

political affairs

FEBRUARY 1959 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|---|-------|---|
| SHIRLEY GRAHAM | [1] | Africa Lifts Its Voice |
| LAZARO PENA | [3] | The Cuban People and
the Batista Tyranny |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [22] | Five Who Made History |
| ALBERT J. LIMA | [36] | The California Elections |
| A. KRCHMAREK | [42] | The Ohio Elections |
| EDITORIAL BOARD,
"CAHIERS DU
COMMUNISME" | [56] | The Lessons of the
French Elections |
| | [62] | Party Program Discussion |

ON THE CIVIL WAR AND LINCOLN
by Karl Marx [16-21]
(2 Hitherto-Unknown Articles)

**ON QUESTIONS CONCERNING
PEOPLE'S COMMUNES**
by Central Committee CP of China
[48-55]

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.

38?

Vol. XXXIX, No. 2

FEBRUARY, 1959

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

Africa Lifts Its Voice

By Shirley Graham

Among those present at the historic Accra Conference of African peoples, held this past December, was Shirley Graham, well-known author, and wife of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois. We are very happy to be able to bring to our readers this first-hand report of that momentous event from the pen of Miss Graham, herself.—Editor.

THE ALL-AFRICAN People's Conference, which convened in Accra, capital of Ghana, December 5-13, with over 300 delegates from all parts of Africa, closed on a note of grim, but united determination:

Despite different languages, different cultural backgrounds, different colonial systems which have separated and oppressed us, the Conference speaks with the united voice of over two hundred million Africans. We have here decided to be free today, not tomorrow!

Tom Mboya, 29-year-old African Member of the Kenya Legislative Council, stood straight and dignified before the assemblage. After only 18 months of political activity, Mboya was so well established as a clear-headed and efficient leader that he had been elected Chairman of this first All-African Peo-

ple's Conference on the first ballot. He had been equal to the most difficult task of presiding over eight history-making days, during which a divided continent had closed ranks.

As delegates and visitors gathered in Accra, one was struck by the diversity of ethnic groups, the babel of many languages, the varieties of dress, the obvious differences brought about by French, British, Portuguese and Dutch influences on the different nations in Africa. To emphasize these differences were provocateurs, imperialistic stooges and defectors who arrived even before the delegates. Among them was a notorious anti-Communist "head-hunter."

Observers and "fraternal dele-

gates" came from Denmark, the United States, Canada, Great Britain, India, China, and the Soviet Union. The world press was represented in Accra in larger numbers and was more active than it had been in Bandung four years ago. Of course, very much has happened in those four years.

Newspapers of the West tried to assure their readers that nothing unusual was happening in far-away Africa, nothing which could possibly effect the status quo or hinder capitalistic designs. A Reuter's report asserted that all "worthy African politicians know that Africa has much to gain from a continuing association with Europeans." London's *Daily Telegraph* frankly was annoyed that Africans should be calling such a conference; it suggested that the delegates should pay attention not only to the alleged desires of their followers, but also to the feelings of those whom they might provoke or alienate. The liberal *New Statesman*, of London, thought that the Accra Conference had achieved little beyond a spate of words. Yet, rather anxiously, it commented:

The moment has come when the anti-colonial movement will either have to identify itself with the cooperation of Europeans or turn to bloodshed. Which choice it makes will not be determined by the rabble-rousing words which struggling nationalist leaders use. They wish to please their followers. But Mboya knows as well as Nkrumah that Europe can still give much to Africa. The choice will be determined by the success of far-sighted Europeans in con-

vincing Africans that a European element in African life does not threaten independence or nationhood.

Another London publication, *The Economist*, hopefully announced that while the Arab world might keep President Nasser busy in the Middle East there are others in Africa who might yet challenge Nkrumah's position. "Dr. Nkrumah's influence on the Conference is being soft-pedalled in public, but it is clearly part of his effort to hold the lead among African statesmen."

The prospect of a Nkrumah and a Nasser standing shoulder to shoulder with a united Africa behind them is something to chill the blood of western imperialists! But the warm words of Nasser's message to the Conference, the active participation of the United Arab Republic delegation, and my own many hours of discussion with tribesmen, trade unionists, camel drivers, and underground workers from Algeria, as well as personal conversations with Prime Minister Nkrumah, have convinced this writer that rumors of rivalry between Nasser and Nkrumah spring from wishful pipedreams, and we shall see the emergence of a *United Africa in our day*.

The All-African People's Conference was called by a Preparatory Committee from the eight independent African states: the United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia with Guinea added later. These independent states accepted the responsibility and assumed the important function of performing at the international level the

stabilization of African and Afro-Asian solidarity. They announced that in their foreign dealings they would follow policies which would expedite the emergence of the independence of all presently-dependent and colonial African territories. It was this group which invited all Africa to send delegates to an All-African Conference with Ghana playing host.

Twenty-eight countries participated in the Conference: Ghana, Basutoland, South Africa, Uganda, Tanganyika, Tchad, Zanzibar, Tunisia, Togoland, Camerouns, Occidental Afrique, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Angola, Sierra Leone, French Somaliland, Senegal, Belgian Congo, Guinea, Ivory Coast, South West Africa, Mozambique, Kenya, Liberia, Dahomey, and Libya.

This was not all Africa. Some sections could not break through the barbed wire barriers which surrounded them, but these isolated areas were not forgotten by their brothers and sisters who did come pouring into Accra all the first week of December. The city had been organized efficiently to receive its guests. The large, modern, air-conditioned Ambassador Hotel became the hub of hospitality. The week-end of December 5th was spent by delegates and visitors getting acquainted, exchanging information concerning their countries, discussing problems and projecting ideas. Undoubtedly hundreds of differences were easily discernible among the men and women from widely separated areas. But,

on the first morning of the Conference when, inside Accra's enlarged and decorated Community Hall, delegates awaited the arrival of Prime Minister Nkrumah, who would open the deliberations, already many misunderstandings had been eradicated and friendships sealed.

Above the speaker's platform stretched a banner with the words: *Hands Off Africa! Africa Must Be Free!* On each side of the hall hung all the United Nation flags, to which had been added the flag of the Chinese People's Republic. On the walls were slogans of the Conference: "Down with Colonialism and Imperialism"; "Down with Racialism and Tribalism"; "Long Live Pan-Africanism"; "Long Live the United Nations"; "We Prefer Independence With Danger to Servitude With Tranquility"; and "We Prefer Independence With Poverty to Servitude With Plenty." Above the door was a huge map of Africa.

Shortly before ten o'clock a tumultuous roar was heard from outside, and we knew that the Prime Minister was arriving. Amid cheers from the delegates, Nkrumah was escorted to the rostrum. A hush fell over the hall; for a moment the Prime Minister, draped in the beautiful gold, red and green ceremonial robes of his fathers, stood looking out over the assembly. Below him sat tribal chiefs from the interior who had never before consented to join in a "people's" conference, and especially significant was the presence of Ashanti chiefs who had so stubbornly opposed Nkrumah's democratic ef-

forts. But now, they were here looking up at the recognized head of an independent state. They, too, were willing to join in the movement to free Africa of all imperialists.

Realization of the importance and uniqueness of this moment gripped the throng. Kwame Nkrumah's words were well chosen, simple and direct. His welcome to these representatives of all Africa rang with joy and pride. "We have had Pan-African Congresses before," he said, "in fact, five of them—but all of these, by force of circumstances, were carried on outside of Africa and under much difficulty." The Prime Minister then paid tribute, at the very beginning of his talk, to the pioneering of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois—"America's foremost son of Africa"—as the "moving spirit in those Congresses." He continued, and I offer only abstracts to convey something of the essence of his speech:

The Conference opens a new era in our African history and our struggle to wipe out imperialism and colonialism from this continent and to erect in their place a union of free, independent African States. . . . Our deliberations must be conducted in accord and our resolutions must flow out of unity. For unity must be the keynote of our actions. . . . Your deliberations are to range over such problems as imperialism, racialism; the arbitrary division of our continent with their resultant frontier perplexities; tribalism and racial laws and practices and religious separatism. . . .

I hope that we shall not repeat on the African continent the petty

squabbles and constant disharmonies, the wars and national disasters which have dogged the history of other continents. It is our belief that with all Africa free, the peace of the world will be better guaranteed, for the elimination of imperialism and colonialism will remove those jealousies and antagonisms which have led to two World Wars and are keeping us now in a constant state of tension with the threat of nuclear weapons.

While we believe that Africa belongs to the Africans, we are not racialists nor chauvinists. We welcome into our midst peoples of all other races, other nations, other communities, who desire to live among us in peace and equality. But they must respect us and our rights, our right as the majority to rule. That, as our western friends have taught us to understand, is the essence of democracy.

Delegates set about their work in a statesmanlike manner. Following morning plenary sessions where reports and messages were heard, five committees worked through the afternoon and sometimes far into the night discussing specific programs of action and drawing up resolutions. While all those attending the Conference were welcomed at the plenary sessions, only delegates from African countries were permitted to take part in the committee deliberations. Some members of the press were annoyed because committee meetings were closed to them. Chairman Mboya informed them politely but firmly that only after the resolutions were drawn up would the committees have anything for the press. (One white

American reporter was caught under a building in which the Committee on Imperialism was working. He was taken by Ghana's security police, but released on his word that he was only trying to find a dark room for developing films!)

The plenary sessions were addressed in three languages: English, French and Arabic. Delegates, speaking for their many peoples, expressed eloquently the woes, frustrations, hopes of a continent where brutal racialism and denial of human rights were the rule. From Algeria to Capetown, from Angola to Kenya, the voices blended: *Freedom!*

"Africa, ancient Africa, has been called by the world, and has lifted up her hands," said Dr. Du Bois, the "Father of Pan-Africanism," and then, as is his wont, he posed the question of questions: "Which way shall Africa go?" He answered: "You may choose between blocs of military alliance, you may choose between groups of political union; you cannot choose between Socialism and private Capitalism, because private Capitalism is doomed!"

After hearing the report made by Mboya on the confession of false testimony made in the trial of Jomo Kenyatta, the delegates in plenary session called for his immediate release, and urged all governments to join in this demand. After learning of the latest repressions and atrocities in South Africa, the plenary session urged all African countries to

cut off trade and working relations with South Africa, and called upon the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations to work for international sanctions against South Africa.

Africa will fight for its freedom if colonial and imperialist powers make that necessary. But the countries of Africa want peace. These two facts were repeated over and over again. Africa has suffered not only from her own wars, but Africans have died in all world wars. They want no more of war.

As the days passed, committee work became more and more tense and prolonged. Chairman Mboya pointed out: "The world anxiously awaits the results of our deliberations. What we do here decides not only the fate of Africa, but much of the future of the world."

Resolutions were not brought out of Committee until the last day. I give them here, somewhat condensed, but retaining as far as possible their original phrasing.

I: COMMITTEE ON IMPERIALISM AND COLONIALISM

The Conference vehemently denounces colonialism and imperialism in whatever shape or form these evils are perpetuated.

The political and economic exploitation of Africans by European imperialists should cease forthwith.

The use of African manpower in the nefarious game of power politics by imperialists should be a thing of the past.

That fundamental human rights be extended to all men and women in Africa and that the rights of indigenous Africans to the fullest use of their lands be respected and preserved.

That universal adult franchise be extended to all persons in Africa regardless of race or sex.

That independent African states ensure that fundamental human rights and universal adult franchise are fully extended to everyone within their states.

II: COMMITTEE ON RACIALISM

This Conference registers its vehement protest against this ugly system and condemns discriminatory laws, especially as expressed in its extreme and most brutal form in South Africa, the Portuguese Territories of Angola, Mozambique, Principe and Sa Thome, where the indigenous populations exist under a regime of apartheid. It condemns:

The lack of educational facilities and the denial of social benefits;

The use of forced labor in territories such as Angola, Mozambique, Belgium Congo, South and South-West Africa;

The alienation of Africa's best lands for the use of European colonizers.

After detailing the proposals relative to a complete boycott of all diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa, this Committee went on to recommend:

That no African State should have any diplomatic relations with any country on this continent that practices race discrimination.

That the independent African States should form an "African Legion" con-

sisting of volunteers who will be ready to protect the freedom of the African peoples.

That, considering that the future of the Mandated Territory of South West Africa has been debated at the United Nations for twelve years, and that the Herero, Nama, and other African inhabitants who have been petitioning the United Nations during that time, still complain of the loss of their lands, and their humiliating subjection to the apartheid system, in this so-called sacred trust of civilization; that this Conference call on the Great Powers who entrusted the Mandate to South Africa, especially the United Kingdom, the United States, and France, together with other former members of the League of Nations, to revoke the Mandate and take immediate steps to grant independence to South West Africa.

III: COMMITTEE ON FRONTIERS AND FEDERATIONS

The Conference endorses Pan-Africanism and the desire for unity among African peoples . . . as a first step towards the attainment of the broad objective of an African Commonwealth, the independent States of Africa should amalgamate themselves into groups on the basis of geographical contiguity, economic inter-dependence, linguistic and cultural affinity.

The Conference condemns artificial frontiers drawn by imperialist powers to divide the peoples of Africa and calls for the abolition of such frontiers at an early date.

The Conference calls upon all states and countries in Africa which are in a position to do so to implement the following program forthwith:

Abolition of passport requirements and

other travel restrictions for bona-fide African tourists, visitors, and students; reciprocal teaching of the English and French languages and history of other African nations in the secondary schools; reciprocal rights of citizenship for Africans from other territories.

IV: COMMITTEE ON TRIBALISM, AND TRADITIONAL INSTITUTIONS

We strongly oppose the imperialist tactic of utilizing tribalism and religious separatism to perpetuate their colonial policies.

We are convinced that tribalism and religious separatism are evil practices which constitute serious obstacles to the realization of the unity of Africa, the political evolution of Africa, the rapid liberation of Africa.

Steps should be taken by political, trade union, cultural and other organizations to educate the masses about the dangers of these evil practices and thereby mobilize the masses to fight these evils.

In addition to any action by dependent countries, the independent countries shall allow their governments to pass laws and through propaganda and education, discourage tribalism and religious separatism.

Those African traditional institutions whether political, social or economic, which have clearly shown their reactionary character and their support for colonialism are condemned.

V: COMMITTEE ON ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT ORGANIZATION

The All-African People's Conference, with a permanent secretariat, is established in Accra. It will:

Promote understanding and unity among peoples of Africa.

Accelerate the liberation of Africa.

Mobilize world opinion against the denial of fundamental human rights to Africans.

Develop the feeling of one community among the peoples of Africa with the object of the emergence of a United States of Africa.

So spoke the united voice of Africa!

The fine hand of apologists for the United States was clearly evident at two points in the Resolutions: only European economic imperialism is condemned; and diplomatic relations were not to be had with any nation *on the African continent* which practiced racial discrimination. Very active at the Conference was a five-man, all-white "fraternal" delegation from the American Committee on Africa. It announced that it represented the American people who desire freedom and independence for all Africa. They said they would press for observance of African Freedom Day in the United States. No doubt, they will carry this message to Little Rock, too!

Some Liberian delegates joined with other conservatives in trying to get through a Resolution setting forth the policy of the Convention as being strictly non-violent, no matter what provocations Africans might

have for retaliating against violence. They also tried to get through an anti-Communist Resolution. In both efforts they failed overwhelmingly.

Certainly the Resolutions passed at the Accra Conference demonstrate that Africans are able to come together, deliberate, and reach agreement on a positive program of action.

Over seventy years ago, in Berlin, thousands of miles away from Africa and certainly without the knowledge or the regards of its peoples, the most "enlightened" countries of Europe met to decide on how to divide Africa among themselves. Their motive was to use Africa's human material and natural resources for their own profit. Then, Africa was called the "dark continent" and its peoples were the victims of greedy, blood-thirsty, patronizing, self-appointed "guardians and trustees."

In Accra, in December, 1958, leaders of Africa came together with the knowledge of and deep concern for the feelings of their people. Before the revolutionary movement gathering force in Africa the artificial barriers installed after that Berlin Conference speedily collapse, as waves rise higher and higher and dash against imperialism and colonialism with increasing strength. New paths that lead to the sovereignty of peoples under the banner of a United Africa are being carved out. And

the peoples of the world need not be surprised.

Historians might have remembered the Boer Wars, and the Mahadi Rebellion in the Sudan, or the more recent Mau Mau outbreaks. Faint hearts might ask why the Lord Mayor of London did not raise a two-million pound fund for the defendants in the so-called treason trials in South Africa, as he did for his precious "freedom-fighters" in Hungary; why bombs were showered on the people of Sakiet and no protests were made in Western parliaments. Christians might ask about the negation of every precept taught by the poor Jewish Carpenter. Educators might remember that Africans schooled in England studied the Magna Charta; and that others studying in the United States memorized the Declaration of Independence.

At the closing session of the Accra Conference, Chairman Tom Mboya of Kenya said:

Hear me, imperialists, colonialists, white supremacists, your day in Africa is finished! Right in front of me, as I speak, is the map of Africa. On it are written these words: "People of Africa, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains. You have a continent to regain. You have freedom and human dignity to attain."

We are united! We are determined! The whistle is blown; Africa is on the march!

The Cuban People and the Batista Tyranny

By Lazaro Pena

The author of this article, a leading Cuban Communist, was the elected Secretary-General of the Confederation of Workers of Cuba until forced into exile by the Batista plunder-bund. For some time now he has served as Secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions. Late in November, 1958, Lazaro Pena wrote the article which is published below; it is believed that readers will find it illuminating of the historic events which have since occurred—and are clearly foretold here—in Cuba. Readers are reminded, also, of the manifesto of the National Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, published in our December, 1958 issue.—Editor.

IT IS MORE IMPERATIVE than ever to give greater international solidarity to the Cuban workers and people who are fighting a savage dictatorship kept in power by the Yankee imperialists.

Shamefully betraying the interest of the nation, Batista's dictatorial government is allowing the American monopolies to pillage the wealth of the country with systematic thoroughness. In return, the North American leaders give Batista political support and furnish him with an abundant supply of arms so that he may cling to power by means of unspeakable crimes.

American-built planes drop bombs, also manufactured in America, on the partisans in the mountains and on the defenseless peasants. They spray vast areas with napalm, killing not only the fighters but also the people who have sought refuge in the mountains after being chased out of their burned out villages.

The government troops get their supplies from the American forces occupying the naval base of Guantanamo, on the south coast of the Republic. A few months ago, the U.S. Navy landed soldiers on rebel-controlled territory, but international protests obliged them to withdraw.

F.B.I. agents prevent Cuban patriots from obtaining weapons on American territory. but Yankee leaders go so far as to use Trujillo, the ruthless tyrant of the Dominican Republic, in order to supply Batista with arms.

The imperialists are exercising all manner of pressure to prevent the alliance between parties opposing Batista from growing stronger.

American firms and the United States Embassy openly support the group of "trade-union leaders" controlled by the dictatorship.

The imperialists are using every possible means to give the fascist regime their full support. They aid

fascists who took power through the *coup d'état* in March 1952, because in this way they are able to plunder the country and place it under their strict political domination.

Batista's despotic régime can only remain in power by shedding the blood of men and women, young and old, of every trade, all walks of life, and every religion. The régime spread indiscriminate terror among the population, without even bothering to find a pretext for its actions.

THE ATROCITIES

To enumerate the toll for only a few weeks, on August 1 the police descended like a bloodthirsty mob on the prison at Havana. They slaughtered four of the prisoners and seriously wounded nine others. Some of them died after being dragged through the corridors of the prison by the police. The prisoners were beaten up with iron bars and revolver butts. Women who were visiting imprisoned relations that day and waiting outside, were struck on the face and kicked.

Between August 6 and 16, the police killed six young people. Their bodies, discovered in the main streets of Havana, were left there for a whole day in full view of passers-by "as a lesson to the population."

On August 16, a bus driver was arrested. When his parents exhumed his body in the cemetery where the police buried him, they found that he had been bludgeoned to death and that the bus he had been driving

had been run over his body several times.

On August 22, the police murdered four people whose half-naked bodies were found in one of the main thoroughfares of the capital. The same day in an inland province, a Captain in command of guerrilla fighters was wounded, arrested by the police and killed. Again on that day, a paper factory worker was murdered in a park in the town of Trinidad. The crime was committed by a policeman who took the body in his car and disposed of it outside the gates of a hospital shouting: "There you are, you can certify that he is really dead!"

On August 25, troops invaded the prison at Santiago de Cuba and killed two political prisoners. That very same day in the same town, three bodies were found in different streets.

The population of Regla, a town near Havana, will never forget the week of September 7 to 14. The week is a traditional religious festival. The authorities wanted to change it into a political demonstration. The population refused to co-operate and hid the picture of the Virgin which is the subject of their veneration.

The government responded swiftly. Twenty-three people were murdered by the police during the nights of that week.

On September 10, four peasants living in the small town of Niquero in Oriente Province, were taken away by the police, soaked in petrol and burned alive. The neighbors,

attracted by the frightful cries of the victims, found four carbonized corpses in the glowing fire.

The same day in this village, amid a great show of force, a child of 14 was attached to the tail of a horse. The animal was sent off at a gallop and the child torn to pieces under the eyes of his parents.

Each dawn between October 1 and 9, a total of 50 people were killed by the police and were found at 50 different places in the village. The breasts of dead women had been mutilated.

Two nights later in Niquero, the police exploded 24 small bombs. The next morning 24 bodies were found. One revolutionary per bomb, said the official announcement.

Murdered: Jose Maria Perez, the busmen's leader. Murdered: Francisco Rosales, the great working class leader. Imprisoned: Faustino Calcines, former member of the W.F.T.U. General Council, although he was acquitted by the courts. Imprisoned: Leonel Soto, former Secretary of the International Union of Students, who has been deprived of all contact with the outside world. Day after day, workers perish and are subjected to the most atrocious torture. The prisons are places where people are murdered, or die of hunger and disease.

Detainees are also kept in army and police barracks. These are the people "detained at pleasure" as the police themselves say of the prisoners who are held without anybody outside knowing of their arrest. These

are the people who are most frequently subjected to torture. Considered as hostages, they may be killed at any instant and their bodies found at dawn in the towns and countryside.

* * *

The National Center of the Cuban working class, the Confederation of Cuban Workers, has been transformed into a government agency. The trade-union leaders elected by the workers have been removed from their posts by the public authorities and other men in the employ of the dictatorship have been designated by decree.

The object is to crush the resistance of the workers. At the same time the dictatorship is ruthlessly interfering in trade-union matters at all levels, dismissing, imprisoning and murdering trade-union leaders and members who are loyal to the workers' cause.

In view of these conditions, the workers who want to see co-ordinated action have formed United Action Committees at place of work in several industries, and have also established a National Committee to Defend Workers' Demands and for the Democratization of the C.T.C. (Confederation of Cuban Workers). The object of these united bodies is to direct and promote the workers' struggle for higher wages and better conditions. Their activities are closely related to the general fight to win back democratic freedom and end the terror and oppression afflicting the nation.

The *camarilla* of trade-union leaders which is very much bound up with the dictatorship and dependent upon it, has to all practical effect been given a free hand by decree to murder workers who refuse to be submissive and who have decided to organize the struggle for their demands and defend the national interest and democratic rights in general. This is done under the pretext of suppressing the activities of the partisans and the communists.

The *camarilla* is supported by the American firms. But there are other companies financed by Cuban and foreign capital which either are willing or compelled to support it. The *camarilla* endorses and encourages the constant waves of dismissals and other measures adopted against the working class; for instance, the violation of labor contracts and of the rights that have been won by the workers, the direct and indirect cutting of wages by raising the cost of living, the heavy taxes imposed by the government and the paltry wages paid to workers and office staffs.

The government is constantly inventing new taxes, on cigarettes, drinks and essential goods. It decides upon and enforces public loans and loans from the United States. It has mortgaged the present and the future of the country. All this has been done so as to make the millionaire officers of the army and the police even richer, to satisfy the insatiable appetites of the "trade-union leaders," to keep the multitude of provocateurs, murderers and spies, and to

pay for the machinery of terror and corruption upon which this dictatorship rests.

DEVELOPING RESISTANCE

But, despite the terror, the whole Cuban population is fighting—workers, peasants, students, professional people, women, young people, and even children. They are fighting in the factories and in the hills, in the towns and in the prisons. And this battle is spreading to all corners of the island, drawing in the whole people to crush the tyranny of the imperialists murderers, who operate against the people and the nation.

The popular boycott organized this summer against Coca Cola, following the dismissal of workers, who opposed tyranny by this American firm, had far-reaching effects in the country and even in neighborhood countries.

In every instance solidarity for the dismissed workers was immediately forthcoming from the workers in many soft drink factories, the footwear and curing industry, hotels and transport services. Soft drinks' workers sent delegations to see lawyers, journalists and others and persuaded many sections of the population to support the workers and join in the boycott.

Throughout the island, tobacco workers, who are employed in the most important branch of Cuban industry, protested against a government decree authorizing tobacco firms to deduct monthly trade-union dues from the workers' wages

and hand them to the discredited leaders of the government trade-union center. To stifle this protest movement the police entered the factories and made mass arrests. They also enforced the measure adopted by the trade-union leaders to abolish the right won by the workers last century to use the reading platform of the workshop to discuss their problem. Under this old-established custom in the tobacco industry, a worker mounts the platform and through the day reads novels, newspapers and other matter to the workers as they work. The workers were able to win the right to use this platform to discuss matters related to their work and other questions. But the measures of repression have not stopped the tobacco workers from carrying on their fight for the reinstatement of the dismissed workers, the release of those detained, restitution of the right to use the reading platform and against compulsory payment of trade union dues.

The sugar workers are also preparing for the struggles which always precede sugar cane harvesting.

A prominent leader of the United Action Committee at the big "Cuba" sugar plant has been arrested five times, but on each occasion, the workers compelled the authorities to release him. At the "Florida" factory, more and more protests are being raised as a result of the disappearance many months ago of a well-known trade unionist, who in all likelihood has been murdered. In all the other sugar factories action is

growing against dismissal, work speed-up and for higher wages and other demands. The sugar cane harvest next January will employ more than half a million workers and offers an opportunity for a decisive struggle to overthrow the fascist dictatorship.

In other less important industries, the struggle of the trade unions for demands and democratic rights is also spreading.

* * *

The government troops are frequently defeated by the guerrilla fighters. On August 6, the operation known as the "campaign to exterminate rebel troops" against the forces led by Fidel Castro, ended in a crushing defeat for the government troops. The government sent more than 2,000 men, supported by tanks and aircraft, against Fidel Castro's forces. The government troops were encircled and their reinforcements wiped out. The survivors, including the commander and other officers, surrendered and were taken prisoner. The operation resulted in hundreds of killed and more than 500 prisoners on the government side. Fidel Castro won a great number of rifles, machine-guns, bazookas, vehicles, radio sets, ammunition and other equipment, all of American manufacture. The patriots are now using this material against the dictatorship.

THE ORIENTE FRONT

There is a second front in Oriente province. It is commanded by Raul

Castro, brother of Fidel Castro, who controls a vast area. On September 12, his patriotic forces destroyed three army barracks, killing a number of soldiers, taking many prisoners and confiscating a large quantity of ammunition. During that period, the head of the police at Banacoa, a big town in the same region, went over to the rebels with all his men and weapons.

Coming down from their base in the Escambray Sierra in Das Villas province, the patriots attacked a number of towns and villages, inflicting heavy losses on the government forces. They now control important highways and railways. Batista's army has had to withdraw from a large section of the territory and take refuge in the towns.

The partisans are active throughout the southern part of Camaguey Province, a region where there are large installations for exporting sugar in bulk which belong to the Francisco factory, of which Mr. Foster Dulles is one of the main shareholders. In this and many other regions, the partisans have forced the army to retreat and this enabled them to contact the rebel forces operating in Oriente Province.

The partisan movement has extended to four out of the six Provinces comprising the Republic. The rebel forces are winning military victories in every area, occupying large towns and severing communications. They have prevented the dictatorship from swaying public opinion in favor of the mock elec-

tions on November 3. The Cuban people have refused to take part in these elections, stained with deceit and corruption. Official communiques did not dare put the figure higher than a 40 per cent vote although it is publicly known that in many regions the vote was no higher than 25 per cent, while it was only about 10 per cent in areas where the guerilla fighters are active. Now that the elections are over, Cuba still suffers under the same tyranny and fear.

The patriots, too, are naturally suffering heavy losses in their unequal battles with an enemy infinitely better equipped and superior in numbers. They face a desperate enemy, discouraged by successive defeats, who does not hesitate to use gas, raze towns and villages to the ground, and murder men, women and children in vengeance for their inability to defeat the patriots. The patriotic struggle is supported by the people and by the most aware and the most active section of the population who are defending, organizing and extending the popular struggle. The partisan movement is developing into a vast popular campaign. This activity, coupled with the partisan movement, will end by overthrowing Batista's despotic regime.

A COUP IS PLANNED

The American imperialists, while giving growing support to Batista, are nevertheless prepared for the eventuality of Batista's regime being overthrown. and are already working with those who could save the

essential structure of the regime by a new *coup d'état*.

There are military men who speak, probably with the connivance of Batista, of a *coup d'état* in order to take over power, help the dictator to escape and paralyze the popular and revolutionary movement. There are also people who, while opposed to Batista, fear the outcome of the popular struggle so that they not only refuse to oppose a *coup d'état* but are working actively to bring it about.

The people, headed by the working class, want the composition, program and policy of the government which would replace Batista's dicta-

torship to be such as to enable it to deal with the basic economic and political difficulties of the country and to settle them in a truly democratic national and anti-imperialist way so as to allow Cuba to take the path of progress, peace and friendship between the peoples of the world.

It is clear that the more extensive and vigorous the international solidarity given the Cuban people, the easier it will be for them to fight the tyranny of Batista which is upheld by the imperialists, and consequently their victory will be genuinely democratic, national and liberating.

PAINFULLY FAMILIAR

1936:

"Germany declares that she requires a powerful army for defense. Why should any foreign nation doubt her sincerity? If the strength of the German *Wehrmacht* can help prevent the Soviets supporting their cunning propaganda abroad with military force, Germany will render a service to civilization."

—Duncan Sandys, Member of Parliament, writing in *European Review*, December, 1936.

1958:

"The danger to peace comes now not from the Germans but from the Russians. . . . We are glad to see the progress of the new German army. . . . The more efficient her army can be made the better it will be for the peace and safety of Europe."

—Duncan Sandys, Minister of Defense, in the House of Commons, Dec. 2, 1958.

On The Civil War and Lincoln

By Karl Marx

The Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is preparing a second edition of the collected works of Marx and Engels, to be published in fifteen volumes. In the course of this work, three historians connected with the Institute, S. Z. Leviova, C. P. Valeva, and M. P. Marinicheva, discovered certain unsigned communications, from Marx, published in the bourgeois-liberal Vienna newspaper, *Die Presse*. Other communications from Marx and signed by him, appearing in this paper during the years of the Civil War in the United States and dealing with that event, have been published (by International Publishers) in *The Civil War in the United States*, by Marx and Engels, edited by Richard Enmale, but the two published below do not appear in the volume and now are published in English for the first time. The translation was done by Amy Schechter from the Soviet journal, *Problems of the History of the CPSU*, No. 5, 1958; it was done from the Russian, since efforts to locate copies of the particular issues of *Die Presse* in this country have not been successful. Readers should bear in mind, therefore, that the translator had to render into English from the Russian that which was published originally in German.

The communications are remarkable in that they provide a strikingly full estimate of Abraham Lincoln; demonstrate again Marx' comprehension of the basic nature of the institution of Negro slavery to the origin, conduct and historic meaning of the Civil War; indicate Marx's special attention to evidences of anti-Confederate feeling among white Southern masses; and show afresh Marx' grasp of the particular political-military problems involved in winning the Civil War.—*Editor*

THE CRISIS ON THE QUESTION OF SLAVERY

Dec. 10, 1861

In the United States, a turning point has obviously been reached in the question that lies at the root of the entire civil war—the *question of slavery*. General Fremont has been dismissed from his post because he declared those slaves free who belong to *rebels*. Soon after this, the Washington government published its instructions to General Sherman—commanding the expeditionary forces in South Carolina—which go further than the Fremont proclamation, ordering that escaped slaves, even those belonging to the *loyal* slaveowners, shall have the status of wage workers, and that, under certain conditions, these slaves shall be armed; in this instance, the “loyal” owners are being consoled by the prospect of receiving compensation at some future time. Colonel Cochrane goes further than Fremont, demanding the general arming of the slaves as a war measure. Secretary of War Cameron has given official approval to the “sense” of Cochrane’s proposal.

Following this, the Secretary of the Interior disavowed the statement of the Secretary of War, in the name of the government. The latter reiterated his “opinion” at an official conference still more emphatically, and declared that he was raising the question in a communication to

Congress. Fremont’s successor in Missouri, General Halleck, as well as General Dix in eastern Virginia, are driving fugitive slaves from the army camps, and prohibiting them from appearing, from now on, in the neighborhood of positions occupied by his army. At the same time, however, General Wood is receiving this black “contraband” with open arms at Fort Monroe. Former leaders of the *Democratic* party, Senators Dickinson and Crosswell, (one-time members of the so-called democratic regency)¹—have declared their agreement with Cochrane and Cameron, and Colonel Jennison in Kansas, is going further than all his military precursors, having made a speech to his troops, in which, among other things, he urged:

No hesitation regarding the rebels and the man who sympathizes with them. . . . I declared to General Fremont that I would not have taken up arms had I believed slavery would survive this war. Slaves who belonged to the rebels keep taking refuge in our camp, and we shall defend them to the last fighter, and to the last bullet. I want no men who are not *abolitionists*;* I have no place for them, and I hope there are no such people among us, since everyone knows that the question of slavery lies at the root of this accursed war, that it constitutes its essence and idea. . . . And, if the government does not approve of my course, then it can revoke the commission it

* The italicized words were given in English by Marx and Engels.

—

gave me, but if this happens, I shall go ahead *on my own hook*,* even though I have only half a dozen men in all to begin with.

In the border slave states, especially in Maryland, and to a lesser degree in Kentucky, the question of slavery has already been decided in practice. An immense ebb and flow of slaves has been observed there. It is estimated, for example, that there are about 50,000 slaves from Missouri, of whom a part are fugitives, and a part have been sent there by the slave-owners themselves of the more remote southern states.

Not a single English newspaper has mentioned—as is not at all surprising—an event which is of the utmost importance and significance. On November 18th, on Hatteras Island, the representatives of 45 North Carolina counties met; they constituted themselves a provisional government, disavowed the act of secession, and announced the return of North Carolina to the bosom of the Union. The constituents of the electoral districts of that part of the state represented at that convention, are being called together to elect representatives to the Washington Congress.

ON EVENTS IN NORTH AMERICA

Oct. 7, 1862

The brief invasion of Maryland has decided the fate of the civil war in America, although for a certain period of the war, the fortunes of both of the contending sides seemed to be in the balance. It has already been pointed out, in the pages of this newspaper, that the struggle for the border slave states is a struggle for dominating the Union; in the meantime, the Confederacy has been defeated in this struggle, although it began it under most favorable circumstances which can never be repeated again.

Maryland is rightly considered to be the head, and Kentucky, the hand, of the slave-owners' party in the border states. The "loyalty" of Baltimore—capital of Maryland—has, up to this time, been maintained only with the aid of a state of siege. An unshakeable conviction prevailed, not alone in the South, but in the North as well, that the appearance of the Confederates in Maryland would serve as the signal for a mass popular uprising against "Lincoln's satellites." The question here was not only one of war successes, but of a moral demonstration as well, which would electrify the supporters of the South in all the border states, and draw them with irresistible force into the maelstrom of events. The occupation of Maryland would mean the fall of Washington and a threat to Phila-

delphia, and also place in doubt the security of New York.

The simultaneous invasion of Kentucky, which is the most important of the border states—thanks to the density of its population, its geographical position and economic resources—was, if it is examined in isolation, only a diversion. In conjunction with decisive successes in Maryland, however, it might have led to suppression of Union supporters in Tennessee, and a flank attack on Missouri; secured the safety of Arkansas and Texas; created a threat to New Orleans; and, most important, carried the war into Ohio—central state of the North, possession of which would allow control over the North in the same way that possession of Georgia would assure control over the South. In Ohio, the armies of the Confederacy, supported by its own center, would have cut off the western states of the North from the eastern, and routed its enemy. Following the defeat of the main rebel forces in Maryland, the invasion of Kentucky, carried out without the necessary vigor, and nowhere meeting with popular support, was reduced to a series of insignificant bushwhacker sorties. Even the capture of Louisville now only served to rally the "Great West"—the volunteers from Iowa, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio, transforming them into an "avalanche" that came crashing down on the South at the time of the first victorious thrust into Kentucky.

In this manner, the Maryland in-

vasion showed that the waves of secession did not possess a sufficiently powerful thrust to spread out towards the Potomac and reach Ohio. The South was forced to limit itself to defense at a time when only an offensive could bring it success. Deprived of the border states, squeezed between the Mississippi on the West, and the Atlantic Ocean on the East, the South in this way has won nothing—except its own grave.

It must not be forgotten, not for a moment, that, raising the banner of rebellion, the Southerners took control of the border states; that they held them under their political rule. They demanded the territory. But together with the territory they also lost the border states.²

And yet the invasion of Maryland had begun under exceptionally favorable circumstances: a series of unspeakably shameful defeats for the North; the Union forces demoralized; Stonewall Jackson, the hero of the day; Lincoln and his government, a general laughing stock; the Democratic Party in the North again gaining strength, and already even weighing the possibility of electing Jefferson Davis president; France and England ready openly to recognize the slave-owners' government, which they had already accorded secret recognition! *Eppur si muova!* But in world history reason always conquers.

Of still greater importance than the invasion of Maryland is Lincoln's proclamation.³ Lincoln is a figure *sui generis* in the annals of history. No

pathos, no idealistic flights of eloquence, no posing, no wrapping himself in the toga of history. He always give the most significant of his acts the most commonplace form. Where another man, acting for the sake of so many "square feet of land" declaims about "the struggle for an idea," Lincoln, even when he is acting for the sake of an idea, speaks only in terms of "square feet of land."⁴

Indecisively, against his will, he reluctantly performs the *bravura aria* of his role, as though asking pardon for the fact that circumstances are forcing him to "play the hero." The most formidable decrees, which he hurls against the enemy, and which will never lose their historic significance, resemble—as the author intends them to—ordinary summonses sent by one lawyer to another on the opposing side, with the pettifogging juridical character, the tangle of petty stipulations of an *actiones juris*. And this is the character the recent proclamation bears—the most important document of American history since the founding of the Union, a document that breaks away from the old American constitution—Lincoln's manifesto on the abolition of slavery.

There is nothing easier than to hunt up traits in the things Lincoln does that are at variance with aesthetics, and seem to lack logic, have the jester form, and contradictions in viewpoint, as do the English Pin-dars of slavery—the *Times*, the *Saturday Review* and *tutti quanti*. And

yet, in the history of the United States and in the history of humanity, Lincoln occupies a place beside Washington! Truly in our day, when every little happening on this side of the Atlantic Ocean assumes an air of melodramatic portent, is there no meaning in the fact that everything of significance taking shape in the New World makes its appearance in such everyday form?

Lincoln was not born of a people's revolution. The ordinary play of the electoral system, not conscious of those great tasks which it was called on to carry out, bore him to its summit—a plebeian, who made his way from rail-splitter to representative in Illinois, a man without intellectual brilliance, without especial strength of character, not exceptionally impressive—an ordinary man of good will. Never yet has the New World scored a greater victory than in this instance, through its demonstration that, thanks to its political and social organization, ordinary people of good will can carry out tasks which the Old World would have to have a hero to accomplish!

In his day, Hegel remarked that in reality, comedy is above tragedy, the humor of the mind above its pathos. If Lincoln does not possess the gift of the pathos of historic action, he does as an ordinary man, coming from the people, possess the gift of the humor of that action. At what moment has Lincoln promulgated his proclamation on the aboli-

tion of slavery in the territories of the Confederacy to take effect on January 1, 1863? At that very moment when the Confederacy is adopting decisions, in the role of an independent state, at its congress in Richmond, on "peaceful negotiations." At that very moment, when the slave-owners of the border states believed

that with the incursion of southerners into Kentucky the "peculiar institution" would have been made as invincible as their invincible control over their countryman—the president in Washington, Abraham Lincoln.⁵

Printed in *Die Presse*, No. 281, Oct. 12, 1862.

NOTES (supplied by the Editor):

1. By the "democratic regency," Marx undoubtedly means the so-called Albany Regency, which for a generation prior to the Civil War constituted a leading group within the New York State Democratic Party.

2. Marx in stating the Confederacy "demanded the territory" has reference to the slaveowners' demand that the institution of slavery be permitted in the entire Federal Territory west of the Mississippi.

3. By "Lincoln's proclamation," Marx has reference to the Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, issued September 22, 1862, in which Lin-

coln warned the Confederates that slaves in areas still in rebellion would be declared free by January 1, 1863.

4. Marx has reference to the fact that while Lincoln assured the Southern leaders that he meant to abide by his pledge of not interfering with slavery where it was, he also meant to stand firm by his promise that in his Administration the institution of slavery would not be permitted to expand into "another square foot of land."

5. Marx here is making special reference to the fact that Lincoln was himself Southern-born, his native state being, of course, Kentucky.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

FIVE WHO MADE HISTORY

The late Dr. Carter G. Woodson, pioneer in scientific Negro historiography, founded, thirty-three years ago, Negro History Week. He designated it to occur in mid-February, having in mind that that month marked the births of Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass. Woodson's idea, slowly and because of much effort by many people, began to take hold; a high-water mark came in 1946 when Benjamin J. Davis, Communist member of the New York City Council, succeeded in getting that Council to adopt his Resolution making the week one to be officially celebrated by the City. Since then, official recognition of the Week has spread to a few other areas in our country, and while today knowledge of Negro history is still at an abysmally low level, it nevertheless is much more widespread than it was back in 1926 or in 1946.

As it happens, February is the birth-month also of George Washington, of course, and of W. E. B. Du Bois and of William Z. Foster. This happy coincidence offers an opportunity for a brief evaluation of the lives of each of these five men; it is suggested that in those lives, with the issues faced and the battles fought, one has a distillation of the progressive elements in the history of the United States.

The five figures share more than a common nationality and a common birth-month; all five were (and two now are) revolutionists. In a sense it is paradoxical that this should be the hallmark of five major American figures, for today at home and abroad reactionary policies characterize the United States. But not least of the values coming from a study of the lives of these five is knowledge that it has not always been so; furthermore, such study offers ground for confidence that it will not always be so. It is worth recalling that not very long ago as history measures time the name "The United States of America" shattered the complacency of those dwelling in palaces as has the name "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" for the past forty years. As late as 1889, the English historian, Lord Acton, in a too-little quoted passage, said of the birth of our country, that it "impresses us first and most distinctly as the supreme manifestation of the law of resistance, as the abstract revolution in its purest and most perfect shape." Lord Acton wrote that it was the history of the United States which taught that where tyranny menaces the people:

It is their right and duty to stake the national existence, to sacrifice lives and fortunes, to cover the country with a lake of blood, to shatter crowns and sceptres and fling parliaments into the sea.

"On this principle of subversion," continued the Catholic historian, "they [that is, we Americans] erected their commonwealth, and by its virtue lifted

the world out of its orbit and assigned a new course to history. Here or nowhere we have the broken chain, the rejected past, precedent and statute superseded by unwritten law . . . ideas rooted in the future. . . ."

Let us inquire, most briefly, into the lives and ideas, issues and battles of each of the Five Who Made History.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

The military leader of the first successful colonial revolution, of the first successful vindication, arms in hand, of the right of national self-determination in the history of mankind, is the Father of our country. Certainly, it is his class position and even his own direct, personal interests that propel him to act as he did—his indebtedness to British merchants which made of him as of colonial tobacco planters generally as Jefferson said, a species of property belonging to British mercantile houses, his competition in land speculation with Crown-favored British investors, the affront to his pride when as a colonel in His Majesty's colonial forces, he was only equal in rank to a captain in His Majesty's home forces. Having said this, one has said that Washington was a man and not a god.

But to battle against these economic restrictions and these national affronts was no mean cause; and to do so meant to fight on the side of freedom—as far as the process of forging human freedom had reached in the eighteenth century.

For seven years of war, Washington was commander-in-chief of a bedraggled, newfangled People's Army, which he led against the most powerful land and naval force then in the world. Knowing its strength lay in its people's character, and that the victory of the Revolution depended upon the successful military use of its popular base, Washington conducted the war as one huge guerrilla operation. He hit and ran; he tempted the British forces inland away from the ports and the sea where their Navy made them impregnable; he fought in all weather and at night as well as day. In the face of inadequate supplies, sectional rivalries, treasonous plotting, heartbreaking betrayals, through the time—and time again—which "tried men's souls," he never showed despair, never yielded to temptation, kept his head, maintained control, and finally brought the British foe to their knees.

He had an admirable sense of reality and a splendid broad-mindedness, unusual for his class and background. If victory depended upon an alliance with a Catholic monarch, more tyrannical than George, he would make the alliance and fight with Louis' men and ships and money; this need not besmirch the Revolution, as not a few purists warned. In any case, without it we cannot win, and if we lose in the field then we certainly lose the Revolution. Moreover, if the King does not fear contact with us, why should we fear contact with him; perhaps his troops and his cause will be "besmirched" and not ours.

Washington was insistent that the "rights of Englishmen," belonged to him, and if those rights could be obtained only by ceasing to be Englishmen, he was ready to take the revolutionary step of battling the King, and getting those rights—and more—by becoming an American.

Once taking that step, and seeing anti-monarchy equally with independence as the heart of the Revolution, Washington held fast to both. He rejected military dictatorship—though it was offered—and held himself subordinate to Congress, though that body's procrastination and inefficiency often drove him to the edge of despair.

Washington saw the republican form of government as the hope of freedom, and in his day no brighter hope shone. As President he steered a course of neutrality in foreign affairs, and of civilian domination in domestic affairs; in both his central purpose was to nurse through the delicate stage of infancy that new thing in the world, a federal republic based upon the idea of the sovereignty of the people.

While a revolutionist, Washington was of the Center, rather than the Left, it is true. He feared the masses more than did Jefferson, though less than Hamilton; he tended toward elitism and paternalism. He only lamented slavery, while Jefferson disliked it and Franklin hated it; but even here, during the war, he urged the employment of Negro soldiers and did employ Negroes as soldiers and seamen—in non-Jim Crow arrangements, by the way. He had, then, all the limitations of ruling classes based upon the private ownership of the means of production, plus even more severe limitations of a slave-owner, limitations present even in the revolutionary stages of such classes. At the same time, the greatest glory of George Washington is that he was the central leader in carrying to success the first bourgeois-democratic, national-liberating, anti-colonial revolution in history.

As such, he was able to say truly:

My first wish is to see the whole world in peace, and its inhabitants one band of brothers striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind.

And as such he did contribute mightily to making real that vision; the realization of which it is particularly incumbent upon us now—we children of Washington, in this mid-twentieth century—to help bring about.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

For us Americans, the most beloved historical figure is Lincoln, whose 150th birthday anniversary is celebrated this month.

In line with the developing neo-conservatism in the United States, the tendency in dominant historical circles is to picture Lincoln as an individual of conservative political views goaded into unwilling action by radicals who were supposed to have been—in the words, for example, of Professor Harry J. Carman—"a constant thorn in his flesh." The contemporaneous opinion of the great Negro liberation fighter, Frederick Douglass, on this matter is much closer to the truth. Douglass wrote that, "viewed from the genuine abolition ground, Mr. Lincoln seemed tardy, cold, dull, and indifferent; but measuring him by the sentiment of his country, a sentiment he was bound as a statesman to consult, he was swift, zealous, radical and determined." Lincoln's

ideas on the Negro and slavery, while not the most advanced of his day, were markedly Left of center. Indeed, it may be remarked that many Americans have yet to reach, on these questions, the position attained by Lincoln a century ago.

We would signalize four central lessons from Lincoln's career as worthy of particular notice.

* * *

The fundamental source of violence in great social transformations lies in the forces of reaction. When the slave-owning class found the election of 1860—held in accordance with all legal requirements—to have gone against them, and when that class decided that it could no longer rule in the old way, it turned to the deliberate organization of counter-revolutionary civil war. While spokesmen for the slave-owners had accused the anti-slavery leaders and followers of being "subversive" and "seditious," the slave-owners themselves took the path of armed treason, and waged war for four years upon the flag of their own country.

In the face of this supreme threat, Lincoln, though urged by many to compromise and to yield, stood firm. He would give the slaveowners nothing beyond what he had promised in the 1860 campaign; when he had made that clear, they chose secession and war. Having so chosen, Lincoln picked up the gauntlet and despite enormous difficulties stood as firm as a rock in defense of the integrity of that "new nation, conceived in liberty."

* * *

Successful resistance to counter-revolution requires an aggressive rather than a defensive strategy; this applies not only to the military but, above all, to the political sphere, of which in any case the military is fundamentally an expression. To break the back of the slaveowners' rebellion, it was necessary to undercut the basic source of their power—namely, their possession of four million slaves. It was the system of slavery that lay at the root of the counter-revolution; to destroy that counter-revolution, it was necessary to destroy slavery. Hence, Lincoln's election pledge, to "safeguard the Union," became in fact a strategy of liberating the slaves and thereby defending the Union. Again, the dialectical nature of all historical processes became clear: preserving the Union required emancipating the slaves; emancipating the slaves required preserving the Union. Thus, in defeating counter-revolution, a social revolution was consummated. In this connection, the central nature of the Negro question to the whole history of American society in general, and democratic advance in particular, becomes crystal-clear.

* * *

Lincoln's resistance to the slaveowners' counter-revolution and his leadership in the revolutionary liberation of the slaves and the defense of the Republic, required international solidarity, especially from the working people of Europe. Just as the main reliance, internally, for the defeat of the Confederacy rested upon the arms of the workers and farmers of the North and the slaves and poorer whites of the South, so the main reliance of the Republic, externally, rested upon the sympathy of the toiling masses of Europe.

Of the governments of Europe it was, rather ironically, only that of the Czar which looked with sympathy upon the struggles of the young Republic,

and this for its own reasons of opposition to the national policies of England and France. Those governments, however, strongly sympathized with the Confederacy, and that this sympathy did not manifest itself in open recognition and active co-belligerency was due, in no small part, to the pressures of public opinion in those countries. The decisive working-class component of that public opinion, in such great cities as London and Manchester, made itself felt in an organized manner thanks to the leadership of the First International, personally guided by Karl Marx.

Another feature of international solidarity that cannot be omitted even in so short an account as this, was the resistance of the great national hero of Mexico, Benito Juarez, to the invasion of his country by forces of imperial France. Had Mexico fallen into the uncontested possession of France in that period, with its common frontier of hundreds of miles with Texas, it would have been a painful blow indeed to the efforts of Lincoln to defeat the Confederacy. In this sense it is true—and rather ironic in view of U.S. imperialism's record relative to Mexico—that the national liberation struggles of the Mexican people played an important part in enabling the people of the United States to retain the territorial integrity of their country, and to rid their country of the blot of Negro chattel slavery.

* * *

The assassination of Lincoln symbolizes the betrayal of the cause of Negro freedom and of democracy committed by the Republican Party in the years following the defeat of the Confederacy. The newly-ascendant industrial bourgeoisie, already moving in the direction of monopolization and tasting the enormous resources of the Southland, betrayed the promise to destroy the plantation system. They betrayed the promise to give the land to those who tilled it, and in the first place to the millions of Negro people, thus making real their freedom. Lincoln's murder is part of the whole aborting of the Second American Revolution; something to be made good in our own day in the destruction of the entire foul jim-crow system, and in the thorough democratization of the South.

* * *

The great Russian novelist, Leo Tolstoy, stated in 1909 that Abraham Lincoln was "a strong type of those who make for truth and justice, for brotherhood and freedom. . . . Lincoln lived and died a hero, and as a great character he will live as long as the world lives."

It is of major significance that of all the splendid figures our country has produced, the one whom we Americans love more than any other is this son of impoverished pioneering parents, who held firm in a supreme test of liberty and gave his life in the sacred cause of human emancipation. If it be true that by their heroes one may know a people, then perhaps the greatest lesson of all from the life and work of Abraham Lincoln, is the fact that that martyr is enshrined in the heart of the American people.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS

On February 17, 1888, some friends of Frederick Douglass surprised him with a party celebrating his seventy-first birthday. They asked for a speech: instead he epitomized his life in two straight-forward sentences: "During the nearly fifty years of my public life, I have been an unflinching and uncompromising advocate and defender of the oppressed. In whatever else I failed, in this I have not failed."

This is enough to earn for Douglass the hatred of the dominant bourgeois historians; but when it is added that this "unflinching and uncompromising" hero was a Negro, one is prepared for the fact that this hatred has displayed itself primarily by the omission of Frederick Douglass from their so-called histories.

At best, as a Negro contemporary, Richard T. Greener, remarked soon after his death, some might "speak of Mr. Douglass as a great Negro, and dismiss his race to oblivion by scanty accorded and only partial justice even to him." Greener was right, too, in declaring that Douglass "was a great man judged by any standard, of any race at any time, in this world's history," that he was "among the five truly great man of this country."

In what lies his greatness? It is in this: Douglass himself said, in 1854, that "The relation subsisting between the white and black people of this country is the vital question of the age," and he was *America's most superb thinker and organizer, tactician and strategist on the resolution of this question to be produced in the nineteenth century.*

Why was this question "the vital question of the age"? Because it involved directly and immediately the fate of four million men, women and children held, literally in chains, in the most brutal system of thralldom ever practiced by man; because, on the basis of the ownership of these four millions, and of the land worked by them and of the crops that labor and land produced, the slaveholding class absolutely dominated the South and exercised a controlling influence over the life of the entire nation; because the enslavement of the Negro vitiated the economic and moral well-being of the entire population and inhibited the development of the nation's productive capacities; because the maintenance of slavery required active and incessant assaults upon the limited liberties of the white masses; because the slave system was insatiably violent and aggressive, at home and abroad; and because the slave system besmirched culture, perverted science and spawned a fittingly foul anti-humanistic ideology.

So, Frederick Douglass, standing as he did in the very center of the struggle for the liberation of the American Negro people, was, as he himself put it, back in 1848, "standing upon the watch-tower of human freedom."

Whence his matchless clarity, selflessness and strength? Basically, from his people and from his and their oppression—and resistance to that oppression. Of course, with Douglass and his consummate artistry, his sense of timing, his marvelous *feeling* for the right path, the proper phrase, the precisely correct tactic, one enters the elusive realm of genius. But the direction and impact of genius may be understood, and that of Frederick Douglass came out of the

anguish and the greatness of the Negro people.

After Dante created his *Inferno*, the people of Florence would point him out and say. "There goes the man who has been in Hell!" Douglass had been in Hell and he knew its proprietors and its victims. He knew it exactly because he was of the victims. Douglass used to like to say that in order to understand, one had to *stand under*. It is on the side of the oppressed that justice is, and it is the oppressed who see truly.

He knew what it was to be a child without the love of a mother, to be hungry, to be cold and ill-clad, so that, as he wrote in his autobiography, "My feet have been so cracked with the frost that the pen with which I am writing might be laid in the gashes." He knew what "thirty-nine lashes well laid-on" felt like, and he knew the torture of interminable, exhausting labor to enrich another. And he saw a crippled Negro woman stripped and bound and flogged—"this lacerated woman tied up by her wrists to a bolt in the joist, three, four, and five hours at a time."

He saw that his people resisted. He knew he despised slavery and he knew his people did. He experienced the magnificent comradeship of the struggling downtrodden, and the exhilarating sense of the strength gained from collective resistance.

Yes, Douglass *knew* his fellow slaves "were neither indifferent, dull nor inapt." On the contrary, he knew that "they were every one of them as true as steel, and no band of brothers could be more loving." Moreover, the common foe and the common aspiration and the common suffering developed the sense of a collective, so that "We never undertook anything of any importance which was likely to affect each other, without mutual consultation. We were generally a unit, and moved together."

In slavery, Douglass saw clearly the class divisions amongst the whites and the suffering of the majority of them who were poor. He never forgot the two Irish seamen who told him, in Baltimore, that slavery was disgraceful and that he ought to be free, nor would he forget the German-born worker who recognized him in his flight and—Douglass believed—knew he was fleeing but kept mum.

Douglass saw that, "The slaveholders, with a craftiness peculiar to themselves, by encouraging the enmity of the poor laboring white man against the blacks, succeeded in making the said white man almost as much a slave as the black man himself." To the end of his days Douglass fought for Negro-white unity, for he knew the division was created and needed by the masters, and hence that unity was vital for their victims' joint emancipation.

This was the preparation of the man who, three years out of slavery and all of twenty-four years old, flung himself into the central question of his time—the question of Negro slavery. And in this central struggle, Frederick Douglass was the central figure.

He flung aside Garrisonian sectarianism and anarchism. He insisted on the broadest possible assault against slavery and its jim-crow reflections in the North. He pioneered in politicalizing the Abolitionist movement, and in striking telling

blows against the ideological base of the slave system—the alleged inferiority of the Negro people. He hammered home the indivisibility of human freedom, the direct and personal interest of white people in the emancipation of the Negro slaves. He saw that the struggle against slavery involved, and was nurtured by, all struggles for freedom everywhere.

In 1848, writing on "The Rights of Women," he insisted "there can be no reason in the world for denying to woman the exercise of the elective franchise. Our doctrine is that 'right is of no sex.' We therefore bid the women engaged in this movement our humble God speed." And half a century later, Elizabeth Cady Stanton said: "He was the only man I ever knew who understood the degradation of disfranchisement for women."

Struggles of the European peasants and workers thrilled him. Typically, of the French uprising of 1848, he wrote: "The despots of Europe—the Tories of England, and the slaveholders of America are astonished, confused, and terrified; while the humble poor, the toil-worn laborer, the oppressed and plundered, the world around, have heard with exultation the glorious peal."

He brought the struggle against Negro slavery to Europe, and some accused him of anti-Americanism, of "irritating the American people rather than doing them good." "They deserve to be irritated," said Douglass. "The conscience of the American people needs this irritation, and I would *blister it all over, from center to circumference*, until it gives signs of a purer and a better life. . . ."

The persecution of the Abolitionists brought to the fore the whole question of civil rights and Douglass was an outstanding fighter on this front. Having personally insisted on freedom of speech to the point of nearly losing an eye and suffering several broken bones, he could say with full conviction: "To suppress free speech is a double wrong. It violates the rights of the hearer as well as those of the speaker."

There was a consciously expressed dialectical quality to Douglass' thinking and work. He was devoid of subjectivity, and operated on the basis of a comprehension of the dynamic interpenetration in society. He insisted on the reality of laws of social science as of physical science and the possibility of discovering what was true and what was just. He saw the secret of history in man's own activity not, "in the clouds, in the stars, nor anywhere else outside of humanity itself." But he knew the activity was not self-propelled and did not spend itself in a vacuum. No—and here he practically echoed Marx, though there is no evidence that he had read him—"A man is worked upon by what *he* works on. He may carve out his circumstances, but his circumstances will carve him out as well."

An awareness of interpenetration permeated his work. "A wrong to one is a wrong to all," he asserted. And: "One end of the slave's chain must be fastened to a padlock in the lips of Northern freemen, else the slave will himself become free."

Tactically, this moved him to get things *done*. "To such a cause as ours," he once said, "a little *done* is worth more than ages of clamor about what *ought to be done*." And he constantly reiterated the unity of theory and action—as he

put it in a recurrent phrase—"action as well as thought is required."

He had a fierce practicality. Nothing mattered but enhancing freedom and this intense and objective partisanship plus his genius for contact with the mass led him, time after time, to put his finger on the crucial need of the hour. And he was at his best in most trying times as in his grasp of the fact, during the Civil War, that the salvation of the Union required the liberation of the slaves, and the slaves' liberation required the Union's salvation.

Similarly, during Reconstruction, he said that those who till the soil must own it, or the fruits of the Civil War would spoil, and he demanded, as a further guarantor of real freedom "the ballot-box, the jury-box, and the cartridge-box" for the Negro people.

The genius of the man may be further indicated by abstracting from one of the greatest political speeches ever made in the United States, his address at the 1883 National Convention of Colored Men. "Who would be free," he said, "themselves must strike the blow. . . . The man outraged is the man to make the outcry." He declared the cause of the Southern Negro masses was "one with the laboring classes all over the world," and urged that "the labor unions of the country should not throw away this colored element of strength . . . we expect to have and ought to have the sympathy and support of laboring men everywhere."

He denounced the plantation system and saw the truth concerning it—peonage for the Negro millions—as the heart, at that time, of the Negro question. He demanded an end to Jim Crow, full equality in education, jobs and politics, and excoriated in words of fire the disfranchisement of the Negro people, living, as a result, under the "control of a foul, haggard and damning conspiracy." And especially he called for a campaign to develop Negro representation, because "our persistent exclusion from office as a class is a great wrong, fraught with injury."

* * *

Even where, with the hindsight provided us by eighty years, we see certain failings in the activities of Douglass during his later years, these are not really central in terms of his dedication to the Negro liberation struggle. Though he saw, in his day, no effective political alternative, for instance, to the Republican Party, and remained within it, he was a veritable flaying machine in its ranks, constantly and as sharply as possible seeking to force it to put into practice its glowing promises.

Even, too, when he asserted that with slavery eliminated, he no longer opposed the expansion of the United States, Douglass thought of this expansion not in colonial, exploitative terms (which was the reality) but in terms of partnership. And one who follows his part in the diplomatic maneuverings connected with expansionism finds that his honesty and decency made him, objectively, an obstacle to such efforts and resulted in his resignation from such posts.

Douglass despised war. In his day he excoriated the government of the United States for its rape of Mexico and he affirmed "*Ever our banner the banner of Peace.*" He saw that "all human governments" in his time, "had been failures" for "war, slavery, injustice and oppression and the idea that might makes right have been uppermost in all such governments," which "have been and still are but armed camps."

Frederick Douglass died, as he had lived, fighting against injustice and for freedom. Two evenings before he passed away, on February 20, 1895, he had addressed a meeting seeking to restore the suffrage to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia. And on the morning and afternoon of the day he died he had participated in a convention of the National Women's Council, encouraging the battle to end women's disfranchisement.

The masters of our social order have nothing but hatred for a giant like Frederick Douglass. Glorifiers of John C. Calhoun—accurately labeled by Douglass, "the great champion of human bondage"—win Pulitzer Prizes, and Pulitzer Prize poets write biographies of butchers like Metternich. The Federal government prepares "A National Program for the Publication of the Papers of American Leaders," and includes 122 names—from John Adams to Henry Ford—but the name of Frederick Douglass nowhere appears.

Abraham Lincoln declared that Frederick Douglass was "the most meritorious man in the United States." He was, in fact, a titan of our history.

W. E. B. DU BOIS

To write of Dr. Du Bois, celebrating his 91st birthday this month, is to think of poetry, because of all the things this modern Da Vinci is, he is above everything else a poet, and because his life has had the nobility, the sense of perfection, and the quality of fulfillment that a true poem possesses. Writing of Du Bois, one thinks of Shelley's lines:

*To defy power, which seems omnipotent,
To love, and bear; to hope till hope creates
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates . . .
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free:
This is alone Life, Joy, Empire and Victory.*

Du Bois, in his first public speech, delivered at Fisk University in 1887—when he was not yet 20 years old—condemned the acquiescence of both major parties in the crucifixion of the Negro people, and urged upon the masses the necessity of independent political action.

He gave voice, in Georgia, over 60 years ago, to the Negro's resistance against the conquest of the South by monopoly capital. He led the struggle against Big Business' "philanthropic" effort to mis-educate the Negro people, and to corrupt their leaders. He recognized the irresistible logic of Socialism half a century ago.

Du Bois organized the Niagara Movement, in 1905, and, speaking out for his people who had always fought like lions for freedom, he said:

We will not be satisfied to take one jot or tittle less than our full manhood rights. We claim for ourselves every single right that belongs to a free-born American, political, civil, and social; and until we get these rights we will never cease to protest and assail the ears of America. The battle we wage is not for ourselves alone but for all true Americans.

It was this Niagara Movement, and Du Bois personally, that were so vital in launching, in 1909, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Dr. Du Bois saw, 50 years ago, with the clarity of genius, an essential element in the unfolding of the twentieth century in the United States: "The cause of labor is the cause of black men, and the black man's cause is labor's own." He, too, more than a generation ago, saw the anti-imperialist potential in a world-unity of Negro people and so founded the Pan-African Movement. How thrilling it is that he has lived to witness, in the recent Accra All-African People's Conference, the firm institutionalizing of that movement, and that he experienced the gratification of hearing the Prime Minister of a newly-liberated African state publicly acknowledge his leadership in this historic effort!

The essence of Dr. Du Bois' life, as poet, novelist, historian, sociologist, anthropologist, editor, educator, and organizer—and as a genial, witty human being—has been the call for Peace. He has sought, in all his private and public endeavors, to help create a dignified, decent, secure, fraternal living-together by a creative humanity.

Increasingly, in his later years, Du Bois has seen that the good things of life—based, as they must be, on Peace so that the good things may be created, shared and enjoyed—can be obtained only by collective struggle. His own natural tendency, reinforced by a shyness sometimes mistaken for aloofness, is to prefer working alone; he dislikes conferences and meetings and the accoutrements of collective effort. This tendency goes hand in hand with a love of scholarship and intensive creative effort; nevertheless, at pain best known only to himself, he has foregone for much of his life the privacy he loves and has seen the need for organizational labors.

Increasingly, Dr. Du Bois has come to believe that the leadership and the main role in the struggle for human emancipation rests with the working class and its allies. As he has put it: "Naturally, out of the mass of the working classes, who know life and its bitter struggles, will continually rise the real, unselfish and clear-sighted leadership."

The logic of his magnificent life has brought Dr. Du Bois to see in the Soviet Union the greatest hope of mankind. With characteristic courage, while under indictment by a shameless, chauvinist, and warlike ruling class, in 1951, as a "foreign agent" Dr. Du Bois chose to write:

I follow a world peace movement which arose in the Soviet Union and today finds there its chief support. . . . While, then, I am and expect to be a loyal citizen of the United States, I also respect and admire the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

We say that Dr. Du Bois made this remark with characteristic courage when and where he did, for courage, too, has been a hallmark of his life. When a young man of 25 years, Du Bois told himself, in his own diary: "Be the truth what it may I shall seek it on the pure assumption that it is worth seeking—and Heaven nor Hell, God nor Devil shall turn me from my purpose till I die."

It is this unswerving dedication to truth as he sees it, that is at the root of Du Bois' courage. It is, too, at the root of his charm and gentleness, for Du Bois in battling all his lifelong days against racism and imperialism, against poverty and ignorance, against oppression and war, has lived in singular peace with himself.

He has, too, been generous. Looked up to as a veritable saint by two generations of striving Negro youth, Du Bois has turned none of them away; and many, many are they whose careers were furthered by the advice and assistance of this man. The list is very long, and in some cases rather ironic; it includes Walter White and George Haynes, Carter G. Woodson and Jessie Fauset, and scores more.

At the same time, Dr. Du Bois has found, of course, allies, and he has made for himself, through his steadfast devotion, literally millions of friends. That it was this man the rulers of the United States once actually indicted, handcuffed and sought to imprison, that it was Dr. Du Bois who for years was refused a passport by a State Department whose Chief is unworthy to pare his toenails—such facts outblast the loudest broadcasts of the so-called "Voice of America."

For this superb son of the American Negro people, I know no better words than those of Shelley, already quoted: "*Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free.*"

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

There are two paragraphs in *The Communist Manifesto*, in which its young authors offer what they feel are the particular characteristics of Communists as compared with other working-class leaders. Since these seem to have been forgotten by many people who have failed to weather the storms and stresses of the recent very difficult period for the Left, it may be worthwhile quoting them; moreover, they are especially pertinent in any effort at a brief summarization of the career, to date, of William Z. Foster:

The Communists [wrote Marx and Engels] are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

John Gates, in explaining his recent renegacy from Communism, has insisted that his main motive has been to "join the American people"; in this insistence, as again demonstrated in his book, his central foe is William Z. Foster. It is Foster who is Gates' villain; Gates, having freed himself from Foster, thinks he is now free—and free to join the American people!

Quite apart from the nauseating demagoguery of this line, and the way in which it manages to agree, in substance, with the anti-Communist critique of the Justice Department, there is a truly ludicrous element in Gates, or anyone else, associat-

ing severance from Foster with "joining the American people."

Foster comes out of a working-class family in Taunton, Massachusetts and he is as much part of this country as is that town. There is no state, in all the 49 now making up our country, into which Foster has not gone, time after time in his more than half a century of working-class struggle and leadership. This man has homesteaded in Oregon, driven trolleys in Philadelphia, worked in Chicago stockyards, in Pennsylvania steel mills, and as a seaman shipped out of a dozen American ports. Foster has been the greatest mass leader in the United States trade-union movement, and his epic contributions in bringing unionism to the basic industries of our country, notably his leadership of the stockyard and steel drives, are all fundamental sections in American history. When you touch Foster, you are in contact with Joe Hill and Big Bill Haywood, with Gene Debs and Charles Ruthenberg, with Mother Bloor and Mother Jones; when you touch Foster you are in contact with the IWW and Gastonia, with the Trade Union Unity League and the organization of the CIO, with Sacco and Vanzetti and Scottsboro. When you touch Foster you are in contact with the Communist Party of the United States; and when you've touched him, you've touched an American and you are in contact with this country.

At the same time, as an American, Foster is the opposite of a provincial or a chauvinist. He is one who has traveled the four corners of the world; one who argued with Kautsky in Berlin in 1909, began studying Lenin back in 1920. Foster, as a white American worker and a working-class leader, has incarnated the idea of international solidarity and has pioneered in exposing and combatting U.S. imperialism, particularly as this has shown itself in the spoliation of Latin America. And, as a white American worker and leader, Foster has paid particular attention, in his activities and his writings, to the cancerous quality of jim crow, the insidious nature of racism, and to the vital contributions which the militancy and strength of the Negro people offer to the general battle for democracy and social progress.

The central themes of Foster's life have been, of course, the struggle against United States imperialism, and for Socialism. This means Marxism-Leninism; and that in turn means vision, conscious planning, boldness, the courage to act—knowing that there will be error, but knowing too that the only human being never to err, is that human being who has never tried to do anything. And it means a Communist Party, based on this outlook, and leading without let-up in every separate aspect and in the totality of this greatest of all social efforts. The indispensability of such a Party has been a central feature of the life and belief of William Z. Foster; he has conducted himself with the closest attention to collective needs, criticism, and decisions. His devotion in this regard has been unswerving, which is to say it has not been uncritical. On the contrary, Foster has differed, sometimes sharply; but always the expressions of difference have been disciplined and have had as their single aim the strengthening of the Party.

On the basis of the experiences outlined above, Foster has seen, from 1917 to the present, the imperialist-shattering nature of the Great October Revolution. As a foe of imperialism and a partisan of socialism, Foster has understood and insisted that the health and strength and building of the Soviet Union were in-

dispensable to the world-wide struggle, and the American struggle, for equality, peace and social progress.

Foster has staked his life on the proposition that Marxism-Leninism is indeed a science and as such is of universal applicability. Specifically, in this connection, he has been the leader in resisting ideas of American exceptionalism; in holding firm to the view that while very significant national peculiarities and particularities exist on the U.S. scene, the United States is a capitalist country, is, indeed, the leader of the imperialist sector, and that, therefore, the fundamental insights of Marxism-Leninism are as valid here as anywhere and everywhere else. When all is said and done, the word for Foster is staunchness; an absolutely indomitable quality, no matter what hardships and persecutions and an immovable revolutionary patience, grounded in the conviction of the truth of Marxism-Leninism.

In a sense, William Z. Foster is proof of the validity of his own view; the applicability of Marxism-Leninism to the United States is shown in the fact that Foster, as profoundly American a human being as ever walked the roads and streets of our country, is also as firm a Communist as has ever lived.

* * *

Of the Five Who Made History all possess impeccable integrity, bold vision, superb confidence, and a profound commitment to the cause of human ennoblement. Seeking to understand the world, all reached, within the limits of their time, of course, such understanding; this brought with it the desire to change that world, and the decision to go ahead and do it. Guided by the needs and desires of the masses, and in turn learning how to guide them, these five stand forth as great patriots and great revolutionists.

The attention of readers is called to a remarkable issue of the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, devoted to "The Humanities in Soviet Higher Education," and dated October, 1958. This issue is made up of articles by 14 Soviet scholars, explaining how the universities in the USSR conduct courses and research in foreign languages, Russian literature, history, archaeology, philosophy, economics, music, drama, painting. Inquiries should be addressed directly to the University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada.—*The Editor*.

The California Elections*

By Albert J. Lima

THE OUTSTANDING feature of the California elections was the role and unity of the labor movement, which resulted in the overwhelming defeat of Knowland and "right-to-work" Proposition 18. Labor saw the two as a joint issue, and throughout the state in virtually every precinct the vote against Proposition 18 and the vote against Knowland were within one or two votes of one another.

Normally the vote for candidates is much higher than the vote for propositions. But this time the workers went to the polls to vote against Knowland and the "right-to-work" proposition.

LABOR'S PART

We may say that labor in California tended to move as a class in this election. All past electoral differences and splits which have plagued labor here ever since the New Deal period were overcome. In San Francisco, where some of the labor leadership, while united against Knowland, were supporting Knight for the senatorial seat, they dropped him like a hot potato when President Eisenhower used San Francisco to make a speech against labor racketeers.

Labor developed its own forms for political activities in many areas, and everywhere it relied on its own initiative to guarantee the campaign against Proposition 18. In some areas, and to a greater extent in Southern California, it used the Democratic headquarters through which to campaign. But for the conduct of the campaign, the material and the initiative in setting up citizens' and special committees labor relied on itself.

In the initial stages the unions concentrated on reaching their own members so as to guarantee that they were registered to vote as well as educated on Proposition 18. They used the central and industry councils, COPE and neighborhood and precinct clubs as well as Democratic Party clubs, to mobilize and activate their rank and file members.

The labor movement consciously sought allies in this election. They made a direct appeal to the small and family farmers in the attempt to circulate an initiative petition to put the 160-acre limitation for use of public water into the State Constitution. In their statement of support, they appealed also for joint action against Proposition 18. They likewise consciously sought unity with the Negro

and Mexican-American communities.

Labor made some very important gains in the Sacramento Valley rural counties, traditionally the base for reactionary and Republican control of the California state government. In the past few years, there has been a trend toward breaking the stranglehold of reaction in these areas. Organized labor and the Democratic club movement and the Negro communities have grown in strength and political stature. This election produced a startling change-over in favor of labor in a number of important counties.

For example, the Sacramento County vote against Proposition 18 was 68.5% as compared to 66% in Alameda County and about 56% in Los Angeles. This county is one of the largest agricultural counties in the state. In other major farm counties, such as Fresno and San Joaquin Counties, a comparable vote was tallied. And in all of these counties, the vote against Knowland was identical with the vote against Proposition 18.

In the 7th Congressional District a member of the Teamsters' Union, identified with the liberal leadership of the Alameda Central Labor Council, was elected to Congress over John Allen, an entrenched Knowland Republican.

The results of this election create a new atmosphere for 1960 and hold the potential of further development of independent political action on the part of labor.

The former liberal mask of the Re-

publican party, with its ability to muster labor support, has been torn away through this election. The Republican Party emerged as the reactionary, ruthless, and anti-labor gang. Hillings, Knowland's running mate for Attorney General, stooped to red-baiting and anti-Semitism in his campaign against Mosk. Knowland raised charges of Brown's identification with gangsterism in California. This method of campaigning resulted in the withdrawal of support on the eve of the elections by the *San Francisco Chronicle*—an unprecedented action by a commercial paper in California politics.

THE NEGRO AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN PEOPLE

The Negro people took a forthright position against Proposition 18 and in support of the labor movement. The Negro communities voted as high as five and six to one against 18 and Knowland, a much higher percentage than in white working-class areas.

Following the elections, the *Sun Reporter*, a weekly Negro newspaper published in San Francisco, hailed the joint victory of labor and the Negro people. It presented a minimum immediate program to be carried out by the victorious Democratic Party. This program contained proposals for state legislation including a state FEPC law, legislation to outlaw discriminatory practices in all state and federally financed housing, appointment of Ne-

* This article, by the Communist Party District Organizer of Northern California, is based on a report presented in December, 1958, to the National Committee, CPUSA. Other articles dealing with the November elections appeared in this magazine in the issue of December, 1958 and January, 1959.—Ed.

groes to all state commissions and agencies, etc.

This same editorial, however, also made very clear that once again the Negro people had come to the support of organized labor in a vital fight, and that they now were going to demand that labor clean its own house of discriminatory practices against Negro workers as a basis for future unity.

One negative aspect of the election was the defeat of the two Mexican-American candidates—Roybal for the Board of Supervisors in Los Angeles, and Lopez for Secretary of State. One of the weaknesses which the Party and the Left and progressive forces must examine is our failure to single out these two candidates for special concentration. Lopez received over 2½ million votes and missed election by only some 15,000. A strong concentration by the Party and the Left-progressive forces could have won the race.

The Mexican-American people strongly opposed Proposition 18 and Knowland. With the Negro people, they identified themselves with the Democratic candidates, and continue to seek electoral expression through this party.

The third aspect of independent political development was the Democratic club movement, which has been instrumental in the revitalizing of the Democratic Party in California. This movement generally represents a progressive and grass-roots development, with some 40,000 members state-wide. Though the

gubernatorial candidate, Brown, side-tracked the clubs during the campaign, other state candidates continued to work with them and to rely strongly on them, as did many local candidates.

THE PARTY'S POLICY

The policy of the Communist Party was geared to the realities of the electoral situation in California. We had some influence on the election. We helped to unify the Left, and together with most of the Left progressive forces added a vital element to the elections. In many areas the role of the Left was recognized by some trade-union leaders.

Our policy was resisted by some in the Party. There was passive opposition from those who resist the idea of the Party playing any role in mass activities, or attempting to give leadership to any aspects of the class struggle.

The main active opposition, however, came from the other side—from comrades who attacked our policy as being tailist. The Party issued a leaflet challenging Knowland as a spokesman for the monopolists, and exposing the fact that his candidacy brought the fascist fringe into California politics. It raised the perspective of mass independent electoral development by labor, the Negro and Mexican-American people and the farmers, leading to the emergence of their own political party, and with a section proclaiming our adherence to a socialist solution

of the contradictions of capitalist society. This the leftists in our Party attacked as being a statement "which could have been issued by any Democratic club."

Knowland also didn't like the leaflet. His campaign manager made a public attack against it, which the Party answered through statements to the press which received considerable publicity.

During the course of the election campaign, a conference was held in San Francisco which formed the Independent Voters of California. The Hallinan and Trotskyite elements attempted to convert this conference into a so-called Socialist Unity Party or Committee, but the overwhelming majority of those attending voted to set up the Independent Voters of California as a non-partisan organization. The Independent Voters has the possibility of making a contribution in the electoral and legislative struggles which will now emerge in this state and nationally.

The *People's World* played a very important role in the campaign. It helped to clarify the main issues and to unite the progressives in the state. Special supplements were printed and distributed on Proposition 18 with some 50,000 copies distributed in California. Many thousands of copies of a special supplement on the Little Rock crisis were also distributed.

The elections show that labor and its allies still operate through the Democratic Party, and there are no important signs of breakaways from these ties. Some in the Left and the

Party tend to ignore this, and have advocated abortive third-party moves or, in some cases the limiting of activities to Proposition 18 and certain other propositions on the ballot.

We must hold firmly to a policy of working within the main channels through which labor and the Negro people operate in these elections. At the same time, it is important that labor and the Mexican-American people continue to strengthen the important developments toward independent political action which developed during this election struggle.

PERSPECTIVES FOR INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION

In order to accomplish this, it is important that labor advocate its own program, both within the Democratic Party and independently, before Congress and the Legislature. The attempts made to win allies in the fight against Proposition 18 should continue. The state merger convention of the AFL-CIO has adopted an advanced program on civil rights and taxation which will aid in this direction. Growing ability to concern itself with the demands and needs of its allies will be a key factor in the growth of political independence of both labor and its allies.

The fight to maintain the machinery established in the course of this election will be strengthened if labor plunges into the legislative fight which will emerge in Sacramento and Washington. Many cities will have municipal elections this year

and there is some evidence that some labor leaders see the importance of labor playing a much more positive role in these elections.

A second aspect of the growth of political independence has to do with the developments in the Negro and Mexican - American communities. Some degree of unity between the two was developed through the activities of the Minorities Committee of the Democratic State Council of Clubs. This committee, which emerged more strongly in Southern California than in the North, was instrumental in guaranteeing the nomination of Lopez for Secretary of State. His strong showing is not lost on the minority peoples in this state.

We have already indicated the demands made on the Democratic Party and labor by the *Sun Reporter*. The fight for an FEPC law will be one of the major issues of the state legislature. In fact, Governor-elect Brown has presented a state FEPC bill as his number one legislative measure.

The increasing activity of the Minorities Committee, and such centers as the Communities Service Organization in the Mexican-American community will be important for the strengthening of the independent political activities of the minorities in this state.

The Democratic club movement is now at a critical stage. The pressure from Governor Brown and many other Democratic incumbents is in the direction of drastically playing down the club organization. Brown's

insistence on campaigning separately from the club organization and the other state-wide Democratic candidates had a negative effect on some clubs and created real problems for some of the candidates for other offices, who were left without needed funds and material.

Some state officers and many local incumbents, however, are determined to help the clubs. Indeed, the club organization gives every evidence of having the vitality and ability not only to weather the storm, but to increase its role. The clubs have established a sub-committee to work out a state legislative program for the January session, and have elected a full-time legislative representative. They have also established a sub-committee to prepare for an issues conference in March, which, if successful, can mark an important turning point and set the club movement on the path to increased accomplishments.

The small farmers in California are in political ferment. From 1950-54, 10% of the California farmers were driven out of farming.

This process has accelerated, and today there are less than 90,000 farmers in this state—a 25% decline since the Eisenhower Administration began its policy of eliminating the "inefficient" farms.

This process includes the integration of the farms with corporations as one aspect of their entire operation. Many independent farmers in this process have become contract growers, and thus an integral part of one big operation, working for the

same boss as the workers in town.

This is having important political repercussions in California politics. In farm areas, where the supporters of Proposition 18 expected a big vote, the farmers voted with labor. This was especially true in those areas where agricultural laborers predominate. Today the farmers are strong supporters of a drastically improved state minimum wage law. Thus, the beginnings of the farmer-labor unity in the elections offer good potentials for future development.

There is a need for a left-progressive legislative program. FEPC has already emerged as the number one legislative issue in California, and possibilities exist for additional legislation such as outlawing discrimination in housing. Taxation will be a major issue in the state legislature as well as in Congress. The AFL-CIO merger convention has adopted an advanced program and the Democratic club organization is pledged to a tax program based on ability to pay.

The Party and the Left need also to consider challenging the po-

sition of labor in support of the Kennedy-Ives bill and calling only for amending the Taft-Hartley Act, and to take a position calling for opposition to the former and full repeal of the latter.

There will be important legislative struggles relative to the problems of agricultural labor in California, and around Public Law 18, relating to importation of nationals from Mexico and other countries as farm labor. Other important issues include the fight for a higher state minimum wage, certain school issues, water and power, aid to California farmers, and unemployment compensation.

Within the framework of these key issues, the Left-progressive forces need to try to unite on program and activities on those questions which will advance the entire movement, and help the further development of independent political action of labor and its allies. The potential exists for the emergence by 1960 of a state-wide coalition which can help bring the independent developments to a new level in California politics.

The Ohio Elections*

By A. Krchmarek

NATIONALLY THE November elections reflected a qualitative change in the political trends in our country. The Ohio results expressed this even more deeply. A number of important results were achieved: (1) a 2-1 defeat of the "right-to-work" proposal; (2) the defeat of Senator John Bricker; (3) the defeat of Republican Governor O'Neill; (4) the election of a Democratic majority to the state legislature; (5) the emergence in embryo of an electoral coalition of labor, the Negro people, farmers, church and other groups.

The merger of the Ohio AFL-CIO was the solid foundation for the development of united and effective independent political activity of labor. Previously, in the absence of such unity, a Senator Taft could flaunt his toryism and win, and the CIO suffered defeat when it submitted a referendum proposal to increase unemployment benefits.

The merger, however, made possible a maximum mobilization of the 1,250,000 trade-union members for active struggle in the elections. The threat of a "right-to-work" issue posed by the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce, was decisive in bringing about an unprecedented

level of labor activity.

Even so, the top leadership of the unions at first considered the job of defeating this issue as quite hopeless, basing itself on past experience. It was very much on the defensive. Because of this, only limited efforts were made to nominate labor candidates, or to influence strongly the Democratic program. Also the Democratic candidates tried, at first, to straddle the controversial issues and evade taking a stand on the RTW.

But this changed quickly when the inner union struggle on whether to compromise or to fight it out was resolved and all forces set in motion. A United Labor Committee, embracing all unions, was set up on state and regional levels to wage the campaign. This welded firmly labor's unity of action and provided the conditions for unleashing to the fullest the massive participation and initiative of the rank and file.

Given these conditions, no political machine or party could even hope to match the dynamic energy and vitality of the trade-union rank and file, its ability to mobilize the masses for whatever had to be done. Moreover, this activity was essentially vol-

untary as distinct from that of the two political machines.

Enormous quantities of printed material were distributed in the shops and communities. In addition to material issued centrally, individual locals had car bumper stickers printed by one printer alone totalling 150,000 copies.

Thousands of union volunteers made history in waging a mass registration campaign in the shops and then extending it to the wards and precincts. A semblance of an independent political machinery began to shape up alongside the apparatus of the Democratic Party, but cooperating closely with its precinct, ward and county organizations.

In reviewing the Republican disaster at the polls, GOP state chairman Ray C. Bliss stated: "The right-to-work amendment did it. It provided a live issue through which the labor leaders were able to turn out a huge off-year Democratic vote." The Republicans had sensed this early, and Bricker had called a conference of fifty of Ohio's top businessmen and begged them to keep the "right-to-work" issue off the ballot. They refused and insisted that the Republican candidates work for its passage.

The Ohio results, therefore, were not merely a Democratic victory, but a labor, and in a larger sense a coalition victory. They emphasized that neither of the two parties can score a major victory without the active, mass activity of labor. The results of this experience will be lasting.

LABOR AND ITS ALLIES

The tempo of the campaign was set in the great industrial and proletarian centers like Cleveland, Akron, Toledo, Youngstown, Dayton, Ohio Valley and many others throughout the state. In these areas the defeat of the RTW was overwhelming. The suburbs of the big cities also showed marked changes in voting. The migration of thousands of industrial workers there, resulting from the construction of new mass production plants beyond the city limits, had a significant impact on voting patterns.

Basing themselves upon this physical aspect, the labor unions made some serious efforts to reach the farmers of Ohio. Unions in each of the industrial centers reached out to the farming areas around them, attended farm organization meetings, set up booths at County Fairs, etc. A complete mailing to every farm family in the state was made twice during the campaign. The result was that of the 88 counties in Ohio, only 16 gave a slight edge in favor of the "right-to-work" law. This was a significant break in the rural areas which had been the backbone of support for Taft, Bricker and conservatism.

An outstanding feature of the elections was the role of the Negro people. The promoters of the RTW law concentrated heavily upon them, playing up to the hilt every weakness of the unions on the job question and existing discriminatory practices in the unions.

* This article, by the Communist Party District Organizer of Ohio, is based on a Report made last December to the National Committee, CPUSA.—Ed.

But the Negro people refused to be taken in by such trickery and demagoguery. They displayed a high level of political and class consciousness—higher than any other sector of the voters. In the nine Cleveland wards most heavily populated by the Negro people the vote against the anti-labor proposal was better than 9 to 1. In Cleveland as a whole the vote was 5 to 1 and in the state 2 to 1.

In the same wards the voters gave DiSalle a 3 to 1 plurality for the governorship, and in the 31st Congressional District Congressman Vanik was re-elected by a 4 to 1 margin over his Negro Republican opponent. Vanik had the full support of labor, campaigned against the RTW measure and for Bricker's opponent, Stephen M. Young, and had a good record in Congress. The Negro voters displayed a high degree of selectivity and were not content simply to have a Negro candidate on the ballot. They were deeply concerned with the issues at stake and measured the candidates on that.

The most serious defect in the Ohio elections was the failure to elect a single Negro to any post, local or state. The Negro candidates were mainly on the Republican ticket and suffered from the Democratic landslide, regardless of all other qualifications. Since the GOP campaigned for the RTW measure, all candidates on their ticket felt the consequences. A reader of the Cleveland *Call-Post* wrote to the editor:

All the fuss is being made because our own people were not elected to

office this year. You say we should vote for our best interest. Well, we black people did that this time. . . . All our people were running on the Republican ticket, and most surely supporting the "right-to-work" bill. And because of this they were against their and our own best interests. And so they went down with old Bricker and do-nothing O'Neill, lost in the Red Sea of Democratic votes.

But the question of Negro representation cannot be treated lightly. The workers and the Negro people are seeking political expression through the Democratic Party. This requires that a determined struggle be waged within the Democratic Party to nominate Negro candidates which would, in essence, assure their election to office, and would strengthen even more the ties of the coalition. Labor, which has lagged badly on this question, should take the lead in fighting for such action.

* * *

The Communist Party recognized from the outset the serious threat to labor posed by the "right-to-work" bill, and the campaign to defeat it was placed at the center of all its work. Its members in the unions, mass organizations, communities and in the Democratic Party made important contributions to the struggle.

The Party raised early the possibility of defeating Bricker at a time when no one, least of all the Democratic Party, considered this possible. Young, in his own words, is "the most uncommitted Senator ever to go to Washington" because no one

thought he could win. The Party also played a vanguard role on the County Charter issue in the Cleveland elections. Its contributions were effective, and were limited only by its means to reach the people.

The Party's position on some of the key issues was brought to the people in printed material distributed by mail, at shop gates, and particularly in the working-class neighborhoods. The response to this material helped to fire the enthusiasm of the membership and embolden it to increasing efforts. They found the warmest response especially in door-to-door distribution and personal contact with people. Results were especially noticeable in the vote where concentrated distribution took place (for example a 15 to 1 vote against RTW).

Moreover, there was a complete absence of red-baiting. The Left and progressive forces were in the midst of strong currents of mass struggle, and no obstacles were placed to hinder their work. Even though much more could have been done, it is a long time since the Party was involved directly in such intense mass activity. For many the question of the role and effectiveness of the Party was answered by experience itself.

But there were also important defects. The mass campaign to defeat the anti-labor measure in Ohio did not find reflection in the pages of *The Worker* and little effort was made to utilize it and build its circulation in the course of activity.

Secondly, the Party did not sufficiently project the issue of peace in

the campaign, even though such issues did emerge and powerful voices did speak out for co-existence, recognition of China, on the peril of H-bomb tests, etc. It also fell quite short in projecting and deepening the concepts of the anti-monopoly coalition, as a basis for further advance in future struggles.

Finally, while the Party took an unequivocal position for Negro representation, a great deal more could have been done, particularly in the trade unions, to focus attention on the Negro candidates and differentiate them from other Republican candidates especially on the right-to-work issue.

* * *

Ohio labor scored an impressive victory in the elections and demonstrated its ability to win support and unite other groups and class forces. For example, City Councils in 26 major industrial centers adopted resolutions in opposition to the "right-to-work" bill. But new problems are rising. Both political machines have been profoundly shaken by labor's independent activity, the huge registration and vote it piled up, the new prestige it gained. They look with foreboding to the next two years. They are already maneuvering in an obvious effort to negate labor's gains.

Thus, State Senator Charles J. Carney, a staff organizer of the Steel Union in the Youngstown District, was the logical choice for the majority leader in the next session of

the Senate. But DiSalle, working with the big city machines, opposed his selection. Failing to achieve this in the Democratic caucus, he appealed to Butler, national chairman of the Democratic Party, to intervene with Griffin, district director of the union, to force Carney's withdrawal, which was done. Similar manipulations are in progress elsewhere. These emphasize the need for far greater attention to the work within the Democratic Party by labor and its allies to defeat such actions.

Nor is the matter of independent political activity fully settled within labor's own ranks. Some in the leadership simply want to forget the whole thing, "heal the wounds and bitterness engendered in the struggle," and return to the old ways. But others are challenging this attitude. The top leaders of the Ohio AFL-CIO sent a letter to all trade-union members urging:

Let us retain intact the political organization which, in the fire and urgency of self-preservation, we so marvelously fashioned. It would be a pity and a tragic waste if we permit the political experience and organization we built in these past months to evaporate and slip away for lack of attention and use. Don't discard the most effective political spirit and mechanism ever created by labor in Ohio. We must sharpen these for the future.

Already new challenges, new struggles, new battle lines are shaping up. Mass unemployment in Ohio is a con-

tinuing problem (101,000 on BUC rolls in January, 1959), and many more jobs are in danger from automation and technological advances. Because of this, workers in basic industries are aroused over the recent action of the Ohio Supreme Court ruling SUB payments illegal in this state.

The Ohio AFL-CIO has called a legislative conference to prepare its program to submit to the Ohio legislature. This includes the legalization of SUB and increase and extension of unemployment compensation. Preceding this by one day, a state-wide conference has been called for the passage of an Ohio FEP bill, and efforts are being made to merge the struggles of labor and the Negro people on these vital issues.

There will, of course, be other issues of direct interest to the people including minimum wages, taxes, old age pensions, public utility grabs, etc., demanding coordinated mass action on a coalition basis. In Cleveland there are such questions as increasing police harassment of the Negro people, decent housing, and the fight for a people's County Charter.

In the approaching municipal elections, strong efforts are needed to promote and to guarantee the nomination and election of labor and Negro candidates to posts in the local governments, and thus further to advance the independent role and activity of labor and the Negro people.

Great economic struggles lie ahead.

One of the first will be that of the steel workers for a new contract. To win this key struggle, they will need inner-union unity, fighting spirit, and fullest support from all organized labor, the Negro people and other sections of the people.

It is clear that a sober, serious approach by the advanced forces is needed to help shape and influence the course of the economic, electoral and political battles now

coming up. Any "leftist," infantile move to isolate the Party and the Left forces must be vigorously challenged and defeated.

The period ahead calls for intensified work to create a mass anti-monopoly movement in the U.S. In this the Communist Party can make a valuable contribution toward clarifying issues and class relationships, and in preparing for the next advances.

"Plainly, the sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word liberty; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures, even in the North, and all professing to love liberty. Hence we behold the process by which thousands are daily passing from under the yoke of bondage hailed by some as the advance of liberty, and bewailed by others as the destruction of all liberty."

—Abraham Lincoln, speaking in Baltimore, April 18, 1864.

On Questions Concerning People's Communes

By Central Committee, CP of China

The development of the commune movement among over half a billion Chinese is one of the great events in history and has stirred world-wide discussion, and harrowing distortion in most of the U.S. press. A basic analysis of its nature was made in a Resolution on the question adopted by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on December 10, 1958. For the first time, in any American publication, this momentous document is being published in full in this magazine; because of its length, it will appear in two parts with the second half coming in our March number—The Editor.

IN 1958, A NEW social organization appeared fresh as the morning sun above the broad horizon of East Asia. This was the large-scale People's Communes in the rural areas of our country which combine industry, agriculture, trade, education and military affairs and in which Government Administration and Commune management are integrated. Since their first appearance the People's Communes, with their immense vitality, have attracted widespread attention.

The movement to set up People's Communes has grown very rapidly. Within a few months, starting in the summer of 1958, all of the more than 740,000 agricultural producers' co-operatives in the country, in compliance with the enthusiastic demands of the mass of peasants, had re-organized themselves into over 26,000 People's Communes. Over 120,000,000 households, or more than 99 per cent of all the peasant households of various nationalities in China have joined the People's Communes. This shows that the emergence of the People's Com-

munes is not fortuitous; it is the outcome of the economic and political development of our country, the outcome of the Socialist rectification campaign conducted by the Party, the Party's general line for Socialist construction and the great leap forward of Socialist construction in 1958.

Although the rural People's Communes were only established a short while ago, the mass of the peasants are already conscious of the obvious benefits they have brought them: labor power and means of production can be brought under unified management and deployment on a larger scale than before to ensure their still more rational and effective use and consequently facilitate the development of production. Under the unified leadership of the Commune, industry, agriculture (including farming, forestry, animal husbandry, side-occupations and fishery), trade, education and military affairs have been closely co-ordinated and rapidly developed. In particular, thousands and tens of thousands of small factories have mushroomed in

the rural areas. To meet the pressing demands of the masses, the Communes have set up large numbers of community dining rooms, nurseries, kindergartens, "homes to honor the aged" and other institutions for collective welfare, which have, in particular, completely emancipated the women from thousands of years of drudgery in the kitchen and brought broad smiles to their faces. As the result of the bumper crops, many Communes have instituted a system of distribution that combines the wage system with the free supply system; the mass of peasants, both men and women, have begun to receive wages and those families which in the past constantly worried about their daily meals and about their firewood, rice, oil, salt, sauce, vinegar and vegetables, are now able to "eat without paying for it." In other words, they have got the most important and most reliable social insurance.

For the peasants, all this is epoch-making news. The living standards of the peasants have been improved and they know from practical experience and the prospects of the development of the Communes, that they will live a still better life in the future.

The development of the system of rural People's Communes is of even more profound and far-reaching significance than this. It has shown the people of our country the way to the gradual industrialization of the rural areas, the way to the gradual transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people in agriculture, the way to the gradual transition from the Socialist principle "to each according to his work" to the Communist principle "to each accord-

ing to his needs," the way to the gradual diminution and final elimination of the domestic functions of the State.

* * *

All this has proved that the Resolution on the establishment of People's Communes in the rural areas adopted in August, 1958, on the basis of the creativeness of the masses, by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party at its Peitaiho meeting, is correct and is of historic significance.

People's Communes have now been set up as a general rule in all rural areas inhabited by peoples of various nationalities (except in Tibet and in certain areas). Some experiments have also begun in the cities. In the future, the urban People's Communes, in a form suited to the specific features of cities, will also become instruments for transformation of the old cities and construction of the new, Socialist cities; they will become the unified organizers of production, exchange and distribution and of the livelihood and well-being of the people, social organizations which combine industry, agriculture, trade, education and military affairs and in which Government administration and Commune management are integrated.

There are, however, certain differences between city and countryside. Firstly, city conditions are more complex than those in the countryside. Secondly, Socialist ownership by the whole people is already the main form of ownership in the cities, and the factories, public institutions and schools (except part of the family members

of workers and staff) under the leadership of the working class have already become highly organized in accordance with Socialist principles; therefore, the switch-over of cities to People's Communes inevitably raises some requirements different from those in the rural areas. Thirdly, bourgeois ideology is still fairly prevalent among many of the capitalists and intellectuals in the cities; they still have misgivings about the establishment of Communes—so we should wait a bit for them. Consequently, we should continue to make experiments and, generally speaking, should not be in a hurry to set up People's Communes on a large scale in the cities. Particularly in the big cities, this work should be postponed except for the necessary preparatory measures. People's Communes should be established on a large scale in the cities only after rich experience has been gained and when the sceptics and doubters have been convinced.

The rural People's Communes which have already been established have not had time to consolidate their organizations, perfect their working systems, systematically settle the new questions concerning production, distribution, livelihood and amenities, management and administration which have arisen with the establishment of the Communes. This is because the Communes were only recently set up and most of them immediately after their establishment threw themselves into the heavy work of the autumn harvest, ploughing and sowing and the nation-wide campaign for iron and steel. There is as yet insufficient experience of successfully running and developing the People's Communes. Different approaches to certain questions are unavoidable.

The urgent tasks at present are to quickly achieve a unity of views on the Communes among all members of the Party and among the people, strengthen the leadership over the Communes, check up and consolidate their organization, define and perfect their working systems, and improve the organization of production and life in the Communes. Energetic efforts must be made to strengthen those Communes which have already set up their basic structure, so that they will be in a position to carry out ever more successfully their great mission of promoting the development of the productive forces and the relations of production.

* * *

The People's Commune is the basic unit of the Socialist social structure of our country, which combines industry, agriculture, trade, education and military affairs; it is, at the same time, the basic unit of organization of Socialist State power. Marxist-Leninist theory and the initial experience of the People's Communes in our country enable us to foresee now that the People's Communes will quicken the tempo of Socialist construction and constitute the best form for realizing the following two transitions in our country: Firstly, the transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people in the countryside; and secondly, the transition from Socialist to Communist society. It can also be foreseen that in the future Communist society, the People's Commune will remain the basic unit of social structure.

From now on, the task confronting the people of our country is: through such a form of social organization as

the People's Commune, and based on the general line for Socialist construction laid down by the Party, to develop the social productive forces at high speed to advance the industrialization of the country, the industrialization of the Communes, mechanization and electrification of agriculture and to effect the gradual transition from Socialist collective ownership to Socialist ownership by the whole people, thus fully realizing ownership by the whole people in the Socialist economy of our country, and gradually building our country into a great Socialist land with a highly developed modern industry, agriculture, science and culture. During this process, the Communist factors are bound to increase gradually and these will lay the foundation both in material and spiritual conditions for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

This is a gigantic and extremely complex task. In the light of experience already gained and under the concrete conditions obtaining in our country, it is possible that Socialist ownership by the whole people may be fully realized at a somewhat earlier date, but it will not be very soon. Though the pace at which we are advancing is fairly rapid, widespread realization of the industrialization of our country, industrialization of the Communes and mechanization and electrification of agriculture in building a Socialist country with a highly developed modern industry, agriculture, science and culture, will still take a very long time. The completion of this whole process will take 15, 20 or more years, counting from now.

The imperialists and those who parrot them say that this time is too short for us to build a highly developed modern

industry, agriculture and science and culture, and that we won't be able to achieve our aim. We have got used to such tunes; there is no need to pay attention to them; it is inevitable that the facts will batter these people down time and time again.

But there will be other people who will say that this time is too long. They are good-hearted people from our own ranks, but they are over-eager. They think that the building of a highly developed modern industry and so on, full realization of Socialist ownership by the people as a whole, or even the attainment of Communism, is something quite easy. They think that ownership in the rural People's Communes is even now of the nature of ownership by the people as a whole, and that very soon or even now they can dispense with the Socialist principle of distribution according to work and adopt the Communist principle of distribution according to needs. That is why they cannot grasp the fact that the Socialist system will have to continue for a very long time. This view, of course, is the result of misunderstanding and such misunderstandings must be cleared up.

It should be pointed out that the switch from agricultural producers' cooperatives to People's Communes, the transition from Socialist collective ownership to Socialist ownership by the people as a whole and the transition from Socialism to Communism are processes which are inter-connected but are, at the same time, distinct from each other.

* * *

First of all, the switch from the agricultural producers cooperatives to the

People's Communes has expanded and enhanced the original collective ownership and contains certain elements of ownership by the whole people, but this does not mean to say that collective ownership in the countryside has been transformed into ownership by the whole people. Now the whole Chinese countryside has switched over to People's Communes, but a certain period of time will have to pass before ownership by the whole people is realized throughout the countryside.

True, the establishment of the People's Communes has indeed added certain elements of ownership by the whole people to the collective ownership economy. This is because the rural People's Communes and the basic organizations of State power have been combined into one; because the banks, stores and other enterprises owned by the whole people originally existing in the countryside have been placed under the management of the Communes; because the Communes have taken part in establishing certain industrial and other constructive undertakings which are by nature owned by the whole people; because in many counties federations of communes exercising a unified leadership over all the People's Communes in the given counties have been formed and have the power to deploy a certain portion of the manpower, material and financial resources of the Communes to undertake constructive undertakings on a county-scale or over (this has already started in many areas), and so on. But at the present time the means of production and products of the rural People's Communes are in the main still collectively owned by the Communes and differ from those of the State-owned enterprises which belong to the whole

people. Both collective ownership and ownership by the whole people are Socialist ownership; but the latter is more advanced than the former because the State representing the whole people can directly make a unified and rational distribution of the means of production and products of enterprises owned by the whole people according to the requirements of the national economy as a whole, while this cannot be done by enterprises run under collective ownership, including the rural People's Communes of the present type.

To gradually promote the transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people, federations of Communes in a county should be established widely throughout the country in the coming years. On the basis of the energetic development of production and enhancement of the people's political understanding, such federations should take suitable steps to increase gradually the proportion of their means of production which come under ownership by the whole people and the proportion of their products which are subject to unified distribution by the State, and, when conditions mature, change collective ownership into ownership by the whole people. If timely steps are not taken to promote and complete this change and if the existing collective ownership be left intact with the result that Commune members confine their attention to a relatively narrow scope of collective interests, the continuous development of the social productive forces and the continuous enhancement of the people's political understanding will be impeded. This is not proper.

However, it must be pointed out that collective ownership still plays a positive role today in developing pro-

duction in the People's Communes. How soon the transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people will be effected is determined by the objective factors—the level of development of production and the level of the people's political understanding—and not by mere wishful thinking that it can be done sooner or later. Thus, this transition will be realized, by stages and by groups, on a national scale only after the lapse of a considerable time.

Those who, because of failure to understand this, confuse the establishment of People's Communes with the realization of ownership by the whole people and make any impetuous attempt to negate collective ownership in the countryside prematurely and hastily carry out a change-over to ownership by the whole people, will be doing the wrong thing and therefore cannot succeed.

Furthermore, the change from Socialist collective ownership to Socialist ownership by the whole people is not the same thing as a switch-over from Socialism to Communism. Still less is the change from agricultural producers' co-operatives to People's Communes the same thing as the change from Socialism to Communism. The change from Socialism to Communism will require much more time even than the change from Socialist collective ownership to Socialist ownership by the whole people.

* * *

True, the free supply system adopted by the People's Communes has in it an embryo of the Communist principle of distribution according to needs; the policy of running industry and agricul-

ture simultaneously and combining them, carried out by the People's Communes, has opened up a way to reduce the differences between town and countryside and between worker and peasant; when the rural People's Communes pass over from Socialist collective ownership to Socialist ownership by the whole people, these Communist factors will grow further. All this must be acknowledged. Moreover, with social products becoming increasingly plentiful thanks to the continuous advance of industry and agriculture throughout the country; with the proportion of what is supplied gratis under the distribution system of the People's Communes gradually growing larger and the standards of free supply being gradually raised; with the consistent raising of the level of the people's political understanding; with the constant progress of education for the whole people; the gradual reduction of the differences between mental and manual labor; and the gradual diminution of the domestic function of the State power, etc., the conditions for the transition to Communism will **also gradually mature**. It is of course not proper to ignore or even impede this course of development and relegate Communism to the distant future.

Nevertheless, every Marxist must soberly realize that the transition from Socialism to Communism is quite a long and complicated process of development and that throughout this entire process society is still Socialist in nature. Socialist society and Communist society are two stages marked by different degrees of economic development. The Socialist principle is "from each according to his ability and to each according to his work"; the Com-

unist principle is "from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs." The Communists system of distribution is more reasonable, but it can be put into effect only when there is a great abundance of social products. In the absence of this condition any negation of the principle of to each according to his work will tend to dampen the labor enthusiasm of the people and is therefore disadvantageous to the development of production, to the increase of social products, and hence to speeding the realization of Communism.

For this reason, in the income of Commune members, that portion of the wage paid according to work done must occupy an important place over a long period and will, during a certain period, take first place. In order to encourage the labor enthusiasm of Commune members and also facilitate satisfaction of their complex daily needs, the Communes must strive to increase the wages of their members gradually and, for a number of years to come, must increase them at a rate faster than that portion of their income that comes under the heading of free supply. Even after the transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people, the People's Communes will, over a necessary historical period, retain the system of distribution according to work done owing to the fact that there is not as yet an abundant enough supply of social products to realize Communism. Any attempt to negate prematurely the principle of distribution according to work and replace it with the principle of distribution according to needs, that is, any attempt, when conditions are not mature, to enter Communism

by over-reaching ourselves—is undoubtedly a utopian concept that cannot possibly succeed.

* * *

Both the transition from Socialist collective ownership to Socialist ownership by the whole people and the transition from Socialism to Communism must depend on a certain level of development of the productive forces. Production relations must be suited to the nature of the productive forces and only when the productive forces develop to a certain stage will certain changes be brought about in production relations—this is a fundamental principle of Marxism. Our comrades must bear in mind that the present level of development of the productive forces in our country is, after all, still very low. Three years of hard battle plus several years of energetic work may bring about a great change in the economic face of the country but even then there will still be a considerable distance to go to reach the goals of a high degree of industrialization of the entire country and the mechanization and electrification of the country's agriculture; and there will be an even longer distance to go to reach the goals of an enormous abundance of social products, of a great lightening of labor and of a sharp reduction of working hours. Without all these, it is, of course, impossible to talk about entering a higher stage of development in human society—Communism.

Therefore, since we are devoted to the cause of Communism, we must first devote ourselves to developing our productive forces and working energetically to fulfill our plan for So-

cialist industrialization. We should not groundlessly make declarations that the People's Communes in the countryside will "realize ownership by the whole people immediately," or even "enter Communism immediately," and so on. To do such things is not only an expression of impetuosity; it will greatly lower the standards of Communism in the minds of the people, distort the great ideal of Communism and vulgarize it, strengthen the petty bourgeois trend towards equalitarianism and adversely affect the development of Socialist construction.

On the question of transition from Socialism to Communism, we must not mark time at the Socialist stage, neither should we drop into the Utopian dream of skipping the Socialist stage and jumping over to the Communist stage. We are advocates of the Marxist-Leninist theory of uninterrupted revolution. We hold that no great wall exists or can be allowed to exist between the democratic revolution and the Socialist revolution and between Socialism and Communism. We are at the same time advocates of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the development of revolution by stages; we hold that different stages of development reflect qualitative changes and that these stages of different quality should not be confused.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee has pointed out clearly in its August resolution on the establishment of People's Communes in the rural areas that in the case of the People's Communes:

"The transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people is a process, the completion of

which may take less time—3 or 4 years—in some places, and longer—5 or 6 years or even longer—elsewhere. Even with the completion of this transition, People's Communes, like State-owned industry, are still Socialist in character, where the principle of 'from each according to his ability and to each according to work' prevails. After a number of years, the social product will increase greatly, the Communist consciousness and morality of the entire people will be raised to a much higher degree, universal education will be instituted and developed, the differences between worker and peasant, town and countryside and mental and manual labor—legacies of the old society that have inevitably been carried over into the Socialist period, and the remnants of unequal bourgeois rights which are the reflection of these differences—will gradually vanish, and the function of the State will be limited to protecting the country from external aggression but will play no role internally. At that time Chinese society will enter the era of Communism where the principle of 'from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs' will be practiced."

In order to clarify misunderstandings about the People's Communes and ensure the healthy development of the People's Communes' movement, extensive and repeated publicity and education based on this Marxist-Leninist point of view must be seriously carried out throughout the Party and among all the people of China.

(To be concluded in the next issue)

The Lessons of the French Elections

By Editorial Board, "Cahiers du Communisme"*

THE DOMINANT FEATURE of the political situation on the morrow of the legislative elections is the importance of the successes won by the party of extreme reaction, and even of fascism—the U.N.R. It is, to begin with, the party of Big Business and of the banks, with delegates like Dassault, of the aeronautic industry, and leaders like Chalandon of the B.N.C.I. Men of the old information networks of the B.C.R.A., and former Vichyites, revived under this new label, sit cheek by jowl in the Central Committee of the U.N.R. and in Parliament with the men of the 13th of May, and of the "Committee of Public Safety" like Delbecque, Neuwerth, or Colonel Thomazo and the leading forces of the Fascist commandos in France, like Biaggi. Along with "independents" of the stripe of Duchet and Pinay, they constitute an overwhelming majority in the Parliament.

What are the reasons for the breaking forth of such a wave of reaction and fascism? To begin with, a deep current of nationalism and chauvinism. For a long time, France was a great world power, in possession of the second largest colonial empire in the world. During the last ten years, a series of setbacks—due to the fact that the bourgeoisie, unable to think any longer of the grandeur of the nation, has seen its

future only within the framework of an outdated colonialism—has led to veritable bankruptcy.

It was not possible for such an empire to be broken up without that event producing profound repercussions among the bourgeoisie and the middle class, and even in certain sectors of the working class. A people brought up for dozens of years in the spirit of imperialism, constantly taught that the grandeur of France was linked with the perpetuation of colonialism, were reduced to frustration and anger.

After the latest reverses experienced in Algeria, the desire to halt the collapse took the form of acceptance of a policy of force, put forward by Soustelle, and by the men of the 13th of May.

In order to convert such a policy into reality, propaganda in favor of a "strong" power, taking full advantage of the deep current of anti-parliamentarianism engendered by so many deceptions, assured the victory of the U.N.R., which had no other program than blind acceptance of the policy of "the man of destiny." The appeals of the leaders of the U.N.R., and of their candidates, often boiled down to one point: follow the leader!

The victory of such a formation thus proves beyond doubt that there has been a weakening of the democratic spirit and of class consciousness, to the advantage of chauvinism and of anti-parliamentarianism.

The U.N.R., and its leader, Soustelle, have great ambitions. The party leaders openly express their intention of infiltrating into the working-class. Like Petain, and the men of the Charter of Labor in an earlier period, the General Secretary of the U.N.R., Roger Frey, on the day after the balloting, was proclaiming that his Party had "risen above class antagonisms." The old idea of class-collaboration, developed by the old R.P.F. under the form of a "Capital-Labor association," made a new appearance with the project of "bringing workers into association with the results of an undertaking"—by tying their wages, of course, to productivity. At the direction of the U.N.R., Albert Marcelet, Director of Personnel at SIMCA, and organizer of a "Workers' and Professionals' Committee for Support of De Gaulle," has been assigned to carry through, in the factories, propaganda for the corporatist and fascist organization for which SIMCA has already provided the model.

Right after its electoral successes—just as during the electoral campaign—the U.N.R. attempted to keep up its double-talk, to present itself as a movement of the center, above parties and classes. This was, moreover, an orientation inspired by De Gaulle himself. After persuading Soustelle to give up the regrouping on the Right that he was envisaging, which carried with it the elimination of the SFIO, De Gaulle—allowing the U.N.R. to use his name in its electoral slogan: "A vote for the U.N.R. is a vote for De Gaulle"—is now undertaking to maintain a tight connection with the classical Right of the Independents, at the same time as he holds in his wake the SFIO and Guy Mollet.

The success of this operation demonstrates the fundamental responsibility of Guy Mollet and of the Socialist Party. The SFIO stirred the chauvinist current among the masses, by its attitudes, not only towards Algeria, with Robert LaCosta, but towards the Suez expedition. Everything was worked out to lead astray the class-consciousness of the French workers, and to drag the working class in the wake of bourgeois chauvinism. Moreover, systematic anti-communism, by making a majority of the Left impossible in Parliament, by dividing the Left and making it powerless, led to the discrediting of the parliamentary system itself, by making sport of it: for it was a terrible disappointment for 12 million Frenchmen who, on January 2, 1956, had voted for a policy of peace in Algeria and of democracy, to see Guy Mollet, on February 6, 1956, aligning himself with the positions taken by the Algerian "ultras," and carrying out a policy of the very colonialism and reaction that the people of France had just condemned. The outcome of this policy was to bring the Republic to its ruin, by giving rein, in Algeria, to those who were plotting against the Republic, and—at home—discouraging and dividing those who were defending it.

Guy Mollet betrayed not only the working-class and the Republic, but even his own Party. Right up to the eve of the elections, he kept before his followers the glittering prospect of seizing upon the spoils of the Communist Party. On the day after the elections, it became evident that his policies had wound up—as Tanguy-Prigent stressed at the Socialist Congress—only in "offering his back to the reactionaries and fascists, for them to stand on." In that operation, the So-

* Theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France. This article, translated by Harold Collins, appears in the December, 1958 issue.—Ed.

cialist Party lost half of its parliamentary representatives. It entangled itself in the path along which the fascists want to drag French policies. And it is not for nothing that Guy Mollet was himself, at Arras, the candidate of Soustelle and of the Fascists of the U.N.R., who called for a huge vote for him!

The December 4th Congress of the Socialist Party has shown that, in spite of the demagogic proclamations of Guy Mollet about his intention to set up a "Left Opposition," his real intention is to go right to the limits of betrayal, not only by collaboration in the government with Soustelle, and with the fascists of the U.N.R., but by involving himself unconditionally, under the very standard of the U.N.R., in upholding the policy of the spiritual leader of the U.N.R.: De Gaulle.

* * *

The only real opposition, capable of gathering together the forces of democracy against the breaking forth of the wave of reaction and fascism, is the Communist Party of France.

The first and second rounds of the elections have furnished the proof of this: from the first round on, the Communist Party of France—with a voting strength of nearly four million, and a percentage of the total vote cast greater than that for "No!" in the referendum—has remained, after twelve years of anti-communist slanders—the first Party of France. In spite of the electoral law—the injustice of which became quite apparent, when with 20 per cent of the votes, the Communists obtained only 2 per cent of the seats—the results of the elections have proven not only that no anti-fascist struggle was possible without the Communists, but also that the Party constituted the directing force

of all republican opposition. In effect, the results have shattered the illusions that certain people were trying to feed, concerning a non-Communist Left which would continue the same anti-communist attitudes as before the referendum.

Our Party's resistance was demonstrated, not only in the number of votes that it obtained, but in the fact that its policy and tactics were understood by the masses. Voters for the Communists approved the tactic outlined by our Central Committee: for Guy Mollet's candidates, neither subsidy nor reward! That is why, in the second round, even when our candidates came in after a socialist, when he had no chance of being elected, we maintained our votes, and often even went beyond the figures in the first round.

That proves that the Communist voters had clearly understood that the Socialist Party could not form a real opposition.

* * *

Our strength flows from the correctness of our political line.

It was and it remains correct, in the struggle for peace in Algeria, and in the solution of the colonial question, to remain unyieldingly faithful at one and the same time to the demands of proletarian internationalism and of the national interest. To set aside the national interests of France in the solution of the Algerian question would have led us not only to violate our principles, but to cut ourselves off from the working-class and the people of France.

It was and it remains correct to defend the principles of the Republic against its enemies—as we have been doing unceasingly since May 13th. To join hands with those who were at-

tacking the Constitution of the Fourth Republic would have led us, not only to stand as security for the anti-parliamentarian campaign, but to blur over the real reasons for the impotence and the disrepute of Parliament: anti-communism, which—by dividing the Left—made impossible those policies of social progress and peace desired by our people.

It was and it remains correct to denounce that anti-communism persisting even among those who—like us—were calling for a "No" vote on September 28th; for that anti-communism has not only been the source of our troubles for eleven years, but—right up to the referendum—was choking off all perspectives for the future.

The essential thing was and remains to have done with that cursed anti-communism, in the interests of democracy and of France itself; and not to keep on carping forever about the "guarantees" that we would have to give to people whose demands on us could only be satisfied if we were to give up being Communists altogether. For their goal is to fit Socialism to the tastes of the petty-bourgeoisie, by demanding the abandonment of the class struggle, of the struggle for socialism, and of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Those, moreover, who were preaching to us to fall into line with these demands of our allies were even able to speak of the almost total collapse of their guiding principles.

It was and it remains correct to show how great and implacable a role is being played by the impoverishment of the working class, especially today, at a time when reductions in hourly wages bring to light the real pauperization of the workers, a pauperization still concealed only a few months back by

certain nominal incomes, ostensibly high, which had been won at the cost of exhaustion, and ever greater wear and tear.

The problems go on: the crisis is developing, reductions in wages and shut-downs increase. More than ever, it is now a question of orienting the struggle for demands directly against the enemy: capitalism, Big Business.

Without giving up just demands concerning social security, family allowances, and the payment of up to 80 per cent of medical and pharmaceutical expenses, it is necessary to demand above all, through the fight for wage rises, that it be Big Business which pays, without placing the burden on the State, which would apparently base its appropriation of the necessary credits on the sum total of taxable incomes. What makes the example of the government's proposition on unemployment insurance so valuable is precisely the fact that it demands that the entire cost be assumed by management. In this area, the ideological struggle must be fundamentally oriented against class-collaboration.

It is fitting also to show the foundations of the national policies of our Party. Our national policies are indissolubly linked with our class policies.

It is because it defends the interests of the working-class that the Communist Party defends the interests of the nation. And that stands out not only in our past attitudes, at the time of Munich, of the Resistance, of liberation, but in our present position on all questions. To begin with, on the problem of Algeria and the Oil of Sahara. Only through agreement with the peoples of North Africa, and of Black Africa, on the basis of mutual understanding and

of equality of rights, can the interests of France be safeguarded, and peace once again established.

But, on the contrary, French big capital and the present government are rushing into negotiations with German and American capitalists for joint exploitation of the Sahara. That can only lead to the aggravation of the conflict and, in the long run, to the ejection of France—especially since continuation of the war requires new loans, leading De Gaulle to go begging for 160 billion francs in Germany, and 40 billion francs supplied by Italy and the Benelux countries.

This policy of submission to the Common Market, a Vatican of six countries in Europe, leads to the creation of a Bonn-Paris axis, based—as the anti-comintern axis was before it—on the struggle against communism and the Soviet Union. At the end of that road lies nothing but further bankruptcy. That is not where the interest of France lies.

* * *

The third task before our Party is the fight for democratic liberties, and the winning back of the Republic.

Republicans of all standings have already been able to judge concretely—from the results—as to the anti-democratic and unjust character of the Electoral law. They have been able to establish beyond question the first violations of the Constitution: Article 66 guaranteeing individual freedom in principle, at the very time when internment camps have already been set up. Secular life is directly threatened, and authoritarian management is being substituted for elected representation in the handling of school funds no less than in the management of hospitals. The right to petition has been abol-

ished by ordinance. Questions which are of vital concern to millions of Frenchmen are being decided by one man, and the Assembly which has just been elected will apparently decline any democratic control over acts of government. Soustelle, along with his factory organizations, moves towards the breaking up of the trade unions and the destruction of labor's freedom.

It is through the denunciation of all these measures, which are contrary to the interests of the working class, of the nation, and of democracy itself, that the gathering of all anti-fascist forces must be accomplished.

In 1934-1936, at a time when fascism had already been victorious in Germany and in Italy, the French workers stopped fascism in our country, thanks to their unity. It was by unity that we rose to the occasion, just as it is from the policies of division and betrayal on the part of Guy Mollet and the Socialist Party that the present situation has emerged. The development of joint action with Socialist workers therefore goes hand-in-hand with the denunciation of Guy Mollet's betrayal.

On all questions directly of interest to Frenchmen today, we must draw up programs of action with which the masses can agree, and we must organize the practical struggles through which to develop mass work. Because the electoral swindle has very seriously reduced our parliamentary representation, the center of our attention has been shifted, from Parliament to mass work.

Henceforth, it is necessary to develop the propaganda activities and the mass work of the clubs and sections, to give a decisive push forward to the independent activity of the masses, in all its forms, from the Young

Communist movement, to the tenants' associations. Contacts must be maintained and developed with republicans of all kinds who have worked with us on the Committees for Defense of the Republic, and in the Committees of Struggle for Peace in Algeria.

In a word, it is necessary to bring new life to all forms of unity down below, among the masses. Such action on the part of the Party holds the promise of great success, for the problems, the difficulties, the contradictions remain, and the men of big capital cannot settle the questions posed by both the crisis and the war.

The vast mass of our people are en-

tering on a new experience; but we must not count on a spontaneous growth of consciousness, nor on an immediate reaction to the miseries they will be enduring.

It is up to our Party—to each and every one of its active workers—to win workers and democratic forces, one by one, away from the fascist enemy, by developing their class spirit, and by showing to all republicans, to all patriots, that it is precisely to the extent that we strengthen a class spirit among the workers that we are defending the national interests, and freedom itself.

Party Program Discussion

TWO FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS

The chief problem in a long-range program for the Party is to determine which are the decisive strategic problems which must be solved in order to achieve Socialism and to define the solution for just these problems. It is not, as sometimes suggested, how to re-define solutions already reached elsewhere in U.S. terms. That is relatively not so difficult.

It is this selection and solution of key problems which have not yet been seriously attempted. Hence there is as yet no draft. The present article is presented as an attempt to begin to fill this gap and in the hope that before too much longer we shall have a collective definition in whatever form, of how our national leadership envisions the road before us. If this is long delayed the discussion will just so long be lacking one of its fundamental ingredients.

Of all the many factors peculiar to the situation of the United States, two have the greatest bearing on our strategic problems.

The first of these factors is the relative lateness of the period when the U.S. enters the road of Socialism. Already while the U.S. remains capitalist, Socialism becomes in fact the strongest world system.

The second of these factors is the strength and role of the U.S. in the capitalist sector.

What conclusions should be drawn from these two peculiarities?

First and foremost, the struggle for peace is not only the most essential of all immediate issues, but sets an objective which, when consolidated and safeguarded, assures the victory of Socialism under conditions of peaceful co-existence. For while Socialism always has been inherently superior to capitalism, today we are in the period of the demonstrations of that superiority before the entire world.

In the long run, peace is mortal to capitalism. It does not determine when or how easily or by what means Socialism arrives. It provides simply the certainty of victory under infinitely more favorable circumstances than the alternative atomic devastation.

Further, the ideology of the cold war and the fake patriotism associated with it is the most powerful political (not economic, directly) means of holding back the workers and the labor movement from socialist concepts.

Considering the role of U.S. imperialism, the first task of our Party *both* in the immediate minimum sense and as Marxist-Leninist, is to secure the peace. If we never did another thing but that, we would earn the gratitude and blessing of every one. Although other efforts for peace have been more extensive we are at an absolutely vital front of the struggle. And not the easiest.

Hence, the period we live in requires that we defeat the cold war to advance

to Socialism. This must be a first strategic objective of our program. How it is defined and handled is certainly open to debate but when it has been well done we will have accomplished a major part of our program job. To finally put this in its proper perspective will be a severe blow to liquidators and "national communists." It also directly opposes the Trotskyite "Peace Through Socialism" with "Through Peace to Socialism."

Secondly, from the dominating position of the U.S. in the capitalist world, it follows that when a turning point is reached in the U.S. there will be practically no effective reactionary intervention from outside. When the U.S., the U.S.S.R. and China are friends who is going to intervene? This clearly applies to Socialism in the U.S. and it is quite different and opposite to the situation of all present socialist nations.

Further, even a considerable turn toward a peaceful and democratic foreign policy plus significant disarmament by the U.S. would release tremendous new reserves of progressive and socialist strength all over the world and so work further to the benefit of the U.S.

To give full scope to the development of peaceful competition, to sharply reduce the repressive role of American imperialism, this is the very special and noble strategic task before our Party and our people.

From the special situation and role of the U.S. it must be concluded that while the struggle for peace is not identical with the struggle for Socialism, nevertheless, there can be no serious struggle for Socialism that does not start from and include the struggle for peace as its cornerstone.

The second decisive program question is the concept of the key role of Negro-labor unity. The importance of this has been emphasized and it will surely occupy a major section of the finished program. However what requires serious thought is this: To reverse the issue from the leading concept of a struggle for minority rights to its logical transformation as a key to the struggle for majority rule.

The question of minority rights remains an important aspect of the general struggle for democratic rights. But not the decisive aspect.

This may be seen by an examination of a third concept of great importance. The concept of majority rule as the essential question of democracy; majority rule promised by capitalism, realized under socialism (see Lenin—*A Corruption of Marxism*, etc.).

The object of winning majority support on the key immediate issues—peace, Negro rights, civil liberties, economic progress—is mainly a question for immediate program. And much progress has been made. A majority even *now exists* or soon will on many of these things.

The question of how to put majority will *into effect* is another matter. Here we get into theory, transition, long-range program.

As a first step we come to the Dixiecrat-reactionary bloc control of Congress. This is a tactical question, true. But also a strategic question of first-rate significance. The struggle for majority rule in Congress against the minority of Monopoly and Dixiecrats *opposes the basic forces* on the issues of the day, forces which will eventually contest the issue of capitalism vs.

Socialism. Not that some important

sections won't shift around, but the basic opponents in a class sense are not fundamentally different.

Majority rule in this sense does not go beyond capitalism. It is majority rule on a limited front—political and social and secondary economic questions. Not majority ownership and control of the economy, which is Socialism itself.

Limited majority rule corresponds to a U.S. equivalent of People's Democracy.

It is a definite term and concept yet flexible enough to cover many stages and relationships of forces impossible to predict or blueprint. The struggle for majority rule will go on from now to Socialism.

Further, it both covers in its limited sense, the immediate objectives and in that respect corresponds to traditional Democratic movements, and at the same time in its more fundamental content illuminates the political superiority and distinctiveness of Socialism. Socialist and bourgeois democracy share certain forms but differ in content.

Our struggle is to maintain that form and give it *more not less content*, until it can be completely transformed with a new content.

At one time Marxists, including Lenin, stated that the democratic tasks in countries like the U.S. have by and large been completed. I think we have to say this is no longer so. The nature of the present war danger and the specific structure of minority monopoly rule in the U.S. with still present fascist tendencies give us two principal democratic tasks (in the limited bourgeois sense); to maintain the peace and to establish majority rule on the immediate issues.

True, these tasks no longer have their original character of capitalism vs. feudalism, but become more identified with workers vs. monopoly capital. Something akin to the transformation of the democratic task of national liberation in these final days of imperialism. The accomplishment of these tasks in the limited democratic sense, brings us face to face with complete and consistent democracy.

This does not answer definitely any questions about form and timing etc., of a farm-labor-Negro or other new party.

However, a fight for majority rule carries certain conclusions. Wherever a section of that majority is today it must be impelled and encouraged to struggle to achieve results on the key issues. Where a form stands in the way—as for instance unity with the Dixiecrats in the Democratic Party (a form suitable for compromise and capitulation to reaction)—that form will have to be discarded and a new form of unity developed. In the case cited, the main effort now should be to oust the Dixiecrats. If a powerful development succeeded in this, obviously we would have a new, unprecedented situation and new problems. If a powerful movement failed to do so we should also have a new situation and problems but of a different sort. This sort of thing a long-range program cannot expound. At least not in detail.

The three questions selected as key questions are mainly dealt with in terms of the period from the present up to a turning point in the struggle against the cold war, up to the early stages of struggle for a transition to Socialism.

Further stages are of course harder to foresee, but in addition the early stages are concentrated on because in the special situation of our nation it may well be that the earlier stages present some of the hardest ideological and practical problems.

Certain it is that labor will neither be able to defend its standard of liv-

ing and conditions nor give leadership to the majority of our people for social progress until it both breaks with the cold war and joins forces with the Negro people. Our long-range program must also help to solve this or it will remain long-range for a very long time.

C. L.

Readers who wish to participate in the Party Program Discussion are reminded that their communications—not over 2,500 words, please—should be addressed to: James S. Allen, Secretary, 23 W. 26th St., New York 3, N.Y.

Readings for

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

DECISION IN AFRICA, <i>by W. Alphaeus Hunton</i>	\$4.00
THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN AMERICAN HISTORY <i>by William Z. Foster</i>	\$6.00
TOWARD NEGRO FREEDOM, <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	
	Paper \$2.00; cloth \$2.75
THE ORDEAL OF MANSART, <i>by W. E. B. Du Bois</i>	\$3.50
HERE I STAND, <i>by Paul Robeson</i>	Paper \$1.00; cloth \$2.50
THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS, <i>by Philip S. Foner,</i>	4 vols. \$15.00
RECONSTRUCTION, <i>by James S. Allen</i>	\$2.00
ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	\$2.00

PAMPHLETS

THE SOUTH'S NEW CHALLENGE, <i>by James E. Jackson</i>	\$.15
MARXISM AND NEGRO LIBERATION, <i>by Gus Hall</i>	.10
NEGRO HISTORY: ITS LESSONS FOR OUR TIME, <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	.15
NEGRO REPRESENTATION—A STEP TOWARD NEGRO FREEDOM, <i>by Pettis Perry</i>	.10
AMERICA'S RACIST LAWS, <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	.10

AT MOST BOOKSTORES OR FROM

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