Already a third of the people of the world live under governments that are either socialist or that are consciously building toward socialism. The people of the U.S., those of Texas included, through their own experiences, will come to see the need for greater unity of the working people and their allies; for an effective political organization that the working people and their allies can use for their own purposes; and ultimately, the need for the working people and their allies to have political power—and the economic power on which political power is based. Those who call the march of the people toward socialism a conspiracy are guilty of the greatest of absurdities. The conspiracies that really surround us are those hatched constantly by the big capitalists, as recent political history in Texas has amply proven.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF TEXAS

The Communist Party of Texas is only a fraction of a percent of the

population. Texas laws, enacted during the hysteria of McCarthyism, ban this party from the ballot and make Communist membership punishable by fines and imprisonment. The wild-est anti-Communist lies were spread by the monopoly press and radio—and still are—lies intended to undermine the anti-monopoly movement as a whole. More and more the people have come to see through these lies, and they no longer have their intended effect. No candidate engaged in open red-baiting in the election campaign, afraid that it might backfire. In spite of all repressive laws, the influence of Marxism has spread. Minds that witness the constant

abuses imposed on society by monopoly capitalism cannot be stopped in their search for an answer. Ideas cannot be jailed.

We Communists do not claim to have all the answers to the many complex problems that face the people of Texas. Nor do we deny that many of our ideas are widely held by others who oppose monopoly domination. We do believe that our outlook, as set forth in the preceding pages, does contribute to a better understanding of the nature of the society in which we live and the need for strengthening the unity of the anti-monopoly forces in all of their struggles.

In our December issue, Arnold Johnson presents a thorough estimate and analysis of the just-concluded November elections held throughout the country.—Ed.

The Referendum Vote in France*

By Maurice Thorez

THE BIG CAPITALISTS, reactionary and imperialist, have succeeded in influencing the masses of the middle class and of the working class, including a section of the workers who have until now voted for our Party.

That is the fact, the great and very serious fact, which we must keep in mind in our examination of the present situation, and of the perspectives.

CAUSES FOR THE DEFEAT OF THE "NO" VOTE

Of these causes, I will consider only the outstanding ones. To begin with, speculation concerning the desire for a change, and the discrediting or betrayal by certain parties of their own programs, of their own electoral commitments, have overthrown institutions already strained by the ostracism declared against us.

Right at the outset, we must assert—for those who felt this desire for a change—that the change had to be (it is necessary to tell them all over again) not recourse to "the man of providence," but the advance towards greater democracy, towards respect for democracy. These voters thought that DeGaulle would bring a stable and strong government, such as France needs in order to carry on its internal

* Concluding remarks made to a meeting of the Central Committee, CP of France, on October 4, 1958. Translated from *L'Humanité*, October 10. The text has been condensed.—Ed.

affairs, and to speak with a voice of authority in our external relations; that an end would be put to repeated crises, that here would finally be a policy, a direction. This is the first reason for the results of September 28th.

The second cause arises from the blackmail of fear and of civil war, carried on by the perpetrators of the Algerian uprising and the rebellion of the military chiefs, or by those who benefited from them.

Perhaps we have not given sufficient consideration to the impression which the mere evoking of the idea of "civil war" can produce among large sectors of the population, in the countryside, and also among the most backward city workers. It was not for nothing, for example, that Louis Bonaparte in his time raised the specter of the *Jacquerie* (peasants' uprisings), the "red specter," in order to create fear. Lenin said of the reactionaries in May of 1917: their tactics? to create fear. To lie, to slander—but to create fear.

People wanted to avoid civil war; and many of these misled people—for they have been misled—did not see that the reactionary forces, the seditious elements that have brought De Gaulle to power—elements which he has never disavowed—would pursue their fascist undertaking by means of the new Constitution.

Besides, many people do not even know of the outrages perpetrated by the

seditionists against the Party headquarters and the active members of organizations. But for three or four days they have been hearing over and over again on the radio, and have been reading in the hostile press, that it is the communists who have gone over to violence. What must we do in this sphere, as in others? We must continue to explain, and then to explain all over again. And we must continue to organize the workers' defense of their headquarters, of their newspapers, of their actives.

It is also necessary to take note of the success of the argument: "DeGaulle is not Massu."

The Constitution itself did not appear to the voters of whom we are speaking to be committing any essential offense against our freedoms. It is hard for simple folk to find their way through it. At the start they read: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Not all of them have gone as far as Article 92, which—for a period of four months—permits the gravest measures to be taken against our freedoms.

With regard to the Constitution, I want to answer right away an objection which has often been made to us: "You seemed to defend the 1946 Constitution." But the fact is that we didn't seem to defend it; we did defend it! That Constitution, which wasn't what we had wished for, but which we had rallied to at the time of the second Constituent Assembly, and which we had been calling on people to vote in favor of—that Constitution affirmed rights, it offered guarantees and possibilities to the working class. All that has disappeared from the present Constitution, and should we not say so to the working class, should we not cry out to the people that it is so?

Had we acted in any different fashion, we would have failed in our duty, in our democratic and working class duty towards the people. We would have rendered ourselves incapable of explaining in simple terms, as we have tried to do, the fact that it was in order to falsify the workings of this Constitution that we were brought to the events of May and of June.

How could we have let it be believed for a single instant that—because we wanted a change—we too were throwing overboard (you cannot call it anything else) the standard of democratic freedoms in order to rally to the one-man constitution?

We must not ever forget the plebiscite character of that September 28th vote. By passing over in silence the struggles and the heroic sacrifices of the entire Resistance movement, they have succeeded in giving credence to the legend that the liberation of France was the accomplishment of one man. That is how it has been taught to children in their earliest classes. And something of it has stuck in the minds of the generation that has come to voting age since 1944.

The third reason has been the desire for peace in Algeria.

Illusions exist as to the possibility that DeGaulle might make peace in Algeria. We have noted all the paradoxes and contradictions in the desires expressed by so many different people who voted Yes: for there is the Yes of the *colons*, the Yes of the bitter-enders, and the Yes of those who really want peace.

We have to deal with the dialectics of life: what is contradictory in these Yes's does not exclude the fact of a common element among them, even if those concerned do not fully understand it, even if they do not acknowl-

edge it to themselves. Frenchmen that one cannot put in the class of the ultras, feel the desire for peace, but with an Algeria maintained, I will not say under the yoke of our country, but at least in its tow.

The fourth reason is the fact that those who called upon the voters to vote No were not able to establish unity among themselves. From that time on, the perspectives for the opponents of the Presidential constitution, for the partisans of the No vote, were cut short.

GRAVE THREATS HANG OVER OUR FREEDOMS

Thus, a serious situation has been created. We had already said so in the month of June: it is a grave matter that government has been imposed by violence from Algeria and Ajaccio.

And now DeGaulle has everything in his hands in order to work out this policy, to consolidate his power and to perpetuate it.

Grave threats hang over the working class and over freedom from this point on, arising out of statutes establishing unlimited authority.

The democratic press has been a particular target: the seizures, the lawsuits at every turn, are not going to be lacking. The same holds for lawsuits against actives. Provocations are in danger of multiplying. And except for an energetic and resolute battle we could head for the worst.

We have stressed all the contradictions in the Yes vote. And for good reason. For even if there are elements in common among them, numerous contradictions exist. And these contradictions will burst forth, they will burst forth on the question of Algeria; over economic and social plans; over foreign

policy, in spite of all the phrases about the independence and grandeur of France. It is therefore true that illusions will be shattered, but not without an effort on our part. They will only be shattered if the party helps to shatter them, if the party acts, if the party clarifies the thinking of the masses by a policy of active and patient explanation.

From all of which there follows the necessity of a firm line. From which there follows also the indispensability of the unity in the ranks of the Party for the battle that must be waged on all fronts: ideological, political and organizational.

Naturally, there has been some disappointment among the workers, and particularly among the Party actives. How could Communists have helped being disappointed—they who have the feeling of having fought with courage, often with heroism; of having expended their energies night and day; of having been at the breach forever, of having made so many efforts? They discover that a part of those who used to vote for us have not followed us!

And then they were saying to themselves: there are our re-enforcements: we are not alone; so many socialists, radicals, farmers' leaders, teachers and students, have taken a position identical with that of the Party. Nevertheless, the results are there: the No's are fewer in number than the Communist votes in the preceding elections.

The disappointment is therefore understandable. And questions are being posed. The contrary would be abnormal.

NEITHER SECTARIANISM NOR OPPORTUNISM

Questions are being posed. They are

being answered more or less correctly. And it is our responsibility to help every Party member to see clearly, to understand exactly, what is the situation and what are the perspectives, to examine consciously and truthfully how far we have come and what is the right thing to do.

Especially since a failure can lead—as it always does—to mistaken beliefs, and can feed both sectarian and opportunist tendencies.

People have said—active Party fighters have exclaimed—“They” will never understand anything. “They”—their own deceived comrades. A sort of retreat from oneself can be effected, with this contempt for the masses who have been fooled, and whom we have the duty—now more than ever before—to enlighten and to win back.

For Lenin has taught us that one can do nothing without and against the workers, against the masses.

Today there can be observed, following the decisions of the Radical and Socialist conventions, a tendency on the part of some to make a blanket rejection of the united-front tactic. “Enough! don't speak to us any more about those Socialists, or those Radicals! That's all done with, now!”

That's done with, is it? Are we then to go it alone, into adventures?

In fact, those comrades who are saying this are able to cultivate their resentment for some time; but the majority have taken up their work again, they have resumed their tasks once more. And in one way and another they have been winning recruits of workers like themselves, of workers who think, “The situation is more difficult now. All the more reason to join the Communist Party.” These have been the reactions among the working-

class: we must close our ranks around the Party, we must fight with the Party.

As to opportunist tendencies, we must keep in mind that certain people who have said nothing during this past period are lying in wait for difficulties which may arise for our Party. They had tried to raise their voices after the 20th Congress, but the Party didn't follow them.

Others have gone back into their shells, waiting for the next opportunity, understanding nothing, accepting nothing of their Party's explanations, of the decisions of our 14th Congress. They were not in agreement with their Party on any question, neither on its foreign policy, nor on its struggle for colonial independence; nor on its expressions of solidarity with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies; nor on the questions of the exploitation of the working class, and of the relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class. They were not in agreement as to the very question of working-class struggle, considered not as the supplement to a liberal-bourgeois movement, but on the contrary, as the essential source of strength, the motive force of the movement, now and in the future. They will try to make the general line of the Party once again a fighting issue, and to add their feeble voices to the noisy chorus of those who once more are proclaiming our approaching demise.

I think that these things must be said openly, because we are entering a period in which the bourgeoisie are looking forward to a situation which would permit disturbances to be created within our Party, thanks to such elements. We have men who have lost their footing, men who in many cases

have done nothing while the bulk of the Party was devoting itself, without reckoning the cost, to our tasks.

And after a prolonged absence they once again show up in their clubs, on the day after the battle, and try to draw up their indictment against the Party, which stands firm against them.

I received a letter in which the writer speaks of a "disaster" for the Party. That was the phrase which stood out Monday morning in the most reactionary sheets. "The Party has lost a third, even a half of its voting support."—why not three-quarters? Why not all of it? In 1956, we received exactly 5,454,000 votes in France proper; the closest examination of September 28th shows a total of 4,624,000 "No's." Taking into account the addition of "No's" by others, the difference for us, as Servin has pointed out, is undoubtedly more than a million, in the neighborhood, that is, of 20 per cent. That fact is serious enough, without anyone talking about the loss of one-third, or even one-half of our support!

But that is a characteristic practice of opportunists: you lose your sense of proportion altogether; you magnify the strength of the enemy, and play down our own strength; and you turn these figures (that supposedly have been "asked for") into a lever with which to change the line of the Party.

The opportunists are losing sight of the real conditions under which the referendum was held; and they ignore the fact, of which Gillot very correctly reminded us, that the Party has preserved the future by preserving the basic forces of the working class.

That these basic forces, these most enlightened elements have remained grouped around the Communist Party in such a battle, without concessions,

and without giving up their principles—that, I say, is a fact of vast importance for the future of the working class, and of democracy.

Besides, it is impermissible for a Marxist to "forget" the enemy. What a peculiar strategy that would be, that imagines it is enough to think out fine plans, to draw up your battle array, and to set your forces in motion, in order for everything to work out just as you planned it, and for you to go from one triumph to another!

We are in the midst of class warfare, it must not be forgotten. And in this class warfare, we do not only carry off victories. Nowhere has it been written, or proven, that the working class struggle pursues a straight line of ascent.

What does our own experience tell us? We have already known other grave situations, even graver sometimes than that of war. After Munich, the situation was very hard for the Party. A few months later, we were on the upgrade.

But certain people, more than merely disturbed, in fact unable to endure the test of September, had given themselves up to a disorderly rout.

We are not out of danger of such eventualities.

I would like to draw the attention of the Central Committee, and of the whole Party, to these things—to make them understand that these are matters over which we can not pass lightly, but that we must keep these possibilities in mind.

Those who lack firmness, the crybabies, will be saying: "It is our line, our direction, which is at stake."

They will be proposing to construct another line—another Party!

* * *

Must I say over and over again that the Party's policy is correct, and that a fraction of our voting support took leave of us, without that being any proof against the Party and against its line?

The core of the opportunists' arguments, their characteristic, is their forgetting the objective conditions.

Putting it another way: they take up the opposition's position, they echo the campaigns of *France Observateur* and of other sheets. They speak of democracy, and even of "cleaning out," all the way up to the top.

Here, we are touching on the continuation of the attack against our Party, which they attempt to hold responsible for the present situation of the masses, in the same fashion in which they hold the Socialist Party responsible. We Communists, we the Communist Party leadership, would be on the same level as Guy Mollet, who made war against Algeria, who supported the onslaught of reaction against the working class! We would be as responsible as they are, and as guilty!

A leading comrade of a fraternal party, Comrade Longo—whose statement you have read, as quoted in an article in the *International Review*, has said, very correctly, that such a thesis is a slander against the French Communist Party.

Communists with any consciousness of their role as Party members cannot speak that way. That is the language of political libel, which goes about under the banner of "unity," despite the task of splitting which has been assigned to it.

No doubt, as Servin has told us, there have been weaknesses and deficiencies brought to light in our activity. I am especially in agreement with those com-

rades who say that there were certain excesses in the Party's campaign. They could have been avoided. Moreover, comrades have noticed how, in our articles, and in our TV and radio appearances, we have, as always, observed what seemed to be the tone needed, moderated but firm.

There is no longer any question of underestimating other deficiencies of which the comrades have spoken. We must see them, we must rise above them—but without exaggerating their effects on the results of the referendum.

Every defect, every weakness has naturally had its influence; but they did not change, they could not change the general attractive power of the movement. They could not change the relationship of class forces, and the internal dialectics of their development.

Marxism teaches that the Party can and must exercise an influence on these relationships of class forces, and on their evolution, by clarifying and organizing the masses as they are being taught by their own experience; but the Party by itself cannot either wipe out these class relationships, nor turn them upside down, make them go in the opposite direction.

That is an elementary Marxist view of the matter. To forget that is to forget the ABC's of the principles of Marx and of Lenin.

Here, I should like to go deeper.

OUR STRUGGLE AGAINST COLONIALISM

Every comrade knows this: that it is with regard to the Algerian war that all the elements of the crisis have come together. We said that at the start there was turning out to be an inability on the part of the bourgeoisie to resolve

the problems born of the collapse of colonialism; that was just how it did turn out, with the development of the Algerian war, following upon the war in Viet-Nam, and with the boiling up of all of black Africa. Certain social forces have always stood for the maintenance in Algeria of class domination, of colonial domination; these include: the big capitalist bourgeoisie, the large "colons," the upper ranks of the army, which are bound by social ties to the Big Bourgeoisie. For, it must not be forgotten, the army is no longer an element outside of classes, it must be analyzed from a class point of view.

All the elements of which I have spoken are naturally for the maintenance in Algeria of capitalist-imperialist domination. But besides, a part of the working class, and still more of the petty-bourgeoisie, has up to now remained stubbornly opposed to our explanations. We had already said so in 1950, as the comrades of the Central Committee may remember.

In that session of the C.C., at Genevilliers, in which we learned of Dimitrov's death, I had observed that, in spite of our Party's tradition of anti-imperialist struggle, in spite of our past struggles against the war in Morocco, the struggle against the colonial war in Viet-Nam was not such a simple task, nor was our unceasing battle for support of the peoples oppressed by our bourgeoisie. We had to take note of the striking changes that had been produced, in the course of 70 years or more of colonial domination, in the understanding of many elements of the petty-bourgeoisie, and even of the working class.

It is a fact that Guesde and Clemenceau, the working-class representative and the representative of the petty-bour-

geoisie, especially of the countryside, were able to fight together during the last century against the Tunis and Tonkin expeditions. It is a fact that, at that moment, they awakened an echo among the masses. And it is no less true that, since that time, those parties—the Radical Party, the Socialist Party, unified before the war in 1914 with what was left of it, after the split in the Socialist Party—have been contaminated by the imperialist ideology of the dominant nation, of the colonial power.

It is not for nothing that one generation after another have been taught in school that the Republic had founded a great colonial Empire, bringing civilization and well-being to the *poor savages*—to the people of Viet-Nam (of Tonkin, as they said) as well as to the Algerians. In such conditions, it was hard to really understand that these ungrateful folk would revolt against the metropolis which had been showering them with benefits and advantages.

That ideology exists. We are fighting against it. We fought against it during the war in Morocco, in 1925. And now, with regard to Algeria, side by side with upholding the Algerian people's aspirations for independence, our efforts were directed towards bringing about peace by negotiations. We influenced other parties and groups up to the point where we were able to win success for the Left on January 2, 1956.

We had made progress with our explanations, and without any concession on principles. And then what happened? What happened every one of you knows, and we must say it over again: the Socialist parties, and others, taking upon themselves a shattering responsibility, turned their backs on their commitments. At the same time, the

Socialist leaders distorted the thinking of the workers over whom they have influence, in order to prolong and intensify the Algerian war. They poured out the poisons of chauvinism and even of racism—Comrade Thevenin has noted that, and it is so: it is enough to recall Suez—the poison of the colonialist spirit. And all that, while invoking internationalism, and the greatest of freedom! They were turning down the independence of peoples, in effect, in the name of the suppression of frontiers!

We must take stock of these factors.

That was how many folk were led to declare themselves, not for war, but—as they say—for "France in Algeria." As to the real positions of the big bourgeoisie and the "ultras," the mass of the petty bourgeoisie, and some workers, were deceived by the Socialist Party and by other groups.

That is the background for the massive "yes" vote. That is what was expressed on the 28th of September—all that plus the speculations about a change, and the deception resulting from the fact that there was no unity of the Left.

On the main point—the question of Algeria—the masses were disturbed, pulled in different directions. What did we have to do? At the same time as we were carrying on our battle on other terrains, we still had to carry through our task of explanation, our responsibility to clarify the workers, to drive the poison out of them. How? By developing the idea (so simple and so true) that "a people which oppresses another people cannot itself be free."

We had said so, and said it again, from the very beginning—we said it over and over again in our 14th Congress, in all our documents and

speeches—over and above the economic difficulties, over and above the losses—both there and here—the Algerian war was endangering our freedom, it was endangering the Republic.

No, the CP was not mistaken on those questions. It showed the correct line. But it is still a fact that we were not followed by all the working people.

Once again, here is the first and chief reason for the success of the "yes" vote. If one part of the working class has been affected by the furious "yes" campaign on the radio, by illusions, by fears of civil war, we must state clearly—that is why, on the question of Algeria, it has not yet been freed completely from the consequences of colonial ideology. We must not forget the fact that colonial super-profits have been, and remain, one of the foundations of social-democratism.

We must see the truth of this. Otherwise, we shall knock our heads against a wall, looking for reasons where they do not exist.

QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO ALGERIA

In another way, I believe it would be erroneous to simply say that the capitalists make war in order to accumulate profits. The facts are not so simple. For those factories which make munitions, there exist many other capitalists who do not manufacture arms, but are interested in other sources of profit. In the overall picture they wish to maintain their seizure of wealth from colonial territory.

Many French capitalists are interested in the oil of the Sahara, more than in any other thing. And they perhaps think they will find means of obtaining this oil by other methods than that of

war, pure and simple. More especially do they think that war risks pushing events to such extremities that they could lose all.

Such reasoning, supported by the socialist leaders, has contributed to the "yes" vote.

We continue to speak frankly. After having tolerated servitude for other people, there are those who accept it at home; they are ready to submit to it themselves for France.

Here we find the same sentiments which certainly were promulgated in Munich: "Sooner slavery than death." Unfortunately, often those who reason in this way risk both, as was seen in 1939. . . .

If our reasoning is correct, it proves that it is more important for us to hold firm, in our struggle for the support of the Algerian people, at one and the same time to the principles of proletarian internationalism, and to the point of view of the interests of France. . . .

We have not allowed ourselves to be troubled when the *France Observateur*, every week, throws out its poison, wishing to have it believed that "The Communist Party struggles no longer for the support of the Algerian people." If you believe this paper, it was not Guy Mollet who made the war, nor Lacoste, nor the colonialists; it was the Communist Party. . . .

As to the subject of the tactics of the F.L.N. (the Algerian revolutionists).

The methods employed by the F.L.N. in France have not served, it must be said very clearly, the just cause of the Algerian people, who have always benefited from the understanding and political support of the French revolutionary workers.

How many times has Lenin explained to us that, in order some day to succeed in the dictatorship of the proletariat—for we will succeed in it—it would be necessary to be assured of the support of the majority of the working class on decisive points! And this support cannot be obtained by violence against this class, by pressures against it, but by efforts at explanation, by action that acquires confidence.

It seems to me we should hold to this reasoning, developed by Lenin under such difficult conditions as the illegal struggle against tsarism to disavow the tactics of the Social Revolutionists, tactics which had involved his own brother, and which had led him to the scaffold.

If the F.L.N. proposes to alert opinion by terror it is mistaken. Rather, this raises hostile opinion. Far from engaging sympathy, it loses it. These methods lead to a false appraisal of the Algerians. Moreover, these things permit many provocations against us.

I conclude in speaking of Algeria: we are in a complex situation. A difficult task devolves on the party which has applied at all times, since 1925, a Leninist approach, one of principle, in favor of the rights of the people to govern themselves, and which also sees itself falsely accused by some capitalists and social-democrats of failing to recognize the national interest, while these same groups would lead France to the abyss. One last observation: in this matter our task is so much more difficult exactly because the influence of the party is larger. This is one of these dialectical contradictions which the opposing forces forget.

In 1928, we had 1,060,000 members; then our electors were ideologically very near to us. But now we have five and

a half-million voters; there is, under these conditions, a margin of electors who are less familiar with the principles of the Party, who naturally undergo fluctuation, who are susceptible to pressures.

OUR POLICY UNDER THE NEW CONSTITUTION

It is a fact that the Constitution has been approved by four-fifths of the electoral body. We can contest the manner by which this result has been obtained; we can say by what methods, by what pressures, they arrived at this figure, but the fact remains.

A great Party such as ours must draw conclusions from this situation. Within the new framework, where the representative institutions clearly play a diminished role, we have decided nevertheless to make use of all possibilities of defending the demands of the laboring masses, of defending liberty and peace. We consider the Constitution as fundamentally bad, especially because of the obstacles which it places against the aspirations of the world of labor. in the present, and in the future; we will not renounce our desire to modify it by the sovereign people. But still we always will remember that it exists. We will not allow ourselves to deviate from our thesis of 1946, confirmed ten years later by our 14th Congress, on the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism, on the role which can bring about a real Parliament, an expression of popular sovereignty, always relying on the masses.

Because we believe what we said in 1946 is right, we believe in the theory of the eventual peaceful transition to socialism. And on this democratic terrain we wish to meet with all the republicans who share our opinion on the

necessity, on the certainty of socialism in France; but who understand, who admit that we have a legitimate ambition to one day lead the working class and the people of our country.

I support in particular, what Vallin has recommended: defense on all grounds, including Parliament, but especially defense by the masses of our locals and our organizations against the fascist attempts, which remain the act of a very small minority. If the working class allows these attempts to develop, if it tolerates their repetition, the impunity assured to their perpetrators, the complicity, implied or acknowledged, of the powers of the police and of government authorities, it would prepare for a most difficult future. These attempts permit the greatest crimes against the working class, against the country.

THE NEXT ELECTIONS

The second question: the next electoral campaign. We still do not know what will be the method of polling. But one thing is sure: our adversaries will do all they can to reduce our representation. We must see this menace.

This circumstance should be considered so as not to be beguiled with false hopes, and especially because the forgetting of reality makes still more dangerous the illusion that what the electors lost on the 28th of September, is going to return to us, easily, without effort. In the course of the campaign we recalled that our party carried no responsibility for the actual state of things, for the incessant colonial wars, a foreign policy upholding the aggressive Atlantic bloc, the armaments race—these sorrows, these military expenditures, and the worsening situation among the laboring masses.

Should we not tell the masses that the responsibility for France's situation rests upon a government which continues to pursue the ill-omened policy of the past?

It is necessary to vote Communist, if we wish to raise an efficient barrier against the advance of reactionary forces. If one wishes to have a firm and decisive opposition, and then place the basis of republican regrouping upon the basis of the defense of liberties, of peace, then a powerful Communist grouping is necessary in the National Assembly.

As to a program, comrades, I need not repeat ideas already announced so often. Our program exists in the major areas; there is little to be gone over on the economical, financial or social side. We should put stress on the demands of the workers, and at the same time show more than ever that we, in defending these demands and in proposing other useful measures, struggle for the interest of the country, for its future, and for the future of its youth. We alone have a program which responds to the present and future interests of France.

We demand peace in Algeria through negotiation, and the establishment of new relations, based on independence, equality of rights and mutual advantages.

In foreign policy, our program naturally demands cordial international relations, disarmament—especially the banning of atomic weapons—and commercial relations with all countries without discrimination.

Our program wishes to move French policy out of the beaten track of the Atlantic Pact. We do not believe that we should be oriented in favor of a reactionary and vengeful West Ger-

many. That policy is contrary to the interests of France.

During the electoral campaign, we recalled the speech made on the London radio by General De Gaulle, on Jan. 20, 1942: Then De Gaulle emphasized the historic and continuing necessity, in the interests of France, of close and friendly relations between herself and Russia.

Thirdly, it is necessary to struggle for unity, during the elections and after. I am not now reviewing the consequences of lack of unity.

When we become acquainted with the electoral law we can more precisely form our tactics. But, here and now, it seems necessary to say: on the first round—because there will be a polling of two rounds—we set up our program, our ideas, the flag of our Party: it is the flag of the interests of the nation, of democratic liberties and of peace. On the second round, we should assemble all the republican forces against reaction and against those who share with it the responsibility of power and of the actual situation. Such should be the orientation of our party.

It is necessary to consider the eventual elaboration of a common program in terms of accord among all republicans. In every way eventual discussions can only be effective if the masses intervene. In all cases the essential thing in the tactics of our front, for elections as for daily struggle, is the intervention of the masses for union and action.

Be active among the masses, that is to say, be active, in accordance with each situation, in the organizations of women, of youth, of tenants, of war veterans. We should orientate all these organizations, not uniformly, not in terms of the positions of the Party, but

rather in exerting ourselves to follow a parallel route, to find the correct forms in each grouping, the special language which conveys these forms.

Comrades, we are cognizant of a new situation. It is important to display at this time firmness and patience. It is necessary to speak in a moderate tone, to absolutely banish outrages and exaggerations. But in our criticism nothing should be passed over; the masses should express their experiences, and they themselves should express them.

How have we explained it yesterday? We said to the workers: "You state the danger which menaces you in the face of the situation in Algeria, in the face of the war. Well, it is not possible for me the Communist, alone, to change the situation, it is you and me, it is all of us who can do it, it is the action of the masses." The conception that Communists have made of parliamentarianism excludes the idea that citizens settle problems once and for all by their vote, and by saying to their candidates: "Act for me." The working class, the people, should act and support their candidates. From the outset there exists for us a great ideological battle, political and organizational. We know that these questions are posed in the Party, that they will have an inner backwash of opposing tendencies. We will have to face this with firmness and confidence.

There are people who will try to retire from the struggle, and will allege noble and ideological reasons for doing so. But we will also receive the re-en-

forcements of new adherents: these are, as was excellently said in *Humanité* this morning, adherents with courage.

Everyone has not reacted in the same way to the difficulties of the Party: there are some who accuse their Party; others who think first of their Party; they work for it and they suffer for it when things are not so easy. In them is re-enforced the spirit of the Party, the wish to struggle under the direction of the Party, to accomplish the task, blow by blow.

Fundamentally it is an honor that, after having attributed to us all the efforts of the "no" campaign, they now ascribe the limitation (on personal tyranny) to us alone. Such a situation is rich with promises for the future.

In the thoughts of the Frenchman today resounds, as an obsession, the perpetual allusion to the Communists. At the moment this word evokes perhaps a doubt, a fear, a distrust. But inevitably, tomorrow there will be confidence. Thus do our adversaries themselves make propaganda for us.

Today, the working class sees us and judges us. It states that we have acted with firmness and courage, and that, though some faults, some errors have appeared here and there, we nevertheless have carried on a battle which has been useful to the people and to the Republic.

We can approach the new stage of our struggle with resolution, and with the unwavering assurance of final victory.

THE NOT-SO-AFFLUENT SOCIETY

The Affluent Society, by John K. Galbraith (Houghton Mifflin, Boston), 368 pages, \$5.00.

John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard professor and economic advisor to the Democratic National Committee, has written a book frankly designed to be a best seller.

The book is well written. Galbraith's approach is humane; its appeal is limited, however, to the mildly sophisticated intellectuals of a few imperialist countries, especially the United States.

Galbraith, as in his book, *Countervailing Power*, appears as the philosopher-economist, the iconoclast and debunker of established ideas. He borrows from Veblen's critique of specific phenomena, and from C. Wright Mills' terminology, but without the class-angled sharpness of either.

Galbraith is certainly right when he says: "No one will think this an angry book." His villain is not monopoly capitalism nor imperialism, but "we," the undifferentiated literate public, who are supposedly responsible for all out-dated ideas and irrational policies.

Yet, in its own milk-toast fashion, this book has positive value. Most American bourgeois economists largely ignore the vital issue of our times, the issue of war or peace. They discuss economics with the disingenuous pretense that war and preparation for war has not been the crucial factor in economic development for two decades. And they accept the formula of the cold warriors, that war preparations and the establishment of the supremacy of capitalism over socialism are the basic goals.

Galbraith also grossly underplays the significance of war in recent economic development. But he does write:

For myself I have little faith in the safety or security which derives from a never-ending arms race—from a competition to elaborate ever more agonizing weapons and to counter those of the enemy. If the possibility exists, the risks of negotiation and settlement, however great these may be, would still seem to provide a better prospect for survival than reliance on weapons which we can only hope are too terrible to use. . . . Even when the arms race ends, as it must, the scientific and technological frontier will remain.

Galbraith is concerned with dispelling the illusions of "conventional wisdom"—by which he means ideas which have lagged behind social development, and hence no longer conform to reality. However, his whole debate is on the

periphery. He attacks secondary false ideas, but not the main ones. And he deals with secondary features of social development, which he exaggerates in extent and distorts in significance. The result is not the dispelling of illusion, but the substitution of more sophisticated illusion.

The main focus of conventional economics, according to Galbraith, has been inadequate production and prevalent poverty, with the need to increase production as the consequent main goal of policy. Today, in Western Europe and especially in the United States, he claims, there is an "affluent society," production is more than adequate for all needs, and poverty exists only in stubborn enclaves.

Certainly capitalism has developed the instruments of production to the point where plenty *can* be produced, poverty *can* be abolished, and mankind *can* truly liberate itself.

But these goals are not yet realized—the second less than the first, the third least of all. And the realization is prevented not by the "conventional wisdom," but by the capitalist mode of production.

This was discovered, not by Professor Galbraith, but over a century earlier by Marx and Engels. Moreover, they showed that the realization of these goals required the overthrow of capitalism, and its replacement by socialism, which is in conformity with the relations of production developed under capitalism.

But it is still true that satiety is of profitable markets, and not absolute. It is still true that not enough means of consumption are produced to provide the needs of the masses. Over-capacity also is only in relation to profitable use. There is still not enough modern productive machinery to provide useful employment for all who desire it. Decent housing and schools are two of the more obvious shortages. While the latter is recognized and emphasized by Galbraith, he does not treat it as disproof of his affluent society thesis, but rather as another example of "our" conventional fallacies—the neglect of public services.

In 1928 Herbert Hoover claimed in a campaign speech:

We in America are nearer to the financial triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land. The poor man is vanishing from among us. . . . Our workers, with their average weekly wages can today buy two and even three times more bread than any wage-earner in Europe. At one time we demanded for our workers a full dinner pail. We have now gone far beyond that conception. Today we demand a larger comfort and a greater participation in life and leisure.

Now Galbraith:

Still, in a world of a weekly industrial wage of eighty dollars and a \$3,960 median family income [poverty] can no longer be presented as a universal or massive affliction. It is more nearly an afterthought.

Probably Mr. Galbraith would resent being associated with Herbert Hoover ideologically. But there it is. Hoover was only wrong in 1928. By 1930

he looked like a damn fool. Let us hope the present depression doesn't make Galbraith look quite so foolish. But he is wrong.

To show the "exceptional" character of present-day poverty in America, Galbraith notes that only one family in thirteen has an income of under \$1,000. But even a decade ago, when living costs were lower, conservative experts regarded \$2,000 as the poverty line, and in 1956, at the height of the boom, Democratic politicians spoke of one-fifth of the nation being ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clad—and they underestimated. Thirty-five million people can hardly be dismissed as afterthoughts by one seriously concerned, as Galbraith appears to be, for the development of human welfare.

Galbraith limits the remnants of poverty to two types, case poverty and insular poverty. The former he attributes to subnormal individuals; the latter to isolated communities where industries are dying out.

He *completely* ignores the poverty of the majority of the 25 million Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican and Indian people in the United States—the poverty of the oppressed national groups. Nor can one accept his conclusion that the boom-time poverty of Pennsylvania coal miners displaced by oil and of New England textile workers left jobless by the runaway shop, is due to their "homing instinct," which keeps them from escaping via migration. The blame for so-called "case poverty" must be placed on the system, not the individuals involved.

In some respects, it is amazing how *little* relief from poverty was realized in almost two decades of scarcely interrupted capitalist prosperity and boom. Senator John Sparkman said in a recent speech:

The Census Bureau reported the continuing existence of 13 million substandard dwelling units in the United States—roughly one-fourth of the total inventory.

A generation ago, one-third of the nation was ill-housed. Today, one-fourth of the nation is ill-housed. This slight improvement should give little comfort to the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth.

Galbraith, indeed, recognizes the weakness of American housing, and grants that it is not due to the lack of desire of the people for decent housing. He acknowledges that the situation is worse than in certain European countries "where slums have been largely eliminated and where *minimum* standards of cleanliness and comfort are well above our own."

But he deals with this elsewhere than in his discussion of the virtual elimination of poverty and the creation of an "affluent society."

And now, a half year of unemployment in the 4-6 million range has already brought back the cyclical poverty which engulfed such a large portion of America in the 1930's, although needless to say it is not yet nearly so severe.

In recent years there has been *less* poverty in America than before, unquestionably so if we limit our attention to "white" workers and farmers. However, this is not due simply to the rise in production over the decades. The rise

in the living standards of the American working class was won by the organized struggle against the employers, and it was granted, reluctantly enough, by these employers out of the extra profits they realized on account of the favored position of American imperialism—the receipt of enormous war profits without wartime destruction, and the multiplication of the foreign holdings of American Big Business. The petty luxuries of so many American workers are financed by concessions granted by employers out of the blood and toil of hundreds of millions of the oppressed of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The internal poverty of oppressed minorities, already referred to, is part of that picture, and yet a pale replica of the conditions endured by Venezuelans, Liberians, Arabians and peoples of many other countries under the heel of American oil, rubber, metal and other companies.

And offsetting the TV sets and electric refrigerators, American workers have more insecurity than ever—continuing economic security, political insecurity in a decade where the spirit of the defunct McCarthy still casts a pall over the labor movement, and above all the universal personal insecurity of the age of the rampant H-bomb.

The alleged satiety of goods of the American people, Galbraith concedes, is limited to purchased goods of highly-advertised types. He criticizes the lack of "social balance" in contemporary American society—our wealth in privately-produced goods contrasted with our poverty in publicly-rendered services. He speaks of the shortage of public services as a "crisis." The press, he writes:

told daily of the shortages and shortcomings in the elementary municipal and metropolitan services. The schools were old and overcrowded. The police force was under strength and underpaid. The parks and playgrounds were insufficient. Streets and empty lots were filthy, and the sanitation staff was under-equipped and in need of men . . . transportation was overcrowded, unhealthful, and dirty. So was the air. . . . These deficiencies were not in new and novel services. . . . That their residents should have no non-toxic supply of air suggests no revolutionary dalliance with socialism.

The causes of this shameful lack of public services in America, says Galbraith, are: (a) advertising is applied only to private products, (b) nobody wants to pay the taxes for public services, and (c) the "remarkable" post-war attack on public services and public servants.

The sources of these wrong attitudes, as usual, are the anonymous and comprehensive "we."

Obviously, Galbraith is evading the real problem.

The bankers and capitalists who control government pursestrings are not interested in adequate education for the masses because there is no profit in it. Despite different advertising emphasis, the American people value education highly enough, and under proper conditions fight for it—as witness the struggles of the Negro people for decent education in the South, and the battles of many

northern residents, Negro, Puerto Rican and white, for better school facilities in New York, Chicago and elsewhere.

Moreover, the rich get ample physical facilities for education for their own offspring. The public schools of Scarsdale and Forest Park are in a different world from those in Harlem and the South Side. They are light and airy; there are not too many pupils per teacher; there are extra-curricular activities.

Moreover, the rich have ample access to private prep schools, colleges, etc., in marked contrast to the comparatively small number of places available to the working class in tuition-free colleges or through scholarships.

Yes, the rich are willing to pay a modest tax on their luxury residences in order to provide the very best of community services in their exclusive communities. But not a penny above the minimum for the city masses from whom they make their profits.

Better-off workers are able to afford some of the highly advertised appliances and gadgets. Galbraith to the contrary, they are far from fully supplied with standard appliances, and certainly do not have them to excess.

But they cannot afford the more important expensive luxuries, such as good housing in a community with adequate facilities.

Galbraith is right when he says that demands for adequate community services are not demands for socialism. But it remains true that capitalism does not provide them because it is run for profit; and that the lack of such facilities is more striking in the richest capitalist country, the United States, than in a number of the advanced European capitalist countries—precisely because the American monopolists are stronger, more aggressive and less subject to mass restraint at the moment.

It is also true that only under socialism are the community needs of the people met in full proportion to available resources, to the point where the White Guard Naum Jasny charges that in the USSR personal consumption is "sacrificed" for health and education expenditures by the State!

And it is also a fact that the emphasized concern of Galbraith and many other capitalist intellectuals for mass education is of recent vintage, since they became aware of the superiority of the Soviet educational system, and realized its negative implications for the survival of capitalism.

Galbraith has a proposal for improved unemployment compensation which is not so important for itself as for some of its implications. He proposes that in periods of "full employment," the present inadequate levels of unemployment insurance be left unchanged, to maintain competition in the labor market. But as total unemployment rises, he proposes a gradual rise in payments reaching a peak of 90 percent of regular wages. His argument is that this would prevent mass starvation, while not unduly reducing labor competition on account of the high level of unemployment. Let millions stay out of work as long as necessary: "But in a world where production is no longer urgent we can obviously view an increase in voluntary idleness with some equanimity."

With all his concern for cultural values of the formal sort, Galbraith would

throw into the wastebasket the highest cultural value, the right of every man to useful and creative social labor.

Of course, despite statutes, capitalism does not and cannot make that right a reality. Socialism can and does. Galbraith, refusing to accept this basic position, is driven by his own sophistication to open advocacy of a very reactionary position on the right to work.

An interesting feature of this contradictory book is the chapter on Marx. Very few bourgeois social scientists have made such a favorable, largely honest appraisal of Marx' scientific work and place in history. He tries to avoid the implications with a rather weak theorizing that Marx was right in his time, but conditions have changed—in particular, there has been "a mountainous rise in well-being." Which brings us back to the whole one-sided, blind theory of the Affluent Society. If indeed, capitalism, in its twentieth century form, could and did bring a "mountainous rise in well-being" to the masses throughout the area of its rule, it would survive for a long time to come. It has not; but the new rival system, socialism, is doing so, and as the hundreds of millions become increasingly aware of the contrast, socialism will triumph on a world scale.

We agree with Galbraith that significant reforms, and gains for the people, can be won under capitalism. We think that a major obstacle, indeed the key source of backsliding in welfare matters, has been the militarization of the economy. Galbraith mentions as a subsidiary reason for the deterioration in social services "the fact that a large proportion of the federal revenues are pre-empted by defense." We think that disarmament and easing of tensions, more than anything else, will improve the climate and political balance in the direction of achieving more welfare for the American people.

LOUIS FLEISCHER

"One wonders whether the State Department senses any moral responsibility to the billion Asians who would prefer to be represented in the U.N. by a nation of their own choosing rather than of ours. One wonders by what tenet of the moral law the State Department justifies barricading behind mental barbed wire a fourth of the human family and treating them as pariahs unfit for association with Americans."

Rev. J. Stuart Innerst, First Friends Church, Pasadena, Cal., in *The Christian Century*, Oct. 29, 1958.

Party Program Discussion

Brooklyn, N. Y.

The posing of the questions [in the September issue—*Ed.*] is a wonderful step, as they are very comprehensive, and it is obvious from them that the thinking is that any program must be based on solid knowledge, as thorough as possible, of what's what. In other words, what is really going on. The sections on the arts have this character, like all the other sections.

In relation to the arts, it seems to me that some of the questions ought to be reworded, or else others added, to give some indication of the fact that what is taking place is not so much a "situation" as a "struggle." Take Mass Communications for example. Actually two very different things are bound together here. One is that of popular art, books, stories, movies, television plays, music, etc. In respect to the latter, it is not enough to indicate that they are "monopoly controlled." That is true. Yet they also reflect real ideas, opinions, bents, sides of life, and a certain amount of existing actual creative talent. And so within them there are conflicting tendencies, even at present. There are decent, humanist approaches, reflections of the problems disturbing the people on racism, on atom war, on war and peace, on science, on the operations of justice, on big business, etc. Even on the low level of these years, a certain amount of victories have been won, like the treatment of Negro-white relations.

Take the fact of blacklisting. This is not synonymous with (although connected to) "monopoly control." If monopoly had things wholly its own way, why is there need for the blacklist? In other words, the blacklist drives out of these popular arts, people who otherwise were able even in a monopoly-controlled or run industry, to make some decent statements. The very nature of the "popular arts" is that however much they are a business, and monopoly run, they must respond in some way to the people's mind.

The "disastrous" effect the questions speak of is a fact. But not the whole truth. Seen in this way, other answers are suggested than those which the questions at present suggest. Making "inroads into the monopoly of mass communications," and establishing "democratic controls," is fine. But before that can even be approached, other important things can be done. One is a fight against blacklist and censorship. Another is the fact that even as "monopoly controlled," these are also public responsibilities, and an active critical atmosphere can be engendered among the people, demanding certain truths, the abolition or lessening of racism, war-mongering, etc., which do not effect the physical "control" of these industries but certainly affect the content and encourage those already in these fields who want to develop more recent trends. Can't the questions suggest this?

Then on the other aspect of the arts, missing I think is an indication of several struggles going on. Take that in the fine arts, literature, music, painting, etc., between destructive withdrawals from life and from social feeling, and the opposite trend towards a truthful examination of American life. It is going on, with many young (and old) creative people disgusted with the "favored" trends towards bleakness, blankness, and cold-heartedness.

Then there is the struggle in progressive ranks themselves between the establishment of a genuinely Marxist creative position and what amounts to a cultural counterpart of revisionism. Maybe it is wrong to raise this now. But certainly any program that emerges should (I think) arrive at some firm statements first of what is expected of a progressive, Marxist artist and intellectual, as the basis for a cadre, and as the vanguard of a fight for the most progressive art in the United States, and second, what is the broadest basis for a general critical struggle to be raised on the cultural scene as a whole ("fine," "popular," and everything); in other words a minimum program. The two go hand in hand, and if there is no clarity on one, there won't be on the other.

I am not sure about the questions relating to the past U.S. heritage. The picture of course is not that of our history being divided among "progressive" and "democratic" creative figures and "reactionary" ones. There was always a certain amount of confusion, due to the very nature of the country's history, and of critical realism. What was Cooper, who was for the Revolution, for a democratic republic against European feudalism, but also for the landed gentry? And with mixed feelings about Negro people, Indians, etc.? What was Melville, with his disillusionment with democracy? What was Whitman, who saw bourgeois democracy as classless (or at least hoped it would be that way)?

What I mean is that the emphasis should be perhaps not on sorting out the "democratic" tradition, but on the need for the people to know the real history of the country, and its cultural heritage, in order to understand the nation today; and that within this, the only way in which we can get this picture is to look upon all the creative figures of the past both appreciatively and critically, extracting the "real America" as the picture develops in all of their work, seeing the first thinking on which the Republic was founded, then the growing critical problems raised as capitalism developed, the various attempts (even those ending in disillusionment) to cope with this. Needless to say, any "whole picture" like this would be that among the best, most lasting writers, etc., of America, the main direction was democratic, critical of capitalism, and part of a real path (however some of them didn't see it) to socialism.

Also missing is any mention (unless I skipped it) of the matter, so important today, of cultural interchange.

This is not a matter of carping or quibbling. I am only raising these first thoughts to help arrive at what is best to do.

S. F.

Bellingham, Wash.

I should like to offer some comments on the question of a program.

What is a program? A fundamental program is not primarily nor even necessarily a summary of the various immediate issues. It is first and foremost a statement of the reason for existence of the Party, an explanation of its objective, its goal, what it aims at.

In a word it is a *summary* of the results of the application of working class science to a given country, its class relations internal and external, and the proper conclusions to be drawn as to the future.

Such a program necessarily constitutes a pledge from the Party to its class and its people. It is not as with other parties a vote-catching device or a convenient screen behind which to pursue other aims.

For the Party itself it becomes the expression of that single-mindedness of purpose which unites it into an effective whole.

To the extent which it adequately expresses the future prospects of the working class and builds an adequate bridge from the here and now to that future, it unites the Party with the class and with the people.

For this is the second great task of a program; having presented the objective, to define in a definite and clear way the chief means by which the present will be resolved into the future.

Here lies the acid test. For, while it is necessary to distinguish between the great objective and the immediate struggles, yet it is even more essential in a fundamental program to demonstrate the unity of the two and the growing over of the one into the other.

If this is properly done the program will reinforce the immediate struggles as well as the long range. If it is botched, one will tend to war with the other.

Only that which is essential to these two purposes should be included in a fundamental program.

Form, style, and length are important but secondary to the main purpose. Persuasion ought not to concern us too much. Definition and perspective should come first. To set forth clearly and definitely where we are headed and how we expect to get there, how this is to the interest of our class, people and the nation, how the laws of history point to just such conclusions in the given situation, that is plenty. Perhaps a little rebuttal of contrary views, but very little.

It should be possible to get this into not 30 to 40 pages, but into say 10.

It would be very wrong to think we must resolve even a majority of the program questions (many purely formal, having been resolved for science long ago by life). The first big task is to boil down the thousand-and-one-question approach to a few key questions and to begin to outline a draft that will meet the requirements outlined above.

C. L.

NEW AND RECENT TITLES

NO MEN ARE STRANGERS, <i>by Joseph North</i>	\$3.50
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF WILLIAM D. "BIG BILL" HAYWOOD	3.50
WHAT IS MARXISM?, <i>by Emile Burns</i>	Paper .95
HERE I STAND, <i>by Paul Robeson</i>	Cloth \$2.50; Paper 1.00
HISTORY AND CONSCIENCE: THE CASE OF HOWARD FAST, <i>by Hershel D. Meyer</i>	Paper 1.00
THE BRAVE NEW WORLD, <i>by Helen and Scott Nearing</i>	3.50
DECISION IN AFRICA, <i>by W. Alphaeus Hunton</i>	4.00
EMPIRE OF HIGH FINANCE, <i>by Victor Perlo</i>	5.50

Pamphlets

A POLICY FOR AMERICAN LABOR, <i>by National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.</i>	.10
FREEDOM IN HISTORY, <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	.10
THE U.S.A. AND CHINA: PEACE OR WAR? <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	.15
THE UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS, <i>by Art Shields</i>	.10

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

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 \$1.50

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