

political affairs

MARCH 1960 • 35 CENTS

SPECIAL ENLARGED ISSUE

- | | | |
|------------------------|-------|---|
| HYMAN LUMER | [1] | Notes of the Month |
| A. KRCHMAREK | [14] | The Battle in Steel |
| ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN | [25] | The Golden Jubilee of International Women's Day |
| ALICE HAMILTON | [33] | Jane Addams: Gentle Rebel |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [36] | The German Question—
Again |
| ELIZABETH LAWSON | [48] | The Gentleman from
Mississippi |
| WILLIAM Z. FOSTER | [56] | Canada's Fight for Freedom |
| R. PALME DUTT | [62] | Mr. Strachey and the Empire |

Resolutions from the 17th National
Convention, C.P., U.S.A.

[65-96]

On: Party Organization; Youth; Women; Civil Liberties; Farm Question; Puerto Rico; Cuba; and others

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, by Hyman Lumer	\$.10
OUR SIGHTS TO THE FUTURE, by Gus Hall	.15
THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE U.S.A., Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention, C.P.,U.S.A., with the Report of Claude Lightfoot	.10
THE CHALLENGE TO LABOR Resolution adopted by 17th National Convention C.P.,U.S.A.	.10
17th NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A. Reports and Resolutions	2.50
ON THE NATURE OF FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker	.35
THE SOCIALIST WAY, by N. S. Khrushchev	.05
HOW TO MAKE LEAFLETS, by Joe Ford	1.00
THE GERMAN QUESTION, by Herbert Aptheker	.25
THE SOVIET UNION TODAY, by George Morris	.35

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.

Vol. XXXIX, No. 3

MARCH, 1960

political affairs

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Notes of the Month

By Hyman Lumer

I. AMERICAN CAPITALISM AND THE COMMON MARKET

THE SPOTLIGHT focused on American-Soviet relations in recent months has tended to draw attention from another highly important aspect of the world scene, namely the changed relationship of forces within the capitalist camp and the consequent shifting and sharpening of antagonisms among the capitalist powers. These are increasingly coming to the surface, particularly in relation to the impending summit conference.

They were strikingly expressed in the thirteen-nation conference on questions of trade and aid, held in Paris in mid-January. Called on the initiative of the American State Department, whose chief spokesman was Douglas Dillon, Under-Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, the conference was ostensibly designed to promote free trade and the improvement of economic aid to industrially backward countries.

THE DECLINE OF AMERICAN DOMINANCE

The uneven development of capitalism in different countries, which has continued to operate since the war no less than in earlier periods, has produced within the past few years a considerable alteration in the balance of forces within the capitalist world. The Western European countries and Japan, having recovered from the ravages of war, have gone on to expand and modernize their industries to a degree never before achieved. Their economies have grown at a rate greatly exceeding that of the United States, and their share of world capitalist production has consequently increased. Correspondingly, that of the United States has declined, and with it the basis of American dominance has shrunk.

In the sharpening competition for the world market, others have forged ahead at the expense of the United States. Thanks to improved

efficiency of production, these countries have succeeded in competing successfully with American mass-produced goods in fields in which American products once reigned supreme. A particularly impressive example is the auto industry. In 1949, American manufacturers produced 84% of the world's output, those of Western Europe 14%. In 1959, American output accounted for only 56% of the total and Western European output for 41%. Moreover, imported cars had captured 10% of the American market.*

As a result, American exports have fallen off while imports of manufactured goods have risen. And the favorable balance of trade, which ran several billions of dollars a year during most of the post-war period, shrank in 1959 to less than \$1 billion. Meanwhile, the United States has continued to spend several billions a year abroad for military and other aid, maintenance of American troops in other countries, increased investments and similar purposes. The outcome has been a big jump in the balance of payments deficit. For a number of years, the United States spent abroad about \$1 billion more than it made up through its favorable trade balance, but in 1958 and 1959 the deficit rose to \$3.5 billion and \$4 billion respectively.

Accordingly, gold reserves in this

* It is important to note that a substantial proportion of the West European firms are actually owned, wholly or partially, by American corporations. This, however, does not alter the basic fact that production of cars has shifted significantly to Europe.

country have fallen considerably, declining from nearly \$23 billion at the end of 1957 to \$19 billion at the end of 1959, with a weakening of the relative strength of the dollar in world transactions. And there has arisen in important sections of big business an acute fear that foreign creditors may demand gold for the dollars they now hold and set off a run on the United States gold stock.

Clearly, the relative position of American monopoly capital has drastically changed. A decade ago the big problem was European recovery; today this problem has vanished. A decade ago every Western European country wrestled with an acute shortage of dollars and was loudly demanding that the United States lower its bars to imports from Europe; today the "dollar gap" has been converted into its opposite, and it is now the United States which is calling on its European competitors to remove restrictions on dollar imports. A decade ago, Western European monopoly capital relied heavily on American assistance in holding down the revolutionary movement at home and the liberation movements in their colonies; today this reliance is much diminished.

Wall Street can no longer call the tune as it once did. This is bluntly expressed by Raymond Aron, writer for the Paris daily *Le Figaro*, who states that "American leadership scarcely exists any longer." (*New Leader*, December 7, 1959.) He continues:

... for the time being the United States is more dependent on Europe than vice versa. This fact may seem paradoxical, and it is rarely given brutal expression in the press. It was easier for the U. S. to conduct the policies of the West when it lent money throughout the world than under present conditions, when it must discreetly ask the governors of the central banks abroad not to change their dollars into gold.

To be sure, the dominance of American big business in the capitalist world has by no means vanished. But it is equally clear that the days of nuclear monopoly and the Marshall Plan are gone, and that United States monopoly capital is today confronted by far more powerful competitors than before.

It is essential to take note that the changed balance of forces within the capitalist sector of the world has developed within the context of the even more profound shift in the relationship of forces between it and the socialist sector. It is the latter which has become the decisive factor in today's world. Now the forces of capitalism can no longer seriously entertain dreams of the destruction of socialism. Instead, they must contend with an invincible socialist world whose advance increasingly encroaches on their imperialist domination abroad and on their hold over the workers in their own countries.

THE COMMON MARKET

Such are the circumstances in

which the Western European monopolists have begun to assert their increased strength relative to American capitalism. Among the main expressions of this is the development of the European Economic Community, or the Common Market, which was established in 1957 and began operation in January, 1959. Composed of West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, it was set up with the announced purpose of "integrating" the economies of these countries.

It projected a process of tariff reduction among its members, looking forward to the elimination of all trade barriers by about 1970, as well as the establishment by that date of a common tariff on imports from outsiders. Its planners envision the "harmonizing" of wage levels, social security provisions, monetary measures and other aspects of their economies. Already certain "supranational" agencies have been set up, in the form of a common ministers' council, a common assembly and a court of appeals, to deal with the projected steps in "integration." And its chief architects envisage as its ultimate goal nothing less than political federation—the creation of a United States of Europe.

The combined resources of the six Common Market countries do indeed constitute a formidable economic force. With a population nearly equal to that of the United States, they provide a combined internal market large enough to afford

the full advantages of mass production. Their combined industrial output is, to be sure, considerably less than that of the United States, but it is rapidly growing.

On its face, therefore, the process of integration might seem to offer genuine prospects of increasing trade and production and improving the living standards of the working people of these countries. The reality, however, is something quite different.

The desire for "integration" has its roots in a basic feature of advanced capitalism, namely the growing economic interdependence of individual countries and the development of a world economy. But under capitalism, such relations between nations can find expression only in the oppression and exploitation of the weaker nations by the stronger and in unending struggles for imperialist domination. Hence, while a valid objective basis for economic integration exists, in practice it becomes a device for strengthening the position of the monopolies against the people and for pooling monopoly assets to the advantage of the stronger among them.

Specifically, the European Economic Community is designed, first, to unite the forces of these countries in competition against socialism—in order to wage the cold war more effectively. Second, it serves as a means of providing mutual support in combatting the national liberation movement and preserving the colonial possessions of its members.

Third, it is directed toward the increased exploitation of the working class of each country. Fourth, it provides the higher, more powerful members of the group with a base which strengthens them in their contest with rival imperialisms.*

The heart of the Common Market is the Paris-Bonn axis—an alliance of French and West Germany monopoly capital, with the latter the dominant partner. Basically, it reflects the renewed striving for domination by a revived German imperialism, with the others seeking to benefit from alliance with it in order to protect their own interests. The aim of Adenauer and de Gaulle is the re-establishment on the European continent of a first-rate military block, independent of the United States and Britain, and armed with nuclear weapons.

The latter aim finds expression in the simultaneous establishment by the same six countries of the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom). De Gaulle especially has fought for the provision of France with atomic arms, an effort now capped by the first French nuclear test in the Sahara Desert. Previously he had refused to permit the equipping of U. S. bases in France with atomic weapons unless France was given a share in their control.

The reaction of Britain to these developments was to seek an arrange-

* For a detailed analysis of these and other features, see A. Arzumanyan, "Socio-Economic and Political Background to Western European Integration," *World Marxist Review*, October, 1959.

ment in which British finance capital could be kingpin. The British monopolists rejected membership in the Common Market, unwilling to subordinate themselves to their West German and French rivals or to scrap Britain's preferential trade agreements with the Commonwealth countries. Instead the British sought to establish a European free trade area, embracing the Common Market, based on reduction of internal trade barriers but with each member free to set its own tariffs for countries outside the area. Failing in these efforts (thanks principally to the resistance of France), Britain proceeded in November 1959 to set up a European Free Trade Association composed of herself, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria and Portugal. An "Outer Seven" was thus counterposed to the "Inner Six" and with these there emerged two rival trade blocs in Europe, one dominated by Britain and the other by West Germany—an expression of the struggle between these two powers for domination of Western Europe.

AMERICAN REACTIONS

Initially, the formation of the Common Market was greeted by American ruling circles. They saw in it an economic consolidation of the NATO forces, and, in particular, a strengthening of American imperialism's chief European gendarme, Adenauer Germany. To be sure, it also offered a threat of greater restrictions on American exports but

this, it was confidently felt, could be offset and potential economic advantages could be derived. Such views have continued to be held by some, among them H. J. Heinz II, chairman of the H. J. Heinz Company, who writes (*Saturday Review*, January 16, 1960):

... any regional organization can in practice become a bloc and, like most people, we are apprehensive of blocs of which we are not a member. But having endorsed the Common Market mainly for political reasons we find consolidation in economic considerations.

First we think of the vast market, free from trade restrictions of all sorts, and we feel that in the long run this market may absorb more U.S. goods and services in anticipation of the rise of living standards and capital investment.

Secondly, as foreign investors, we think of expanding outlets and opportunities for American capital investment throughout Europe.

But Mr. Heinz's optimistic views are not shared by most of those in top business and government circles. On the contrary, there is widespread fear of a split of Europe into two trade blocs discriminating against one another and against the United States, thus making further inroads on its already diminished volume of exports and aggravating the deficit in the balance of payments. Today the general view is that the United States is in a dilemma between political advantages and economic penalties. Nor would this be removed

by unification of the "Six" and the "Seven." Says *New York Times* writer Edwin L. Dale, Jr. (January 17, 1960):

The United States is in a hopeless dilemma as to whether it does or does not want a Europe-wide free trading system with tariffs against outsiders. This is the "solution" of the trade split desired by the majority of the nations of Europe, but it is a solution that could hurt United States exports more than the present two blocs.

Neither has the situation brought the desired political advantages, for NATO is today weaker and not stronger. The easing of international tensions has greatly lessened the utility of the "threat" of Soviet aggression as a means of compelling adherence. The fact that the European capitalist nations no longer need to lean on American economic and military strength as in the past has loosened these ties still more. Hence the threat to the existence of NATO has grown.

From the outset, the United States has carried the lion's share of the arming of the NATO forces, and today this share is increasing. In 1959, military spending of the Western European countries fell from 7.6% of total national outlays to 6%, while that of the United States remained at a level of more than 11%. During the past year, the total expenditures of all the European NATO partners for arms was less than \$14 billion, as against \$46 billion in this country. And American demands for

greater European contributions, compelled by the growing balance of payments deficit, have so far proved unavailing.

American ruling circles have sought to counter their mounting problems in a number of ways. They have demanded reduction of bars against dollar imports, with a limited degree of success. They have tacked a "Buy American" provision onto loans from the Development Loan Fund and threaten to extend it to other funds as well. At the same time, they have sought to circumvent the trade restrictions by stepping up American investment in productive facilities in Europe. In the first half of 1959, such investment totalled \$122 million as against \$42 million in the same part of 1958. Between 1950 and 1959, total American investment in Western Europe rose from \$1. billion to \$4.5 billion. "U.S. businessmen," wrote one newspaper recently, "are swarming all over Europe."

THE DILLON PLAN

But such efforts do not suffice to meet the problems of American big business, and it has therefore felt impelled to move, through the Paris Conference, toward the setting up of a single all-embracing trade association including the United States. The conference was dominated by this country, and its main proposals were adopted. Yet, though much was agreed to "in principle," the conference produced singularly little in the way of concrete positive achievement

toward realizing the State Department's aims.

The Dillon Plan presented to it called for a North Atlantic trade bloc consisting of the eighteen countries making up the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (the "Marshall Plan countries") together with the United States and Canada—a bloc in which, clearly, it is intended that the United States shall be the dominant power. The plan has been hailed in this country as a new "economic NATO." But the conference did no more toward its realization than to set up a committee of four to draft plans to be considered at a later date.

The Dillon Plan also calls for the assumption by the European countries of a share in providing aid to underdeveloped areas, a demand which the State Department had been making for some time prior to the conference. In fact, Dillon had complained that the United States, as sole dispenser of aid, was in effect financing the purchases from Europe by the undeveloped countries. Here the response was ready agreement "in principle" accompanied by the insistence of Britain and France that they were fully committed in "aid" within their own empires and of the others that they were already doing all they could. And in this respect, too, the conference went no further than to set up an eight-nation committee to consider the matter.

The conference itself, therefore, solved nothing. No real answer to

the split was arrived at, and no commitments of any kind were made. And the ultimate outcome remains problematical. It is not impossible that some sort of trade bloc can be knocked together, but the outcome so far is eloquent testimony to the reduced influence of American monopoly capital on its rivals.

What is important to note, however, is the real nature of the American aims. Ostensibly the State Department's actions are motivated by such noble goals as the promotion of free trade on a world scale and the development of effective economic assistance to the industrially backward areas. In reality, they represent an effort to overcome the growing rifts in the capitalist camp, to shore up the anti-Soviet alliance, to bolster the world position of U.S. finance capital, and to continue to wage the cold war under the new conditions imposed on the capitalist world.

These actions are designed also to overcome the differences existing over approaches to the coming summit conference and to present a united front to the Soviet Union. Their essence is expressed in the following injunction of Drew Middleton (*New York Times Magazine*, December 13, 1959):

The Soviet Union can be stopped by realistic negotiation over outstanding issues by a united Western coalition led by an American Government that not only knows exactly where it is going, but has stated its direction and its rea-

sons so clearly that there can be no doubts or divergencies among its allies.

In line with this, a central feature of all the proposed measures is that they deliberately exclude the socialist countries. The trade association advocated by Dillon is based not on inclusion of these countries but on continuation of the cold-war trade embargo. And the question of "aid" to other lands is conceived of as a means of combatting the growing economic influence of the Soviet Union and stemming the tide of national liberation. In fact, the latter is today a basic consideration in all moves for "integration" and all trade blocs, from the Common Market on. What the advocates of "free trade" really want is a bloc of the advanced capitalist countries directed against both the socialist world and the countries seeking national liberation.

The Eisenhower Administration has undertaken to promote the spreading of responsibility for foreign "aid" through the establishment of an International Development Authority whose declared purpose is to make long-term, low-interest loans for economic development. It is to have a total capital of \$1 billion with the United States contributing nearly one-third. This would be at best a bare beginning even if it were genuinely motivated. But what is significant is that this is offered *in opposition* to proposals for the handling of such aid through the U.N. with Soviet participation. On this point, C. L. Sulzberger writes in the *New*

York Times (January 20, 1960): "Inside our Administration there have been discussions on the best way to meet the challenge. Some advocated a global aid program in which the free and Communist worlds would work together under the U.N. *It has now been decided to reject that idea.*" (Our emphasis.)

That the American position represents primarily an effort to adjust the continued pursuit of the cold war to the new balance of world capitalist forces is shown also by Eisenhower's recent proposal to give atomic weapons to our "trusted allies," a radical and dangerous departure from the present policy. It follows upon the heels of de Gaulle's insistence that atomic warheads on French soil cannot be controlled by another country exclusively, and is undoubtedly an accommodation to the pressures of the Bonn-Paris axis.

It demonstrates strikingly that these policies lead not toward world cooperation and peaceful coexistence but toward war. Eisenhower's proposal has already evoked widespread protest. Thus, the Federation of American Scientists describes it as "catastrophic folly," and as an act "which would virtually doom us to the ultimate calamity of nuclear war."

AN ALTERNATIVE POLICY

Clearly, any genuine alternative to these policies must be founded upon the concept of agreements which include the socialist countries. The

answer to the need for economic cooperation among the European nations lies not in the formation of blocs based on continuation of the cold war and directed against the Soviet Union, but in the opening of unrestricted trade with the socialist countries and in agreements for economic cooperation among *all* European countries. The relationship of the United States to these in turn must be imbued with the same spirit of ending the cold-war trade embargo, of working to establish mutually beneficial trade relations with all countries and of providing aid to the economically backward areas in concert with the Soviet Union and other socialist lands as well as with other capitalist countries. Only such an approach leads to world peace.

Furthermore, only this approach offers any real prospect of stability in world trade. For the present trade blocs, despite all the rhetoric about their historical permanence, are fundamentally unstable. Not only are they now torn by the conflicting interests of their members, but they will tend to crumble with the first serious storm clouds of economic crisis, as each country strives to insulate itself from the dumping of goods by others. True, genuine stability of world trade is not possible in the boom-bust capitalist economies. But the inclusion of the socialist countries with their large markets and their stable, crisis-free economies, would provide a steadying factor of

advantage to the capitalist countries.

The attainment of policies serving the true interests of American workers entails, among other things, a fresh approach to the question of international labor solidarity. The practice of manufacturing products abroad and importing part of them into the United States, to which big business is increasingly resorting, costs the jobs of American workers. At the same time, the threat of moving production abroad serves as a club against wages and working conditions. And meanwhile, workers in this country are led to blame their plight on cheap foreign labor and to seek solutions at the expense of the workers of other countries.

These practices cannot be successfully fought by such means as raising tariffs on such imports in proportion to wage differentials, which is being advocated by a growing section of the labor movement. In the end, such an approach only helps the employers in their policy of pitting worker against worker.

If the growing interdependence of national economies increasingly compels economic cooperation among nations, and if the monopolies are accordingly impelled to strive to strengthen themselves by interlocking increasingly with those of other countries, as in the "integration" of the Common Market, then certainly these developments demand equally the increasing cooperation and solidarity of the workers of different lands. To a growing extent, the

workers abroad against whom American workers are presumably to be protected are the employees of the same big corporations. In fact, a major part of American imports is produced by American-owned firms abroad.

The creation of depressed areas of chronic unemployment through "runaway plant" policies is not peculiar to the United States, but takes place in the European capitalist countries as well. The shifting of production across national borders, presumably for reasons of greater efficiency, which is one of the features of the Common Market operation, serves to increase the extent and the misery of such depressed areas.

Such problems clearly cannot be dealt with by the workers of each country fighting on their own. The only real answer lies in a *common* struggle against a *common* enemy, in behalf of the working conditions and living standards of *all* workers. In the United States, the seat of the world's most powerful and reactionary imperialist forces, this requires that labor fight firmly against the oppressive policies of American imperialism abroad, not only in Europe but especially in Latin America. It requires an end to the support of the top labor leadership to the cold-war policies of Wall Street and the State Department. It requires an end to its self-assumed disruptive role of anti-Communist policeman of the State Department in the labor movements of other countries.

A common struggle by American labor for world peace, for democracy and for the economic welfare of the working people, side by side with labor's allies at home and with the workers of all other capitalist countries—this is the need of today.

II. THE JAPANESE-AMERICAN TREATY: THREAT TO PEACE

In Europe, the chief bastion of Wall Street's aggressive cold-war policies is West Germany; in Asia, this role is being assumed by the erstwhile Axis partner of Hitler Germany—Japan. The Asian counterpart of the rearming and renazification of Adenauer Germany is the equally sinister remilitarization of Japan. A big step in this direction is the revised American-Japanese Security Pact, signed in Washington on January 19.

The new treaty has been hailed as re-establishing Japanese-American relations on the basis of the full equality and sovereignty of Japan. In reality, however, the effect of the treaty is to establish an aggressive military alliance between the two countries with Japan as the junior partner. It states:

Each party recognizes that an armed attack against either party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes.

The term "either party" is ex-

plained by a further provision giving to the United States "the use by its land, air and naval forces of facilities and areas in Japan." In addition, the treaty provides that both parties "will maintain and develop, subject to, their constitutional provisions, their capacities to resist armed attack"—in other words, for the buildup of the Japanese armed forces.

Thus, the treaty continues the maintenance of American military forces in Japan, and it obligates that country to retaliate against any attack on these American bases, though it has no jurisdiction whatever over them. There are no specific provisions prohibiting the stocking of nuclear weapons on Japanese territory; hence the door is left open to converting Japan into a nuclear arsenal with all the dangers this holds for the Japanese people. In a word, the treaty provides for the rearming of Japan as the main instrument of United States cold-war policies in the Far East, and serves to intensify considerably the menace of war in that area and on a world scale.

Such a treaty as this was negotiated, it should be noted, despite the fact that its main terms are explicitly prohibited by Section 9 of the Japanese Constitution. This section states that "the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation," and continues: "In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea and air forces, as well as other war

potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized." Ironically, this provision was written into the constitution at the insistence of the American occupation forces in Japan, headed by General MacArthur.

Under this provision, the Tokyo District Court had ruled that the stationing of American troops in Japan was unconstitutional. However, an obliging Supreme Court reversed the ruling, on the argument that the court lacks power to pass on the legality of treaties. It was this decision which opened the door to the signing of the revised pact.

This action was taken also in the face of a bitter struggle against it by the trade union and democratic forces of Japan. So strong was the opposition that at one point the Kishi government was compelled to postpone the signing for a year.

The treaty is, however, in the interests of the Japanese ruling class, the *zaibatsu*. These powerful monopoly groups, which were ordered dissolved after the surrender of Japan, have been fully resurrected and are today even more powerful than before the war. The treaty is likewise in the interests of such American monopolies as General Electric, Westinghouse, Standard Oil, Alcoa and others who have substantial holdings in Japanese industry or other profitable relations, and who will profit from the growth of large-scale arms production.

Through the Kishi government,

which has consistently functioned as their faithful servant and spokesman, these big business elements already had begun to rebuild an arms economy, much of it financed with American money in military aid, expenditures for arms by U.S. military forces in Japan, and other forms. And shortly before the signing of the treaty, a new six-year armaments program was launched.

The purposes of American imperialism in all this are clear enough. As one American correspondent in Tokyo expresses it: "The rearmament program is made possible largely through military and economic aid from the United States, granted for the apparent purpose of establishing Japan as an economic colony, a permanent advance base against Asia, a cut-rate arsenal and a source of ground troops for any future war in the East." (John G. Roberts, "Remilitarization of Japan," *The Nation*, December 19, 1959.)

The Japanese warlords have their own aims, however, namely the re-establishment of the dominance of Japanese imperialism in Asia, only this time within the framework of a Tokyo-Washington axis. The rebirth of Japanese militarism, directed toward the accomplishment of these aims, and the possibility of its provision with nuclear weapons, creates a growing menace to the peoples of Asia and to world peace. Nor are the present ruling-class policies, which have led among other things to the severance of diplomatic and

economic relations with People's China, in the best interests of the Japanese people.

Coming at a time when world tensions are easing, when the Khrushchev visit to this country has helped bring the fight for peace and disarmament to a new stage, and when powerful pressures are developing for a change in U.S. relations to People's China, the new treaty is a serious setback to the struggle for peace.

For the American people, it is as vital to fight against the remilitarization of Japan as against that of West Germany.

III. THE FIGHT FOR AN EFFECTIVE RIGHT-TO-VOTE LAW

When the Federal Civil Rights Commission came forward with its proposal for federal registrars to protect the rights of Negroes to vote in the Southern states, it met with an enthusiastic response from all supporters of civil rights. And indeed, such federal intervention to protect the right of Negro voters to cast their ballots is very much needed.

The Commission's proposal, it now appears, has set off a considerable hubbub over civil rights legislation in Congress. Bills bottled up in committees for months are being pushed to the floor. This is, of course, a reflection of mounting popular pressure for action. But it has also another motivation. "The reason," says the *New York Times* (February 7, 1960), "is that under pressures of the coming elections parties and can-

didates are moving to make their records on an issue that will be important in the campaign."

Unfortunately, the discussion now taking place displays very much the earmarks of "making a record." As this is written, there is beginning to develop a rash of proposals and counterproposals which are marked principally by their growing complexity.

The chief proposal which has been presented in opposition to that of the Civil Rights Commission is the bill drawn up by Attorney General William P. Rogers. He objects to the Commission's recommendation on the grounds that the registrar plan would give the prospective voter only a registration certificate that would be rendered worthless by the obstruction practiced against Negroes at the polls; also that it applies only to elections for federal posts. He advocates instead a system of federal referees in which individual complaints are heard by a federal judge, who then appoints referees to investigate further. If their findings are upheld, voting certificates are issued, with contempt action against state officials refusing to honor them.

No doubt the criticisms of the Commission proposal have some merit. But that of Rogers is no less open to criticism. It subjects Negroes seeking to vote to such formidable procedures and possible dangers to themselves that few would attempt to use such machinery. Now Senator Thomas C. Hennings of Mis-

souri is reported to be drafting a bill of his own combining the chief features of both these proposals.

It is impossible at this point to foresee all the gyrations and maneuvers which lie ahead. What is important, however, is that the purpose of such legislation must be not to "make a record" or to get someone elected to office, but to provide a workable system that will in fact enable Negroes in the South to vote with full assurance and security—one that requires them to do substantially nothing more than is required of whites in order to vote.

This will require a considerable amount of federal intervention and protection. But if a law is to be passed which means anything, it must provide for whatever degree of federal intervention is needed to make it work. Clearly, nothing will be gained by the passage of some meaningless piece of legislation, which is what now appears to be in the offing.

Effective right-to-vote legislation can be passed in Congress. As more than one observer has indicated, solid northern support can block a southern filibuster. This can be done if the labor movement and the American people generally make themselves heard in unmistakable terms by every senator and congressman. The crusade for effective civil rights legislation is among the most urgent tasks to be fulfilled in this session of Congress.

The Battle in Steel

By A. Krchmarek

IN THE FIRST WEEK of 1960, the steel workers of America, half a million strong, achieved a significant victory not only for themselves but in a larger sense for the entire working class of this country. It was one of the most important class conflicts of the entire postwar period, reflecting the rising tide of the class struggle, the growing moods of militancy and the changing class relationships.

Locked in battle for more than eight months with the giant steel monopolies—four months on strike and two additional months under a Taft-Hartley injunction imposed by the government—the steel workers forged an over-all unity in their ranks that gained in scope and militancy as the battle went on.

The 116-day strike was the longest in the history of the industry, and surpassed in length even the bitterly fought 1919 steel strike led by William Z. Foster. The workers emerged from this test with their union intact, their ranks more solid than at the outset, and with some gains in wages and benefits.

In the course of the struggle there also began to take shape a growing support of the steel workers by labor on a national scale. This found many forms of expression—the militant

Labor Day parade in New York, meetings in other cities, offers of financial help by other unions, etc. The stand made by the steel workers inspired the entire working class with a new spirit. It will have an important influence on the struggle of millions of workers now facing the monopolies on similar issues.

THE CONTRACT

In assessing the results of this struggle, however, it is necessary to note that the economic gains achieved are the smallest of any since the end of the war. The total package is estimated by the companies at about 39 cents an hour for the life of the contract. But this is a deliberately inflated estimate. If all the exaggerations are eliminated, the actual total is at most 27 cents an hour. In this sense the victory is sharply limited, even using the inflated figure. By contrast, the 1956 package totalled 81 cents an hour.

In a letter to the stockholders, the president of Republic Steel Corporation wrote: "While we did not fully attain our objectives . . . we did, nevertheless, materially slow down the rate of increase in our labor costs. In the past ten years labor costs

in the steel industry have increased 8% a year. The present settlement will reduce this increase to about 3.5% per year in this contract."

While the 17 cents an hour previously won in cost-of-living increases is retained, future raises are sharply limited. The 4-cent increase due on January 1, 1960 under the old contract was eliminated, and the new contract limits such increases to a maximum of 3 cents a year for the next two years. And even this is gutted by the agreement that any future rise in the cost of hospitalization and insurance will be taken out of the cost-of-living allowance.

The best improvement was made on insurance and hospitalization. The 50-50 payment formula was dropped and the companies are now to pay the entire cost. Another new feature is the payment of a lump sum of \$1,500 to a worker at the time of retirement (less his vacation pay for that year, less 3 months pension payments).

The practical result of this is expressed in the forecast that the profits of the steel corporations in 1960 will surpass anything in history. They are justified in feeling that their strategy paid off. "The settlement was a great deal better than the public has been led to believe," said the president of Republic Steel.

THE KEY ISSUE

However, the significance of the

victory lies not in the amount of wages or benefits gained, but *in the ability of the steel workers to defend their union* in the face of a carefully prepared assault by the steel corporations. The central aim of the companies was to achieve a breakthrough on the all-important issue of work rules—to abolish the procedures established in Section 2B of the old contract.

The eight-point demand of the companies on this issue was put forward to give them a free hand, unhampered by the union, to change existing work rules and production practices and to set up new ones. This flows directly from their plans to introduce automation and other changes in production on a wide scale. At this time automation in steel is only in its infancy.

Even in the old contract the companies had a right to introduce new machinery and automation. But their ability to reap the full benefits from this were cramped by the established work rules, giving the union an opportunity to fight to salvage at least some of the jobs.

Through automation the companies cannot only drastically reduce the work force; automation also changes the make-up of the work force. Old skills, old methods, old jobs are abolished. "Cross-crafting" is pushed, speed-up increased. It creates havoc with seniority, with job classifications, with job security. It eliminates the lowest paid and the

highest paid workers. No man's job is secure. For years the companies have kept the hiring of Negroes to the minimum on the pretext of educational qualifications; automation serves them as an excuse to do so to a much greater degree. The work rules are the only protection the steel workers have to meet this threat. The companies carefully planned to eliminate this roadblock in their path, and in the midst of the negotiations they rejected their eight-point demand.

The offensive of the steel companies was conceived as a "pilot" project for a wide assault by monopoly capital upon the entire trade union movement. *Fortune*, the rich man's magazine, stated bluntly: "Wages and work rules in the steel strike are the main issues across the whole front of labor-management relations." Any important breakthrough by the steel companies, therefore, would have signalled a heightened offensive by the employers in other industries, and the pattern set in steel would inevitably have been pursued in all basic industries.

Consequently, in thwarting any big breakthrough on the issue of work rules, the steel workers performed an inestimable service to the American working class as a whole. On this point, A. H. Raskin of the *New York Times*, speaking for the companies, was right in saying: "We took a hell of a licking," even though

in many other respects the "licking" wasn't so bad.

A DEFENSIVE STRUGGLE

Circumstances forced the steel workers to wage a defensive battle, and this imposed definite limitations on their ability to win any important gains. Yet, a defensive struggle under certain conditions can also result in positive advances. As our trade-union resolution [published in the February *Political Affairs*] correctly states, such a defensive action, properly led, can be expanded by the workers into an offensive for more basic objectives. One worker commented: "The battle of Stalingrad was a defensive struggle, but it changed the course of the war against the Nazis." It is in terms of its class meaning and content that this struggle, too, must be weighed and assessed.

Two class giants met in battle. One was fully armed, fully prepared in every respect, with the weight of advantage on its side at the outset. The steel workers on the other hand entered the struggle with severe handicaps. At the outset their ranks were far from united. Illusions and apathy prevailed. Only limited preparations had been made for the battle. And the ideological offensive of the corporations had taken its toll.

The top leadership of the union was deeply imbued with class collaborationist concepts of "mutual

trusteeship" and "labor-management partnership." They did not anticipate nor did they make serious preparations for the severe storm that was looming ahead.

No real testing of the unity and fighting capacity of the steel workers had taken place since the 1946 strike. Concessions on wages and benefits had been gained for the most part without serious conflicts, although some serious battles had occurred. Long periods of relative prosperity had created many illusions. The top leadership had accepted this as a permanent condition, and supported the cold-war policies of the monopolies as a basis for continued prosperity.

The companies also were keenly aware of the differences within the union, the ferment and dissatisfaction of the rank and file, and the wide opposition to the top leadership which found expression in the Dues Protest Movement, whose leader Don Rarick piled up a record vote against McDonald for the union presidency. Nor was inner unity advanced when, on the very eve of negotiations, McDonald took steps at the convention to expel the leaders of the Dues Protest Movement.

Even with regard to the morale and unity of the steel workers, the advantage appeared to be on the side of management. Actually, however, this turned out to be the most important miscalculation of the steel

companies. Their estimate as to the readiness and ability of the steel workers to wage a militant and determined struggle proved wrong.

DECISIVE ELEMENTS OF VICTORY

Under the impact of the companies' demands to wipe out the work rules all these negative factors were brushed aside. Fighting morale grew steadily. It forced a hesitant, vacillating top leadership into a fighting stance against the corporations. The rank and file waged the struggle not in opposition to the leadership, but in support of it. The workers demonstrated their ability to compel this leadership to move, and disproved the claims of some that only the outright removal of the present leadership would open the road to a militant struggle. Clearly, this relationship is not a cut and dried matter, but is subject to change under the pressure of this class struggle.

The rank and file turned the tide of battle. It was the decisive force that took the starch out of the arrogance of the steel barons and forced a settlement. The decisions were made not in Nixon's home, in Mitchell's office, or at the conference table. The settlement really was forced in the steel towns, on the picket lines in the local unions and in the homes of the steel workers.

Nor was this rising mood and morale to be gauged by the size or

the turbulence of the picket lines. Rather, a deceptive calm prevailed. But the skimpy picket lines, while indicating the defensive nature of the strike, were not a sign of weakness. The companies—always alert, always testing—knew this for a fact, for whenever any danger arose the picket lines came quickly to life.

The final and compelling answer was provided by the steel workers in a test vote taken by the union (and confirmed by the companies' own test) on the final offer made by the steel companies. Even after a 116-day strike, the workers so overwhelmingly rejected this offer, that no one, least of all the companies, could misunderstand their mood. For example, in the National Tube mill in Lorain, Ohio, with some 10,000 workers, the vote of those polled was 98% against the offer. And in another poll the steel workers' wives in Lorain voted 92% against the acceptance of the offer.

The unity, militancy and fighting spirit of the steel workers was, therefore, the decisive factor in forcing a settlement—this plus the support given by the labor movement. In the face of this, it became necessary for the companies to back down, especially in view of the implications a continuation of the attack would have in a year of presidential elections.

ELECTIONS AND NIXON

The changed course of the strug-

gle and the new trends among the workers created problems for the ruling class in preparing its tactics for the 1960 presidential elections. For these developments could have an important bearing on the role of the working class in the elections and on changing political alignments. Nor would it be easy to pass anti-labor laws in Congress in an election year.

Monopoly capital sought to squeeze maximum advantage out of a bad situation. They brought in Nixon to reap the glory of having "settled" the dispute and thus enhance his presidential prospects. The Republican Administration is skillfully seeking to capitalize on events—on the exchange of visits by Eisenhower, Nixon and Khrushchev, on the summit meeting, and on the steel settlement, to gain political glamor for this favored candidate of monopoly capital.

Many important lessons, too, are to be drawn from the methods used by big business in a struggle of this nature, its flexibility and continued ability to maneuver. The original plan was to use the Taft-Hartley injunction at a moment when serious weaknesses began to appear among the workers. It was to be applied at a point most favorable to the companies, to weaken the morale of the workers and make them receptive to the acceptance of the final offer by the companies.

But when, instead, the opposite

took place among the workers, coupled with a growing depletion of the built-up inventories of steel, a change of tactics was required. At this point it became the task of the government to take the companies off the hook, and this it skillfully did. There is no doubt that backstage agreements were made between the companies and the Administration not only on price increases, but also on the passage of anti-strike legislation—if not this year, then in the next session of Congress.

NEW PROBLEMS

The victory of the steel workers is far from decisive. The key issues have not been resolved but only postponed. What the workers have achieved is in the nature of a holding operation. One phase of the struggle is ended and another begun. The battle over the work rules is now transferred from the conference table directly into the mills. It will be fought out plant by plant, company by company.

While the steel workers succeeded in blocking them from achieving their objectives on the work rules, the companies did succeed in punching some important loopholes in the new contract. Two joint union-management committees were agreed upon to make a study of the issues at stake. This is already creating deep concern and uneasiness among the workers.

The Human Relations Committee is to study and make recommendations on incentives, job classifications, seniority, medical care, etc. The Work Rules Committee is to study existing practices at the plant, district and national levels. They can make recommendations for changes which, if accepted by both sides, become effective at once.

There is no doubt that the companies will seek to exploit to the fullest the loopholes thus provided. The next two years will witness a relentless struggle around these issues but the battleground will have shifted into the mills. It will require an alert and militant rank and file and local union leadership to meet the situation as it unfolds in every mill.

The two committees will also pose a threat to existing grievance machinery in the locals, and a danger of taking bargaining and grievances out of the hands of the workers and the local union officers. Close attention will be needed to prevent this. But given the awareness and militancy gained in the struggle just concluded, the steel workers ought to be able to thwart the new attacks from this source.

The big test, of course, will come two years hence when the present contract expires. We can be certain that the assault of the corporations on this central issue will be renewed with even greater force. In the meantime, the attack will continue, in

other directions, in other industries, in an effort to open up the flood-gates.

THE HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The main feature of the American economy is the tremendous expansion of the productive forces and the creation of an economic surplus far beyond the dreams of any past generation. But this enormous productive capacity, under capitalist conditions, comes smack up against the severe limitations of the effective market of capitalist society. Thus, each year American industry is capable of producing millions of tons of surplus steel, automobiles, etc., for which the capitalist market provides no outlet.

This growth of surplus capacity is clearly indicated in the steel industry. From 1950 to 1959, steel producing capacity rose from 99.4 to 148.5 million tons. But steel output has not risen proportionately and the percentage of capacity employed has declined. Today the economy's steel requirements can be met in eight months of operation of the steel mills. The rest is surplus, inventory, overproduction.

Formerly, the "break even" point for the steel companies was more than 60%. That is, they were able to show a profit when operating at 60% or more of capacity. This has gone down so that the "break even"

point is now about 40%. Thus, in 1958 when steel production averaged 60% of capacity the companies still made a big profit.

But the process of expansion of steel capacity continues at an even greater pace. The enormous sum of \$1,600,000,000 has been allocated for this purpose in 1960 alone. The use of hydrogen in the furnaces has almost doubled their capacity. New machinery and technological processes are being installed. New automated mills are in the process of construction, and this new phase, automation, is only in its infancy. The productivity of the individual worker has multiplied many times over.

DEPRESSION, LAY-OFFS, STRIKES

As a direct consequence of this situation there arises the necessity for periodic cutbacks of production. These are effected in an anarchistic manner, peculiar to capitalism, through depressions, layoffs, strikes, etc. Since the end of the war the intervals between such stoppages have been getting ever shorter. The following strikes have taken place in steel:

1946 —	26 days
1952 —	59 days
1955 —	12 hours
1956 —	34 days
1959 —	116 days

In addition to the strikes, large

scale layoffs took place during the depression periods of 1948, 1954 and 1958. In the last of these years almost one-half of the steel workers were hit. Now, after a 116-day strike, production of steel is running at about 95% of capacity. It is estimated that some inventories will be replenished by April, the rest by August. A steady decline in steel production is expected to set in during the last six months of 1960, and with it a renewed wave of layoffs.

Against this general background, the 116-day strike takes on the features of a lock-out. The companies had built up huge inventories of steel deliberately, and then forced the strike by their demands. The strike permitted the inventories to be worked off and opened the way to a period of renewed production.

The companies consciously prepared to take fullest advantage of this situation to make a slashing attack upon the union. They passed anti-labor laws in Congress; they tried to poison the minds of the public with the McClellan investigations of union corruption; they made efforts to pass "right-to-work" laws in key industrial states; they waged a massive public campaign to blame inflation on wage increases, etc. And they sought to destroy the influence of the Left and progressive elements in the unions.

THE SHORTER WORK WEEK

It is not enough merely to await a

renewal of the steel corporations' offensive. It is of the utmost importance to put forward a program and demands by the union to meet the imminent threat to job security posed by automation and technological advances, a program whereby the steel workers can benefit from such advances.

The foremost demand in this respect is for a sharp reduction in the work week without any reduction in pay. Because of the rapid changes now taking place this demand for "30-40" will of necessity, and despite the reluctance of the top leadership, become a central issue in steel, auto and other basic industries.

While the Communist Party and other progressive forces have advocated this demand for many years, it is now taking on the proportion of a mass, popular issue. In the steel negotiations, it emerged in a rudimentary form in the Steel Wage Policy Committee under growing pressure from steel locals. But it was quickly forgotten in the face of the offensive of the steel corporations. All the more so since no serious consideration had been given it, nor had there been any preparations to fight for it, nor any consultation with the rank and file in projecting it. It was still treated as a mere talking point, with no serious idea of fighting for it.

Now the time has come to put it forward as a central demand, as the union's alternative to the program of

the companies. In doing so, it must be understood in a realistic manner what it will take to win this objective. No easy concessions will be granted by the steel companies, and no easy victories should be anticipated.

On the contrary, it will require the full united strength of the steel workers and the support of the entire working class. Therefore, thoroughgoing ideological and organizational preparations need to be set in motion even now. A broad campaign of education on this score not only of steel workers, but of all workers and of the general public, is essential for the winning of this demand.

The masters of U.S. economy are under no illusions as to the intensity of the struggles that lie ahead, nor as to how they will be resolved. Looking ahead, *Fortune* magazine predicts: "The coming decade may see desperate and costly labor disputes. The steel strike may be a preview of this." The working class of America, and the steel workers first of all, need to recognize this, and prepare to meet the new challenge ahead.

OTHER IMMEDIATE TASKS

Work Rules: The establishment of the union-management committees to study work practices in the mills was an important concession to the steel companies. Even before, severe limitations and inadequacies

existed under Section 2B to protect the workers from constant infringements by the management. Now they have an opportunity to further dilute, chip away and weaken even this limited protection.

Consequently, maximum attention will be required by the rank and file and the local officers to block attempts at such infringement. No changes whatever should be permitted without the approval of the membership. Every action of these committees should be the subject of the closest scrutiny by the workers at all times.

More than that, a definite program should be worked up by the locals, districts, etc., to fight to gain *improvements* in existing work rules and practices. This should be accompanied by a fight in the shops to enforce the work rules and to reduce speedup. Here, too, the best defense is an offensive, and gains can be scored if the fight is pushed even through such committees.

Political Action: The experiences in steel also emphasize with great force the need for far more vigorous independent political activity of the steel workers, and of all labor. While Congress may hesitate to pass new anti-labor laws in an election year, they will have no such hesitations after the elections. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, to put forward and actively fight for the election to Congress, state legislatures and other bodies, candidates responsive to the

needs and program of labor. Negro and labor candidates should receive full support. An independent program of labor and a vigorous campaign behind key issues and candidates is needed. Much is to be learned from the dynamic campaigns waged in several states to defeat the "right-to-work" bills.

Organize All Steel: During the recent strike, 15% of the steel-making capacity continued to operate at all speed. The time has come to put an end to this division in steel labor's strength. The organization of the unorganized in Armco Steel, Weirton Steel, National Steel and other companies should be undertaken without delay.

Labor Solidarity: The steel workers should be in the forefront and set an example in solidarity actions in support of the railroad and other workers now facing similar battles on work rules in their industries. Any victories won by them will help the over-all unity, strength and confidence of the working class as a whole. This was proven to the hilt by the results in the steel struggle.

THE ROLE OF THE LEFT

The trade-union resolution of our Party stated: "There is a realistic possibility for the emergence before long of a much broader base for progressive policies and democracy within the trade unions." The events in steel confirm this estimate.

An important feature of the steel situation has been the dissatisfaction of the rank and file with the failure of the top leadership of the union to deal adequately with the problems arising from automation, job-security, speed-up, lay-offs, etc. At one time this ferment found expression in a limited form in the Dues Protest Movement.

Now, lacking an adequate program and a perspective to meet these problems, the workers in increasing numbers have been turning to the Left and the known progressives to provide answers and give a lead on these questions, as well as to point out the course of struggle.

Unevenly, the Left has played this role in the steel struggle, mainly at the rank and file level. It did provide an important stimulus in a number of areas to conscious and effective rank and file actions. In some areas this progressive and Left trend became a decisive factor in influencing the local and to some degree the national events in the union. To the degree that such initiative was forthcoming, the response was immediate and positive. In the course of the steel struggle red-baiting practically ceased, at all levels.

The progressive forces found, too, that sections of the leadership were willing and ready to respond to ideas and suggestions—to discuss them, project them and to fight for them. Recognizing the inadequacies of the ideas and program advanced by the

top leadership, they were ready to look for new sources of initiative and inspiration. The progressive currents, consequently, grew stronger and more influential even though lacking cohesion, coordination and a definite perspective. There now exist far greater opportunities to make headway in developing this healthy trend, and much attention is needed to find suitable forms for its growth and development.

The political line and estimates of the Communist Party were fully borne out by the events in the steel struggle. Our Party has continued to play, even though in a relatively limited way, its role in the steel struggle. And its prestige was greatly enhanced among thousands of steel workers.

Tens of thousands of national and local pieces of literature were issued by the Party to the steel workers before and during the strike. Several issues of four page folders dealing with the specific problems and issues in industry, the shorter work week and other questions were distributed. The response from the steel workers at all times was warm and friendly. The contents were closely read, widely discussed, and comments

conveyed to the Party. Letters were received asking for additional material to be used by workers as a basis for discussion. Some criticism by non-Party workers was made for not issuing enough material.

In some steel areas a wider distribution of *The Worker* was undertaken during the strike with a similar response. In one steel town permission was sought from the City Administration to place *The Worker* in boxes on street corners. Rather than permit this, the city administration ordered all other papers, including the local paper, off the corners.

The prestige of the Party was greatly enhanced in the course of the struggle. Experience has also shown that the Party must be much bolder in projecting a program and solutions to the big problems facing the American working class. We should not underestimate the readiness and the ability of growing numbers of workers to consider a fundamental re-organization of the American economy on a socialist basis. We need to draw the lessons from this experience as to our own work, our special contributions as the most far-seeing section of the American working class.

The Golden Jubilee of International Women's Day

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

THIS YEAR, in all countries around the globe, women are celebrating International Women's Day—recalling the past, recounting the present, planning for the future. This jubilee marks a half century of achievement—a leap forward in the economic, political and social status of women in many of the countries of the world. While such tribute is taking place everywhere, we American women can feel a special pride in the fact that the day had its origin here among the working women and mothers of the East Side of New York City, in the years 1908 and 1909. They were struggling to build the needle trades unions to abolish the firetrap, sweat-shop conditions, in which they toiled long hours for starvation wages. They were demanding the vote to end their political helplessness in face of the evils that polluted their area—prostitution, corruption, slum dwellings, poor schools.

Called by the Women's Committee of the Socialist Party, they came to street meetings. They were poor and shabby, with shawls over their

heads, not all speaking English, but eager to change the lot of their families and themselves. Clara Zetkin, then a woman Socialist leader (later a Communist leader and friend of Lenin) had been battling for years in Germany to commit the hesitant German Social Democracy to the cause of woman suffrage. She heard of these working-class demonstrations in New York and seized upon them to present a resolution at the Copenhagen meeting of the Socialist International Congress in 1910, proposing an International Women's Day dedicated to equality for women in all fields. It was adopted.

CLARA ZETKIN

For over fifty years, to her death in 1933, Clara Zetkin was an ardent advocate of the rights of women and for their participation in the labor and Socialist movements. She was a Social Democratic member of the Reichstag for many years. She helped to found the Communist Party of Germany with Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, who were mur-

dered by reactionaries in 1919. Clara Zetkin became a Communist member of the Reichstag. Her last appearance there was in 1932, at the age of seventy-five. As the senior member she had the right to open the first session. Nazi terror had already enveloped the country. She spoke for over an hour, vehemently denouncing fascism and calling on the workers to unite against the menace of Hitler. This was the great woman who proposed International Women's Day, fifty years ago. Today it is an honored holiday which has spread to the remote corners of the globe.

WOMEN'S WORK

A brief glance backward reveals that the majority of American women have always worked in one way or another, either in the home or at outside labor, or both. In the colonial days the home was the scene of many essential tasks, including the weaving of cloth, the preparation and preservation of foods, the making of soap and candles, etc. The beginnings of what have now become giant mass production industries, employing thousands of women and men, were then in the handicraft stage. Much of it was traditionally "women's work." The development of power-operated, labor-saving machinery brought about the industrial revolution, the transition from the old domestic system of pro-

duction to the modern factory system. It took much of their work and many women out of the home. How ridiculous, therefore, are complaints we still hear that "women take away men's jobs!" Historically, the reverse was the case. Men are doing what since time immemorial had been regarded as "women's work." Machinery has made work a neuter gender.

WOMEN AT WORK TODAY

Today out of 67½ million employed in the U.S.A., 22 million, or one-third, are females over 14 years of age. Their jobs range from professional, agricultural, clerical, service, housework (paid) to factory and shop operatives. This is out of a total female population (over 14) of approximately 63 millions. It is estimated that 35% of women who work for wages are also home-makers, or carry a double work load. Working outside the home is a necessity, not a choice, with these women. With the high cost of living, increased taxation and the desire to give children a proper education, mothers are forced to augment the family income. Few families today are supported by one wage earner. "The pin money" working girl, a figment of the imagination in years gone by, is not even mentioned today. A job is no longer a stop gap between a father's home and a husband's home. Attempts to drive wo-

men back into the home after both wars, failed because of the urgent needs of families.

But women do not yet receive equal pay for equal work, nor are they upgraded to the higher skilled supervisory posts in industry. They are discriminated against in job opportunities, and little or no attention is given to their special problems, as women. They are in the cheaper labor brackets, and are most likely to be laid off first, along with Negro and immigrant workers. Only a small percentage—3,400,000 or 3½% of women workers—are organized in trade unions. Where they are in unions, they are active and militant in strikes, and shop struggles. But they are elected to no higher offices, and the number of women workers on the union executive boards or as delegates to conventions, is disgracefully low. In industries, such as the needle trades, where women predominate, practically all officers are men. The women's auxiliaries, which were such a powerful aid to the C.I.O. in its initial organizing drives, play a minor role today. No woman is on the top governing body of the AFL-CIO, nor serving as a president of any international. Those who suffer the most from neglect by the unions are Negro, Mexican and Puerto Rican women, the most exploited in industry and discriminated against in social conditions. The labor scene in relation to women is one of the most disgraceful in our

country. Many unorganized lags are in the industries where large numbers of women are employed.

It is not only in industry but in education, especially for the professions, that American women suffer inferiority. The struggle for the right to co-equal education has been a long and bitter one in our country. The impossibility of being able successfully to compete with men deters many talented women from entering the professions. Architecture, engineering and the legal professions are practically closed to all but a few determined women. In 1957 dental degrees were awarded to 3,011 men and to 27 women. Medical doctor's degrees went to 6,432 men and to 353 women. Heads of many major women's colleges are men. There are a few women judges, but mostly in domestic and children's courts. No woman lawyer is appointed to a high court of state or nation. All of this is in sharp contrast to the status of women in the Socialist countries.

THE NEW SOVIET WOMEN

In a recent speech to an All-India Women's Conference, Ekaterina Furtseva, representing the Soviet Union, spoke with pride of the new Soviet woman. 45% of industrial workers are women, 85% of the health service and 69% of the educational system, are women. There are 233,000 women engineers, and 300,000 women doctors; 110,000 re-

searchers, and over a million teachers are women. Women are given a maternity leave of 112 days—56 before confinement and 56 after, plus a paid annual holiday. A system of children's institutions — nurseries, kindergartens, playgrounds, boarding schools, libraries, out-of-town summer camps and holiday homes, help to give children the best of care and women the opportunity to exercise their abilities in every field of endeavor.

WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT IN THE USSR AND THE USA

In a country where forty-two years ago three-quarters of the population were illiterate, today Soviet women are actively participating in political life. The Soviet Parliament (the Supreme Soviet) has 366 women elected as members, or 27% of the total. In the respective republics 1,718 women are members of their governing bodies and women in local Soviets (regional) number more than 69,000 or 38%. These startling figures are in sharp contrast to our own country, after forty years of women's suffrage. Only seventeen women are members of the 86th Congress. State legislatures average seven women members. There is one woman Senator, Mrs. Smith of Maine, to ninety-nine men. Like the Negro people, they are driven to "separate but equal" feminine set-

ups, even to their own "Who's Who." Newspaper women are not eligible to membership in the National Press Club in Washington, D. C. On rare occasions, such as when Nikita Khrushchev addressed the Club, they were invited to be present, at his request.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The industrial revolution, by taking women out of the home and the category of unpaid hand labor, opened up the road to the complete emancipation of women which would mean to be free and equal and to enjoy full rights with men in all spheres of human activity—economic, political, legal, cultural, and social. It laid the basis for the limited progress of women in the capitalist countries, and has helped the tremendous progress of women in the Socialist countries, in the last few decades. The struggle of American women for their rights has been a heroic one. A new generation, who take the right to vote for granted, have no realization of what it cost. It was a bitter disappointment to the pioneer suffrage advocates when the word "male" was written into the 14th Amendment in 1868, in defining a citizen. The 15th Amendment, as yet not enforced in the South, which gave the right to vote to all eligible citizens, regardless of color, thus excluded all women, Negro and white. In 1920, the 19th

Amendment was ratified guaranteeing the right to vote to citizens *regardless of sex*. It marked a great victory. The struggle for equal legal rights, however, involved more than the right to vote. It meant to women the right to be elected to office, to participate in government, to serve on juries, to own property, to dispose of her earnings and property, to have custody over her children—in short to be a legal individual, not subjected to control by a father or husband. When suffrage came it was estimated there were hundreds of laws depriving women of their rights, which had to be removed from the statute books. Many are still there.

POLITICAL POWER OF WOMEN

In spite of the magnificent struggles of American women to win the right to vote, their successors have never made full and effective use of the ballot. The two-party system, corruption in politics, the virtual disfranchisement of all Negro women in the South, which vitiates the 19th Amendment, contribute to the lag in political activities on the part of women. Yet American women possess great political power. It is estimated that this year women voters will outnumber men at the polls. 31 million American women will be eligible to vote, in 1960. Both the Democratic and Republican parties recognize

the potential in these figures, and have national women's committees to reach the women voters. The Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO (COPE) has a Women's Activities Department. The League of Women Voters of the U.S.A., an outgrowth of the earlier suffrage organizations, does splendid educational work to alert women to their duties as voters. In fact an amazing contradiction exists between the political inertia and the many splendid organizations of American women devoted to the welfare of women and children, social progress and peace. It has been said one must be very poor or very indifferent, not to belong to something in America today.

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

In spite of all this feminine ferment, the old parties do not nominate women in any numbers. Women are not appointed by the President to any important posts. They are allowed to do plenty of hard work on a precinct basis during campaigns. What an improvement could be made in Congress if it were representative of our country's population! This would require the election of a substantial number of Negroes, workers, farmers, youth and women members. It would mean to democratize Congress—to retire the aged, reduce the number of lawyers and politicians, kick out the Dixiecrats—make Congress the true voice of the

American people. This could guarantee a peace budget to eliminate armament expenditures, high taxes and super-profits for rich monopolists.

WOMEN FOR PEACE

Women, with very few exceptions, are ardently for peace. It is the all-over issue of 1960, dearest to the hearts of women. Twice in the last fifty years, the world was plunged into war. Deadly as these conflicts were, they would be child's play compared to nuclear warfare. Even in the preparation for it, the fall-out from nuclear tests scatters disaster and death far and wide. Be it in Arizona, the Sahara desert or the wastes of the Pacific, the winds of heaven become carriers of poison. All over the world the universal cry on International Women's Day is for *peace*. Women, who give life, are fighting to preserve it. Banners will float over millions of women, gathered in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America and North America—demanding "*Ban the Bombs! Peace and Friendship! Peaceful Co-Existence of all Nations!*"

Women united, have a mighty power to stop war. We American women have an opportunity to exercise this power in 1960. Let the voice of the women be heard!

EVILS OF CAPITALISM

We women in capitalist countries cannot afford to be complacent about

our "progress." We face many evils which are absent in Socialist countries and which we must deal with in our country, such as juvenile delinquency, child labor, drug addiction, mental disorders and prostitution. All of these are byproducts of an exploitive profit system of society. What shall we say of the widespread existence of prostitution in the U.S.A. as illustrated by the shameful exposure, at a recent Congressional hearing, of a plane load of "call girls" (the polite name for prostitutes) flown to Miami by record companies to entertain disk jockeys at their convention? Sex as a commodity is unheard of in a Socialist society. From what I heard in a federal prison, it is a highly profitable, well-organized business here.

POVERTY IN THE USA

Occasionally I pass by the miserable tenement in the Bronx to which we came as children from New England sixty years ago. It is still in use as a dilapidated dwelling for Negro families. An eighty-four year old school collapsed on the East Side this past Lincoln's birthday. Only the absence of the children because of the holiday averted their injury and possible deaths. Women have been burnt to death in loft factory fires in this same area. The housing and sanitary arrangements for low-paid unorganized seasonal migratory

families, Negro, Mexican and white, in the South, West and North, are indescribably horrible. Their children are denied education, and work in the fields with their parents. Whole families of Puerto Rican newcomers live in one room in old dwellings in New York City. More than once there has been a story in the papers of children bitten by rats which are more numerous in New York than the population. Partly due to recession, but also to automation, large areas in the coal fields of Kentucky and West Virginia have been officially declared "depressed areas," with miners unemployed and families destitute or on relief. Hard hit by permanent unemployment are the auto and textile industries. Many mining camps and textile towns are "ghost towns" today. These are some of the facts in American life, faced by American women.

They are not isolated examples of misery in a garden of prosperity. Rather it would be safe to say that one-third of the nation are still not adequately housed, fed, clothed and cared for in sickness. Hardest hit are women and children. It is unnecessary, in fact criminal, in a country with the resources of the U.S.A. What is spent on armaments alone would remedy this situation. American women can help to change all this.

WOMEN UNDER SOCIALISM

Many years ago, August Bebel, a

German Socialist pioneer and co-worker of Clara Zetkin, wrote a famous book called, *Women Under Socialism*. It was first published here in 1902. Lenin praised it as "written strongly, bitterly, aggressively, against bourgeois society." Bebel's conclusion, after analyzing the lot of women in all forms of society, ancient and modern, was that, "*Communism is the most favorable social condition of women.*" When he wrote this, there were no Socialist countries. But his conviction is borne out today by the rate of progress in the USSR and other Socialist countries. Even the most antagonistic reporters are compelled to concede this.

NEW WORLD FOR WOMEN

Now in 1960 we can see the broad outlines of a new Socialist world for women. Everything is not complete or perfect, but the abolition of the profit system, and the social ownership of the means of life, is making possible economic security for all. It has abolished the domination of women by men. It has guaranteed to women an independent existence as a human being—a worker, a citizen, a wife and mother, with the right to work, to vote, to an education, to participate in all public affairs, to rest and leisure, to medical and child care, to a peaceful old age—free from anxiety. The care of mother and child is now a social responsibility freeing her from dependence upon individual men, either father or hus-

band. This has revolutionized the conditions of women. The socializing of all age-old vestiges of the handicraft days, such as the individual cook stoves and washtubs, will transform the home from a place of continuous monotonous drudgery into a place of leisure for family companionship. All the modern mechanical improvements made possible by electricity, can help to emancipate women if they are used in a communal way and not to continue the home as a glorified and glamorized work shop. The Russian women, viewing the wonderful "American gadgets" at the exhibit in Moscow last year, said this quite frankly.

On this golden jubilee of Inter-

national Women's day, we women of the Communist Party, U.S.A. salute all the splendid women in our own country and around the world, who are fighting for peace, for the full equality of all human beings, for the welfare of the children, for a happy and prosperous life for all. Let there be co-existence and peaceful competition in the field of women's work and progress! Let us join together internationally to help each other! Walt Whitman, the great American poet, thus described the new woman of the future we are all striving to become: "They are ultimate in their own right—they are calm, clear, well possessed of themselves!"

In our April issue, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn will contribute another article dealing with Women in the Socialist struggles of our country.—*The Editor.*

Jane Addams: Gentle Rebel

By Alice Hamilton

One hundred years ago, Jane Addams, pioneer fighter for social justice and against war, was born. Her impact upon American and world history was very great; many of her ideas and efforts are crystallized in the organization she founded, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which continues to play a significant role today. We are proud that one of Miss Addams' staunchest comrades-in-arms, Dr. Alice Hamilton, a pioneer woman physician, has contributed some of her memories and estimates of the great protagonist of peace.—The Editor.

SINCE THIS IS THE hundredth anniversary of the birth of Jane Addams I have been asked to add my contribution to the many tributes that are being written by her friends and admirers. I think I will take as my subject one side of her character that is not often described but that impressed me, who knew her intimately, very strongly.

Jane Addams was deeply sensitive to criticism, she never enjoyed a conflict, she really suffered when she found herself out of touch with the mass of her countrymen, but that never changed the stand she took. There are two instances of this courage which are stamped on my memory. The first happened before I arrived at Hull-House in 1897. It was during the famous Pullman strike of 1894. I am sure that none of the present generation has any idea of what the atmosphere in the United States was then, especially in

Chicago. The city was still obsessed by the memory of the Haymarket riot of 1886, when the Chicago police marched into a crowd of strikers in the big market place and a bomb was thrown at them, killing one policeman and wounding seventy. Although the thrower was never identified, four Anarchists were executed, as inciters of the crime. Nowadays we hear little about Anarchists but in those days they were the ones to be feared and to be blamed for every uprising of the working people. When the Pullman strike came and was joined by a sympathetic, and wide-spread strike of the railway worker's union, all the pent-up fears of Chicago were released. That was the strike which Eugene V. Debs led and which sent him to prison.

Pullman regarded himself as an employer far above others in solicitude for his workers. He built the first model town in the United

States and he interested himself in many forms of social welfare; he was, in short, a benevolent autocrat. But when the depression of 1892-93 came and economies became necessary, he lowered wages and dismissed many workers. The strikers met with no sympathy from the press, rather with denunciation of the "destructive, lawless mob," instigated by Anarchists and by "Dictator Debs." Jane Addams was a young woman, not yet well known but she spoke out on the side of the workers. She realized that Pullman thought he was a model employer, but she called him "A Modern Czar." Shakespeare's King Lear is a lavish ruler, he gives away kingdoms as he pleases, but he demands his right to do what is "best" for those he benefits and he is heart-broken over their ingratitude, as poor Pullman was. Jane Addams pointed out, in a speech and a magazine article, that Pullman failed to sense the social passion of the age which had seized the workers, a passion for emancipation from feudalism, and that nothing would satisfy the aroused conscience of not only the working class but of all thinking people, except the complete participation of the workers in the material, spiritual and intellectual inheritance of this country.

How amazingly simple and old-fashioned all that sounds nowadays, how "dated." But in the nineties it was sensational and far from accepted by the "upper classes,"

to which Jane Addams was held to belong. She was a "traitor to her class." It would have been easy for her to argue that Hull-House, her cherished work, was still hardly established and might be set back for years if she made so unpopular a move, but she risked that and followed the course she felt was right.

The second time was also in Chicago and also at a time when the city was swept by fear of "radicals, Anarchists." It was McKinley's assassination by the Anarchist, Czolgosz, that woke up the dormant terror which had been left in Chicago by the Haymarket riot. Unfortunately for Hull-House the fact that Emma Goldman, an avowed Anarchist, had come there to a meeting just recently and that Peter Kropotkin, a well-known Russian revolutionist, had stayed there with us for a number of days, both at a time when Czolgosz was known to be in Chicago, was enough to start a rumor that the two had met there, plotted the killing and Czolgosz had been their tool. We went through a bad time, but chiefly at the hands of reporters. The police did not molest us; they did, however, make arrests, right and left, of all who could be suspected of radical opinions, among them some Jewish intellectuals who belonged to the group calling itself "philosophical Anarchists." These were opposed to all forms of violence and were distinct from the

"Anarchists of the deed," who planned to assassinate the Czar.

It was at that moment, when the reputation of Hull-House was at its lowest point, that Raymond Robins came to beg Jane Addams to help this non-violent group, who had been caught in the police net and were being held in jail incommunicado, while the police were searching for evidence that would link them to Czolgosz. Robins had been able to do nothing himself but he believed Miss Addams might persuade the Mayor to let them have a lawyer and let her see them and bring back some reassurance to their frightened families. Nobody who has not lived through one of Chicago's anti-radical outbursts can understand the courage it took to do this, to risk the obloquy that it would mean, not only for herself but for Hull-House. She went to the Mayor, Carter Harrison,

who told her that if she was ready to take the responsibility on her own shoulders, she might visit the prisoners and carry out their requests. She did, and of course she lived down the antagonism. Chicago, always in the end, forgave her for her "mad" ideas and, in the intervals of panic or of war madness, gave her help and affection.

Perhaps it was when the United States entered the First World War that Jane Addams felt most deeply the separation from the great mass of her fellow Americans. Her convictions, her moral sense, forced her to oppose war, to go against the stream. She was an outspoken pacifist till her death and for much of that time she had to endure the alienation of many who had been her friends and followers.

This is the side of her character which deserves to be emphasized.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE GERMAN QUESTION — AGAIN*

Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress, speaking in London, January 23, 1960, stated:

The Jewish people has paid with millions of its sons and daughters and the Western democracies with more millions of their youth for not having taken the Nazi danger seriously when it started. To repeat such an error would be a crime.

It is not possible to disagree with Dr. Goldmann's lament concerning the loss of millions of Jewish and non-Jewish lives in the struggle against Hitlerism. I must admit, however, that I was struck by Dr. Goldmann's failure to mention the casualties suffered by the peoples of Eastern Europe—after all, seventeen million Soviet citizens lost their lives in World War II, and the USSR had a little something to do with defeating Hitlerism—and, by the way, saving the lives of about two million Jews.

Moreover, while of course Dr. Goldmann is right in warning about the too-prevalent attitude of dismissing neo-Nazi signs as unimportant, it must yet be said that it was not a question, in the past, of refusing to take Hitlerism "seriously."

Hitler certainly was taken seriously by the Left of the entire world, and that Left stated from the beginning that fascism meant fearful war abroad and terrible repression at home. True, in many quarters these warnings and analyses were shrugged off as exaggerations or misrepresentations, but this was because ruling circles in the West felt a kinship with fascism and therefore falsified its vicious character. For the same class reasons, the real nature of fascism, in terms of its being a political form adopted by the most reactionary wings of monopoly capitalism, never was brought home to the majority of the American people, even when our country entered the anti-Axis war.

Western leaders, certainly, did not fail to take Hitlerism seriously; they took it quite seriously and that is why they built it up and lent it every assistance. That is why they acceded repeatedly to Hitler's demands. At Munich, Great Britain and France did not grudgingly yield to the demands of Hitler—they

* In the April and May, 1959 issues the present writer discussed the two Germanys and U.S. policy; somewhat later this was issued, with additions, as a pamphlet, *The German Question: Toward War or Peace?* (New Century Publishers, N. Y., 1959). The present article is to be considered a supplement to that work.

did not, in that sense, appease him, as the story goes for popular consumption. No; at Munich, Chamberlain and Daladier eagerly threw the throbbing body of Czechoslovakia to the rapacious Hitler, not in the hope of satiating him, but in the hope of strengthening him for what he promised to do—that is, to attack eastward, to destroy the USSR.

It was Chancellor Adenauer, just the other day—on January 22, 1960—who told His Holiness, Pope John XXIII: "I believe God has given the German people in these calamitous times a special task to be guardian of the West in the face of the powerful forces that press on our countries from the East." One might think that Konrad Adenauer—who is, after all, no matter how exalted a personage, but a lay Catholic—might have permitted the Pope to tell him what God's will might be; but then the arrogance of the old German officialdom—of which Adenauer is a classical example—knew no bounds, and at times would even tell God what He had in mind, let alone instruct the Pope on such uncertain matters.

The main thing, however, is to note that when Adenauer said what he did to the Pope, he was imitating exactly—even to his piousness—the late Adolph Hitler. It is for this purpose and on the basis of this promise that Czechoslovakia, with its enormous armaments works and its tremendous fortifications, was given to Hitler—as a bribe and an encouragement for him to move East and consummate the "divine Germanic mission."

It is necessary that this be frankly faced if one is to understand the roots of the neo-Nazism in present-day West Germany, and if one is to be able to struggle for their uprooting with a likelihood of success.

* * *

The liberal London weekly, *New Statesman*, in an editorial dated January 9, 1960, declares:

"There are two views on the anti-Semitic revival which has begun in Germany with strange swastika outcrops in this and other countries." These two views, continues the magazine, are: "Some claim it is the work of a psychopathic fringe"; and the other view is one which sees the anti-Semitic revival as due to a poor educational effort, and feels that, "Any hope that a new generation of Germans, untainted with Nazi doctrine, would arise to exorcize Hitler's ghost must therefore be abandoned."

This editorial, summarizing as it does so much of the content of liberal comment, deserves somewhat extended analysis. It is, in the first place, noteworthy that the *New Statesman* forgets that there are two Germanys, a German Federal Republic in the West and a German Democratic Republic in the East. The paper forgets—though its own news pages have made this perfectly clear—that an apparent miracle has happened, for east of the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin, swastikas are not scrawled on walls; it is only west of the lands of

totalitarian tyranny—as our Free Press never tires of saying—that synagogues are bombed, and Jews assaulted, and cemeteries desecrated, and swastikas blotched on buildings (interspersed, of course, in the United States,* with bombs hurled at schools where Negro and white children dare to study together).

One would think, furthermore, that those interested in these anti-Semitic outrages would seriously ponder why they occur in Austria and not in Czechoslovakia; why in England and not in Poland; why in Bonn and not in Budapest; why in the Borough of Queens and not in Bucharest. That such things are not publicly pondered reflects the fact that some hate Socialism more than they do anti-Semitism—“better Hitler rather than Thaelmann,” as the German equivalents said back in 1933. For the same reason, news of the mass demonstrations held in Socialist countries protesting the newest anti-Semitic outrages in the West has been kept out of the commercial American press, from the *New York Post* to the Hearst newspapers.

These items were not “fit to print”: *Sofia*, January 14: a mass meeting called by the Central Consistory of Jewish People of Bulgaria, heard Joseph Astrukov, a leader of that Consistory, warn that “in West Germany, fascism and anti-Semitism always had been associated with militarism,” and to “urge all the Jewish people in the capitalist countries to unite and fight against the resurgence of fascism”; *Budapest*, January 13: the Hungarian government called a meeting, attended by thousands, commemorating the fifteenth anniversary “of the deliverance by the Soviet army of more than seven thousand Jewish people from Hungarian concentration camps”; the theme of the meeting was the equality of Jews in the New Hungary, who “were playing an active part in the building of Socialism,” and the speakers denounced the “fascist persecution of Jews in West Germany and other western lands”; *Warsaw*, January 12: The Central Council of the Polish Lawyers’ Union protested the “shameful activities” in West Germany and “called on all progressive jurists of the world to fight against neo-Nazism and anti-Semitism”; *Lodz*, January 11: Nine thousand workers in the largest cotton mills in this Polish industrial center “demanded that the activities of the fascist brigands in West Germany be stopped immediately and that the anti-Semites be punished severely.”

Nothing but the most perfunctory, two-inch notice was given in a few of the commercial newspapers of the United States to the tremendously sig-

* The systematic inculcation of anti-Semitism by fascist groups in the United States deserves extended study in its own right. *The Christian Century*, Feb. 17, 1960, notes that, “For a short time after the [latest] outbreaks began no one publicized them because Police Commissioner Kennedy [in N.Y.C.] had issued a plea that the acts were isolated cases of rowdiness by juvenile delinquents and that publicity would encourage repetition.” This magazine continued: “The American Jewish Committee had already charged that the anti-Semitic campaign was sparked by wealthy Hungarian nazis who have headquarters in West Germany, Austria and Australia.” The New York Intergroup Commission “charged that hate literature distributed by neo-nazi groups had set off the wave of hooliganism.” Between Christmas and January 13, 1960, at least 30 religious structures were defaced in New York City alone. The Commission Chairman charged that police officials had “known for many months of a rising tide of anti-Semitism in New York City.” Most government officials sought to shrug the whole business off as some kind of “fad,” and the leadership of many Jewish groups thought it best to follow a policy of silence—a combination of suggestions made to order for the fascist vermin and their well-heeled sponsors.

nificant demonstration, involving twenty thousand people, before the Auschwitz site of the Nazi extermination of four million Jews and non-Jewish political prisoners. Delegates from thirteen nations assembled on January 23, 1960, as the guests of the Polish government, and pledged unyielding resistance to fascism and war, and eternal remembrance of those who perished in the struggles against these scourges. Before the crematoria of this former hell-hole stands a stone tablet with the words carved in Hebrew, Yiddish and Polish: “In memory of the millions of Jews, martyrs and fighters, who perished at the hands of the Hitlerite murderers.” Among the delegates was a Soviet Army Colonel, Gregory Davidovitch Yelisavietsky—the same Soviet officer who had led the forces that finally liberated Auschwitz on January 25, 1945, and rescued five thousand remaining prisoners. This Colonel Yelisavietsky belonged at the ceremony not only as leader of the liberators, but as himself Jewish, and one who had seen his own family wiped out by the Nazis.

It was at this ceremony that the Prime Minister of Poland, Jozef Cyrankiewicz, himself a survivor of Auschwitz, said:

From this platform we proclaim: We shall never forget and we shall never permit! We have brothers in all parts of the world. Their representatives are here with us as our guests. Let them too proclaim: We shall not forget and we shall not permit! We shall not keep silent—we, former prisoners of concentration camps, as long as the last one of us will have any strength left. After us will come others whom we are teaching to hate fascism, violence, intolerance, anti-Semitism, war and destruction. We shall not cease our struggle until that day will come for which the mighty socialist camp is struggling, the day of universal disarmament and universal peace. All of us who have come out alive owe so much to those who are resting here. We know that at this moment all men of good will are with us.*

When has a Prime Minister of Poland spoken in these terms? Is this of no consequence to those who would combat anti-Semitism? What shall one say of Jewish “leaders” who keep such information from the rank and file and from non-Jewish masses? Who can forgive their hypocrisy and deception?

Normally, the American press pays great attention to anything Premier Khrushchev says or is alleged to say, and from time to time it will even concoct “interviews” with the Soviet Prime Minister and later “freely” print a retraction, in one-inch space on page 28. That press, however—including the *New York Times*—could not find the space to quote certain paragraphs from Premier Khrushchev’s speech before the Supreme Soviet, in Moscow, on January 14, 1960, although these paragraphs dealt precisely with that which was then making headlines. Here the Soviet Premier was warning that the reactionary

* Yuri Suhl vividly described this ceremony in *The National Guardian*, February 22, 1960.

domestic and foreign policy of the West German government bode ill for its people and for all mankind. He noted that the Government, while persecuting Communists and other progressive-minded people, was hiding the truth about fascism from its people, and especially from its youth, and that it was, in particular, "ignoring such crimes of the Nazi regime as the Reichstag fire, the persecution of the Jewish population, the atrocities committed in concentration camps." Moreover, said the Soviet Premier:

The recent anti-Semitic Nazi demonstrations in the towns of West Germany are a sign of the strengthening of the forces of reaction. . . . Many decades ago, when reaction was at its height in czarist Russia, the black hundreds frequently organized anti-Semitic pogroms. Lenin, the Bolsheviks, and all progressive people came out vigorously against the shameful phenomenon.

In Germany, Hitler did his best to fan anti-Semitism. He stamped out all freedoms, he flouted democratic rights. And he did all this to embark on his murderous course to unleash a war.

More recently, Premier Khrushchev, in replying to a letter from Adenauer, pointedly referred to the fact that certain West German officials had tried to associate Communists with the anti-Semitic eruptions in the West. Denying this as the sheerest fabrication, Khrushchev said its invention reflected the bankrupt position of reaction in general. He added, in a letter published in full in *Pravda* and *Izvestia* (Feb. 2) but, again, not in the American press:

In the conditions which have been created in Western Germany, fascist and Hitlerite elements have intensified their activity, and are making themselves increasingly felt. They are spreading the poison of hatred and anti-Semitism. The spider of the swastika again is crawling out of its nest. This has evoked the indignation of all decent peoples. I repeat, this could have happened only in conditions which favored and encouraged fascist elements.

* * *

We return now to a consideration of other ideas in the *New Statesman* editorial. There, the reader will remember, reference was made to "an anti-Semitic revival in Germany." We have seen that the paper meant to say West Germany. We would add that what has happened in West Germany from December 1959 through February 1960 was an intensification, not a revival, of anti-Semitism there. The difference is more than merely verbal. If there had been a revival, one would believe that the thing revived had been extinct or nearly so; and if this were true, if what one had was a flash in the pan, a merely transitory and eccentric occurrence, then one might be prone to believe the "explanations" offered by the Bonn government that the "inci-

dents" were non-political, and merely prankish or, at worst, expressions of delinquency or psychoses.

But anti-Semitism in West Germany is deep and widespread and has characterized that area ever since its creation twelve years ago. Thus, one finds Drew Middleton, writing from West Germany in the *New York Times*, October 15, 1951: "Six years after the end of the war, most Allied observers agree that anti-Semitism continues to exist in Germany. It often reveals itself in crude vandalism against Jewish cemeteries or brutal attacks in speech and in print by extremists." That was six years after the war—and now we are living fifteen years after the war and we read the same dispatches from West Germany. The *New York Times*, March 16, 1959, headlined: "Bias Issue Stirs Germany's Jews" and told of "perplexity and terror" among the Jews of West Germany—that was a year ago and now the headlines recur. What one has, then, is intensification, and the question arises, why this is so, and at this particular time?

The answer lies in the rise of popular disquiet among the West German population with the line of the Adenauer government. At the last general elections there, this opposition forced the Christian Democratic Party to announce, despite bitter resistance by the Chancellor, that Adenauer would be kicked upstairs, after the elections, and made President. But after the elections, Adenauer discovered that he had not meant what he had pledged, and the Party discovered that it had not meant it either, and Adenauer remained. Nevertheless, developments since those elections have moved generally in the direction of lessening Cold War tensions, and a *detente* in international affairs is exactly the course that Adenauer cannot abide. The West German government was created and was armed for the purpose of constituting the main anti-Soviet instrumentality, in Europe, of Washington's "massive retaliation" and "liberation"; the bankruptcy of this Dulles line, creates insufferable crisis for Dulles' main protegee—Adenauer.

Internally, Adenauer's government has responded by banning, in October, 1959, the Association of Nazi Persecutees; by outlawing the West German Peace Organization and placing on trial, beginning in November, 1959, the leadership of that organization; by mass police raids and arrests—reminiscent of Hitler's heyday—so that from December 9 through December 11, 1959, fifty-two persons were arrested and charged with the distribution of "Communist and subversive" literature; while on December 14, eight persons went on trial in Cologne for "seeking to undermine the stability of the Federal Republic," by calling for socialist and communist unity to prevent another war. It was in that city of Cologne, eleven days after this trial began, that swastikas appeared on a synagogue, heralding the start of the present wave of anti-Semitism.

These acts mark culminations of a path first decided upon ten years ago when the Adenauer government outlawed the Communist Party; given the history of Germany, such an act reflects a policy committed to reaction at home

and aggression abroad. Everything done since by that government reflects efforts to implement that policy.

The latest judicial vindication of such a policy came in a series of decisions rendered by West German courts early in 1959, rejecting claims for compensation by victims of Gestapo persecution—both in Germany and outside its borders—on the grounds that the Gestapo was a constituted arm of the German state and that its accusations, when supported by a German court, must be accepted as accurate and true. Thus, in particular, the West German Court of Appeals held: "It is immaterial whether the claimant was at the time to be regarded as anti-social or not. *The decisive factor is that the criminal police [i.e., the Gestapo] regarded him as anti-social, and for this reason took him into protective custody [i.e., threw him into a concentration camp].*"*

In foreign affairs, it is notorious that the Adenauer line is to oppose a lessening of international tensions; specifically, in the recent period that government has done all it could to sabotage the forthcoming Summit meeting in Paris this May. The developing conflict between Great Britain, France, West Germany and the United States also is public knowledge and some of the economic roots of this mounting split are explained in the article by Hyman Lumer, elsewhere in this issue. Perhaps the most blatant manifestation of a line of ultra-reaction in foreign policy came in November, 1959, when the Foreign Minister of Franco Spain, Don Fernando de Castiello, paid an official visit to West Germany. The announced object was to get Adenauer's support for Spain's inclusion in NATO; after friendly talks in Bonn with the Chancellor, the Don visited West Berlin. *Der Tag*, organ of Adenauer's party in West Berlin, welcomed him editorially, in its issue of November 10, and went out of its way to remind its readers that: "This is not the first time that Castiella has visited Germany. About ten years ago he came here in the uniform of a Spanish volunteer to join the Blue Division on the Eastern front." Franco's Foreign Minister did not fail to return the compliment: in his public address in West Berlin, he compared it with the Alcazar fortress in Toledo—Alcazar and West Berlin, he said, two symbols of "freedom."

In January, 1960, the Bonn Government enacted an "emergency law" which—very much as the similar law recently passed in France—further inhibits the power of Parliament and gives the Bonn Executive the power to restrict the holding of meetings, the functioning of trade unions, and the exercise of the right of free speech.

The intensification of anti-Semitism in West Germany in the past few months is a reflection of the accentuation of reactionary policies at home and provocative policies abroad by the Bonn Government.

* * *

There remains the main substance of the *New Statesman* editorial—an in-

* If this story appeared at all in the American press, this writer missed it. The story is told in full by the Bonn correspondent of *The Manchester Guardian*, April 2, 1959.

sistence that there were two, and apparently, only two, views concerning the nature of the recent anti-Semitic outbreaks in West Germany: that they were the work of youngsters and/or psychotics; that they reflected the more or less immutable nature of the "German soul" and that exceedingly prolonged "educational" efforts would be required before any appreciable dent could be made—if it ever could be made—upon that strange soul. These are the two views, in one or another form, that one finds repeated in scores of editorials throughout the "Free World," and in most sermons devoted to the subject in the past few weeks. It is, also, essentially the line taken by the Bonn government and by the leadership of most American Jewish organizations.

There is, however, another view; this holds that anti-Semitism, in its fierceness and its widespread character, exists in West Germany today because the denazification, decartelization and demilitarization solemnly promised in the Yalta and Potsdam treaties have not been carried out.

Instead of demilitarization, West Germany has been remilitarized and she is today the strongest military power in West Europe. This remilitarization now includes provision for West Germany to manufacture her own missile weapons, and lately, *President Eisenhower has suggested that West Germany should be permitted to manufacture atomic and nuclear weapons.*

Instead of decartelization, the monopolistic structure of West Germany is more intense than it was under Hitler. Today the old tycoons who profited under the Kaiser and under Hitler—Krupp, Thyssen, Flick, Siemens, Mannesmann, and the rest—are all back in full control and again they are making tens of millions of marks and backing once again dozens of extremely reactionary political movements, organizations and newspapers. Seymour Freidin, writing from Duesseldorf (*New York Post*, Jan. 24, 1960), remarked that the city was filled with offices wherein sat "the advance men, collectors so to speak, for the ultra-nationalist, neo-Nazi, and anti-Semitic organizations that grew like toadstools in the lush lawn of prosperous West Germany." "If there is no link with big money around the Ruhr," asked Freidin, "what keeps all these wretched organizations in business here?" Terence Prittie, writing from Bonn, reported: "A recent survey named 30 neo-Nazi papers and weeklies which were being regularly published. It named, too, 42 neo-Nazi or dangerously Nationalist publishing houses, and 19 lending libraries and 'book-clubs.'" (*Manchester Guardian*, Jan. 21, 1960).

It was in 1959 that Chancellor Adenauer sent a telegram to Herr Friedrich Flick on his 75th birthday, congratulating him on his "great and amazing life of achievement in long and self-sacrificing toil"—this is the same Herr Flick who was convicted at the Allied War Criminals Trials in Nuremberg for "spoliation and plunder of occupied territories," for contributing to the Gestapo, and for "enslavement and deportation in slave labor on a gigantic scale"—this is the exemplar of a self-sacrificing life of achievement. Is it any wonder that some bar-room cockroach paints swastikas on synagogues?

Naturally, then, instead of the promised denazification, there has been renazi-

fication. This is why today the detective chiefs of the cities of Aachen, Dortmund, Cologne, Essen, Gelsenkirchen, Duesseldorf, and Bonn, itself, all are men who held high rank in Himmler's Gestapo! This is why over one thousand judges in Adenauer's Germany were judges in Hitler's Germany—no wonder they rule in favor of the Gestapo!

This is why the highest officer in the West German civil service, Hans Globke, State Secretary and personal assistant to the Chancellor, is the same Hans Globke who headed the "racial questions department" in Hitler's Interior Ministry. This is why Adenauer's Minister of the Interior, Gerhard Schroeder, was a member of the SA in the "good old days" and a prosperous lawyer throughout that era; why Fritz Shaeffer, Adenauer's Minister of Justice, also had been an SA leader, so notorious as to have been fired even by the U.S. occupation authorities just after the war as a leading Nazi; this is why four other members of Adenauer's Cabinet were officers in Hitler's Wehrmacht—one of them, Oberlaender, in charge of occupation duties in Poland. This is why *every one* of the scores of generals and admirals in West Germany's armed forces held the position of colonel or its naval equivalent, or higher, under Hitler. This is why Adenauer's highest ranking officer is Lt. Gen. Adolf Heusinger, the same General Heusinger who under Hitler was a member of the German General Staff and planned the invasions of Yugoslavia, Belgium and the Netherlands.*

* * *

In the German Democratic Republic—in East Germany—all this is absent. There, *the reverse of the conditions in the West prevails*, though, presumably, the same "mystic German soul" is present. There the Junkers and the tycoons have been eliminated from significant economic, political and social life, or they have fled to the West and are "freedom fighters." The landed estates and the factories, the mines and the banks have been socialized. There the entire educational system is geared towards denazification, and instead of ignoring the Hitler period, that system concentrates upon that era and demonstrates the political and economic roots of Hitlerism and dwells upon the human catastrophe it inflicted upon Germany and the world.

I saw all this with my own eyes last summer in East Germany, and discussed it with dozens of people, including the Minister of Education, himself a veteran of seven years in concentration camps. But then my partisanship is well-known—not to say notorious—and so we shall turn for testimony on this matter to a thoroughly respectable source. I have in mind no less a personage than R. H. S. Crossman, a leader of the Right-wing of the British Labour

* The fullest listing of the political affiliations, past and present, of the West German elite, taken from official sources, so far as this writer knows, is in appendix III of *Germany Rejoins the Powers*, by K. W. Deutsch and L. J. Edinger (Stanford University Press, 1959, \$6.50).

Party. Mr. Crossman has been visiting the German Democratic Republic and has written about this, under the title, "The Wrong Side of the Elbe" in the *New Statesman* (January 23, 1960).

In East Germany, writes Crossman, "The purge of Nazis and, equally important, the 'ex-doctrination' from fascist ideology and the indoctrination with Communist ideology have been executed with ruthless efficiency." He states that he has seen many textbooks used in the GDR; "a preliminary glance at these textbooks of modern history shows that all of them devote many pages to copious illustrations exposing the persecution of the Jews and the atrocities of the gas chambers, as well as to a systematic exposure of the crimes of the Third Reich and the causes of them." Crossman continues that he has interviewed not only officials and teachers but also many students and schoolchildren: "They have been most effectively inoculated against fascism and brought up to treat Jews and people of other races as brothers. In the kindergartens it was delightful, for example, to see the way the colored children were treated."

In the GDR, the Cabinet members are made up of veteran anti-Nazi fighters, Communist and non-Communist. The latter fact—non-Communist Cabinet members, may surprise many Americans, even those so well informed as readers of *Political Affairs*. The fact is that the GDR is a multi-Party socialist state; there are five functioning parties. All have their own impressive headquarters, their own daily and weekly press; each of the non-Communist parties has thousands of members and in the elections, return numerous members of the *Volkskammer*. All are represented in the Cabinet; the Foreign Minister, for example, Lothar Bolz, is a member of the National Liberal Party, and was the first non-Jewish lawyer to be disbarred (back in 1933) by Hitler.

Four of the Cabinet members of the GDR are survivors of concentration camps; two of them are veterans of the anti-fascist struggle in Spain; almost all of them were workers—carpenters, metal workers, office workers. Two of the highest ranking government leaders in East Germany are themselves Jewish—the Minister of Justice is a Jewish woman, Hilde Benjamin, whose family was wiped out by the Nazis; the Deputy Director of the East German Radio is Gerhart Eisler. While Adenauer's Army chief was a Lt. Gen. under Hitler, the military commander of the armed forces of the German Democratic Republic is Karl Heinz-Hoffmann, a fitter by trade, a fighter with the 11th International Brigade against Franco, a member of the anti-Nazi underground inside Hitler Germany.

In the GDR there is no conscription, unlike West Germany. While the original plan called for a volunteer army of 120,000, the army in East Germany actually totals 92,000. Crossman asked General Hoffmann if the decision to have a volunteer force was based on military considerations. No, he replied, from that viewpoint conscription is preferable. The decisive consideration was political; "we wanted to construct the model of what the armed forces of a peaceful united Germany will ultimately look like . . . and we are able to

select only completely reliable anti-fascists and *I can assure you that today we haven't a single Wehrmacht officer in the whole of our forces.*"

Economic production has leaped ahead in the GDR; its rate of growth is even greater than that of West Germany, with its "miracle." General living conditions, in terms of consumption items, are now comparable, in West and East, though the East was very much the poorer area of the original Germany, though the devastated USSR could offer little help to the GDR in the years just after the War, and though American capital has poured into West Germany and West Berlin at a fantastic clip. Furthermore, the educational and health systems in the East are superior to those in the West, while unemployment—especially among coal miners—is a serious problem in the West and is non-existent in the East. Other amenities, particularly for leisure and culture, are better in the East than in the West.

Largely as a result of these developments, the exodus of people from East to West (particularly after the flow of Hitler-appointed professionals and teachers, Junkers and Big Business men, and the transplanted Germans in present Polish territory was completed) has decreased very greatly; at the same time, the flow from West to East has grown. In 1958 about 55,000 people came to the GDR from the GFR; in 1959 about 65,000 did so. In the GDR now there are seven reception centers to handle this growing stream. Again, we may turn to Crossman for some apt observations. The Englishman visited the smallest of these centers, in East Berlin itself. He questioned the newcomers who happened to be there with him. There were coal-miners leaving the unemployment of the Free World; some women seeking relief from the slums of the Free World. Crossman concluded:

But what interested me on this occasion was a young man sitting sulkily in the corner, who told me that he was the son of a small businessman in Hamburg. He had taken his higher school certificate but had done badly and could find a job only in the docks. The boy sitting next to him gave a nudge and whispered. "Tell him the truth, you fool." At this the young man raised his dark eyes and said: "You see, they thought I looked like a Jew, and that is why I am here."

In the German Democratic Republic, demilitarization, decartelization and denazification have been accomplished; in the German Federal Republic they have not been seriously attempted and therefore the social structure that prevailed under Hitler remains intact. This is why swastikas appear only on walls west of the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin.

* *

Now, as in the days of Hitler, leaders of Big Business in France and Great Britain and in the United States—and particularly, in the latter—have the

closest ties and the heaviest investments in West Germany. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, American Direct (Corporate) Investment in West Germany rose from \$204 millions in 1950 to \$574 millions in 1958; what is more, while the rate of profit from U.S. investment in 1958 was 10%, the rate of profit from U.S. investment in West Germany in 1958 was 15%.

Now, as in the days of Hitler, the Governments of these Western countries have built up what they hope will be an amenable Germany, for the purpose, as Adenauer confessed to the Pope, of anti-Sovietism. But that policy boomeranged in the 1930's and 1940's; it has brought us now to open Jew-baiting in West Germany and to the bankruptcy of the policy of "massive retaliation," of "containment" and of "liberation." If that policy is pursued in the 1960's, it will end in an even greater fiasco than it did in the 1940's, because the world is twenty years older, because the forces of socialism are incomparably stronger, and because the peoples of the world—including many millions in West Germany—demand a life of peace, decency and creativity, and not one chained to the destructive purposes of profit, perfidy, and prevarication.

In particular, at this moment, as the time for the Summit Meeting draws closer, one must be alert to the fact that the United States has officially announced itself as no longer bound not to resume nuclear-weapons testing and France has exploded an atomic bomb. If to this should be added decisive moves—other than the remarks of the President of the United States and most recently of the British Foreign Secretary—towards permitting West Germany to manufacture her own nuclear weapons, then may well have been dealt an irretrievably fatal blow to the chances for a successful outcome of the May Meeting. Therefore, nothing is of greater consequence right now, and especially for Americans, than that *we activate ourselves in every possible way to bring pressure to bear upon the Administration and upon all Congressmen insisting that that awful step not be taken.*

From the somewhat longer-range viewpoint, we must, in this decade of the 1960's, implement the promise that Franklin Delano Roosevelt made in a message to Congress on September 17, 1943:

There is one thing I want to make perfectly clear: When Hitler and the Nazis go out, the Prussian military clique must go with them. The war-breeding gangs of militarists must be rooted out of Germany—and out of Japan—if we are to have any real assurance of future peace. . . . We shall not be able to claim [warned the late President] that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world.

In that sense, the war against fascism is still with us. In dedication to its complete victory lies the path of duty for all friends of humanity.

The Gentleman from Mississippi

By Elizabeth Lawson

Elizabeth Lawson, well-known author of several works in the field of Negro and Civil War history, has produced the first full study of the life and career of Hiram R. Revels, first Negro United States Senator. We are publishing below a portion of this important work—it deals with the maiden speech made by Revels in the Senate of the United States exactly ninety years ago, in March, 1870—The Editor.

ON THE LAST SUNDAY in January, 1870, a tall, portly man of great dignity, with benevolent features and a pleasant voice, a minister of the gospel and a leading figure in southern politics, stepped from the train in Washington, bearing the credentials of a United States Senator-elect from Mississippi. These credentials opened a debate which for days packed the galleries of the Senate and brought virtually all of its other business to a standstill.

The man who sought admission was Hiram Revels, a Negro; the church which he had long served was the African Methodist Episcopal. The orator Wendell Phillips called him "the Fifteenth Amendment in flesh and blood." The *New York Times* commented: "It will be an era in that very aristocratic body when the black man actually sits, veritably a man and a brother, and a Senator as well." Nor did the press fail to note that Revels would be the first of his race to participate

in national legislation, nor that the State which now sent him to the Senate had been unrepresented there since Jefferson Davis left Washington in 1861 to become President of the Confederacy.

Through speeches that praised him and speeches that reviled him, Revels sat quietly on a lounge behind the Speaker's desk. Finally, on the afternoon of February 25, Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts, revered veteran of the Abolition movement, rose to make for his party the closing plea:

All men are created equal, says the great Declaration, and now a great act attests this verity. Today we make the Declaration a reality. For a long time a word only, it now becomes a deed. For a long time a promise only, it now becomes a consummated achievement. The Declaration was only half established by Independence. The greater duty remained behind. In assuring the equal rights of all we complete the work.

What we do today is not alone for ourselves, not alone for the African race now lifted up; it is for all everywhere who suffer from tyranny and wrong.

The *New York Times* the next day reported:

Mr. Revels, the colored Senator from Mississippi, was sworn in and admitted to his seat this afternoon at 4:40 o'clock. There was not an inch of standing or sitting room in the galleries, so densely were they packed; and to say that the interest was intense gives but a faint idea of the feeling which pervaded the entire proceeding. When the Vice-President uttered the words, "The Senator-elect will now advance and take the oath," a pin might have been heard drop. But as Senator Wilson [of Massachusetts] rose in his seat and stepped to the lounge where Mr. Revels was sitting, to escort that gentleman to the Speaker's desk, the galleries rose to their feet, that they might miss no word or lose no glimpse of what was being enacted below.

REVELS' EARLY LIFE

Hiram Revels was born—probably in 1822—a free Negro in Fayetteville, North Carolina, of free parents. He studied in North Carolina, Indiana, and Ohio, and before the Civil War he taught and preached in six States, including the slave State of Missouri. There, in 1854, he was imprisoned for teaching the gospel to Negroes. "According to the slave code," he wrote later, "no free Negro had even any right to remain in that State because their

presence tended to arouse discontent among the slaves."

When the war broke out, Revels was in Baltimore. He is credited with helping in the formation of two regiments of Maryland Negroes; two years later, he urged the Negro men of St. Louis to join the colors. In 1864, he went to Vicksburg in the wake of the Union Army; there were almost 80,000 soldiers encamped in and around the city, and Revels helped the provost marshal to care for the Negro population. He entered political life in Natchez in 1868, where he served as alderman; in 1870 he became a member of the upper house of the Mississippi Legislature.

This Legislature, made up for the first time of both races, ratified the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, guaranteeing to the Negro people citizenship and the right to vote. It abolished the Black Code, organized a system of public schools, and made Jim-Crow in public life legally a thing of the past.

As they worked in the fields or cities or walked the roads, the freedmen sang:

The good time coming is almost here!

It was long, long, long on the way!

Since 1861, both of Mississippi's seats in the United States Senate had been vacant. Now, with the conditions for readmission of the State honored, the time had come to fill the vacancies. To the post held by

Jefferson Davis at the outbreak of secession, the State Legislature chose Adelbert Ames, a white man, a Radical Republican, who had served as a general in the Union Army.

To fill the post held at the outbreak of secession by Senator Albert Gallatin Brown, the Legislature decided upon Hiram Revels. The term of James L. Alcorn, who had been elected in 1865 to succeed Brown but whom the Senate had refused to seat because of his Confederate sympathies, still had fourteen months to run; it was to this unexpired term that Revels was elected.

REVELS ENTERS WASHINGTON

On January 30, 1870, Revels entered a capital city that was gas-lighted, and whose main streets were unpaved. Parts of Pennsylvania Avenue were cobblestoned; other parts were marked by deep wheel-ruts. Five years after the end of the Civil War, the schools of the District were completely segregated. The city directory distinguished between white and Negro residents by marking the names of Negroes with an asterisk. Senator Charles Sumner was calling for repeal of the charter of the Medical Society of the District on the ground that the Society discriminated against Negro physicians. Pending action on his credentials, Revels made his home with George T. Downing on Capitol Hill. Downing was a leader in the Negro lib-

eration movement, in the Republican Party, and in the struggle to organize Negro workers into trade unions. Four years earlier, Downing, together with Frederick Douglass, had led a Negro delegation to the White House to protest President Andrew Johnson's clemency to former Confederates and his indifference to the rights of the freedmen.

The admission of Revels to Congress remained during his entire term a matter of controversy in the press, the forum, and the pulpit. Thomas Nast, foremost American cartoonist of the day, who was aligned with the Radical Republicans, drew for *Harper's Weekly* a sketch showing Iago (Jefferson Davis) watching a Senate Chamber in which Othello (Hiram Revels) is surrounded by admirers. "Time Works Wonders," read the caption, which went on to quote Iago's lines: "For that I do suspect the lusty Moor hath leap't into my seat: the thought whereof doth like a poisonous mineral gnaw my inwards."

Why, asked the Negro people, should not Revels be merely the first of a number of national legislators of the race? Why, in fact, should not constituencies with a white majority send a Negro to Congress? Thus the *New Era*, a Negro newspaper of Washington, D. C., in an editorial entitled "The Ice Is Broken," stated:

Let our white friends show by their

works in doing as well as the Southern states have done, in sending colored men to Congress. There is no reason why a colored man should be passed over because the majority of the constituents are white, for colored people have not used their majorities in any such way.

For instance, in the Rochester Congressional District no man can be found more able than Frederick Douglass. Why should he not be sent to Congress from a Northern district, and thus prove to the South that it is our principles, rather than our strength, which enfranchises the Negro, and opens up to him the immunities of citizenship?

REVELS' MAIDEN SPEECH

The Negro churches of Washington announced from their pulpits on Sunday, March 13, that during the following week the Senator from Mississippi would deliver his maiden address. It was known that the subject of Revels' speech would be the readmission of Georgia. In that State, adherents of the Confederacy had in 1868 expelled the Negro members of the Legislature and had declared persons with more than an eighth of Negro ancestry ineligible to public office. Congress passed in 1869 a bill restoring the expelled Negroes, and when the Legislature reconvened with both races present, that body asked for Georgia's readmission to the Union.

To the bill for Georgia's readmission, the House of Representatives passed an amendment, introduced by Representative John A. Bing-

ham of Ohio, a Republican of sorts, providing for a new election to the Georgia Legislature, thus over-riding the act of Congress whereby the Negro members were restored to their seats; furthermore, by this amendment, State judges whose decisions had upheld Jim-Crow lines in civil and political affairs were to stay in office. With Georgia readmitted, Federal troops would be withdrawn, and under these conditions a reign of terror was inevitable.

Five days before his maiden speech on March 16, Senator Revels rose to present a petition which he had received by telegraph from the expelled Senators and Representatives of Georgia's General Assembly. The petition read:

Honorable Hiram R. Revels: The undersigned desire you to present this protest to the Senate of the United States when the Georgia bill comes up for discussion, as you are the only representative of our color and race in that body. We urge you to do all in your power to prevent the adoption of Mr. Bingham's amendment, the result of which would be to deliver us, bound hand and foot, into the hands of our most bitter and relentless enemies. We ask your aid and influence. Shall we ask in vain?

The enclosed petition was signed by nineteen members of the House and Senate of Georgia. These men, the petition declared, represented over 90,000 citizens of the State. If the Bingham amendment should

pass, "we shall be driven from the polls by armed and organized bands of rebels, and our State given over to the guidance and control of the most extreme men of the Democratic Party."

"The Event of the Hour in the United States Senate," read the *New York Times* headline on March 17. "First Speech of the First Colored Senator." The story from Washington ran:

At one o'clock today Senator Revels rose to address the Senate on the Georgia bill. Not in a long time has more interest been felt in a maiden speech, or more curiosity evinced as to what was to be said, and the mode and manner of the saying. At one o'clock the galleries were apparently as well filled as they possibly could be, but somehow the crowds that came after managed to find accommodation such as it was.

When the tedious business of the morning hour was nearly finished, and one o'clock approached, Mr. Revels became the cynosure of all eyes. When he stood up in his seat a murmur ran through the Chamber. There was a flutter in the galleries and a straining of necks down into the arena below. Senators wheeled their chairs, making the colored Senator the focus of their observation.

Mr. Revels' first few sentences satisfied his numerous friends that his speech would be a success and a triumph.

* * *

"Mr. President," the new Senator

began, "I rise at this particular juncture in the discussion of the Georgia bill with feelings which perhaps never before entered into the experience of any member of this body. I rise, too, with misgivings as to the propriety of lifting my voice at this early period after my admission into the Senate. Perhaps it were wiser for me, so inexperienced in the details of senatorial duties, to have remained a passive listener in the progress of this debate, but when I remember that my term is short, and that the issues with which this bill is fraught are momentous in their present and future influence upon the well-being of my race, I would seem indifferent to the importance of the hour and recreant to the high trust imposed upon me if I hesitated to lend my voice on behalf of the loyal people of the South. I therefore waive all thoughts as to the propriety of taking a part in this discussion. When questions arise which bear upon the safety and protection of the loyal white and colored population of those States lately in rebellion I cannot allow any thought as to mere propriety to enter into my consideration of duty. The responsibilities of being the exponent of such a constituency as I have the honor to represent are fully appreciated by me. That feeling prompts me now to lift my voice for the first time in this Council Chamber of the nation; and I stand today on this floor to appeal for protection from the

strong arm of the Government for her loyal children, irrespective of color and race, who are citizens of southern States, and particularly of the State of Georgia."

THE SCENE IN THE SENATE

In the Senate that day were men whose names were forever interwoven with the Abolition struggle. Four or five benches away from where Revels was speaking sat Senator Charles Sumner; the press noted that he occasionally smiled a little. Perhaps he was thinking of the three years when his life had been despaired of by physicians in Europe and America, because his skull had been smashed by the cane of an enraged slaveholder.

There was Senator Carl Schurz of Missouri, who had come a long distance for this consummation. He had been a refugee after the 1848 Revolution in Germany, an orator and organizer in the Lincoln campaign of 1860, a Major General in the United States Army.

"I maintain," Revels went on, "that the past record of my race is a true index of the feelings which today animate them. They aim not to elevate themselves by sacrificing one single interest of their white fellow-citizens. They ask but the rights which are theirs by God's universal law, and which are the logical sequence of the conditions in which

the legislative enactments of this nation have placed them."

In the galleries, Negro and white men and women were listening intently. There were more Negro men than white in the galleries; in the gallery reserved for ladies, there were as many Negro women as white. The Diplomatic Gallery was filled with the relatives of Senators who had not been able to gain admission elsewhere.

THE NEGROES' WAR SERVICE

"I rose," Revels continued, "to plead for protection of the defenseless race which now send their delegation to the seat of Government to sue for that which this Congress alone can secure to them. And here let me say further, that the people of the North owe to the colored race a deep obligation which it is no easy matter to fulfill. When the Federal armies were thinned by death and disaster, from what source did our nation in its seeming death throes gain additional and new-found power? It was the sable sons of the South that valiantly rushed to the rescue, and but for their intrepidity and ardent daring many a northern fireside would miss today paternal counsel or a brother's love.

"Many of my race, the representatives of these men on the field of battle, sleep today in the countless graves of the South. If those quiet

resting-places of our honored dead could speak today, I think that this question of immediate and ample protection for the loyal people of Georgia would lose its legal technicalities, and we would cease to hesitate in our provisions for their instant relief.

"We are told," Revels declared, "that at no distant day a great uprising of the American people will demand that the reconstruction acts of Congress be undone and blotted forever from the annals of legislative enactment. I inquire if this delay in affording protection to the loyalties of the State of Georgia does not lend an uncomfortable significancy to this boasting sneer with which we so often meet? Delay is perilous at best; for it is as true in legislation as in physic, that the longer we procrastinate to apply the proper remedies the more chronic becomes the malady that we seek to heal."

At this point Revels quoted from the British playwright Thomas Randolph, solemnly repeating these lines:

*The land wants such
As dare with rigor execute the
laws.
Her festered members must be
lanced and tented.
He's a bad surgeon that for pity
spares
The part corrupted till the gang-
rene spread
And all the body perish.*

Senator McCreery of Kentucky was sitting half averted, talking occasionally when he could find a listener, assuming indifference to the great event that was being enacted. Senator Davis of Kentucky wandered from his seat to the side of Senator Thurman of Ohio. Thurman, for his part, busied himself in sorting letters and papers.

If Revels noticed the studied rudeness of these three Senators, he gave no sign. Instead, he turned to an analysis of the complex events in Georgia since the Civil War. "In the month of November, 1867," he stated, "an election was held by authority of the reconstruction policy of this Congress in the State of Georgia. Its object was to settle by the ballot of her whole people, white and colored, whether it was expedient to summon a convention which should frame a constitution for civil government in that State. The vote cast at that election represented thirty thousand white and eighty thousand colored citizens of the State. It was a majority, too, of the registered vote, and in consequence a convention was called. A number of the delegates who formed that convention were colored. By its authority a constitution was framed just and equitable in all its provisions. Race, color, or former condition of servitude found no barrier in any of its ample enactments, and it extended to those lately in armed rebellion all the privileges of its impartial requirements."

JUSTICE IS MOCKED IN GEORGIA

This constitution was submitted to the people and was adopted despite all efforts of the former Confederates. The legislative body chosen under the new constitution was convened in Atlanta in 1868.

"Peace and harmony," continued the Senator, "seemed at last to have met together. But their reign was of short duration. By and by the reconstruction acts of Congress began to be questioned, and it was alleged that they were unconstitutional; and the Legislature which was elected under the constitution framed and supported by colored men declared that a man having more than an eighth of African blood in his veins was ineligible to office or a seat in the Legislature of the State of Georgia. In the month of September, 1868, twenty-eight members of the Legislature were expelled from that body."

The white members continued to sit. No free schools were established. The courts of law, at least as far as colored men were regarded, were a shameful mockery of justice.

Congress took no action to remedy this state of affairs and aid the people of Georgia.

In December, 1869, Revels went on, President Grant recommended an act—which was passed by Congress—restoring the expelled persons to the Legislature. The full Legisla-

ture being reconvened, that body adopted the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The State then asked for readmission to the Union, having met the conditions set.

A bill providing for the admission of Georgia was prepared for Congress. The House, in dealing with this question, passed the Bingham amendment recommending that the terms of the members of the existing Legislature of Georgia, which included Negroes, should expire.

"I protest," Revels concluded, "in the name of truth and human rights against any and every attempt to fetter the hands of one hundred thousand white and colored citizens of the State of Georgia. I wish my last words upon the great issues involved in the bill before us to be my solemn and earnest demand for full and prompt protection for the helpless loyal people of Georgia.

"I appeal to the legislative enactments of this Congress, and ask if now, in the hour when a reconstructed State needs support, this Senate, which has hitherto done so nobly, will not give it such legislation as it needs."

The *New York Times* noted that Revels' speech had occupied exactly thirty minutes in the delivery. "The congratulations which the colored orator received," the paper said, "were numerous and flattering. The galleries slowly thinned out."

Book Reviews

CANADA'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

By William Z. Foster

TIM BUCK'S LATEST BOOK, *Our Fight for Canada*,* a selection of his writings over some 36 years, with an introduction by Leslie Morris, is a splendid piece of work. The Communists in our country, as well as in Canada, would do well to read and study this book. Tim Buck, the tested head of the Communist Party of Canada, is well known throughout the Communist world for his many sterling qualities. He is a staunch fighter, an excellent Marxist-Leninist theoretician, and generally a splendid Party leader and mass worker. This book exhibits his many good points.

The book is a survey of the Canadian Party's organizational and theoretical history, giving the general highlights of both; at the same time it contains numerous excellent resumes of the major campaigns of the Party over the years. It is a fine blending of the theory of the Party and its application of this theory among the masses. Tim Buck writes very well, and his descriptions of the many struggles that the Canadian working class and the Party have engaged in are models of good agitational material, as well as fine examples of Marxist-Leninist analysis. The book is packed with many valuable lessons and should be in every American Communist's library.

The Canadian Communist Party, our next-door neighbor, is a brother Party of the CPUSA, and many of the writings about the early days of the Canadian Party largely parallel the history of our Party. One of the pieces of duplicative history in the book that interested me very much had to do with the Trade Union Educational League. The Canadian Party, as well as our own, backed this organization, which played such a big part in the early life of our respective Parties. Tim was one of the leaders of our joint TUEL, which was born in the USA, and he relates that it struck so deeply into the working class of Canada that at least one-third of the organized workers of the country followed the lead of the TUEL in some of its campaigns. This is about in line with the situation south of the border. It is too bad for us that Tim Buck didn't deal with the joint experiences of our two Parties, especially in such instances.

The Canadian working class, like that of the United States, is heavily foreign-born, or of immediate immigrant parentage. Its component nationalities are essentially the same as ours, except that there is a larger per-

centage of representation in it from the English, Irish, and Scotch, due to Canada's long period as a colony of Great Britain. People of French descent are also a large factor in Canada. This is the source of most of its 42% Catholic minority. Canada is in fact today a bi-national state, which presents the Communist Party with one of its most complex problems—to help the oppressed French minority protect itself from the oppressive Anglo-Saxon domination. There are also fewer Negroes in Canada than in the United States. In the vast, thinly settled north, the Indians remain a very important factor. Canada, with nearly 18 million inhabitants, is growing very rapidly. Covering more than 3,845,000 square miles, Canada is larger territorially than the United States (not counting Alaska and Hawaii).

The Canadian working class has a complicated record in politics. Active Marxists began to play a role about the turn of the century. The Socialist Party of Canada was formed in 1904. The scattering communist groups from 1919 onward eventually crystallized into the Workers' Party of Canada in 1922. This became the Communist Party in 1924. The Party was outlawed in 1931, and regained its legality in 1936. It was outlawed again in 1940, and in 1943 it re-established itself as the Labor-Progressive Party. It resumed the name Communist Party at its 16th convention in October, 1959. The Communist Party of Canada has always been very active, and for the most part, percentage-wise, it was larger than the Communist Party of the United States, and it is so today.

Canada has had a rich and complex history with its trade-union movement, as Tim Buck's book emphasizes. It is full of the contradictory policies of Canadian, British, and American trade unions, competing with one another for the backing of the working class. This injured the solidarity of the workers to a large extent. The Canadian workers produced many unions of a Canadian affiliation, both local and general. They constitute a growing national factor. One of the most famous of Canadian unions, organized in 1919, was the "One Big Union," a sort of Canadian IWW, which had a large following. Since then, there has grown a large number of very important Canadian labor organizations.

The unions with general headquarters in the United States have played a large, if not decisive, role throughout Canadian labor history. Such trade unions, as early as the 1880's, both in the shape of the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, had a considerable membership in Canada, which was then a sparsely settled frontier country. In fact, the first name of the AFL, given to it at the founding convention of that body in 1881, was the "Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada," showing the strong Canadian influence. This name it retained until 1886, when it adopted its present title of the American Federation of Labor. The AFL unions (and the independent Railroad Brotherhoods) eventually gained the upper hand in Canada over the few British unions, and to a large extent also over the native labor movement. They even undertook to cram the Canadian unions

* Progress Books, Toronto, 407 pp., \$3.00 paperbound, \$5.00 clothbound.

into what was an AFL district council, the "Trades Congress" of Canada. To this extent they hamstrung the Canadian labor movement, disrupted the workers' influence in Canadian life, and played into the hands of the bosses (both Canadian and United States) in Canada. In later years, Canada experienced the great influence of the CIO, the AFL-CIO amalgamation, etc., and the AFL-CIO, through its Canadian affiliates, is dominant in Canada. Another United States union, in the early days, was the Industrial Workers of the World, which was very influential in Canada. The Communists played an important role in all these organizations, with a continuing stress upon the need for the workers of Canada to have a free and untrammelled movement of their own, not dictated to by the leading figures of the United States trade union movement.

Canadian labor history is full of hard-fought strikes, in coal mining, metal mining, railroads, lumber, longshore, automobile, various building crafts, etc., in all of which the Communist Party was an important factor. One of the most celebrated of these strikes, indeed one of the most famous strikes in the history of all North America, was the general strike in Winnipeg in May, 1919. The striking AFL workers had decisive control of the provisions of the tied-up city. This strike shook the bourgeoisie of the whole continent, and correspondingly inspired the workers throughout the Americas. Generally, Canadian heavy industry strikes, reflecting much of the brutal United States open shop spirit, were very hard fought. Canadian communists, especially being led by Tim Buck, for more than a

generation past, have been noted as first class trade-union fighters.

The Canadian Communist Party has had a special role with the farmers, as is well illustrated by Tim Buck's book. Canada is a country with a highly modern industry; it has a large number of industries in coal mining, metal mining, oil, lumber, etc., and they are very advanced in their technique and capitalist tendencies. Canada is also especially developed in agriculture, and is one of the great grain producing countries of the world. Canada does not have so many huge dairy ranchers, fruit growers, cotton growers, and other large farming interests, such as are to be found in the United States. The small farmers are a larger percentage in Canada, and they have played an important part politically in the history of the country. The Communist Party has long been deeply interested in these popular struggles, in the East as well as the West. Consequently, it has had a larger percentage of representatives, both national and local, in the government than we have had in the United States.

Another basic activity of the Canadian Communist Party which is dealt with at length in Tim Buck's book, is the fight against war and the loading down of the Canadian people with armaments. Particularly since the cold war began, the anti-war struggle in Canada has become more and more intense. The mainspring of the pro-war preparations is the United States, as Buck makes very clear. The USA has attempted to treat Canada like a military outpost, having not only used all its influence in the country (which is great) to put across various militariza-

tion propositions, but it has also loaded up the country with American military bases, troops, and other paraphernalia of war, as well as planning to use Canada's excellent fighting forces for its own purposes.

The United States has inflicted upon Canada the Marshall Plan, in its special Canadian form, and other militaristic programs, and has done its best to make the Canadian people believe that war is both inevitable and indispensable. The American style red-baiting has been the common fare of the Canadian people for many years past. The Communist Party has met this war issue head-on. It has boldly and ceaselessly fought every step to militarize Canadian life, pointing out that this was primarily the work of the imperialist invader of the country—the United States. At the same time, it insisted that war was not inevitable. The whole thing was recognized and condemned as a part of the United States fight for world domination. Especially, the Canadian Communist Party has fought ceaselessly against the growing menace of fascism.

At its 16th National Convention (October 9-12, 1959), (which takes us somewhat beyond the confines of the book), the Canadian Party gave its utmost attention to the total disarmament proposal placed before the United Nations by Premier Khrushchev of the USSR, and to the somewhat modified foreign policy of the United States government. Khrushchev indicated that this showed the possibility of easing the cold war and of eventually making war impossible. In Buck's Keynote Speech at the 16th Convention, he said: "There is ground for confidence

that we are on the path to widespread adoption of policies of peaceful co-existence . . . The world is entering a new phase of international relations. . . . It must be emphasized, however, that the battle to achieve full acceptance of peaceful co-existence is only at its beginning. It will have to be fought for every inch of the way . . ."

* * *

Throughout its history, Canada has led a bitter struggle for national existence against the attempts of the United States to absorb it. Since the Communist Party was organized, this fight for nationhood has permeated all its activities. Ever since the United States was formed it has engaged in a program of rapid expansion. It seized (sometimes by forceful "purchase") the whole mid-west from France; the Floridas, Mississippi and Alabama from Spain; the entire southwest from Mexico; California, also from Mexico; big slabs of Oregon and Washington from England; Alaska from Russia, etc. Half a continent was thus added to the original 13 states, and the basis laid for the great United States empire.

The United States expansionists did not overlook Canada. During the Revolutionary War, with very considerable support inside that country, they tried to take over Canada proper, but were militarily defeated by the Canadians and British. In the War of 1812, they also set as their major objective, Canada, but again they were frustrated on the field of battle. After the Civil War they plotted to seize Canada, but could not make it. From that time on they have undertaken to strengthen

their economic and political influence in Canada generally by grabbing industries and the land, the banks, etc. Even today there is a vigorous minority that is looking for every means possible to grab Canada. For about a century, until recently, Great Britain seriously resisted American attempts to seize Canada, but British influence was overwhelmed. The Communist Party has been amongst the most intelligent and militant in this fight for Canadian nationhood, and in realizing that the nation must be led by labor.

* * *

The Canadian Communist Party had a bout with revisionism in the past couple of years, which Comrade Buck deals with sharply in his book. But this deviation was certainly not as insolent and destructive as its counterpart in the United States. So relatively mild was its influence, and so firmly was it met by the Party, that Tim Buck, in his book, doubts that the whole affair in Canada should be dignified by the name of a crisis. The Party rallied sharply against the revisionist attack, which was led by J. B. Salsberg, and the Party leadership took a firm stand, as well as against dogmatism and sectarianism. Hence, the whole attack was a dud.

In his excellent analysis of revisionism, Tim Buck says, "the campaign of attempted revisionism attacked Lenin's position all along the line." In addition to slandering Marx, the revisionists argued that Lenin was all right for Russia, but out of place in Canada—much along the line taken by the United States revisionists. The gen-

eral position of the Canadian revisionists was, according to Buck, "the vulgar claim that in Canada social reforms can be gained and built one on another until capitalism is reformed and becomes socialist Canada." The revisionists attacked the whole body of Marxism-Leninism in detail, with special stress upon the vanguard role and democratic-centralism. These principles were especially under fire in the United States also. About democratic-centralism, which was a special target for the revisionists in the United States as well as Canada, Buck says, "One of the first signs of a revisionist tendency was the proposal to abolish democratic-centralism." The Party rebuffed this whole opportunist line, however, and the 1957 convention overwhelmingly voted down the revisionists.

In a progressive spirit, the Canadian Party called for a general Party recruiting drive of 10% in the 1959 convention period. This was over-fulfilled, and a Party increase of 15% or better was achieved. At the just concluded 16th convention, another Party recruiting drive of 10% was agreed upon, and no doubt the Canadian Communists are enthusiastically building their Party in the excellent situation that exists for Party growth. The Party goes ahead in its work firmly based in its ideology, practice, and constitution on Marxism-Leninism.

* * *

The concluding chapter of Comrade Buck's book is entitled "The Road to Socialism in Canada." In the vivid life struggle of the Party, this decisive objective of the Party has always been kept to the front. In the Party's long

fight to ready the working class for their great socialist task, it has had to fight against innumerable schemes of the revisionists and opportunists to sabotage and defeat this historically successful fight. In his book, Buck singles out one such reactionary argument and delivers some telling blows against it. This is the contention that Canada would not, in any event, be able to establish socialism because its aspiring boss, the United States, would not permit it to do so. But Tim Buck demolishes this contemptible defeatism. He asserts, and he is correct, that when the Canadian people are ready to set up socialism they will receive adequate support from the working class of the United States, and from the socialist forces of the world.

The contemptible revisionist argument, demolished by Tim Buck, has a familiar smell to the Communist Party of the United States. It is part of the trappings of Browderism. Just before the arrival of the Duclos article, Browder noticed that the Australian Communist Party had a militant program of socialism, whereupon he wrote to that Party that the United States, which supposedly had a crushing power

in Australia, would not permit it, but would smash any such socialism; so the Australian working class had better adjust itself to the slower tempo of the American working class. Browder claimed that this letter to Australia was the best piece of "creative" Marxism he had ever written. But, of course, the Australian Party, headed by Comrade L. L. Sharkey, indignantly repudiated it.

Comrade Buck designates the present period, when socialism is growing so fast throughout the world, "the epoch of the fulfillment of Marxism." In this spirit, he proudly calls the Canadian Communist Party the Canadian section of this greatest movement of world history. The recent Canadian Party convention said: "The 16th National Convention meets at a time when the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist system is being universally acknowledged. Interest in socialism is rising. Capitalist illusions are crumbling with the deepening crisis of imperialism. Conditions today provide increasingly favorable possibilities for Party growth and the extension of its influence. We must make this possibility a reality."

By R. Palme Dutt

Vice-Chairman, Communist Party of Great Britain

EVERYONE HAS BEEN delighted to learn that Mr. Strachey has written a book about the Empire—*The End of Empire* (Random House, N. Y., \$5).

For everyone remembers that striking news photograph in which Mr. Strachey, as Minister of War, was depicted in uniform, with gun in hand, in the jungles of Malaya, stalking the guerilla fighters of the Malayan Liberation Army.

It is not recorded if his immediate objective was Chin Peng, who marched in the Victory Parade in London in 1945, and was decorated by the British for his valor in leading the same Liberation Army against the Japanese invaders—and on whose head the Labor Government and Mr. Strachey in 1950 placed a price of £7,000 reward for his capture “dead or alive.”

So a book by Mr. Strachey on the “End of Empire” arouses the same kind of pleasurable anticipation as would have a book by Noske about the “End of German Militarism.”

(For the benefit of younger readers, Noske was the prominent German Social-Democrat who armed the Kaiser’s officers to suppress the German working-class revolution after the First World War.)

Ten years ago, during the Labor Government, I published a little book entitled *Britain’s Crisis of Empire*, in which I sought to show: that the Empire was not in the interest of the British people; that the costly efforts to maintain it were wrecking the Labor

Government; that colonialism was doomed and the British people would be better off without it.

At that time Mr. Strachey was among the most bellicose Labor Ministers in maintaining the Colonial wars, which he still seeks to justify in this book.

Now, ten years later, after he and his brasshat associates have been thoroughly whacked by the national-liberation movement, he comes out with a book on the *End of Empire* to announce his startling “discovery”—that the loss of empire (which he too readily assumes has already almost completely taken place) can be beneficial to the mass of the British people.

The Social-Democrat always learns history only from its backside, after the event.

Mr. Strachey does me the honor of frequently citing and arguing against what he regards as my views on these questions. I am castigated in good company, as he usually couples my humble opinions with those of Lenin.

In his previous work, *Contemporary Capitalism*, he sought to refute Marx by exposing the fallacies of Lassalle’s Iron Law of Wages, against which Marx always fought, emphasizing the role of trade-union and legislative action.

Now he seeks to refute Lenin on imperialism by exposing the weaknesses of Hobson’s “under-consumptionist” economic theory of imperialism—against which Lenin always fought—

and the consequent, pathetic, though noble-hearted liberal illusions and pessimism of Hobson—which Lenin exposed.

His two chapters are actually entitled “The Hobson-Lenin Explanation.”

In his *Contemporary Capitalism*, which he regards as the first volume of this book, Mr. Strachey sought to make the case for a “progressive” capitalism, under the beneficent influence of the Labor movement, spreading prosperity and rising social standards.

Provoked by the suggestion that the imperialist economy of Great Britain which is still the largest world empire, might have something to do with the relatively higher standards of a minority of those exploited by British capital, he now seeks to prove that the profits of empire, or of the overseas operations of British monopolies, play only a small part in the British economy.

His statistical arguments to establish this would require more space than is possible in a review to handle in satisfactory detail. But it may be said that any serious analysis would show them to be highly unconvincing.

For example, he contrasts the £438 million gross profits in 1951, quoted in my book as earned by 817 companies operating overseas (not the big imperialist monopolies like Unilever or Royal Dutch-Shell, seven of which alone earned another £468 million in the same year) with a gross national income of £12,537 million in the same year.

But the “national income” is an economic imaginary. If Lord Bugsblood draws £10,000 from judicious investment in Malayan tin and rubber, and spends it to employ a butler, valet,

three footmen, four gamekeepers and five undergardeners, the resultant “national income” will be boosted up to £20,000 with “only half” coming from the Malayan loot.

The blood of the imperialist tribute (in a hundred more forms than simply the overseas investment income) courses through all the veins of the British economy, and gives it the feverish glow of a spurious and transient prosperity.

Similarly, he contrasts £667 million gross profits from overseas investment in 1956 with £4,000 million gross receipts from overseas from all sources.

The two figures are not comparable. One is profits; the other, total trade, including imports of raw materials to manufacture for export.

When Sir Robert Giffen (no Communist), in 1899, sought to show the growing importance of overseas investment, he contrasted an estimated total profit from overseas trade of £18 million with a total profit from overseas investment of £90 million.

Or take oil. Mr. Strachey devotes a chapter to it to refute “greatly exaggerated” ideas of the importance of profits from it in the British economy.

He does not mention that the published profits of the British oil companies of £431 million, in 1958, exceeded the total profits in that same year from British engineering, shipbuilding, and iron and steel put together.

A little more than a trifle.

In the end, after all the argument, he has to admit that “overseas investment and the imperialism which goes with it” do represent “a logical interest for the shareholding, property-owning tenth of the nation”—but not for

the 90 per cent of wage and salary earners.

That was our case, m'lud!

Mr. Strachey defines imperialism as "the process by which peoples or nations conquer, subdue and then permanently dominate (either de jure or de facto) other peoples or nations."

This is, of course, the ordinary popular usage. But this rejection of Lenin's scientific theory of monopoly capitalism leads to hopeless confusion.

On the one hand, it enables Mr. Strachey to mix up under one hat entirely different social conditions—such as "Assyrian imperialism," "Roman imperialism," "feudal imperialism," or "modern imperialism"—and add to the mixture some nonsense (without a tittle of concrete evidence) about "Russian imperialism."

On the other hand, it leads him into a tangle of contradictions to define the continuing operations of monopoly capitalism in ex-Colonial countries which have won political freedom, but still suffer from Colonial economy or imperialist economic, and sometimes also strategic, domination.

He protests against Communist exposure of these continuing forms of imperialist exploitation (varying in each concrete case), but in the end has to admit that:

"It is quite true that the dissolution of imperial sovereignty over most of the undeveloped world is no proof that its exploitation for the benefit of the highly developed countries has ceased.

"But it is a pre-requisite for it ceasing."

That was our case, m'lud!

Mr. Strachey loves to play with the formulas of Marxism. But the heart of Marxism is the unity of theory and

practice.

In *theory*, Mr. Strachey recognizes that the dissolution of imperialism is in the vital interest of 90 per cent of the British people.

But in *practice*? Mr. Strachey as Labor Government Minister lines up with the imperialists.

The Malayan war is justified with a flyblown official hand-out about "4,000 to 5,000 militant Chinese Communists" (holding up hundreds of thousands of imperialist armed forces for over a decade) worthy of General Massu in Algeria.

Kenya? We must face the "task of putting down rebellions, such as the Mau-Mau rebellion in Kenya."

Nkrumah? Into prison.

The Tory-armed suppression of the democratically elected Ministry of British Guiana? "The extremely difficult issue of whether or not it is the duty of democrats to allow the election of non-democratic forces."

Abadan? He is so discreet about the question of "using armed force," which he mentions as having been under consideration, that he omits to mention the dispatch of warships; but Lord Morrison has since informed us that they were only restrained from military action because "unfortunately the military were nowhere near ready."

Reference was made at the outlet to Noske. This was unfair to Noske. Noske was frank. He said: "Someone has got to be the bloodhound."

To combine the role of Noske with the mellifluous accents of Mr. Pecksniff is a feat only attainable by what Mr. W. N. Ewer, now Commander of the British Empire, used to call "the god-damned English gentlemen."

Resolutions from the 17th Convention C.P., USA

ON PARTY ORGANIZATION

I. INTRODUCTION

The Party is rallying in unity around policies for mass work, for peace, democracy and security. It is consolidating its ranks on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism as applied to the specific conditions of American life.

For these reasons, and because of increasingly favorable objective conditions in the overall, it faces the urgent necessity as well as new opportunities for rebuilding and revitalization. The correct mass policies of this 17th Convention arm the Party with the first essential, in the new conditions, for the renewed development of the Communist Party, USA.

But the opportunities and possibilities flowing from our correct general line will come to naught unless we grasp one other essential: the need to gear the Party, in every facet of its activities, to the correct application and fulfillment of its mass policies. Given this, our small Party could, in the conditions shaping up, almost overnight become a large and influential force in the life of our country.

To do this, it will be necessary: 1) to shake off and overcome apathy and certain concepts, practices, and shortcomings which remain with us from the past; 2) to make a turn in the fight for the Party's ideological and organizational work directed to the realization of the mass line.

The perspective before the American people, and hence before our Party, is one of heightening mass struggles as the conflict over the future economic and political course of our country sharpens. Already a new fluidity characterizes the national and local scenes as groups and individuals begin to shift their positions to meet changed conditions.

These developments are a signal to the Party to be ready to react more quickly and with greater boldness to events, both in the application of the united front and in timely projection of Party and Left initiatives. They are also an alarm clock rousing us to the time of day, advising that while we have time to make a break with "holding operation" conceptions, *we have no time to lose*.

To gear the Party to the fulfillment of the 17th Convention decisions requires that in good time—the shortest necessary time—we overcome our most serious weaknesses and solve a number of long-unsolved problems.

II. OVERCOME OUR SHORTCOMINGS

The Party approaches the task of drastically improving its ideological and organizational work from the standpoint of confidence in its scientific socialist theory and with the knowledge that, despite the ravages of the recent years, it has the capacity, the vitality and the will to fulfill its

guiding role in relation to the mass struggles of the people.

The wave of revisionism which threatened to engulf the Party has been repulsed, and those who sought to deny the need for a Marxist vanguard party of the working class have been routed. The anti-Party sectarians have been rebuffed and incorrigible dogmatism finds itself more and more isolated.

The ideological unity of the Party has been restored in every considerable measure. Today, it is possible for a *united* Party to wage the struggle against opportunist tendencies to the right or to the "Left" as they arise concretely in the course of mass work.

The Party's capacity and potential for mass work has been demonstrated in difficult conditions and at the very time when the revisionists were proclaiming its death while the sectarians were clamoring for policies which would further isolate the Party.

Despite certain glaring gaps and much unevenness, the Party played an important role in a number of electoral struggles (California, Ohio, New York, Illinois, Michigan, etc.); in a number of strike struggles (steel, auto, packing, hospital, etc.); in the fight against unemployment (national and state marches, lobbies); in the fight for integrated schools, housing and for state FEP's; and in the development of peace actions, especially in relation to nuclear tests as well as other issues in a number of areas. A number of districts have developed their capacity for united front actions on local and national issues, a capacity which extends to a growing number of sections.

At the same time, the Party has advanced its public role in numerous

ways: the distribution of over 1½ million pieces of national and local mass materials of all kinds since the 16th Convention; the growth of the number of Party and Left-sponsored mass meetings and forums; the more frequent appearances of the Party at public hearings, and on radio and television; the growth of invitations to Party speakers on college campuses and before mass organizations.

Marxist education has been revived in a number of areas. There is a growth of Marxist study circles and classes for non-Communists. A beginning has been made toward re-establishing a cadre training program. Major headway has been made in the resolution of basic theoretical questions relating to the Negro question. Attention to youth work, for some time completely abandoned, has been resumed. Recruiting has been renewed in a number of areas. Important advances have been registered also in other fields.

Recognizing that these accomplishments afford proof that the Party has the will to live, to fulfill its vanguard role, the fact remains that they are only a small indication of what must and can be done, if we overcome our weaknesses. That this much was done in the midst of the critical inner situation and great objective difficulties attests to the basic health of the Party, to the fact that it has the inner strength and resources to make the required drastic improvements.

At the same time, hampering the spread and development of these accomplishments, there exist a number of serious weaknesses:

1. The temporary loss of the *Daily Worker* and the checking of the de-

cline in *Worker* circulation at such a low point as to prolong the critical situation of the press.

2. Continued underestimation of organizational work and much organizational looseness, reflected in unsatisfactory functioning of many Party organizations, in departure from the principle of democratic centralism, in the low ebb in the circulation of literature as well as the press, in the absence of systematic recruiting, and in many other ways.

3. Great unevenness of participation in the Party's mass work from district to district, section to section, club to club, member to member.

4. Insufficient collectivity at all levels in working out mass policies and planning mass work in the course of the execution of such policies and in subsequent evaluation and exchange of experiences.

5. Failure to rally the Party as a whole to react in time and with sufficient strength to a number of important situation affecting the interests of the working class, the Negro people and their allies.

6. Failure to give necessary attention to a number of important areas, such as national group work, especially among the Spanish-speaking minorities, work among farmers, and the problems of women.

7. Insufficient attention to ideological work and cadre development.

8. Insufficient attention to problems of mass education, especially to the development of class, political and socialist consciousness on the urgent issues of the day.

It is imperative that we be unrelenting in the struggle to overcome these weaknesses in the shortest possible time.

III. GEAR THE PARTY TO ITS MASS POLICIES!

Master the United Front!

Mastery of the theory and practice of the united front policy is the key task before the whole Party—before *every organization, every member.*

The united front is the basic style and method of our mass work. This encompasses comrades in the labor and mass organizations as well as those comrades able to function publicly as Communists in or out of mass organizations.

Our ideological work must be directed first of all toward rearming the Party with a keen understanding of the theory and practice of the united front, and of how to build the Party in the course of its development. It must combat concepts which require ideological agreement as the basis of unity in action. It should develop understanding of the role of Left initiative and of the Party's independent role in relation to the united front. It must imbue the entire Party with the confidence that all members, all Party organizations can and must play a role in winning this biggest unwon battle, whether on a large scale by helping to move many organizations in concert on one or more issues, or on a small scale by moving small numbers of people on single issues.

Practical leadership must be directed first of all to helping members, clubs and sections solve problems of developing the united front. The absence of attention and guidance to work in the mass organizations must be overcome.

Work in mass organizations must

be placed on a selected, concentration basis, while at the same time it is vitally necessary to overhaul and modernize the Party's time-tested main policy of concentrating its attention to basic, decisive sections of the working class. As in the policy of industrial concentration, studies must be made of the mass organizations and issues to determine focal points of priority which are decisive for moving masses in relation to their urgent needs.

Knowhow in the development of mass work must be promoted through restoring the practice of exchanging experiences and evaluating activities, through conferences and other appropriate means.

Assistance must be provided comrades in unions and mass organizations toward learning how to advance Party policies, how to go about building Left groupings, how to develop political and class consciousness, how to bring people closer to the Party and into its ranks.

The remnants of distorted concepts of security left over from the McCarthy period, which hamper the Party's capacity to develop the united front, must be overcome. Real problems of safeguarding the Party and its members from reaction's persecution must be separated out of the mass of confusion and distortion which surrounds this question in many areas, and resolved on the basis of collective application of a general Party position to each specific case. Above all the question must be approached from the viewpoint of safeguarding the capacity of Communists to do mass work, to increase the influence of the Party's policies, to advance the united front—and not as an excuse to evade these responsibilities.

RENEW LEFT INITIATIVES

A number of recent experiences confirm the value and need of timely and properly projection of Left initiatives in building the united front, and in helping, sooner or later, to regain acceptance of Left as well as Communist participation in united fronts.

At the present level of development, there are many cases in which Left initiative can stimulate united activities and movements. The emergence of a more militant Left sector in the struggles of the labor and Negro people's movements today affirms this necessity and places a new urgency upon more conscious efforts to help reconstitute the Left in the mass movement.

At the same time, outside the existing mass organizations of labor and the people, the experiences of the Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born nationally and in some areas, of organizations for defense of civil liberties in Illinois, California and elsewhere, as well as of certain other organizations, prove the value and the need for reviving certain types of Left organizations where they can stimulate—not conflict with—the mass movements.

STRENGTHEN THE PARTY FOR ITS MASS TASKS

The irregular functioning of many Party clubs, the unsatisfactory level of literature and press circulation, the widespread organizational looseness and lack of attention to political organizational work, the neglect of educational work in many areas—all these seriously impair the Party's capacity to carry out its policies. The maintenance and

strengthening of the Party organizationally is indispensable to its ability to help build the united front, to help the great majority of the American people find their way to a common arena of struggle against monopoly reaction.

The tendency to transform what are in reality two harmonious sides of Party work into conflicting, antagonistic interests, as expressed in the erroneous concept of "inner work versus mass work," inflicts great damage on the Party. It must be resolutely overcome.

There can be no effective Party work which is not directed in one way or another to the solution of mass problems, to the development of united action of the people for peace, democracy, economic and social advance. There can be no effective work in the labor and people's organizations which is not directed in one way or another to winning non-Party people to support in their own best interests united, mass action for peace, democracy and security, to strengthening the Party's influence among the people, and to building the Party.

The Party exists and labors for the people. All Party work is mass work, including that which maintains and strengthens the Party itself. All mass work by Communists is Party work, including that which cannot, by virtue of objective factors, be publicly known as Communist work. Both advance the interests of the people, both advance the interests of the Party.

Moving to increase and strengthen its work among the organized and unorganized sectors of the population, therefore, the Party must all the more move decisively and rapidly work to strengthen its organizational and educational work.

IMPROVE THE WORK OF THE CLUBS

Improvement of this work must be directed first of all to strengthening the role of the clubs. Club life must be enriched with the restoration of ideological and theoretical discussions, and liberated from the mass of administrative detail now bogging it down. Necessary administrative functions, dues collections, financial contributions, etc., slog up club agendas only when they are not properly handled, when the clubs lack responsible people to handle them, or where clubs find little else to do.

Every club must have a specific character and concrete reason for existence, arising from the blending of Communist content and policies with the specific nature of the problems of the given mass of people amongst whom it lives and works. Each club must know its shop, its community, its area of responsibility as it knows its own members. It must develop a program to meet the needs of the people whom it seeks to influence. It must plan its meetings in advance, aimed at working out the means of furthering the club program.

The planning of work must be restored, discarding the negative features brought to light from past errors. It is necessary to distinguish between planning for what the club can do in conditions it directly controls, such as the public work of the Party, and planning in relation to the mass movement of the people.

It is one thing, and an essential one, to plan how we shall increase the circulation of *The Worker*, what leaflets we shall issue, what contacts we shall

work up for recruiting, etc. It is another, and harmful, thing to transpose this type of planning to the arena of mass organizations and trade unions.

For this, another type of approach is required. To achieve this, it is necessary to develop not only maximum clarity on the Party's mass policies, but also thoroughly to learn the problems and needs of the people among whom we work, to be ever attentive to their thoughts, moods and readiness to respond, to develop maximum flexibility in tactics based on what we learn from listening to the people and on readiness to consult with them on ways and means of advancing the common interest.

Through such mass work, each club can build groups of people around itself to work with and draw upon to build the Party. And in such conditions of thriving Communist mass work, the clubs will find the healthiest state for the mastery of the vital administrative functions of the Party.

REVIEW THE CONVENTION POLICY

Especially imperative is the need to strengthen the Party's base among the industrial workers and the Negro people. To re-establish the concentration policy it is necessary to overcome the separation which has developed between the Party's industrial and community work. The *whole* Party must come to know the problems of the working class, Negro and white, and its unions; of its decisive sectors first of all; and the Party's policies toward them.

The Party's community members are a vital force for reaching industrial

workers in their homes and neighborhood organizations, not only through distribution and sale of mass literature and the press, but also through helping to generate united labor-community activity and political action on the urgent issues of the day, through building the united front.

The relationship between industrial and community work must be re-examined with a view to their maximum possible integration or coordination consistent with the needs of maintaining and strengthening the basic shop and community clubs.

New organizational forms must be sought and tested to improve the Party's ability to reach the people with its mass and concentration policies. Tendencies to conservatism in organization, to hold tenaciously onto outmoded forms from sheer habit must be surmounted while guarding against tendencies to liquidate for proven basic shop and community forms.

DEVELOP COLLECTIVE WORK

Related to the decline in attention to Party organization, and proceeding parallel with it, has been a departure from collective methods of work. This has become a serious weakness, and the strengthening of and the fight for collective work has become a prime necessity.

Collective work means not merely that leading bodies meet regularly and arrive at decisions together. It also involves Party discipline—the responsibility and subordination of each individual to the collective. It means a constant review of the work of every leading body and its individual members

and a continual process of Marxist criticism and self-criticism in the course of the work. It requires full restoration of the principles and practices of democratic centralism while combatting bureaucratic tendencies.

But the concept of collective work is by means confined to relations among members of leading bodies. It also includes those between leadership and membership, between higher and lower organizational levels—all the more so today when the Party must learn to operate with far fewer full time officials. Real collective work means pooling the experience and judgment of membership and leadership as the best basis for arriving at correct decisions. It is this which constitutes the essence of Party democracy, which resides no so much in the formal counting of votes as in the extent to which decisions are based in actuality on the widest participation of the Party membership.

It is important also to foster initiative from below. The action of the Michigan Party, setting up area councils consisting of club leaders and state committee members, is a commendable effort in this direction.

Although there has been improvement in collective work during the past two years, the present situation leaves much to be desired. Both nationally and on the district level, there is a widespread tendency to substitute individual action for collective leadership. Individual leaders report on their work infrequently or not at all, are not held sufficiently responsible to the collective.

The leadership, especially in the national center, has not been sufficiently close to the membership. It has not given adequate guidance to the Party's

work, and has not been sufficiently felt in the ranks of the Party.

Considerable improvement in style of work is required. Leadership must make itself more readily available, and must develop much greater initiative and boldness in maintaining contact and in giving correctness to its guidance of the Party's work. Among other things, every Party leader should not only be a member of a club, but also attend meetings and participate in the club's activities as much as possible. This will aid the clubs in question, aid the leaders in turn, lessen the gap between leaders and members and further help to renew confidence in leadership. Other means of increased contact and exchange should be sought, such as meetings with representative groups of club and section leaders or comrades active in specific fields of work, to discuss particular problems. Such consultative meetings can in many cases be extended to include non-Party people.

Every Party leader should, as part of a systematic cadre-training policy, select and help to develop newer and younger cadres and to achieve a proper blending in the utilization of older and younger comrades. In particular, the Party's leadership training program must give special emphasis to the development in leadership of women and especially Negro women comrades.

Consideration should also be given to the establishment of regional organizations. These can serve as valuable links in the chain of leadership, providing a means of more frequent, more extensive and more concrete discussion of problems than is possible on a national scale.

The fight for collective work de-

mands an all-out struggle to put an end to all manifestations of factionalism and factional approaches. This vicious evil, grown to menacing proportions in the course of the Party crisis, has in the main been rooted out of our ranks as the Party has turned more and more to mass work. However, manifestations persist in a few quarters, threatening to disrupt the work of the Party anew. These must be eliminated, for nothing is more destructive of Party unity and collective work. The pernicious theory that inner-Party differences inevitably give rise to factionalism, assiduously spread by the factionalists in self-justification, must be exposed as an anti-Party idea. Factionalism is an evil which cannot be tolerated if the Party is to play its role and grow.

BUILD THE PARTY

Finally, attention to recruiting as a systematic, regular activity of the Party must be re-established. Not only are new possibilities developing for recruitment, especially among industrial workers, the Negro people and the youth; organized attention to recruiting is indispensable to achieving the restored growth and influence of which the Party is capable. We must attempt to win back the sound elements among those who left the Party as part of a recruiting drive.

Toward these ends, the incoming Na-

tional Committee shall conduct a Party Building Drive, to take place from February 1st to May 1st, 1960.

Above all, far more attention must be paid the Marxist press. In the Party's present circumstances, the need of *The Worker* as an organizer and mobilizer of the membership, as an instrument for reaching out beyond the Party itself, is considerably greater than in the past. This includes not only greater attention by Party organizations, but the building of independent organizations to promote and support it wherever possible. Building the press is mass work. Party leadership should participate more in writing for the press. The incoming National Committee must also explore the possibilities for developing conditions favorable for the re-institution of the *Daily Worker*.

* * *

Our Party has come through the fires of many ordeals. It is being steeled and tempered. It has begun to achieve the quality of maturity. Armed with correct mass policies, aware of the need to fight for correct application of those policies to every locality and to strengthen the Party organizationally and ideologically, the 17th Convention is confident that our Party will succeed in transforming the new qualities it is acquiring into mass influence to help advance the best national interests of our country in a world of peace.

ON THE YOUTH QUESTION

A NEW UPSURGE

AS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE enter a new decade of struggle for peace, democracy and security, American youth are showing powerful beginnings of a new upsurge. Emerging from a period in which they felt the greatest impact of McCarthyism and the cold war, in which the drive to conformity and the fear to speak out weakened or destroyed their organizations and cut off the development of experienced leadership, the youth have entered a new period of mass struggle. It is a period marked by a march of 26,000 young people on Washington to demand immediate school integration, by an American delegation of 400 to the Vienna World Youth Festival, and by widespread sentiment and organized action among students for peace, for exchange with the socialist countries, against compulsory ROTC and against loyalty oaths for federal scholarships.

Every section of the country can point to signs of the upsurge. In one area the local Young Democrats are breaking with the long domination of their adult leadership and entering the struggle for a progressive platform. Others have witnessed participation of the youth in the fight against "right-to-work" laws. In still others the Youth March organizations go on, with teenage, organizations of Negro and white, continuing committees and other varied forms representing the most widespread, youth activity. And in a num-

ber of cases, actions of support for striking workers, such as food collections, have taken place.

The youth are coming to socialism and to our Party. The Sputniks and the socialist peace initiative have had a profound effect on them, reared though they have been on a diet of cold war and Soviet-hating. Groups interested in Marxist study and action have appeared in a number of cities among college students, teen-agers and other youth. The youth membership of our Party is growing faster than that of any other section. And our Party youth, feeling the need to advance the democratic youth movements, have with the rest of the Party begun the process of building mass ties and influence, and can point with pride to accomplishments in the Youth March and other struggles.

But this new upsurge is still evidenced unevenly, in a great variety of forms, on a variety of issues and in a variety of geographical areas. The task before us is to help bring about national movements around specific issues.

Youth, and particularly Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youth, are faced with job insecurity and the lowest pay, with limited chances for advancement on the job, and with a lack of social, recreational and athletic facilities. They are faced with an educational system characterized by overcrowded public schools and by trade schools which cost much but teach little, incapacitated by segrega-

tion North and South, deprived of some of the best teachers by the witch-hunt, and offering curricula which contribute to producing an anti-union, anti-Communist and chauvinistic population.

The answer of big business to the problems and challenge of youth is to bend them to its own ends. It presents to youth a world of moral destitution, brutalized culture and a future of dog-eat-dog and nation-eat-nation. And when some youth respond to this with acts of so-called juvenile delinquency, monopoly answers with an iron hand and with cynical police brutality toward working-class and minority young people.

The greatest responsibility for answering big business lies with the trade unions. There have been some efforts to meet this responsibility. The steel workers have issued a pamphlet on trade unionism for high school students. Some local unions have opened their facilities to the sons and daughters of their members and to youth in the community for education in trade unionism. Many locals and some international unions supported the Youth Marches. But on the whole there is a serious lack of trade union initiative on the youth question.

Increasingly, adult community organizations are working for a brighter future for their children. PTA's and other organizations are moving to secure adequate school facilities and teachers' salaries. Community groups are working to provide more recreational facilities. Growing numbers of adults are sponsoring teen-age social and sport groups. Some are even trying to provide after-school jobs, and job training in church facilities. And some

are acting on juvenile delinquency, though often not in a very effective manner.

In addition to the importance of the trade unions and adult community organizations, the securing of the needs of youth and the winning of youth itself for democracy and peace and away from the influence of big business necessitates the involvement of the Party as a whole on the youth question. So far, this continues to be left as a question for the young comrades alone. However, the problems and outlook of today's youth will not automatically disappear after their thirtieth birthdays, but will leave a mark lasting for their entire lives.

PARTY WORK AMONG YOUTH

To work among youth is to work for the future. The present generation of youth, led by the working class, is the guarantee of success in the struggle for peaceful coexistence. It is also the base of the Party of the future. Without full attention to its needs and development, therefore, the Party jeopardizes its own existence as an effective vanguard. *Youth work must be placed next to work in the labor and Negro people's movements as a major area of mass work.*

First, attention must be given to the existing mass youth movements and organizations, helping to build them on the basis of their own programs and striving to win them for united action for peace, integration, support to labor and political action. Special attention should be paid to advancing the fight for peace among all groups, and especially among working-class

youth. Support should be extended wherever youth are setting up local councils for peace, friendship and exchange.

Many more adults can be involved in youth work—in organizations of parents, in anti-delinquency committees, in youth services and settlement houses, etc. Consideration of their own youth problems must become the concern of all people's organizations.

Of major importance among such organizations are the trade unions. Organization by unions of their sons and daughters would be of inestimable value both to the youth and the labor movement. The solution of the special problems of working and unemployed youth must become a major concern of the trade unions themselves.

All possible encouragement and aid should be extended on a local basis as well as on a national scale to Party and non-Party youth seeking to set up Marxist youth organizations, to students organizing Marxist discussion clubs and other such groups on campuses, and to the building and development of teen-age groups and clubs of all kinds.

The Education and Youth Commissions should prepare a special educational program for the training of Party youth, to include full-time and other types of schools, and material for classes, discussion groups, self-study, etc.

A two-month ideological campaign on the youth question throughout the whole Party, beginning March 1 and ending on May Day, should be organized. The purpose of this campaign is to develop our understanding of this question and to orient the whole Party membership towards the youth in all

areas of activity. Material for this campaign shall be issued by the Education and Youth Commissions.

The Party should find both the opportunities and forms for speaking directly to non-Party youth on the issues of the day and on socialism. Forums, debates, leaflets, meetings, etc., should be encouraged to the fullest degree.

State committees are urged to involve youth in every level of Party leadership in all commissions and committees.

The incoming National Committee, within a period of no more than 30 days after the adjournment of this convention, shall appoint a full-time director of youth affairs and establish a functioning national commission on youth affairs composed of youth and adult members. This commission, among other things, shall issue a regular national Party youth bulletin. We urge that in a brief period of time those state committees which have not yet done so, shall establish political and organizational responsibility for youth affairs.

TOWARD A MARXIST YOUTH ORGANIZATION

A Marxist youth organization is essential to the development of a mature American youth movement. Such an organization would help to move the present democratic youth groupings and movements in the direction of support to and alliance with the labor and Negro people's movements. It would contribute to uniting the present generation of youth in the people's fight against monopoly capital. It would win tens of thousands of young people to the cause of socialism.

It would not, however, constitute a

Marxist vanguard organization. It is the Communist Party which is the vanguard of the working class, including the working-class youth, as well as of the other strata of the youth. Its vanguard role cannot be delegated to other organizations; to do so would be to set up more than one center of Communist leadership, more than one Communist Party.

Among the conditions for the establishment of a Marxist youth organization is the existence of a substantial body of non-Party socialist-oriented youth, participating in varying degrees in the activities of existing youth organizations and movements, and ready to join with Party youth in its formation. Since this condition is not yet fulfilled in a sufficient number of areas in our country, the formation of such a national organization today would be premature.

We urge every State Committee to develop its mass youth work, through education and action, in such a manner that the conditions for setting up local Marxist youth organizations will emerge as rapidly as possible. Our work with youth in existing mass movements and organizations, our agitation for our Party youth program and our education for socialism will help guarantee such a base.

We look forward to the emergence of a national, organizationally independent, socialist organization of youth which is dedicated to participation in the everyday struggles for the immediate demands and needs of youth; which consistently conducts agitation and education for socialism amongst youth; and which educates its membership in the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Such an organization, to grow and

develop, would have to give serious consideration in policy and organization to the interest and other differences existing between working and trade union youth, student youth, and teen-agers.

Through its educational, cultural, sports, social and political activities, it should be made as attractive as possible to all sincere young people, ranging from those who agree to all its principles and activities to those who want merely to learn about socialism or participate in one or another of its activities. It should be open to all except conscious anti-Communists, racists, and the dead-end sects.

A PROGRAM FOR YOUTH

The struggle for the needs, desires, and aspirations of American youth is a struggle to which we dedicate our entire Party. Our participation in these struggles will help unite youth, in alliance with labor and the Negro people, against the common enemy of all, the big monopolies. To enhance this struggle, we present, for the consideration of America's youth, the following program:

The Right to Learn:

1. Free education and educational facilities, from kindergarten through college.
2. Elimination of all forms of discrimination, including the quota systems, to guarantee full integration at all levels of education.
3. Federal school financing to guarantee:

- a. All necessary improvements in physical plant, facilities, and educational staffs needed to eliminate

inequalities created by segregation.

- b. Expanded scholarship grants, loan funds and part-time work projects freed of all loyalty provisions.
 - c. Free night schools, from public school through college, for those unable to attend full-time institutions.
 - d. Decent wage standards for teachers.
 - e. Expanded vocational training to include new skills needed because of growing automation, and a non-discriminatory job placement program.
 - f. Review of present curricula, textbooks and other materials to guarantee provision of education for higher skills, an accurate picture of the contributions of labor and minority groups to American life, education for democracy.
4. Defense of academic freedom. The elimination of all restrictions on the right of students to organize, to listen, to discuss, to debate, to evaluate, to conclude, and to act.
 5. The restoration of full political rights to teachers wherever these have been restricted, so that they may again become full-fledged citizens. A teacher whose citizenship rights have been curtailed by law or otherwise, cannot teach others the rights and duties of citizens in a democracy.
- ##### *The Right to a Job:*
1. A Federal Youth Work program to provide on-the-job training at prevailing union wage rates, especially in the new skills demanded by modern automated industry.
 2. Expansion of present apprentice training and on-the-job training programs. Defense of the right of Negro

and other minority youth to participate in all job training programs and to have the same access to jobs, equal wages, and trade union membership as other youths have.

3. Unemployment insurance for students who leave school, or for other youth seeking jobs for the first time.

The Right to a Decent Home, Recreation, and Culture:

1. A vastly expanded program of slum clearance and low-rent housing developments in all communities on a fully integrated basis. Opening of all present housing to Negroes and other minority groups. Legislation making discrimination in private as well as public housing a crime.

2. All public school, public park, and other public institutions with recreational and athletic facilities to remain open after school hours and on week-ends for use by young people on a non-discriminatory basis, and the establishment of new centers.

3. Youth participation in the administration of all after-school recreational and athletic programs, and in social service center programs, should be encouraged and developed.

4. The addition to present teaching staffs of trained recreational workers, to work with these youths in the organization and use of the present and future facilities.

5. A people's educational campaign against the attempted brutalization and debauchment of America's youth, directed against the monopolists who control cultural media and use them in their glorification of war, murder, crime, brutality and sexual perversion.

6. The opening of trade union halls, churches, and facilities of all people's organizations for use by the sons and

daughters of their members and by the youth in the particular communities, and the development of youth activity programs by such organizations.

Granting of adult legal status, including the right to vote, to all reaching their eighteenth birthday.

A World at Peace:

1. Abolition of the draft, of compulsory military training and service, and of the ROTC.

2. Ending of all nuclear testing.

3. Complete disarmament. All funds needed for the implementation of this whole program could easily come from a part of the present armaments expenditures.

4. Development of youth exchanges—students, workers, athletes, musicians, teachers and other groups—between the United States and the socialist countries.

* * *

This program should be incorporated into an American Youth Act, to be brought forward in time to serve as the basis for youth activity in the 1960 election campaign. On a state scale, incorporation of applicable features into a State Youth Act should also be considered.

Henry Winston, a National Secretary of the Communist Party, was convicted and jailed under the Smith Act during the worst period of war hysteria and McCarthyism. He has already served over four years in prison, and his application for parole has been denied three times. Suffering special discrimination as both a political prisoner and a Negro, Winston's health was allowed to deteriorate to the point where a most serious operation was finally necessary. As a result, vision in one eye is totally lost and in the other badly impaired and he remains critically ill. Still, the Government sadistically persists in its refusal to grant him a medical parole. We urge all our readers to write to the President and urge him to release Henry Winston from prison, and remove from the reputation of our country a stain that becomes more and more glaring as the injustice causing it is continued.—*The Editor.*

ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE the fulfillment of the goals and ideals set for our Party and the people's movement in this Convention, we must seek the full participation of women. American women are already in motion fighting back against exploitation and discrimination in the home, in the shops, on the farms, and against restrictions on full participation in the economic, social, cultural and political life of the country.

Ninety per cent of the women are housewives; 35% of all women also hold jobs outside the home. Their unpaid labor as housewives and underpaid labor as workers are the sources of superprofits to big business.

Of the 22 million women who work, only 3½ million are organized. Their average wage is 60% of men's wages. They are forced into the lowest grade jobs, and have few opportunities for upgrading. Negro women workers are subject to even greater exploitation. Their average wage is half that of white women; 62% of their jobs are limited to domestic and service work. These degrading conditions and barriers to better working conditions will continue to lower the working standards of all workers, unless the trade unions undertake a consistent campaign for the rights of women workers.

Puerto Rican and Mexican-American women are also at the lowest rung of the job and pay ladder in light manufacturing industries and agriculture.

Not only is it necessary to organize the unorganized and extend minimum wage benefits, but it is necessary to

undertake a special campaign to wipe out the pay differentials, upgrade women workers and open the doors of job opportunities.

Mothers, wives and sweethearts, long the silent victims of war, are now the most vociferous fighters for peace. Women can take a war budget and turn it into a peace budget. Jennie Higgins, community worker, can help convert bombers into schools, houses and a decent life.

Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American women face the ghetto problems of smaller than average pay checks to meet exorbitant prices and rents, the worst housing and school conditions, and racist attacks upon themselves and their families. They are in constant battle with the slum atmosphere of dirt, disease and deterioration. This is the spreading epidemic that infects our whole society. White women and society as a whole, in their own interest, must wage a fight to eradicate it.

A more effective program for progress can be carried out by encouraging and using the power of women as a political force in the 1960 elections. We must help bring into action the vote of the Negro and poor white women in the South. We must help win the right of Puerto Rican and Mexican-American women to register in Spanish, and the right of all women to political participation and representation.

The main barrier to understanding the status and needs of women is the concept of the "weak-kneed, weak-

mind, unstable woman." Big Business uses male supremacy as a means of fostering this concept, in order to guarantee its super-profits from this mass of underpaid workers.

Women in our country are highly organized in social, civic, church, religious, political, professional, business, historical and auxiliary organizations. Most of these organizations have programs for peace, civil rights, economic security, civil liberties, youth problems and women's rights.

United actions among women's organizations on these issues can be a powerful force in support of the American working class and the people's movements, an integral and necessary part of an anti-monopoly coalition.

The Communist Party has long recognized the special exploitation of women, their status and special needs, and the value of enlisting their vigorous action in behalf of the working class and broad people's movement. But this attention has been uneven, inconsistent, and of late virtually non-existent.

We therefore conclude:

1. Consciousness of the status, the rights and the role of women should be drawn like a thread through every aspect of Party work.

2. A National Women's Commission should be set up as quickly as possible, as well as commissions in the districts wherever feasible.

3. The Party has the task of putting forward a program for bringing women forward in work and leadership, with special attention to the problems of Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American and Indian women.

4. The Party should conduct an ideological program for better understanding of the source of discrimination against women, and of the role of women under socialism.

5. Conferences and discussions should be organized to develop national and local programs of work in this area.

* * *

On March 8, 1960, the whole world will celebrate the 50th Anniversary of International Women's Day, born in the U.S.A. We can take this occasion to renew ties with the international women's movements. We will also celebrate the 40th anniversary of the victory of women's right to vote. We must join hands to make these celebrations a big leap forward in recognizing the role and power of women's activities and organizations, the tremendous value and impact of a united women's movement, and the need of a program for the rights of women that will encourage them to add their militant fighting capacity to the people's movement against the common enemy—monopoly capital—for a world of peace, economic well-being, equality, and eventually of socialism.

ON THE FARM QUESTION

THE POLITICAL ASSAULT against the labor movement is paralleled by an attack on the existence and living standards of small and middle farmers. These attacks also aim to split the natural alliance of labor and the small and middle farmers and to pit these two classes against each other. Farmers are fed the false propaganda that labor causes inflation, while labor is falsely told the farmers and their legislative programs cause high food prices.

The cold war policies have distorted the channels of world trade and shut off American farm products from sale abroad. They have substituted the products of the armaments factories for the products of our harvests.

Big agriculture pays; middle-size and small agriculture are being dealt heavy blows. In the South the shift from cotton to livestock, and toward increased mechanization, is creating an upheaval in the lives of large masses of Negro tillers.

Middle farmers are being eliminated as well as the so-called "inefficient" small farmers. The hands of the banks, processing monopolies and feed trusts are taking a tighter grip on agricultural production, especially through vertical integration.

During the past decade one million farm families and five million persons have been eliminated from agriculture. Today, one-third of the farmers' income is from off-farm wages and salaries. In 1959, it is estimated, net farm income will be two billion dollars be-

low what it was in 1958, and for 1960 an additional drop of one billion dollars is forecast by the Department of Agriculture.

Meanwhile we continue to produce "surpluses" while millions of Americans are underfed and hundreds of millions throughout the world hunger.

The Administration knows only one answer: cut the "surplus" by cutting out farmers. In this it has the support of the big farmers who hope to take over what the family farmers must sacrifice.

A FARM PROGRAM

As Communists, our answer to the major problems outlined above must be based on a class approach. It must be based on supporting the interests of the small farmers as against those of the large capitalist farmers. Our program should include the following:

1. A main advantage of big farmers is the vast profits they sweat out of the terribly underpaid and exploited farm workers. The organization of effective unions among farm workers would be a major help to small and middle farmers. The initial steps already taken by the AFL-CIO deserve all-out support.

2. The method of farm price protection must be changed. Farm produce should sell on the open market, and prices under parity should be supplemented by deficiency payments on only that amount of production per farm that will sustain a family-size farmer.

3. We oppose crop curtailment, but where there is reduction it must be imposed entirely on the big farmers.

4. The Communist Party urges full participation of its members in every struggle to keep small and middle farmers on their farms, including support of legislative programs for low-interest credit, soil conservation, crop insurance, federal aid to education and other demands of small farmers.

5. We favor the enactment of a national food stamp plan that will supplement the starvation wages imposed on millions of Americans, and that will provide adequate food and clothing to the millions in depressed areas. Such a program would be of direct help to both labor and farmers.

6. The world, too, needs a food stamp plan. Let us subsidize the shipment of food abroad to allay hunger, instead of military hardware for destruction.

7. Agriculture in the South has special complex problems tied up with the fight for democracy in the South. Some of these are dealt with in the resolution on the Negro question.

PERSPECTIVES

Our neglect of the farm question is a serious weakness in our practical activity, and represents a big gap in our efforts to apply Marxism-Leninism to the tasks ahead.

In particular, this defect in our theoretical understanding threatens serious consequences for our electoral activities for 1960. An essential component of the 1960 electoral campaign is the coordination of farmer, labor and Negro efforts, enlarging to a national

scale the splendid 1958 state campaigns against "right-to-work" laws.

The common interests of the farmers, workers and Negro people require an offensive against the Dixiecrats. It is the Dixiecrats who are the gun runners for the offensive against the labor movement. It is the Dixiecrats who block the democratic advance of the Negro people. It is the Dixiecrats who defend the interests of big farmers and plantation owners.

Farm-state liberal Congressmen trade with the Dixiecrats to help pass farm legislation. Deals are made whereby the Dixiecrats trade their votes on farm laws for support of anti-union and anti-civil rights positions. The Dixiecrats must be isolated in national politics and then totally eliminated. This can only be done by a farmer-labor-Negro coalition in which each understands and supports the basic needs of the others, and which develops urban support in the North and West for adequate farm legislation.

The 17th Convention should spark a serious turn toward implementing the basic Marxist-Leninist principle of the alliance of farmers and workers. The first requisite for achieving this turn is the adoption of measures by every district leadership to guarantee that especially the trade union cadre of our Party becomes conscious of its responsibility to win the labor movement for a full understanding of its stake in lending the fullest support to the pressing needs of the family farmers, and in the labor-farmer alliance.

Secondly, it requires steps toward the full participation of all farm comrades in their farm organizations, seeking to direct the attention of their fel-

low farmers toward more consistent and purposeful activity to save the family farmers from extinction, to establish bonds with the city working class, and to advance the program of the Party on the peace, civil rights, civil liberties and trade union fronts.

The Party favors the immediate preparation of pamphlets and literature which will (1) make available a survey of the existing farm situation to the broadest masses of farmers, workers and middle class people, and (2) make known the Party's position on the critical issues facing the farmers.

and on the methods of their solution.

The National Committee should be directed to establish a functioning farm commission to include a member of the National Executive Committee, and to establish regional farm commissions under the direction of regional subcommittees of the Party. The political perspectives which have been outlined in our national draft resolution, in Comrade Hall's speech, and in this resolution, will only become effective if serious organizational steps are undertaken.

On Lincoln's Birthday, 1960, Louis E. Burnham, implacable fighter for the liberation of his people, the Negro people, and gentle and inspiring friend, passed away. But 44 years of age at his death, Lou already was a veteran of a generation's fierce struggle and selfless toil in the service of his country's ennoblement and his people's freedom. A talented writer, a deep thinker, a gentle soul, a staunch fighter for Socialism, all these we have lost with the loss of Louis E. Burnham. In the thundering freedom-struggles of the American Negro today one has, quite literally, the monument to Lou's work; those of us who yet remain will do our best to carry on, with the beautiful image of Lou Burnham never far from our hearts.

—The Editor.

ON "THE WORKER"

FAVORABLE AS THE objective conditions are for the successful realization of the decisions of the 17th Convention of the Communist Party, these historic goals will not be reached without building *The Worker* into a popular, mass, Marxist-Leninist newspaper which has gained the confidence of tens of thousands of trade unionists, and of the Negro people and other minority groups.

The Editorial Board and Staff of *The Worker* are conscious of the need to improve the paper politically, in coverage and analysis, as well as to make its style more popular. Toward this end, we also greet the agreement reached by *The Worker* and the Midwest comrades to publish a Midwest Edition beginning May 1, 1960.

The anti-monopoly movement, the peace forces of America, the Negro liberation movement, organized and unorganized labor, the national minorities of our country, those forces fighting for the peaceful co-existence of countries with divergent social outlooks—all will find in *The Worker* a dedicated supporter of the aims for which they fight and a press that interprets events from a Marxist-Leninist position and in the interests of a socialist society in the USA.

The circulation and financial support of *The Worker* have been seriously affected by the intrigues and anti-Constitutional hysteria provoked by the McCarthyites and directed in the main

against the Communist Party, as well as by the crisis within the Party.

But despite these blows, despite weaknesses associated with the production of *The Worker* in its content or management, it stands today as one of the ideological bulwarks against the attempts of the monopoly-controlled metropolitan press to win the minds of the American people for its cold war policies.

The building of The Worker is for Communists not just another of their several tasks. Rather, the building of its circulation, strengthening its financial base and support and giving fundamental aid to those who seek to restore the *Daily Worker* become tasks without whose successful achievement the establishment of a powerful peace movement, an invincible labor and Negro liberation movement is impossible.

Therefore, the 17th Convention instructs the incoming National Committee to make the building of *The Worker* a responsibility to be assumed by the Party as a whole and by every individual member of the Party.

In assuming this responsibility, this Convention believes that the National Committee should *place a major political duty upon all Party leaders to give guidance and specific attention to the building of Worker circulation.*

The Worker can and must be carried to the American people.

This Convention believes that promises and preparations should be made

early for financial aid to *The Worker's* 1960 financial campaign.

This Convention proposes to the incoming National Committee the organization of a financial campaign for support of *The Worker*, to raise a sum of \$75,000 or more, which will begin on the 36th anniversary of *The Worker*, January 13, and end on or before the last of May.

The present circulation of *The Worker* is between 13 and 14 thousand. This Convention believes that that circulation can be successfully raised to 20,000 within the year 1960.

It therefore instructs the incoming

National Committee to create a standing Worker Builders Committee which will immediately formulate a circulation campaign to begin together with the financial campaign.

It is obvious that conditions do not permit uniform responsibilities. But this Convention believes that no district of the Party should be without a press director.

We believe that the greatest possible coordination should exist between those responsible for the building of *The Worker* and those responsible for its production.

ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

DESPITE A NUMBER of court decisions and other developments indicating a lessening of the worst aspects of judicial assaults on democratic rights, reaction is still determined to carry on in the spirit of McCarthyism.

The illegal use of Congressional committees to persecute peace advocates, trade unionists and the Negro people still continues. Proceedings under the Smith Act, though sharply slowed down, also continue (as witnessed by the convictions in the Denver and Junius Scales cases, as well as the Noto, Lightfoot, Hellman and other convictions). At the same time, Comrade William Z. Foster is vindictively kept under Smith Act indictment, despite the fact that his health precludes his ever being brought to trial.

A number of Communists and labor leaders have been convicted under the Taft-Hartley Act. The Department of Justice is still pressing the outlawing of the Communist Party under the McCarran Act. In a number of states, the NAACP is being forced out of legal existence by means of new state laws. The attack on the foreign-born, while somewhat eased, is still being waged. The FBI continues its harassment of supporters of peace and democratic rights and its gagging of all public discussions of its Gestapo-like activities.

The sham of the government's democratic pretensions is shown by the stubborn refusal of the Parole Board to release our unjustly-imprisoned comrades, Henry Winston, Gil Green and Bob Thompson, while crooks are regularly paroled or pardoned. Their continued imprisonment, the brutal sentence in-

flicted on Morton Sobell, the Taft-Hartley jailings, the sentences imposed on the numerous individuals who merely asserted their rights under the First Amendment—all these, and others as well, give the lie to the pious hypocrisy that there are no political prisoners in the United States.

The fight to free these political prisoners merges with the great democratic struggle of all Americans, irrespective of political outlook, and in the first place of organized labor, whose right to organize is intimately bound up with the maintenance of constitutional rights. An inescapable element in the struggle is the fight for the right of the Communist Party and its members freely to organize, speak, write and assemble.

With a relaxation of tensions and the growth of the anti-cold war atmosphere in our nation, the fight for democratic rights and the smashing of every vestige of McCarthyism can take on new, unprecedented proportions. A new initiative on the part of Communists to participate and help develop this broad movement for civil liberties is the need of the moment.

The 17th National Convention accepts this responsibility and instructs the incoming national committee to take all steps required to set up the necessary apparatus for such activity in the national center and in all districts, and, as a first step, to guarantee a task force in every district to strengthen the amnesty campaign for our comrades Winston, Green and Thompson in order to win their freedom in the shortest possible time.

ON THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THE SOUTHWEST

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN PEOPLE are located in the Southwest and constitute the largest national minority in that area. Our Party can only reflect the Southwest if it is rooted among the Mexican-American people. This is true not only because of the historical development of the region but because today there are approximately 4 million Mexican-American people there. Substantial progress can only be made in all sections of the working class movement, the labor unions, the fight for independent political action, etc., when decisive significance of the Mexican-American people is recognized.

The Mexican-American people constitute an oppressed national minority with strong ties of language and culture. They suffer discrimination from chauvinism and the entire pattern of national oppression.

There are several distinct features of the region and the Mexican-American people that require study and analysis. One of the features is its heterogeneity. Among the 4 million many have roots going back three centuries since the United States forcibly wrested the Southwest from Mexico in 1848. A second segment arrived in the United States in the waves of immigration from Mexico that began with the turbulence which was opened up by the Mexican Revolution and wracked Mexico from 1910 to 1917. Immigration

from Mexico has continued in large numbers since then, reaching a yearly peak of 65,000 in 1955.

A second feature of the community is its still-existing popular use of the Spanish language and the continuing influence of the culture of Mexico.

The third feature is the relatively low state of organization as a people. This is seen in the fact that there is no Spanish language or bi-lingual press that plays the same role as does the Negro press in the Negro liberation movement. Further, the strong continuing ties with the Catholic church that with the exception of the Catholic Conference on Rural Welfare plays no part in the fight for equality and integration. The Mexican-American people have been deprived of a long experience in the hard school of parliamentary and electoral struggles. The middle-class, the professionals and the bourgeoisie form an almost insignificant percentage of the Mexican community. In Los Angeles County, there are not more than two dozen doctors (the 1950 Census counts twelve). Lawyers are found in a similar number. There are reputed to be only two architects, two dozen social workers, etc. Business men are found primarily in small retail businesses.

WORKING-CLASS CHARACTER

The overriding distinguishing feature is the working-class composition

of the Mexican-American people. In the Southwest they constitute the vast majority of workers in the mining, smelting and refining industries as they do in the agricultural fields and sheds. In many parts of the country they are a vital part of basic industry. In Los Angeles, for example, they already constitute what might be described as the "heart of the working class." They are a major part of the working class in the organized industries such as steel, auto, longshore, furniture, and food processing as well as in others, including the skilled trades. In some unorganized industries such as garments and electronics there are 60,000 Mexican women employed.

This proletarianization has created the base for a large stable community. This fact together with influences of nationalism in Mexico and increased educational and economic opportunities have created a trend which is increasing the unity of the various elements of the community and influencing their consciousness as a people with special problems. Expressions of the growing identity and group consciousness are the National Community Service Organization and the American G. I. Forum. Both are broad social action organizations liberal in character, and they are the first to arise on a national scale and to follow the pattern of the Anglo type of mass organization.

These organizations have integration as their main objective. A growing feature of the Mexican-American community is the desire to take part in and influence the major people's organizations of our country. This is true in those trade unions where they are organized. There is a growing corps

of leadership developing in these unions. Politically the community is almost all Democratic with the exception of certain counties in New Mexico where political affiliation tends to be more of a traditional family tie. The community, although it is as high as 95% Democratic, does not have the party prejudices and the undissoluble ties to be found in other communities. Perhaps this is because of its relative political newness. Los Amigos De Wallace, for instance, produced some of the largest demonstrations ever seen in the Mexican community of Los Angeles.

Even though Democratic, the Mexican community is still largely inactive politically. Over half of those eligible to vote are not registered, and participation in Democratic clubs is limited to the small organized elements. Perhaps this is because the history of the Mexican people is a revolutionary and not a parliamentary history. In those parts of the Southwest where the Mine Mill Union has fought for representation and political activity, it is found that there are Mexican-Americans in City Councils and other governmental bodies.

EDUCATION

The economics of the community, the language and the cultural differences, and the lack of a special approach by the educational systems have contributed to making the Mexican community one of the most poorly educated groups in the country. The 1950 census reports that whereas the overall median number of school years is 12.1 it is only 8 years for the Mexican

people in the urban areas and 4 years in the rural areas. A recent survey showed that the schools start Mexican children who, in the majority of cases know no English, with a curriculum in English. We should demand of the school system a bi-lingual education to overcome this unequal status of Mexican-American children. The survey also showed that the lack of understanding, counseling and assistance for adjustments to high school education resulted in a large number of students either being dropped or quitting school. We should demand adequate staffing of this counseling service by Mexican-American personnel to solve this problem and to force the schools to encourage more liberal arts education for the Mexican-American youth. The insidious "American Destiny" theme that runs through the curriculum and the distorted version of history of our relations with Mexico soon create in the Mexican child a gnawing sense of inferiority. American history versions must be corrected to give a true picture of American imperialism and the valiant history of Mexico.

IMMIGRATION

There is almost no Mexican family that does not have some contact with immigration problems. Even those who have been here for generations are subject momentarily to being questioned and frisked by the immigration service, and if found without proper identification to being locked up until a friend or relative can be contacted for identification. Others know of neighbor's wives and husbands sent out of the country in the middle of the night

and of the frenzied worry and activity to bring them back. In 1954 over a million people were given "voluntary departures" to Mexico. The figures have dropped since but the insecurity and harassment remain in the day-to-day life of the Mexican-American.

There is a growing resistance to this persecution. In Los Angeles, for example, the Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born highlights the brutal treatment by the immigration department, and has brought the problem to the attention of the world. The Community Service Organization conducts citizenship classes which have been instrumental in the growing fight against this constant harassment. There is the fight to repeal the Walter-McCarren Act. This should be emphasized.

MIGRATORY LABOR

The imperialist exploitation of Mexico by the United States is so great that there are millions in Mexico who have never had a job. Those who do have work have such incredibly low standards that it is really true that the bad conditions in the United States are preferable to them. It is safe to say that as long as the economic pressure brought about by the disparity of the two countries continues, there will be an irresistible movement of workers to the United States. The *braceros* are the contract workers who are yearly brought for seasonal work by the large growers of the United States.

"In the case of the migrant Mexican we have a unique kind of internal colonialism. The native laborer works hard for pitiful wages, suffers the so-

cial inferiority of a native in the eyes of his master and the community and lives under the subhuman conditions so often characteristic of native colonial life. The difference between the traditional and the new colonial natives is that they are kept with us within distance when we want them and then driven out of the community when no longer needed. . . ." (Charles Abrams, *Forbidden Neighbors*, N. Y., 1955; Harper.)

Our treatment of the *braceros*, as one Catholic Bishop put it, is a "crime that calls for a vengeance." Housing conditions are intolerable in many areas, cheating in wages and non-payments of wages are the common pattern. The American trade union movement for a long time has taken the attitude of fighting the entire program on the grounds that it was lowering standards. But lately more and more of the union leadership is beginning to realize that it must fight for better conditions of these workers, for solidarity with them, and to organize them. The struggle for higher standards is the key demand because we should never be put in the position of fighting a fellow working class and depriving it, on narrow nationalistic grounds, of its right to work.

REPRESENTATION

Hand in hand with the trend toward organization, there has come a strong and universal demand for representation. Electoral victories in Texas are greeted by all sections of the community from the newly arrived immigrant to the resident of many generations, and from Texas to California.

New Mexico has one senator and one congressman. But the lack of representation in the Southwest is appalling. In California, for example, the more than one million Mexican-Americans are not represented by even one elected official in the state or county governments and by not even one legislator. The drive for representation extends to every area of community life. The G. I. Forum, essentially a middle-class organization, felt called upon at its last convention to congratulate the International Union of Electrical workers for having appointed a Mexican-American business agent.

LABOR MOVEMENT

The fact that so many workers are Mexican places a great problem before the trade union movement. Recent developments in the fight for F.E.P. and minimum wage laws in California have emphasized this point. The special responsibility for an energetic campaign to organize the agricultural workers is beginning to take root. Every such movement, including the building of broad citizens committees, should be supported.

Of special importance is the drive to organize those unorganized industries with a high concentration of Mexican women. In order to make this a reality the unions should recognize the special problems of these women. Concessions must be made on the question of language, struggle on the immigration problems and the need for their cultural expression. There must also be a recognition of the growing demand for representation on all levels of union leadership. The most important legis-

lative demand is that for a minimum wage of \$1.50 an hour, already put forward by the labor movement.

Other issues that unite this regional community are the need for real fair employment practices, to end discrimination in housing, and to create more opportunities for higher education through the support of scholarship funds and the demand for state scholarships and facilities to meet the economic problems faced by low income families in attaining higher education.

THE PARTY

The general isolation of the Party is sharply demonstrated in our isolation from the Mexican-American people of the Southwest. Our Party has an important history in organizing and leading struggles of the Mexican-American people. To root the Party in the Southwest is to influence a decisive na-

tional minority. The National Committee together with the Southern California district should guarantee a real effort to revitalize the Party organization in the Southwest. Special steps must be taken for the development of Mexican-American cadre as well as our other forces in the community. Our Party should seek forms to initiate the movement of unity with the other sections of the Spanish-speaking American people. Our Party must seek to initiate steps that will lead to the unity of the two largest and most oppressed national minorities—the Negro people and the Mexican-American people.

The fight for equality, the move to organization, the stability and working class character of the Mexican-American people means that with increased and special attention they can become a powerful element in a people's coalition.

ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

WHEREAS, the Indian people are an exploited and oppressed national minority, whose living standards are low, and whose cultural activities have been suppressed—a minority which can be brought into the struggle for a new life in the United States, and

WHEREAS, the American Indian has been the victim of the most brutal oppression, characteristic of a policy of genocide, and

WHEREAS, the history of broken promises and scrapped treaties is a shameful part of our American history, and

WHEREAS, the ideology of Anglo-

Saxon and white chauvinism dominates the policies of government bureaus and others on the American Indian in all parts of the country, and

WHEREAS, our Party has given its responsibilities in this area only the most limited and scattered attention,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this entire question be put on the Party's agenda as one of its next tasks, and that the Party take all necessary measures to participate in a broad movement to determine steps necessary to a solution and to a correction of our weaknesses in this field.

ON PUERTO RICAN WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

PUERTO Rico is a nation. It is a direct colony of American imperialism.

The Communist Party has a two-fold task in relation to Puerto Rico.

First, to aid the people in Puerto Rico in the fight against economic, social and political oppression by Wall Street imperialism, and for full sovereignty and independence.

Second, to aid the Puerto Ricans in the United States, in their struggles against extreme conditions of poverty, slum ghettos, discrimination, police brutality, and other forms of oppression as a national minority.

Puerto Rican youth has been used as cannon fodder, without consultation or consent from the Puerto Rican people, in all U. S. imperialist wars.

Over 65,000 Puerto Ricans participated in the Second World War. In the U.S. imperialist invasion of Korea, Puerto Rico suffered one casualty for every 660 inhabitants as compared with one casualty for every 1,125 inhabitants of the United States.

As of December 1958 there were 608,000 Puerto Ricans by birth and 241,000 of Puerto Rican parentage living in the United States. There are sizeable Puerto Rican communities in large cities from coast to coast, with a Puerto Rican population of 654,000 in New York City alone.

This National Convention therefore declares that it is an imperative duty for our Party to turn its face to the Puerto Rican people, to learn their con-

ditions and needs and to give them practical and political aid in their efforts to organize themselves into unions, to raise their desperately low wages, to improve housing conditions and abolish slums, to attain proper education, to meet the social, cultural and economic needs of their youth, to combat the chauvinist campaign of slander and lies about the Puerto Rican people, and to struggle against every act of discrimination and oppression.

The Convention considers that appropriate attention to the vital needs of the Puerto Rican, as well as the Mexican-American and Negro people, is a test of Communist integrity and responsibility because the Communist Party has always been distinguished by the fact that it is the defender and champion of the most exploited and oppressed sections of the working population.

The Convention therefore decides upon the following concrete steps to overcome the long neglect and grave weaknesses in relation to our work among the Puerto Rican people:

1. The incoming National Committee shall make a thorough study and evaluation of our work in every community and industry in which there is a significant number of Puerto Ricans throughout the United States. Special emphasis in this study shall be given to housing, jobs, peace, and political action.

2. In states where there are large populations of Puerto Ricans, consideration shall be given to establishing Puerto Rican commissions and Puerto Rican concentration clubs, enlisting for such clubs Spanish-speaking and other comrades interested in Puerto Rican work.
3. The National Committee shall organize a Party seminar and classes on Puerto Rican work in every city with large Puerto Rican communities.
4. A special bulletin shall be issued in Spanish devoted to facts of Puerto Rican life and experiences in struggles, based upon the proposed study.
5. Within a reasonable time and after adequate preparation, state conferences shall be called of delegates from all clubs or sections to draw up fuller state-wide plans of work. An important feature of such conferences shall be the question of jobs for Puerto Rican, Mexican-American and Negro workers.
6. A special commission on Puerto Rican work shall be set up by the National Executive Committee.
7. *The Worker, Political Affairs*, and other publications shall give

major attention to Puerto Rican work.

8. The Party shall make a conscious and persistent effort to involve Puerto Rican members in all phases of leadership.
9. This National Convention shall send a message of greeting to our brother Party of Puerto Rico paying tribute to the courageous stand taken by the witnesses called before the Un-American Activities Committee in Puerto Rico, and shall pledge them our full aid in the struggle against proposed contempt citations as well as other attacks against the sovereignty of the Puerto Rican nation. This Convention recognizes the self-criticism by the National Committee of the inadequate support given to the Puerto Rican comrades and others in connection with Un-American Activities Committee hearings both here and in Puerto Rico.
10. This Convention of the Communist Party of the United States demands the freedom of Dr. Pedro Albizu Campos and all other Puerto Rican political prisoners now in Puerto Rican and federal prisons in the United States.

ON WORK AMONG JAPANESE-AMERICANS

WHEREAS, OUR PARTY made serious errors in our work with the Japanese people in our country, specifically in the failure to oppose the relocation centers during World War II,

BE IT RESOLVED; that this convention honor those Japanese comrades and friends who have steadfastly main-

tained their ties to the Party and to the progressive movement, and that we make every effort to rebuild our ties and to rebuild our Party among the Japanese in our country, with special attention to overcoming weakness of the past.

ON REVISION OF U.S.-JAPANESE TREATY

WHEREAS, Japan's Kishi Government under pressure of American imperialism is seeking to revise the treaty between Japan and the United States in such a way as to continue making Japan into a base for U.S. military forces under the rule of American imperialists, and

WHEREAS, such a revision of the treaty will increase international tension, involve the United States in a further program of intimidating the Japanese people and worsen relations between peoples, and

WHEREAS, the needs of peace and the American people require an approach to establishing friendship between peoples of all countries and an end to U.S. imperialist ventures in Japan and all other countries, and

WHEREAS, we hold a special responsibility because it was the United States Air Force, on the basis of a decision of the then President Harry Truman,

which dropped the destructive atom bombs that rained death and annihilation on the civilian populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this convention protest the efforts of our government to revise the treaty for purposes of continuing the use of Japan as a military outpost of the United States, that immediate steps be taken to withdraw all U. S. troops and military forces from Japan and bring them home, and that Okinawa be fully restored to Japan, so that there is restored a basis for friendship of the people of our country with the people of Japan, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the sense of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower and to the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees, and that further steps be taken to implement this resolution.

ON CUBA

ON DECEMBER 7, Cuba's military commander-in-chief warned his people that the nation may be invaded by the armed mercenaries of Dictator Trujillo of the Dominican Republic and of other reactionary forces. The world has already been told about the five thousand cutthroats from the Nazi army and the Franco fascists who were being trained to make the invasion. Thus, Cuba—the country where the revolution against imperialism in Latin America has reached the highest point in history—is in great and immediate danger.

This poses an immediate responsibility of utmost historic gravity before the American people, and especially before its most decisive sectors: labor, the Negro people and all honest democrats and progressives who want to see every nation achieve sovereignty, independence, and economic and political advance. This issue is one that must be at the very top of the agenda for Communists in the United States.

Not only is revolutionary Cuba threatened by military invasion; it is subject today to the combined onslaught of powerful forces manipulated by American imperialist interests who dread the impressive advances being made by the new government. Capitalist newspapers, State Department officials, television, radio, the combined agents of ex-Dictator Batista and Dictator Trujillo—all have joined forces to defame and injure in every conceivable way, economically, politically, militarily, that country whose ad-

vances are regarded as sacred by the 200 million inhabitants of Latin America, as well as by all enlightened mankind everywhere.

Imperialism fears that the new Cuba will succeed. It sees that unity of all revolutionary forces within Cuba has been strengthened since the hosts of freedom forced Batista to flee just over a year ago. He and those he represents desperately strive to make their comeback before the unity, which cements all genuine revolutionary forces in the island, makes such advances that the forces of reaction can never again possibly win the day.

Advances are being made, first of all, in the countryside. The Land Reform is moving ahead at a magnificent rate. Peasants are getting land. Farms appropriated by the government from Batista hirelings are being run as cooperatives. Farmers are also getting implements, instruction and substantial credits. Cement homes are going up to replace the age-old, rickety *bohios*—the straw-thatched one-room huts. Schools are being built everywhere to wipe out the more than 50% illiteracy.

Similarly, among the working people in the cities, rents have been cut by 50% everywhere. Electric rates have been reduced drastically by intervening in the enterprises of the big Wall Street corporation, Electric Bond and Share. Telephone rates have been cut 50% with the cost of calls reduced from a dime to a nickel.

Trade-union democracy has been

strengthened greatly by ousting the labor-dictator Mujal who fled with Batista. Mujal had had the blessings of ORIT, the regional inter-American workers' organization which serves as the State Department's instrument among the Latin American workers, and which never found it necessary to declare one word of criticism against his bestial acts. This is the Mujal whom Cuban labor calls the *chivato*—the stoolpigeon—because he turned over any unionist Batista wanted to the dictator's Gestapo for torture or death.

The Tenth Congress of the Cuban labor movement, the CTC, saw further labor advances when the most powerful *mujalista* elements were ousted from office and influence; when the two million-strong confederation voted to break ties with ORIT, which they branded as a tool of the State Department, and reactionary leaders in the United States.

The people of the USA can learn much from Cuba's democracy. The new government, in enunciating its set of principles a year ago, placed the elimination of racism as one of the major immediate objectives. The advances in this decisive field can be gauged by the fact that Cuba's head of the army today is a Negro; the head of the airforce is a Negro; the head of the military forces of Oriente, the principal province, where a third of Cuba lives, is a Negro. Consider the advance in this country if the same could be said of us. No wonder the press has clamped a conspiracy of silence upon such advances, and instead has embarked on a smear campaign of unprecedented proportions.

The imperialist forces that exploit and oppress the Cuban people and the

rest of the Latin American nations are the same monopolists that exploit the workers of the United States. This fact places upon the workers and progressive forces of the United States the responsibility of developing solidarity and aid to the embattled people of Cuba and the other nations of Latin America.

One hundred years of struggle by the Cuban people against Spanish and U.S. imperialism resulted in very little freedom for the Cuban nation until the democratic-popular anti-imperialist revolution led by Fidel Castro and the 26th of July movement. The revolution, supported by 95 per cent of the Cuban people including the Popular Socialist Party, brought into existence a genuine liberation movement for the first time, free from corruption and determined not to compromise with the main enemy of the Cuban nation: American imperialism. That is why American imperialism is forcefully resisting every step taken by the Castro government.

Whether through diplomatic channels such as the recent State Department statement protesting against Cuba's "anti-Americanism," or by direct armed attack from airplanes based in Florida, U.S. imperialism is using every means to undermine Cuba's progress toward complete freedom.

The people of the United States have much in common with the Cuban liberation movement. Cuba is fighting for her sovereignty and freedom from foreign intervention as did the American people in the course of their own revolution of 1776.

Moreover, the working class of the United States today has a big stake in solidarity with the Cuban workers.

The latter harbor no illusions as to who is their real enemy. When they cry, "Down with Yankee imperialism," they are resisting the same monopolists who are the bitterest exploiters of American labor.

We therefore propose:

1. To work to mobilize U. S. public opinion and to organize support, especially in the trade unions, for the Cuban people: a) to answer the lies and slanders being spread by imperialist circles about Cuba and its new government, through *The Worker*, leaflets, meetings and forums, and every other possible means; b) to encourage the sending of telegrams of greetings from trade unions to their opposite numbers in Cuba on appropriate occasions; c) to help organize assistance to Cuban workers' families—money, clothing, etc.; d) to organize

help for Cuba's school children—contributions of paper, pencils, recording machines, etc.

2. To develop continuous activity, not just sporadic actions, in support of Cuba.

3. To build friendship organizations involving non-Cuban people, with the specific and main slogan of "Hands off Cuba."

4. To send delegations to Cuba for trade union and cultural exchanges.

5. To strive to arouse our people against any reactionary move to wreck the Cuban sugar quota and against other measures directed to weakening the Cuban economy.

6. To call on progressive Americans to protest the unwarranted action of steamship companies in trying to destroy the Cuban tourist trade.

Coming in March—

COMPOSER AND NATION

THE FOLK HERITAGE OF MUSIC

By Sidney Finkelstein

For laymen and musicians alike, this book surveys four centuries of music from the standpoint of the place of folk music in creative musical composition. It focuses not only on the great 19th century composers who consciously allied their art with national traditions, such as Smetana, Dvorak, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, but throws new light upon the masters writing during the period of the rise of modern nations and the baroque era, such as Vivaldi, Handel and Bach. The author presents in a new and fresh way the classic era of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, and uncovers the social and psychological issues that affected the work of the great romantic composers, such as Schumann, Chopin, Berlioz, Wagner and Brahms.

Fully a third of the book deals with the twentieth century musicians such as Debussy, Mahler, Richard Strauss, Vaughan Williams, Bartok, Villa-Lobos, Stravinsky and others in terms of new problems raised in contemporary music. There is a chapter on American jazz, and others dealing with recent criticism of contemporary Soviet composers.

Well known for his previous books, including *How Music Expresses Ideas*, *Realism in Art*, and *Art and Society*, the author has compressed into this volume an invaluable musical education. Price \$4.00

Order from your local bookshop or from

New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.