

political affairs

SEPTEMBER 1960 • 35 CENTS

- | | | |
|-------------------------|------|---|
| SHIRLEY GRAHAM | [13] | The African Personality |
| JAMES E. JACKSON | [31] | To the First Party
of the Americas |
| ANDRE BARJONET | [35] | On the Law of
Maximum Profits |
| HERBERT APTHEKER | [46] | The Bomb and Imperialism |
| B. RYURIKOV | [57] | Humanism in Our Epoch |

U.S. IMPERIALISM AND THE CONGO

by Hyman Lumer

[1-12]

THE 1960 ELECTIONS

PEACE AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

by Nat. Exec. Committee, CPUSA [20-30]

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

THE SUMMIT FAILURE, by Gus Hall	\$.15
JOHN BROWN, AMERICAN MARTYR, by Herbert Aptheker	.25
YOUR STAKE IN THE 1960 ELECTIONS by Gus Hall	\$.15
UPSURGE IN THE SOUTH, by Benjamin J. Davis	.15
JEWES IN THE SOVIET UNION, by Sofia Frey	.10
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
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 SOVIET UNION TODAY, by George Morris	.35
ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION, by H. Aptheker	.25

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. 9

SEPTEMBER, 1960

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

U.S. Imperialism and the Congo

"Notes of the Month" by Hyman Lumer

EVENTS NOWADAYS MOVE with lightning speed, and nowhere is this more so than in Africa, where the national liberation movement is making tremendous strides forward. One colony after another is gaining its independence and in the year 1960 alone, sixteen new independent states will have come into existence by November.

Among these is the Belgian Congo, long regarded by the imperialists as a "model colony" and one of the strongest bastions of colonialism. The crumbling of this fortress is a severe blow not only to the Belgian monopolists but to world imperialism—a blow which it is strenuously resisting. Thus, less than two weeks after its birth, the infant Republic of Congo found itself defending its newly-won independence against aggression launched by its former Belgian masters with the connivance and support of the major imperialist powers, and in the first place of the United States. And here, too, events are moving swiftly to a climax.

It is clear that behind the Belgian return in force lies the heavy hand of the American ruling circles, without whose backing the Belgian imperialists, compelled by forces beyond their control to grant independence to the Congo, would have been far less able to march in. It is the role and aims of U.S. imperialism in the picture which form the chief object of our concern here.

WALL STREET AND AFRICA

In the schemes for world domination which are the foundation of Wall Street's cold war policy, Africa has held a very important place as an anti-Soviet base and a potential source of enormous profits and power, to be wrested from the hands of Wall Street's imperialist rivals. For U.S. imperialism is a latecomer on the African scene; by the time it emerged as a major world force, Africa had long been divided up among other imperialist powers.

Prior to World War II, American investment and influence on that continent were very small. In 1929,

I

according to the Department of Commerce figures, Africa took only \$92.4 million, about 1 per cent of total direct private investment abroad. In 1943, the proportion was no higher. After the war, however, U.S. imperialism greatly stepped up its drive to expand its holdings, and not without success. By 1955, direct investment amounted to \$657 million or 3.5 per cent of total foreign investment, and since then it has grown to nearly \$800 million*

The United States has also greatly increased its imports from Africa, which have multiplied more than eleven times since 1938. Significantly, much of the increase is in strategic materials, particularly uranium. At the same time, Africa was developed as a base of cold war operations through the construction of major air bases in Morocco, Algeria and Libya, as well as the securing of rights to use similar bases in other parts of Africa. Among these is the huge base at Kamina in the Congo, which the United States is reported to have had a hand in building.

All in all, U.S. penetration of Africa has been substantial. "The Wall Street bankers," wrote James S. Allen as far back as 1952, "now

* The actual amounts are considerably higher than these figures indicate. Department of Commerce figures are based on book values, not the current market or replacement values, which are higher. Also, they exclude investments channeled through U.S.-controlled corporations in other countries, particularly Britain and Canada.

have a powerful vested interest in preserving the entire colonial structure of Africa, favoring only those changes which will increase their share of the spoils." (*Atomic Imperialism*, International Publishers, p. 215.) The penetration has, however, encountered definite limitations, and it must be added that Wall Street's concern lies as much in its drive for further expansion as in its present stake.

THE CONGO

The fabulous mineral wealth of the Congo, most of it concentrated in Katanga province, has made this area an especially tempting morsel in the eyes of American monopoly capital. The Congo accounts for about 75 per cent of the capitalist world's output of cobalt, more than 60 per cent of its industrial diamonds, 9 per cent of its copper and substantial proportions of a host of other important minerals. It is the richest source of uranium available to the capitalist world, and produces practically all of its radium. In addition, it is an important producer of a variety of agricultural products.

For the Belgian monopolists, the exploitation of these vast resources has been a source of enormous enrichment. This bonanza they have zealously guarded from the very outset against foreign intrusion. This has been accomplished through the

formation of an intricate, close-knit state-monopoly combine, headed by the Société Général de Belgique.

As James S. Allen sums it up: "In their efforts to dominate the Congo mines, the American atomic trusts confront one of the most thoroughgoing monopolies ever established over a colony. Monopoly control over the resources and labor of mineral-rich Katanga province is complete." (*Atomic Imperialism*, p. 194.) Kingpin in Katanga is the Union Minière du Haut Katanga, which controls not only its mineral resources but also all other aspects of its economic life. In fact, the entire province has been aptly described as one big company town.

U.S. monopoly capital has persistently striven to break the tight grip of the Belgian combine and to gain control of the Congo's mineral wealth, above all its uranium. The door was opened shortly after the turn of the century with a loan made by the Rockefeller interests, and this was followed by similar indirect investments in the Congo's key industries, as well as direct investment in a number of peripheral industries. But the first opening for direct investment within the sacred precincts of the Union Minière did not come until 1950, when the Rockefeller and Morgan interests succeeded in securing a substantial block of stock in Tanganyika Concessions, a British firm holding a

14 per cent interest in Union Minière. With this transaction, American finance capital acquired a significant stake in the exploitation of the Congo.

A number of American firms have made investments in a variety of Congo industries, among them Socony Mobil Oil, Texas Company, Shell Oil Company, Armco Steel, U.S. Plywood Company, International Business Machines and others. The Bank of America holds 15 per cent of the stock of Société Congolese du Banque. With these and other interests, U.S. investment in the Congo today ranks second only to that of Belgium. Britain ranks third, and West Germany maintains a share through a sizeable loan to Belgium.

Thus, while the Congo has been under Belgian rule, it can truthfully be said that it has been a colony not of Belgium alone but of the big imperialist powers collectively. In the words of Soviet Premier Khrushchev: "The bayonet was Belgian but the masters were large American, Belgian, British and West German monopolies." It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that these powers have joined hands in an assault on the Congo's independence, for though they may fight among themselves over the division of the spoils, they are as one in their determination that there shall continue to be spoils.

To be sure, despite these inroads the Belgians have succeeded in retaining the bulk of the investment in their hands (some estimates place it as high as 90 per cent). But the American stake, in particular, is by no means inconsequential. To its investments must be added the fact that nearly all of the Congo's output of uranium and cobalt (also used in the manufacture of nuclear devices) goes to the United States, providing, along with access to air bases, another big incentive to intervene. "Because of the contribution the mineral resources of the Congo make to the industrial and military requirements of the United States," says a report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "it is essential that our future relations with it be such that the continuation of these supplies be assured." (*United States Foreign Policy, No. 4, Africa, Washington, 1959.*) And of course, the best way to assure this is to gain the ownership of their source.

It is essential to note that the word "our" in the above quotation really refers to American finance capital—to the Rockefellers, Morgans and their ilk—who seek to fatten themselves on the slave labor of the Congolese people, and not to the masses of the American working people, themselves victims of monopolist exploitation, who have nothing to gain from these adventures.

COLONIAL POLICY TODAY

When the Belgian ruling circles agreed to grant independence to the Congo, they were by no means abandoning colonialism. Rather, in the face of the tremendous impetus and force of the colonial liberation movement—a tide which could no longer be held back. Says E. Arab-Ogly, writing in the *World Marxist Review* of May, 1960:

Today the colonial powers are acting cautiously, preferring as a rule to avoid the danger of armed uprising from which they would risk losing both their political influence and their economic interests. The instructive example of Holland, which forfeited her economic positions in Indonesia because of a reckless attempt to crush the liberation movement there, was fresh enough in the minds of the Belgian rulers to force them to make concessions to the leaders of the Congolese nationalist parties, and, with the threat of a national uprising hanging over their head, to promise the country independence this summer.

Thus, the purpose of this move was not to surrender but to *retain* the rich Belgian holdings in the Congo. The idea was to grant political independence but to seek out "reliable" Congolese leaders with whom they could form a "partnership" which would leave them in economic control.

Of course, this is scarcely an origi-

nal idea. What is important, however, is that such a policy of "neo-colonialism"—of granting formal independence in order to perpetuate the economic stranglehold of imperialism—has become widespread among colonial powers in recent years they were simply beating a retreat times.*

This is a game at which U.S. imperialism has been particularly adept. Having few outright colonies, it has traditionally carried on its imperialist robbery under a cloak of nominal independence of the oppressed nations, the most notable example being Latin America. Of course, its exploitation of these countries has been no less rapacious on that score. Nevertheless, it has sought to trade on this feature of its rule, hypocritically presenting itself as "anti-colonial" and as a friend of oppressed peoples which deals with all nations as equals.

At the same time, U.S. imperialism has utilized its dominant position in the postwar capitalist world to take advantage of the difficulties of its imperialist rivals, stepping in

*The existence of nominally independent countries which are in fact economic dependencies is not something new. Lenin wrote (*Imperialism*, p. 85) that "finance capital and its corresponding foreign policy . . . give rise to a number of transitional forms of national dependence." Lenin was referring, however, to the occurrence of such forms in the process of colonial enslavement, whereas today they occur in the process of colonial liberation. That it, the need to resort to such policies represents a setback for imperialism and an advance in the struggle for liberation.

to "assist" them and emerging with a considerable share of their investments in its possession, a notable case in point being the extensive inroads of American oil companies on British and Dutch concessions in the Middle East. In this way, the American monopolists have succeeded, within a shrinking sphere of imperialist operation, in greatly expanding their foreign investments at the expense of rival imperialisms. It is these tactics which U.S. imperialism seeks to employ in the Congo today, with the aim of grabbing as much as it can.

IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION

The course of colonial policy today is not a smooth one—"reliable partners" are not so easily found, nor is it so easy to place them in power. In the Congo, despite Belgian efforts to the contrary, the people were perverse enough to choose an "unreliable" leader in Patrice Lumumba—a leader dedicated to the achievement of genuine liberation.

It is now clear that the Belgians, apparently anticipating the possibility of such an outcome, had prepared to return in force after granting independence, either to regain their rule over all of the Congo or to emasculate the Republic of Congo by detaching the vital Katanga province. The rebellion of the Congolese troops against their white officers

provided the necessary pretext, and some 10,000 Belgian troops were sent in, allegedly to "protect Belgian citizens." In Belgium itself, the colonialist elements came forward with a plan calling for the reconquest and military occupation of the Congo. At the same time, a reliable tool was found in the wealthy Moise Tshombe in Katanga, who promptly called for the entrance of Belgian troops and announced the secession of Katanga from the Republic of Congo.

In fact, from the time it became evident that independence might have to be granted, moves were already on foot to nullify it by splitting off Katanga. From London there emanated schemes for uniting Katanga with Northern Rhodesia. "Only a year ago," writes a staff reporter of *U.S. News and World Report* (July 4, 1960), "the whites were threatening to break rich Katanga Province away from the rest of the Congo and to join white-governed Rhodesia." On the other hand, schemes arose for establishment of Katanga as an independent state, and the evidence indicates that these emanated from Washington. Thus, in early June, shortly before the proclamation of independence, Tshombe paid a rather mysterious visit to Washington, returning to sing the praises of the Americans as saviors of the Congo. And shortly after his return, the *U.S. News*

and *World Report* of June 25 printed a prediction that soon after the Republic of Congo was established, Katanga would declare its independence.

U.S. imperialism was in the picture from the outset, giving its full assistance to the Belgian aggression. The American air base in Libya was used as a shuttling center for the transport of Belgian troops; other American facilities were also used, as were the NATO facilities based in West Germany. On more than one occasion, American forces were smuggled into the Congo. Thus, on July 20, the Soviet Union protested the appearance of a U.S. detachment in Leopoldville under the guise of helping to evacuate refugees.

If American troops were not sent into the Congo in force during this period, it was for purely tactical reasons. Thus, when a request by a group of Congo cabinet ministers for 3,000 American troops was turned down, the reason, as reported by the *Wall Street Journal* (July 13, 1960), was the following:

Behind the U.S. decision to reject the appeal for direct intervention by U.S. troops lay the fear U.S. intervention would link this country in the minds of Africans to the old colonial powers. Many officials here fear the U.S. is already too closely identified in Africa with Belgium, Britain and France. They are trying to avoid hav-

ing the U.S. pictured as a foe of African nationalism.

"Can you imagine the name we'd get if U.S. troops had to fire on the Blacks?" shuddered one State Department official. "The Russians would have a field day with that."

At the same time, however, preparations for direct intervention had been made. A *New York Times* story of July 13 relates: "Units of the United States Twenty-fourth Infantry Division based in West Germany have been on a stand-by basis for several days, poised for a quick airlift to the Congo." Somewhat later, Marguerite Higgins wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune* (August 1, 1960) that the United States was prepared "to send American soldiers under some sort of U.N. umbrella if the U.N. forces proved inadequate to do the job with sufficient speed." One wonders just what job Miss Higgins is referring to.

In short, it was decided not to use American troops solely because it was found that in Africa, no less than in Latin America, the crude open intervention of the past is no longer feasible. Hence, too, the decision to use the U.N. as an "umbrella."

"PARTNERSHIP"

The American aid to the Belgian aggressors was undoubtedly provided with the aim of getting im-

portant economic concessions in return. At the same time, American monopoly capital has been busily engaged in seeking independent channels of expansion.

Witness, for example, the speedy appearance on the scene of the promoter L. Edgar Detwiler who is described, among other things, as "recently active in dealing in oil concessions in the Middle East." Detwiler has set up a Congo International Management Corporation in New York, and claims that Lumumba has signed a 50-year agreement to set up a jointly-controlled company to exploit Congo resources, with the necessary capital to be supplied through the New York corporation from U.S. sources and with the profits to be divided between them and the Congo government. The proposed sum for investment is no less than \$2 billion. Detwiler describes the proposed arrangement as a "partnership" and brags that the word "concession" never entered the discussions.

Lumumba has denied signing the agreement, and it is not clear what, if anything, will become of this particular venture. What is clear, however, is that under the guise of "partnership" huge sums in profits would continue to be siphoned out of the Congo, this time into the tills of *American* bankers and monopolists.

Then there is the proposal of Vice-

President Nixon to set up, on U.S. and British initiative and working through the U.N., a "joint African development commission." This body, says Nixon, would serve as a clearing house "for advisory services and investment opportunities." It might, he continues, mean the difference between "Communist enslavement and the growth of free viable societies." (*New York Times*, August 18, 1960.)

Exactly how Mr. Nixon's clearing house would operate is not disclosed, but it seems evident from even this brief description that it is intended to facilitate American investment in Africa, including the Congo, and to misuse the U.N. for this purpose into the bargain.

In addition, there are the not-so-public arrangements with Tshombe concerning American concessions in Katanga. True, he is openly financed by Union Minière, but this does not preclude his working for the Americans as well.

ROLE OF THE U.N.

When the direct aggression of the Belgian forces aroused such a storm of protest that it could no longer be openly supported, the United States and the other imperialist powers proceeded to utilize the U.N. as a vehicle for their aggressive actions. The attitude with which the U.N. forces were sent into the Congo is illustrated by the directive

issued by Under Secretary Ralph J. Bunche to his staff: "You are here to pacify the Congo and then to administer it." (*New York Times*, July 31, 1960.)

The request for U.N. troops made by the Lumumba government was a simple one: remove the Belgian troops and assure the sovereignty of the duly constituted Congo government. Toward this end, the resolution adopted by the U.N. Security Council on June 14 authorized Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, in consultation with the Lumumba government, "to provide the Government of the Republic of Congo with such military assistance as may be necessary."

But Hammarskjöld saw things differently. The Belgian troops were to leave, but the timing was up to them. Moreover, the U.N. troops were to "avoid any involvement in the domestic political conflicts" in the Congo—including Tshombe's defiance of the government. And while Congolese soldiers were disarmed by the U.N. forces, the Belgian troops were allowed to retain their arms.

As for Katanga, Hammarskjöld first allowed the empty threats by Tshombe to become a pretext for holding back. When troops were finally sent, it was *by agreement with Tshombe and on his terms*. The Belgian troops remained. On the grounds of "non-interference,"

no steps were taken against Tshombe; on the contrary, Hammarskjöld established the friendliest relations with him. And the Lumumba government continued to be excluded from the province.

Much more could be added to this catalog. But the important point is that Hammarskjöld's actions served not to strengthen the legitimate government but to help undermine it. They served to keep Tshombe in power, to help him consolidate his secession and to give him time to consummate his business deals and to sell Katanga to the highest bidder. In short, his actions have served to promote the interests of the imperialists against those of the Congolese people. Small wonder that he has aroused so much animosity among the latter.

WHO WILL WIN?

Whatever the exact outcome of the current struggles, it can be said that the imperialist forces cannot in the end succeed in their aggression against the Congolese people. They cannot succeed because the relationship of world forces today is weighted against them.

The Congolese people have the firm backing of the Soviet Union, People's China and the other socialist countries. The Soviet government has made it plain that it will not tolerate continued aggression

against the Congo. In his message of July 14, Premier Khrushchev stated that "the U.S.S.R. will not shrink from resolute measures to curb the aggression."

The Soviet Union has also given substantial aid to the Congo in the form of 10,000 tons of food, 100 trucks with parts, repair depots and instructors, Red Cross doctors and other personnel, medicines, etc. And it stands prepared to give the Congo technical and economic assistance toward its economic development.

The Soviet warnings are no idle threats. Soviet intervention served to halt the British and French invasion of Egypt in 1956. Soviet warnings also helped to deter invasion of Syria by Turkey in 1957 and of Iraq by the United States in 1958. The Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist world stand today as a powerful bulwark against imperialist aggression and in defense of national freedom.

The Congolese people also enjoy the fullest support of the other liberated nations of Africa. Ghana lost no time in demanding "hands off the Congo" and denouncing any attempts to detach Katanga. Ghana, Guinea and the United Arab Republic have announced their readiness to place troops at the disposal of the Congo government to drive out the Belgian occupationists. Other African nations have similarly declared their solidarity with the Con-

golese people, as have progressive forces the world over.

It is in the first place the militant stand of the socialist world and the African nations that, together with the vigorous struggle led by the Lumumba government, has arrested the plans of the Belgian aggressors and compelled the imperialist forces to pull in their horns. The days when the imperialists could ride roughshod over other nations are gone, and they now find themselves in a situation in which they risk losing more than they gain through aggressive action. This does not mean that they will surrender their positions in the Congo without a struggle. But it is a struggle in which the odds are increasingly against them.

FOR FULL INDEPENDENCE

The key to full and lasting independence for the Congolese people, as for all other liberated countries, is *economic* independence from imperialism. The real issue is who will control the resources and industry of the country. If these remain in the hands of foreign monopolies, whether Belgian, British or American, to continue to exploit them as in the past, the result will be to perpetuate the existing backwardness and in the end to render independence meaningless.

Real independence for the Con-

go, therefore, requires that Belgian imperialism get out of the country; even more, it requires that U.S. imperialism get out. The Congolese people must be free to build their industries and develop their economy for their own benefit.

The imperialists contend that their economic participation is vital to this, since the country lacks the necessary capital, technical personnel and experience. But the fact is that more than three-quarters of a century of imperialist rule have left the Congo woefully backward, with no industrial development, with much of its natural resources untapped and with millions of acres of highly fertile land unused, while its people live in the most abysmal poverty. And this will inevitably remain the situation as long as imperialist domination persists.

To be sure, the Congolese people are in serious need of economic and technical assistance. The Belgian rule, marked by unparalleled brutality and subsequently by the most revolting paternalism, cloaking a shameful system of forced labor, has left the country with an average per capita income of \$40 a year, with some 15 percent of its labor force unemployed as of 1959, with less than twenty Congolese in the entire country possessing a university education, with less than 700 doctors for a population of 13½ million, and not one of them Congolese. And so on.

To overcome such a legacy, help is needed. But it must be help with no strings whatever attached.

Today such help is forthcoming from the socialist world, and the African peoples are becoming increasingly aware of it. When the United States sought to bring pressure on the Nasser regime in Egypt by withdrawing aid in building the Aswan Dam, the Soviet Union undertook the project. When the French precipitately pulled all personnel out of Guinea as soon as it became independent, the Guinean government turned to the socialist countries. A most inspiring example, in Africa as elsewhere, is the action of Cuba, which has responded to Wall Street's offensive by driving the U.S. trusts out and has turned to the Soviet Union and China for trade and assistance.

The imperialists are stricken with fear at the prospect that the African countries—the Congo in particular—will follow Cuba's example and expropriate the foreign monopolies. For American big business such developments would mean a further shrinking of its sphere of operations and the loss of potentially lucrative sources of superprofits. But to the overwhelming majority of Americans they would be of real benefit.

The present aggressive activities of Wall Street may add to its profits, but for the American working peo-

ple they create only a mounting burden of taxes and inflation. Furthermore, its aggressive maneuvering in the Congo and elsewhere creates a danger to world peace. Therefore it is in the interests of the American people, no less than in the interests of the Congolese people, to demand a policy of "hands off the Congo."

It is necessary to fight for an end to the use of "aid" as an instrument of economic oppression, and for a positive program of assistance in the form of long-term, low-interest loans without strings. Such assistance could be channeled through the U.N., provided it is used solely as a means of transmitting aid and not as a device for opening the doors to imperialist penetration, as is now being attempted in the Congo.

Such a program of aid would be of genuine advantage to American workers. If applied not to the Congo alone but to all the liberated and undeveloped countries of the world, it would open up a vast market for American goods and would go far to offset the spectre of rising unemployment which now plagues our economy.

We live in a period marked by the decline of world imperialism and the ascendancy of the forces of world socialism and anti-imperialism. In such a period, American monopoly capital is more and more sharply confronted with the alternatives of

pursuing a vain effort to preserve and restore its outmoded system on a world scale, with all the disastrous consequences this may entail, or of retreating from its present untenable positions. It is to the advantage of the American people to compel the monopolists to take the second course—and it is possible to do so, in the case of the Congo as well as in other situations.

August 22, 1960

Our readers will be happy to know that a new, progressively-minded youth magazine makes its appearance this month. It is called *New Horizons for Youth*, and a yearly subscription is only \$1. Those wanting to subscribe, should make their payment to Youth Publications, Inc., and the address is 799 Broadway Room 235, New York 3, N. Y. The Editors takes this opportunity to wish the new venture the greatest possible success.

The African Personality

By Shirley Graham

At the invitation of the Government of Ghana, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and his wife, Shirley Graham, were present at the Installation of Kwame Nkrumah as the Republic's first president. We are very happy to bring our readers a report from Africa written for *Political Affairs* by Miss Graham—the Editor.

Behold the man of awakened Africa, behold the Liberator! His words echo and re-echo in Africa and the man of bronze and ebony wakes up from his long slumber, he wakes up to destroy his chains and follow his own path. "I will create my own heroes," the new man of Africa exclaims. "I will follow my own light, I will find my own God and the African Personality is born." In the East, where Jomo Kenyatta still languishes in exile, in the South where the blood of men, women and children cries to high heaven, in the North where Africans are still fighting and dying, the African Personality is emerging. "I will die but never yield!" This is the great challenge which today faces Western man and his civilization.

I was one of many Europeans and

Americans who in 1958 first heard the phrase, "African Personality." Addressing the opening session of the All African Peoples Conference meeting in Accra, the then Prime Minister of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, reminded the delegates of what the truly liberated and developed African Personality would contribute to the enlightened advancement of Mankind and to the stabilizing of world peace. Few western reporters bothered to include this statement in the accounts they sent to home papers. "After all," one of them asked me, with faintly veiled contemptuous amusement, "what does it *mean*?" Events of the intervening two years have furnished some answers to that question.

There are those who are prepared to recognize the African Personality only in the strong man who

rises to seize power, who assembles and sends soldiers to the Congo, who places an iron band of total boycott around South Africa and demands that all foreign armies leave the continent of Africa. "We want no part in the imperialists' struggle for power; we are not concerned with cold or hot wars between so-called East and West! We would free ourselves of all crippling entanglements. Africa is not part of Europe. Scram out of Africa!"

These are exact quotes which I have taken from African spokesmen. Yet I should like to approach a discussion of the African Personality from another, and I believe, even more significant point of view.

* * *

It was while we were guests of the Regional Commissioner of Ashanti that I made the acquaintance of Ossie. The Regional Commissioner's residence corresponds to a Governor's mansion in the United States since Ashanti might be called a state of the Republic of Ghana, and the spacious, beautifully appointed house, surrounded by luxurious gardens, certainly can be called a "mansion." This, however, is not a description of Kumasi, capital of Ashanti, nor even an account of our visit there. I speak here only

of Ossie, sturdy, near five-year-old son of the Regional Commissioner.

Ossie had evidently been "briefed" before our arrival. He was duly impressed with the importance of "the doctor." He was dignity itself when he stepped forward to welcome us; mutual respect could be plainly seen as the near five-year-old and the ninety-two-year-old visitor gravely shook hands.

Ossie smiled graciously at me, but did not speak. We assumed that he did not know English. As callers arrived, however, Ossie insisted on keeping his place quite near the doctor, apparently following everything that was said with great interest. Only when the visitors addressed him in their native tongue did Ossie say anything. Then, he seemed only to give polite response. His interest seemed fastened on the conversation with "the doctor," which, of course, was in English. I was puzzled and finally asked his mother if Ossie was studying English and therefore was anxious to hear it spoken. She laughed gently, "Oh, Ossie knows English. He was born in London and English was the first language he learned. But since we've come home he simply refuses to speak English. Right now, he doesn't want to miss a word the doctor says so he can repeat everything to his

brother." (A brother, two years older, was away in boarding school.)

For three days Ossie accompanied us on long drives, followed "the doctor" at a respectful distance and walked with me in the gardens. He posed for my camera and at all times clearly demonstrated that he understood anything I said to him, but he always responded in the language of Ashanti. His mother explained that "he says he doesn't like English." On our last morning in Kumasi, the busy Regional Commissioner remained away from his office to breakfast with us. As Ossie slid into his chair and greeted me with his merry eyes, I told his father about my futile efforts to induce Ossie to talk to me in English. Father and son exchanged twinkling glances. They were exactly alike—the same round heads, broad forehead and eyes set wide apart, the same very dark skin, which would be black were it not for a kind of red glow that seemed to shine through, the same square shoulders. The father explained:

"It's his African personality expressing itself. He insists that you speak his language—the language of the people—the language of the country. English is something he feels is alien." He turned to Ossie who was listening intently to his

father's explanation, and spoke rapidly in the native tongue. Then the father translated for me. "But I have told him that since you are a dear friend from a far away country where you have no opportunity to learn the language of Ashanti, that if he be a polite and generous citizen of his country, he would speak to you in the language which you understand and make you happy to be with us." Ossie looked down at his bowl while his father spoke. His side glance at me expressed embarrassment.

The moment of our departure came. Many people had gathered to see us off. The car was waiting when Ossie appeared. He carried in his hands two flowers. One, he handed to "the doctor" and bowed deeply. Then he came to me, handed me the second flower and said sweetly, "Goodbye." At my expression of delight his face was one broad smile and he added, "Come back soon!"

As I climbed into the car my eyes were swimming with tears. Even yet it is impossible for me to say whether my tears were for the dear friends we were leaving or for myself—the exile, who lives in a far-off country, where I could not learn the language of Ashanti. Ossie had clearly shown that he was sorry for me! When I think of the African Personality I

think of this not quite five-year-old, straight and clear-eyed on Sunday, wearing his spotless robe of white cotton which hung from shoulder to ankle, proud to walk as he saw the robed men walk, proud to welcome me to his home, to show me his garden and telling me to "Come back soon!"

The most recent African personality with which the western world has been confronted is the Prime Minister of the Republic of Congo. And he proved to be a real surprise. It is well known that young Patrice Lumumba has only the most elementary of the white man's "education." Authorities in the Belgium Congo did not permit education of "their natives." Mission schools taught enough reading and writing to make better servants. Congolese did all the hard work, carried the tools of white technicians, worked in the mines, dug in the earth, etc., etc., but were allowed to do nothing that required technical training. I understand there is *one* Congolese lawyer in the Congo, no Congolese doctors, dentists or teachers. While other colonial powers have allowed small numbers of their subject peoples to study in European or American colleges, no Congolese, who managed to escape from the Belgian Congo, could ever return. Thus, the

white man's argument that the Congolese were "not ready for self-government" has some validity in that the Congolese people have no skills and little knowledge for modern living. Forgotten, of course, is the fact that these people in the Congo governed themselves before they were "subdued" by white men.

With this background (or lack of it) and under the circumstances in which Prime Minister Lumumba was coming to the United Nations, it is clear that an ill-mannered, ignorant, arrogant, probably highly emotional half-savage was expected. I have seen only British and French accounts of his visit, but the writers in these papers were amazed by Mr. Lumumba's bearing, awareness and alert mind. "He wore his inexpensive, ruffled suit with dignity," wrote one. "He spoke in only slightly accented French, was open and frank, skillful in parrying questions he did not wish to discuss and definite in his demands." Only once did he show any "temper." That was when questioned on the Belgian reports of widespread raping by the Congolese. Then, they said, he snapped, "I have received no reports of any white women being raped by Congolese soldiers."

I can understand his temper. Rape is the oldest and first charge made

by all white oppressors who find themselves being resisted by those whom they have held in subjection. The same story ranging from Mississippi and Georgia to the Congo or South Africa—always told to inflame and cement hate and determination to keep "the blacks" down! The general impression is always given that raping white women is the first and foremost objective of all black men—everywhere in the world! Common sense gives the lie to such accusations, but common sense has no part in this age-old lie to inflame emotions.

I saw the arrival in Ghana of a plane-load of Belgian "refugees." They were mostly women and children whose plush-padded world had suddenly been ripped apart. Leopoldville, it must be understood, has been a modern, beautiful, rich city *for whites*. Those women refugees had only seen blacks as servants for their comfort and convenience. They said they were in no way responsible for "the troubles." They were frightened that night and the Ghanaians welcomed, fed and housed them. Later they were helped on their way. Everyone was kind and comforting. It happened that just two days before, I had been crawling through the foul dungeons of Elmina, a huge pile of rock built

by the Portuguese. Here for several hundred years, captured Africans were gathered and chained to the walls of these dungeons until they were let down through horrible chutes in the wall to waiting boats below and thence to ships in which they were carried away to eternal slavery. I must say that I viewed those "refugees" from the Congo with something less than the consideration with which the Ghanaians received them.

But Ghana is led by a most enlightened and wise exponent of the African Personality: Kwame Nkrumah. His official title is "Osagyefo." This is a title which was old in West Africa when Columbus discovered America, which is why the Ghanaians have chosen it. The word means much more than "Your Excellency." It is not a term of obeisance. It may be translated "God-sent" or "Liberator" or "Redeemer." When one travels over the hundreds of miles of excellent roads which now bind this country together, sees the electric wires spanning the country, the water works, schools, hospitals and libraries, so recently erected, when all around one witnesses the renaissance of the ancient glories of Africa giving flower to the loftiest reaches of Socialism—one understands why the

people call Kwame Nkrumah "Osagyefo." His once bitterest foes, the Ashanti chiefs, now advise, "Follow Osagyefo! He leads you wisely and well."

At the Prorogation of the last National Assembly in Ghana to be held under a representative of the Queen of England, Kwame Nkrumah told Lord Listowel, "The people of Ghana have enacted for themselves a new Constitution because of our conviction that we need a form of government which will more truly interpret the aspirations and hopes of the people of Ghana and give full expression to the African Personality."

Ghana's constitution is an extraordinary example of old Africa and advanced world thinking. Some of its features resemble some in constitutions of other countries. The Head of State is an elected President as in the United States. The Ghana constitution, however, provides that the person elected President is also leader of the majority party in the National Assembly. He is, in fact, Prime Minister. This is intended to preclude any possible division between the executive part of the government and the legislative part. Again, while the President is not himself a member of the National Assembly, his cabinet is appointed

from members of the National Assembly. Every citizen in Ghana over twenty-one years of age has one vote. The life of Parliament is five years. Thus, once in every five years there must be a general election and whenever this happens there will simultaneously be a presidential election.

The constitution declares that: "Chieftaincy in Ghana should be guaranteed and preserved." It specifically provides for a House of Chiefs in each region of Ghana. While the Chiefs no longer have judicial power over any people—that is the right to fine, judge, punish, call to war, etc.—the chiefs exercise certain important traditional and advisory powers. Traditionally the Chiefs are *custodians* of the land. Private ownership of land was introduced into West Africa by the white man. Ghana's goal is *to return all land to the people*. Meanwhile, the chiefs are the custodians of land. The agrarian reform here strives for the same end as in all socialistic countries but because of the communal ownership which is traditional in Africa this reform must follow a slightly different method.

A major principle of the constitution is related to the conception of African unity. Parliament is entrusted with the right, at any time that a union of African States

becomes possible, to surrender the sovereignty of Ghana in whole or in part so that Ghana can merge with such a union. The constitution stipulates "that the independence of Ghana shall not be surrendered or diminished on any grounds other than the furtherance of African unity."

Speaking at the Inaugural Luncheon in Accra on July 4th, President Sekou Touré of Guinea said:

The United States of Africa which a few years ago was only a vague fancy,

an aim that then appeared over-ambitious or hardly credible, is now a possibility that seems capable of fulfilment. It is already inscribed in the hearts and minds of our people. It is chronicled in song in our villages and schools. Our peasants, workers, the housewives, old men and, above all the younger generation dwell upon the idea with unrelenting zest.

In point of fact, no past effort has been wasted, no sacrifice has been made in vain. No patriotic action has been accomplished, but what it stands inscribed as part of the triumph of Africa.

The 1960 Elections

By National Executive Committee, CPUSA

At a meeting held in New York City, August 6-8, 1960, the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party adopted the Resolution on the 1960 elections that follows—the Editor.

The political situation this year, in 1960, is not the same, by far, as in previous election years. Despite all factors, which give a surface similarity, we cannot overlook the changed relationship of forces on a world scale, and the increasingly unfavorable position of world imperialism and of U.S. imperialism in particular.

In the main, these changes are: the continued and rapid growth of the socialist nations; the increasing strength and independence of the newly created, neutral, or uncommitted nations, including their greater reliance on the socialist nations for aid; the revolutionary developments throughout all Africa and in Cuba—with mass repercussions in Latin America; the conflicts within the imperialist camp, including marked signs of economic instability, pointing toward a new cyclical crisis;

plus the upsurge of the mass people's movements abroad and here.

These are all new factors creating political instability and pressures for political re-groupings which can greatly change the political picture. No amount of surface unity brought about for the purposes of the election campaign should cause us to lose sight of these sharpening contradictions.

* * *

In evaluating the two old-party conventions, and particularly the Democratic, it would be incorrect to see only that the deeply entrenched political machines, subservient to monopoly capitalism, dominated these conventions, and nominated candidates traditionally associated with reactionary foreign and domestic policies.

Actually, to a greater extent than ever before, there were two powerful forces exerting pressure on these conventions:

a) the monopoly capitalists, with Governor Nelson D. Rockefeller as their public spokesman, fighting to keep both parties in line with their imperialist class interests and tied to a policy of continued cold war and of worldwide anti-Communism; and

b) our own American peace advocates, the Negro people, the trade unions, the aged, the farmers, demanding peace, civil rights, and other social legislation. The signature campaign and demonstration at the convention for Stevenson, the peace marches, the marches and demonstrations for civil rights, the appearance of hundreds of progressives before platform committee hearings, the McLain primary campaign for the aged and for Stevenson in California are without precedent in America politics.

Though the reactionaries triumphed in the selection of candidates and in retaining firm party control, the platform concessions they were forced to make will haunt them throughout their administrations, and can be made to stimulate a mass movement of tremendous proportions for their fulfillment.

These concessions, reflecting the

sharpening contradictions in American political life, can only temporarily hold the masses to the two-party system. In the longer view, they can contribute greatly to the political enlightenment of the masses, and to greater support for, and movements toward, a Labor-Farmer-Negro people's party—a Farmer-Labor party, uniting all the anti-monopoly forces.

* * *

Our Party's mass approach to all the questions and problems which arise in connection with the 1960 election campaign should be based on two primary considerations:

a) how can we reach, work with, and influence workers, Negroes, farmers, the aged, the youth, liberals, progressives and the broader "Left" to enter into determined, persistent mass pressure campaigns—of all kinds—at all levels—from the simplest to the higher forms—for peace, in support of colonial struggles, for civil rights, and for a full range of labor and social legislation; and

b) how, through these efforts, can we help to further the growth of grass-roots independent political movements, in the first place involving the trade unions, but including

such other independent pressure movements as can be developed among all sections of the people.

Through every possible channel of struggle, we should strive to give a new, broad impetus toward the formation of a coalition of the anti-monopoly forces leading in the direction of a new party representing the interests of the common people. It must be emphasized that such a perspective will develop only out of our participation in the struggle of the people, and not out of agitational campaigns alone. Moreover, each state and locality will have to study carefully its own special problems and develop a proper tactical line to suit its own situation.

In this connection, particularly under the somewhat confused and contradictory conditions of this year's campaign, it is necessary to emphasize that Communists, as representatives of a vanguard party, must be ready and able to work with and among the people in liberal, insurgent, and independent movements, and among people aligned or unaligned with either old party or their candidates, as well as with trade unions, peace groups, Negro and other people's organizations.

There is widespread and growing discontent with the old-party machines. Those many labor, farm,

Negro, and progressive organizations like COPE, the New York Liberal and Insurgent movements, the midwest Independent Negro Voters League, the rapidly growing Negro people's movements in the South, the California Council of Democratic Clubs, the North Dakota Non-Partisan movement, and numerous other local, state, and even national movements are embryonic parts of a new, broad, grass-roots people's political coalition.

They will not at this moment unite in a new political party. They will try this year in the main to win their demands through Democratic or independent candidates. But if they can now be drawn into struggle on issues to put pressure on the candidates and Congress, it will speed up their disillusionment, and their readiness for independent and united political formations. We should strive to aid and encourage such developments.

* * *

Under the circumstances of this year's campaign, with both the Nixon-Lodge and Kennedy-Johnson tickets basing themselves on cold-war positions of "military strength" or more billions for armaments and anti-Communism, and in the face

of a widespread mass dissatisfaction with their past reactionary records, it would be an error for our party to indicate support for one ticket or the other, either directly or implicitly.

Any idea that one candidate is a "lesser evil" than the other this year would serve only to retard the development of mass political struggle around the issues of peace and social legislation. It would further the same sort of passivity and reliance on capitalist class politicians as followed the 1958 elections, and result in defeats and disillusionment for the people. Only a sharply critical attitude toward both the Nixon and Kennedy tickets, and an emphasis on the need for struggle, can serve the people's interests.

* * *

However, from the viewpoint of reaching and influencing the masses of the people, it would be a still greater error to adopt a negative, defeatist, "curses-on-both-your-houses" position. The idea of boycotting the election reflects only petty-bourgeois frustration. Such positions reflect a failure to appreciate significant new factors in the campaign and narrow down our appeal and our ability to develop struggles of workers and others. Such positions would not be un-

derstood by the broad masses, and among the "Left" it would only encourage "stay-at-home" moods, and feed such sects as the SLP or the Trotskyites, who render only lip service to socialist aims, but, by their policies, isolate themselves from the people, and sow discord and disunity.

In this connection there are two factors that require clear emphasis. First there is the indisputable fact that the Nixon-Lodge ticket has abandoned the peace pretexts of the Republican Party, and today symbolizes before the country and the world those two-faced, double-dealing, provocative policies of the Eisenhower regime associated with the U-2 and RB-47 incidents and the torpedoing of the summit conference. Moreover, Nixon's record in the House, in the Senate, and as Vice-President is marked by one long series of anti-labor, reactionary deeds. A defeat for this ticket would be heralded everywhere as a defeat for those war-inciting and anti-labor policies. This is no unimportant factor.

The second is this: under the circumstances of the two-party entrapment, and considering the traditional alignments of workers, farmers, Negro people and progressives generally, the people will express themselves mainly through the

Democratic Party. It would be an illusion to think that the people are going to abstain from voting or sit out this campaign. The carry-over of the FDR tradition, the social pressures exerted by the main trade union, Negro, and farm leadership, and the fact that they have no other meaningful way to express themselves, will cause most to support the Kennedy-Johnson slate.

It is necessary to recognize this is fact if we are to fulfill our role of reaching and influencing the people. Any other perspectives would be unreal, and would result in our isolation from the broad masses of the people. It is necessary to emphasize this fact because we, as Communists, must know where the people are to be found, and then learn to work with them there, giving leadership and direction in the struggle for their needs and interests.

This does not mean that we, as a party, or as Communists, should endorse the Kennedy-Johnson ticket. On the contrary, we should be sharply critical of the past role on peace and social and labor legislation of both Kennedy and Johnson. What we must clearly recognize is that the mass of the common people with whom we must march forward—or stand still—are to be found in that camp. It means also that they

are there because they have been influenced to believe in the platform commitments of the Democrats.

Our aim as a party—and our comrades in mass organizations—should avoid a negative or defeatist attitude under such circumstances. We should patiently explain and contrast the experiences of workers and farmers under FDR, when strikes, demonstrations, marches and many forms of mass pressure were needed to win social concessions, with the experiences in 1958, after the election of Democrats with fine, high-sounding promises, but with no mass struggle or pressure, where the workers won no social gains and got only retrogression in the form of the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin bill.

We should not dampen the workers' spirits, or take a "what's-the-use" attitude, but rather strive to inspire and organize them for independent political activity and pressure on the issues of peace, civil rights, and legislation, measures reflecting the needs of workers, farmers, the youth, the aged, etc. Only in that way will they be won away from the influence of the old parties and encouraged to build and unite the independent forces of the people for political action leading to a new party.

* * *

In a number of districts across the country there are local candidates in both old parties, and probably some independents who have a more forthright position on the issues, than do the presidential candidates. In such cases there should be no hesitation in participating in all proper ways in such campaigns, using them to clarify issues, to raise the understanding of the people, and to organize them to exert pressure in a positive way on the campaign as a whole.

Also, in most states there are Representatives and Senators with long, hide-bound, reactionary, anti-labor and cold-war records. Regardless of their party affiliation, all efforts should be made to rally broad united front movements to insure their defeat. Peace or labor candidates should be run in such cases where possible.

Campaigns to register voters should be supported by our party everywhere.

* * *

In those election districts where Communist candidates are on the ballot, the campaign should be conducted in such a way as to unite the people in the area, including those supporting other candidates, to fight on issues. We should avoid

all tendencies to separate ourselves from the broad mass of the people under the pressure of our own campaign. Care must be used to make our independent campaign a means of reaching, unifying, and influencing the whole movement, including particularly those who persist in expressing themselves through the old parties. Then, also, our candidates should make widest use of the platform promises of Democrats and Republicans to expose their role, and to draw the people into struggle for the people's needs.

Our Party would have preferred to have its own candidates for president and vice president this year. That is not possible, only because of a whole series of restrictive laws—laws which violate our nation's Constitution and its Bill of Rights—specifically designed to keep government power in the hands of the capitalist two-party system, and to keep Communists and other minority parties off the ballot. Such anti-democratic laws as the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, Taft-Hartley, the Landrum-Griffin Act, etc., work to the detriment of all labor, Negro, peace and other progressive organizations, as well as to our detriment. We urge all progressive forces to repeal such restrictive and oppressive laws.

Meanwhile, ours is a party of a

different kind, based upon the science of Marxism-Leninism. Our aim is not votes and offices except insofar as they help us better to fight for and serve the interests and needs of the working people. Therefore, the running of Communist candidates in the elections is of special importance. They run as the most advanced spokesmen of the united action of the people, for their immediate burning needs, and for the future—including the eventual socialist transformation of our society.

Today we place emphasis on the fact that mass developments are rapid and decisive, here as well as abroad. Things are fluid. What seems true today may not be true tomorrow. The course of history will not be settled by the candidates or platforms as we see them now. It will be determined by the people in motion, as it was in South Korea, Japan, Turkey, Cuba, and now in the Congo.

Think of the effect of the sit-ins

in our own Southland and the nationwide supporting actions, of the demonstrations against the Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco, of broad peace marches and other mass movements across the country. These developments demonstrate the decisive ability of the people in motion to affect and mold events in our country, when the people take the struggle into their own hands.

In this period militant and united actions of the people are decisive. Out of them will come a broader people's political movement, with our Party stronger, more influential, and increasingly recognized as a vanguard of the people. Through devoted activity in the people's interests we will not only regain our own full status as a party and win our rightful place on the ballot in all States, but we will be able to aid the American people in breaking away from the two capitalist parties, and advance their struggle for a better, fuller life.

On Peace and Peaceful Coexistence

By National Executive Committee, CPUSA

At a meeting held in New York City, August 6-8, 1960, the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party adopted the Resolution on peace and peaceful coexistence that follows—the Editor.

WE MEET AT THE time of the fifteenth anniversary of the atom-bombing of Hiroshima by U.S. military forces—an act whose ghastly brutality will never cease to shock and alarm decent people the world over. It is fitting, on this occasion, that we declare once again that the paramount task before the American people—before all mankind—is the securing of world peace. It is fitting, too, that we reaffirm our profound conviction that war is not inevitable, that peace and peaceful coexistence can be won.

This conviction was forcefully expressed by our 17th National Convention, whose main political resolution (*On the Fight for Peace and the Struggle Against the Monopolies*) states:

Peace is the urgent objective, the common need and common hope of people everywhere. Heretofore this has been a dream deferred, an elusive aspiration, passed down from generation to generation. Now the conditions have matured for transforming this dream into reality, into a way of life for all the nations of the world. For peace has become a necessary condi-

tion for the very existence and further development of human society, just as war with modern methods of annihilation has become unthinkable. The peaceful coexistence of nations with differing economic and social systems, and competition between them for peaceful pursuits, is the sole alternative to an atomic catastrophe.

The resolution also avers:

. . . For the first time in human history the possibility now exists for the elimination of the scourge of war and the release of the full potential of the human race for the solution of the age-old problems of poverty, disease and ignorance. These new possibilities have been created by profound and irreversible changes in favor of the camp of peace, freedom and social progress.

The soundness of these views has been amply borne out by events. Nor are they in the least negated by the rise in world tensions growing out of the Summit failure. Moreover, our experiences and views are in harmony with those of other Communist parties.

*This is the text of a Resolution adopted by the Committee, August 8, 1960.

* * *

The cold war policy of American imperialism is in a crisis, and the events following the collapse of the Summit in May only serve to emphasize the depth of that crisis. Nor can the fact that both major parties enter the 1960 national elections with like programs for speeding up the arms race and intensifying the cold war hide or solve it. The continuation of such policies can only aggravate tensions, endanger the peace of the world and imperil the security of the United States.

In the world of today, the cold war policy has proven bankrupt. National unity based on such a policy is a deception and a fake. There can be no acceptable or workable alternative to a firm foreign policy of peaceful coexistence—one that will end the cold war, negotiate in good faith with the Soviet Union for controlled disarmament and for settlement of the Berlin problem, and accord China her rightful place in world councils.

Peaceful coexistence is the only policy which is in accordance with the state of the world today. The basic shift in world relations, which has proceeded since the end of World War II, cannot be reversed. The main historic trend continues: in favor of socialism, of independence from imperialism, of the forces of democracy and progress. Ours is the epoch of the disintegration of

imperialism. It is the epoch of the rise, consolidation and final victory of world socialism. In such an epoch, the strength of the world forces arrayed against imperialism must continue to grow, and with it the realistic possibility of averting war between capitalist and socialist states and of establishing peaceful coexistence as a long-range policy. In such an epoch, war is not inevitable, and world peace and disarmament can be fought for as realizable goals.

* * *

However, peace will not come of itself. It must be fought for. To obtain a national policy of peaceful coexistence, the people must wage a constant struggle against the big monopoly and imperialist forces in our country—the forces who seek to block the liberation struggles of colonial and oppressed peoples and to “contain” socialism, while at the same time they strive to advance their own aggressive, expansionist ambitions.

Today, American imperialism strives to undermine and destroy the revolution of the Cuban people through economic warfare, accompanied by plots and preparations for military intervention. In the Congo, Wall Street allies itself with Belgian imperialism, with the aim of taking into its own hands control of the country's resources and depriving the Congolese people of their hard-won independence. The fight for

peace, which is menaced by these aggressive imperialist policies, demands an unrelenting struggle by the American people against the actions of U.S. imperialism in these and other parts of the world. It demands their wholehearted support for all struggles of colonial and oppressed peoples for their freedom.

Similarly, the fight for peace calls for a stepping up of the campaign to end nuclear tests and to outlaw nuclear weapons. It calls for a struggle to liquidate American military bases abroad, and to put an end to the provocative violations of Soviet and Chinese territory through U-2, RB-47 and other such flights. Above all, it calls for a revival and intensification of the crusade for disarmament.

If it is to the advantage of the imperialists to foment international tensions, it is equally to the interest of the people to fight in every way for the lessening of tensions, for the resumption of negotiations with the socialist countries in an atmosphere of serious striving for agreement. The setbacks and rebuffs which American imperialism is suffering today are defeats not for the American people but for the cold war policies of monopoly. They are victories for the cause of peace and the best interests of our country.

The fight for peace demands a far greater struggle for the recognition of People's China, for her admission to the United Nations, for

an end to American occupation of Chinese territory through the puppet Chiang Kai-shek, and for the lifting of the total economic embargo which now exists.

The imperialist forces in our country also utilize the cold war to strengthen the grip of monopoly on the economy, government, political parties and cultural life of the United States. Hence the struggle for a national policy of peaceful coexistence becomes the focus of all other struggles at home—of the struggles for democratic rights, for Negro freedom, for economic improvement. These are all interwoven with the fight for peace, which serves the cause of social progress, at the same time that the fight for social progress serves the cause of peace.

* * *

Despite the Summit collapse and the heightening of world tensions, favorable conditions continue to exist for relaxation of tensions and for the creation of new grounds for resumption of negotiations at all levels. The shift in the balance of forces has greatly restricted the freedom of action of U.S. monopoly in the world. It has also served to sharpen greatly the contradictions among the imperialist powers and world monopoly groups within a much-reduced capitalist world. To be sure, the nature of monopoly and imperialism has not changed. But they are no longer dominant

in the world. Their aggressiveness can now be curbed, at home as well as on a world scale.

The ruling monopoly circles are confronted with these alternatives: They can either continue on their present course, leading to intensified war preparations and sharpening of tensions—a course which will progressively worsen the world position of the United States. Or they can retreat from their present extended aggressive positions, making accommodations to the revolutionary changes in the world, and seek negotiated settlements of outstanding disputes.

In the present world situation, the pressure of mass peace and democratic movements can force monopoly to adopt the latter alternative. Pressure by the American people is essential, and especially a heightened struggle of the American working class. Contradictions within monopoly circles on such questions as nuclear testing, East-West trade, policies toward China, foreign economic aid, etc., can prove important, but only if a people's peace movement exploits such contradictions in the interests of peaceful coexistence.

If they are forced to retreat and to make accommodations, the monopolists will strive to compensate

themselves for such losses at the expense of the people. They will seek to achieve their imperialist objectives abroad through new forms of intervention and economic dealings with weaker nations. They will also seek to take their losses out of the hides of the American people through intensified exploitation, through austerity programs, and through further attacks on labor and democratic rights. But the same united strength of the people which is capable of defeating the aggressive cold-war policies is equally capable of defeating all such efforts and securing important new advances.

Hence, under all circumstances the struggle for peace and democratic solutions requires the combined, united efforts of all popular forces against the power of monopoly and aggressive imperialism. More, it requires the growing unity of the forces of peace in this country with those in other countries, and the growing unity of all the world peace forces with the socialist countries as their bulwark.

Through such struggles and the development of such unity, for which the world situation today is highly favorable, war can be averted and peaceful coexistence achieved in the world of today.

To the First Party of the Americas

Following is the text of the speech delivered by James E. Jackson to the Eighth National Assembly of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba, held in Havana, August 16-21, 1960. Jackson, a member of the National Secretariat of the Communist Party, U.S.A., headed a Party delegation to the Assembly. The speech was delivered August 19th.

By James E. Jackson

GENERAL SECRETARY Blas Roca, delegates to the VIII National Assembly of the Popular Socialist Party, esteemed fraternal representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties from the various countries of the world,

Greetings!

First, permit me to convey the fraternal greetings of Comrades Gus Hall, Eugene Dennis and William Z. Foster, and other leaders of our Party who were unable to attend your Assembly because of travel restrictions imposed by the U.S. government.

At the same time, permit me to express, on the part of our delegation, our admiration for the report of Comrade Blas Roca—so clear, brilliant, profound, and of course, correct; and the program of the National Committee; they reveal the clear road, the certain course toward the total realization of the glorious perspectives that the Cuban revolution has opened to the people.

Dear Comrades:

To this historic convention of the Popular Socialist Party, our frater-

nal delegation brings you the heartfelt greetings, expressions of high esteem, and hearty congratulations from the Secretariat, the National Executive Committee and the membership of the Communist Party of the United States.

In the new Cuba, the Popular Socialist Party is the party of patriotism, the party of selfless loyalty and exemplary service to the people's revolutionary cause and to its government led by that outstanding national hero and statesman—Fidel Castro. Indeed, all the accomplishments of the Popular Socialist Party are at once the achievements of the Cuban people and their government.

The glorious achievements of the Cuban revolution—of which the history and service record of the Popular Socialist Party is an integral part—has won the admiration of the freedom-loving peoples of the whole world.

With the courage and daring of a David, the people of Cuba with Fidel Castro at their head, has forced the Goliath of the North to give up

his seat on the backs of your workers and peasants. You have retrieved your wonderful "pearl of the Antilles": your Cuba, from the dirty grasp of the imperialists, and the people proclaim their will to secure it forever, in the challenge of their oath: "Patria o Muerte! Vencemos!"

Dear comrades and friends, we are especially grateful to the Cuban people for the distinction that they make between the U.S. imperialists (those robber barons and their political pawns in the government who are guilty of the worst crimes against the Cuban people, those robbers of your resources and exploiters of your workers and peasants), on the one hand, as distinct from the plain people of our country, who are also the victims of exploitation and oppressive domination by these same men of the trusts.

The vast masses of the people in the United States have no vested interest in the overseas mills, mines, real estate or military bases which the U.S. billionaire gang have established as outposts for the robbery and exploitation of Cuba, Latin America and the whole "free world."

The superprofits they secure from such enterprises abroad becomes a means not only to further enrich themselves, but to further depress the real wages of the working people in the U.S. itself.

The nationalization and liquida-

tion of the foreign holdings of the U.S. monopolists abroad in no way conflicts with the true self-interest of the U.S. working people. On the contrary, it is a valuable international support to the class struggles which the working people of the U.S. must unceasingly wage in defense of, and to advance, their livelihood and liberties against the men of the trusts and their representatives in government.

Indeed, if the true interests of the working people of the U.S. were articulated, they would express themselves thus:

"Help yourself to our bosses' mines, plants and plantations, Cuban brothers and sisters! They were built out of capital gained from the unpaid labor of both of us!"

The aggressive, interventionist circle of the U.S. imperialists is roaring like a tiger and baring its fangs at Cuba. It wishes to make her its victim.

Yankee imperialism is an old tiger, and blind to the new world reality; nevertheless, it is dangerous, very dangerous.

But thanks to the militant unity of the whole Cuban people in upholding the gains of their revolution; thanks to the favorable balance of power on a world scale enjoyed by the forces for peace and freedom which have as their mighty bulwark the friendship and unselfish aid of the Soviet Union and China, the socialist camp of nations, U.S. im-

perialism has been unable to execute its plans for the overthrow of the Cuban government and for the restoration of its yoke of foreign domination.

With each new wave of the rising tide of the anti-imperialist movement, the area in which the tiger of imperialism can have his way grows smaller and smaller. Nevertheless, a tiger remains a tiger—to the end a deadly and dangerous beast of prey. Even when increasingly isolated and marooned, it retains its essential character. Hence, the need for continuing vigilance against counter-revolutionary intrigue and military invasion. Therefore our Party considers among its foremost tasks, that of rallying the people of the U.S. to expose and frustrate any interventionist scheme or military attempt upon the sovereign government of the Cuban people.

We shall continually strive to enlarge and intensify activities to further U.S.-Cuban friendship. In spite of all the lying propaganda of the capitalist-controlled press, the people of the U.S. have not been won for intervention in Cuba's affairs. Demonstrations and educational work in support of Cuba, "Hands-off-Cuba" movements, in which our Party participated or which it stimulated, have helped to bring forward the grandeur of the image of heroic Cuba.

Our Communist Party, which

lives and works inside the eye of that typhoon (U.S. imperialism) which is so menacing to the peace, security and social progress of the peoples of the Americas in particular, and of the world in general, has suffered many blows in recent years.

Electoral laws and anti-Communist statutes have prevented our Party from entering the elections under its own banner.

Even now our Party is facing a court ruling on the infamous McCarran Act whose aim is to take away even the limited legality we have secured and to repress all other militant labor and peoples organizations.

Nevertheless, it is today a Party with firm unity, a strong leadership, and a clear Marxist-Leninist line of policy. It will continue to develop in solidity and strength as it unfolds its activities among, and in association with, the masses of our people in struggle on all the vital social issues which relate to, and gear into, the over-all struggle for a basic change in the foreign policy of the government toward peace.

In the November presidential elections, the dual parties of the Big Business interests have confronted the electorate with a situation wherein both the Republican and Democratic Parties advocate the continuation of the cold war armaments race and a spirit of "crusade against Communism." But the ever-rising

incidence of direct mass actions of the popular forces in our country will yet force the issue of peace into the forefront of the election struggle.

Already the militant mass actions of the Negro people—featuring mass sit-in actions, marches and demonstrations—have compelled both parties to be responsive in their respective platforms to the civil rights demands of the Negro people and their white allies.

Our Party will do all in its power to further develop the mass action initiatives of the people in order to compel a change of course, a retreat from the cold war policy, in the interests of peace and progress, on the part of one or another of the candidates. At the same time, our Party will help the masses draw the lessons from their experience with the betrayal of the capitalist parties, for the crystallization of sentiment for the establishment of a true people's party of labor, the Negro people, the farmers and all anti-monopoly and peace forces.

Our Party is grateful to the PSP for its generous fraternal aid in our struggle for the freedom of our imprisoned Party leaders—Henry Winston, Gil Green and Robert Thompson (today in federal prisons)—and other victims of McCarthyite repression of civil liberties in our country.

Our Party is inspired by the great

work of the heroic PSP which, overcoming all difficulties, contributes decisively to the liberation and renovation of the Cuban nation. In theory and in practice, it is blazing new trails and is finding solutions for all problems which beset it and which confront the nation. The PSP is indeed the *First Party of the Americas*.

You can be sure, comrades, that the Communist Party of the United States will fulfill its obligations of international solidarity with the Cuban revolution, overcoming all difficulties that may be raised against us, come what may!

May the fraternal unity of our Parties grow ever firmer in the common struggle against the monopolists of the United States and Yankee imperialism!

Long live the Popular Socialist Party, vanguard of the nation and leader of the Cuban working class!

Long live the Popular Socialist Party which lives by, and carries forward, the all-conquering banner of Marxism-Leninism!

Long live the international working class solidarity, anti-imperialist unity, and alliance of all who seek world peace.

Long live friendship between the peoples of Cuba and the U.S.A.!

Long live Cuba and its government led by Fidel Castro!

On the Law of Maximum Profits

By Andre Barjonet

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN GENERAL AND SPECIFIC ECONOMIC LAWS

IN A VERY INTERESTING book just published in France, *Problems of Dialectics in Marx's Capital*, the Soviet philosopher, M. Rosenthal, has reminded us of the distinction which it is necessary to make between *general and specific* laws of economic and social life.

The importance of *general laws*, that is, those laws which operate in all social formations, arises from the fact that "thanks to their operation, all phases of historical evolution are linked in the unique and necessary process of social development." For example, the law of the necessary correspondence between the relations of production and the character of the productive forces is a general law, no less valid for the capitalist mode of production than for the socialist mode of production.

Specific laws, on the contrary, ex-

press "that which qualitatively distinguishes one social formation from another." Of course, specific laws "go hand in hand with" general economic laws, and reflect the most general relations of production. For example, the laws of surplus value, of the average rate of profit, of capitalist accumulation and reproduction, etc., are specific laws of capitalism.

THE LAW OF MAXIMUM PROFIT AS A SPECIFIC LAW OF CAPITALISM

Likewise, the *law of maximum profit* can be regarded as a specific law of present-day capitalism, that is, of monopoly capitalism.

Let us recall the statement of that law, as formulated by Stalin in his work on *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* (N. Y., 1952, p. 32):

... the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given

*Translated from *Economie & Politique* (Paris), May, 1960.

country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits.

After this law had been formulated in that fashion, the expression "maximum profits" passed into current use, frequently without any serious scientific foundation. And then, with the appearance of criticisms directed against certain analyses of capitalism in *Economic Problems of Socialism*, a tendency developed to use the expression less frequently.

It seems evident to us, however, that the reality which brings this expression back to light warrants a deeper analysis, in order to pass beyond the general sense of "maximum profits" that is most often given to it.

This conception is certainly too vulgarized to constitute the specific law of monopoly capitalism. Similarly with regard to the notion advanced by certain economists, according to which "maximum profits" would be nothing other than "high monopoly profits," otherwise known as "superprofits." In our opinion, "maximum profits" constitutes a *new economic category*, specific in character, and as such incapable of being reduced to the cus-

tomary economic categories of profit, additional surplus value, or superprofits.

PROFITS AND SUPERPROFITS ARISE OUT OF SURPLUS VALUE

If one examines carefully the statement of this law, one cannot help being struck by an expression such as "exploitation of the majority of a given country," in place of the traditional formulation concerning the exploitation of the working class.

Since the working class is, in general, far from being the majority of a given country, it is clear that these two expressions are not at all equivalent.

Thus, if one can readily conceive of capitalism being able to oppress politically and even impoverish (for example, through taxation and inflationary price increases) the majority of the population—and not alone the working class—one is much less able to see how this "exploitation" of the majority can be translated into profits and even more into "maximum profits."

We are not recalling to mind, in this article, the elementary truth that capitalist profit has as its sole source the surplus value extracted from productive labor.

On the contrary, we are directing the attention of our readers to the

fact that it is exactly the same with regard to the different kinds of "superprofits." When a capitalist occupies a more or less monopolistic position, we know that he is able thereby to realize superprofits, or to collect an "additional surplus value"*: it then becomes a question of the phenomena of rents or of transfers, but in any case, the "supplementary" profit thus obtained by the monopolies has no other source than the unpaid surplus labor of the workers.

Exploitation or "superexploitation"—both strike at the working class alone.

Similarly, price increases (or taxation) have the effect of reducing in fact the real wages of the workers; the "profit" which the capitalists can derive from this corresponds to nothing else, basically, than a rise in the rate of surplus value. This remains the source. It is again the same (despite appearances) with regard to the lessening of purchasing power of which the middle strata of the population are the victims, the income of these strata being derivative income which would not exist, in the final analysis, without the surplus labor of the working class.

THE "PROFIT OF EXPROPRIATION"

It would not be more of the same, however, if chronic inflation, for example, led to an impoverishment of these strata (or of a portion of these strata) of such a nature that certain of their members found themselves obliged to give up a part of their possessions in order to be able to exist. Such an eventuality is not at all imaginary; it was produced in a massive and spectacularly dramatic fashion at the time of the great inflation of 1924 in Germany. It took place once again during the war in France. In our own time, certain of the least-favored strata of the nation (older workers, retired workers, pensioners, etc.) are still victims of it.

Since certain of the "possessions" of which we are speaking were acquired not only through payment for work performed, but also through inheritance, one may say that we are dealing with phenomena of a character (if not of a scope) comparable to those which are designated as *primitive accumulation*, and which stem in fact from *pure and simple expropriation*.

It is the same as far as those *transfers of income* are concerned which are obtained to the detriment of agriculture, and more precisely of small farming. The latter (exactly like the authentic artisanry) consti-

*See on this point the *Manual of Political Economy* of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Chapter VII, pp. 128-129. (In the English edition, pp. 132-134. Translator's note.)

tutes a survival of the old order, and is integrated into capitalism only to the extent that it becomes subject, in spite of everything, to the laws of the capitalist market.

Like the artisan, the small farmer pays himself his own wages and, when he can, pockets his own surplus value. To the extent that the difference between agricultural and industrial prices (and especially those of industrial products required in agriculture) is too weighty and persists too long, the small farmers become the victims of a veritable stripping and of constraint, at the limit, toward pure and simple disappearance, after "sale" of their possessions under the worst possible conditions.

The final beneficiaries of this operation are the capitalists, who collect in this very special case a "profit" of expropriation or of plunder, of which one can no longer say that its source is surplus value.

Naturally, this phenomenon is still clearer and more widespread in the case of colonial exploitation, where words like "theft" and "plunder" finally have to be understood literally. Although in no way exceptional, such cases do not, however, constitute the general rule: in reality, colonial exploitation, as in the case of the small farmers, rests above all on the play of price differentials. Foreign trade thus is an essential instrument in the plunder of the

colonies: by "colonies" one must of course also understand certain countries, more or less "independent" in appearance (on the political level), but which continue to be under the economic domination of the imperialist nations. The exploitation of the countries of Central America by the United States, and especially by certain well-established trusts in the United States, is a classic example of these modern operations of "primitive" accumulation.

It goes without saying that war, properly speaking, permits pure and simple plunder to the profit of the capitalists of the occupying nation: the transfers of wealth and manpower from occupied France, Poland and the Ukraine, to the profit of the Third Reich, are significant recent examples of this. The documents in the Nuremberg Trials (and especially those dealing with Krupp) prove that it had not been at that time a question of "plunder" in general to the profit of Germany, but rather of the regular, systematic and coherent draining off of the resources of the occupied countries to the profit of the great German trusts.

As to the manufacture of armaments, and the greater or lesser militarization of the economy, they obtain for the monopolies, according to all evidence, very high profits, but these enter in general into the classical pattern of differential prof-

its (transfer of surplus value, thanks in particular to the aid of the state, prices very much higher than real values, etc.)

THE NATURE OF MAXIMUM PROFIT

To sum up, we believe that the realization of maximum profit implies:

a) *Capitalist superexploitation, properly so-called*, that is, the setting in motion of all the classical means of increasing the rate of surplus value (length and intensity of labor, productivity, low wages);

b) *Transfers of income* whose source nevertheless remains surplus value itself; these transfers result from the raising of prices, capitalist utilization of nationalization and of taxation, "gifts" of the state to the monopolies, etc.;

c) *New forms of primitive accumulation*, either by the workings of runaway inflation, or the serious distortion between agricultural and industrial prices ("plunder" of the working farmer and of strata with fixed incomes), or by the mechanism of foreign trade (colonial exploitation), or finally by theft, properly speaking (colonial brigandage) and war.

In this last case, the actual profit of the monopolies would then include, beyond *surplus value*, certain elements which could not be con-

nected, even indirectly, to the traditional exploitation of the working class. If this is so, "maximum profits" correspond in effect to a new reality.

HOW THE AVERAGE RATE OF PROFIT IS FORMED

Before discussing this, we wish to examine at this point what we should understand in these conditions by the "rate of maximum profit." In the capitalist order of so-called "free competition" (in point of fact, this has never been complete), we know that the different rates of profit which, themselves, result from the technical and organic composition of capital in the different branches of industry, tend to become uniform by virtue of the competition itself, finally producing an average rate of profit.* The average rate of profit assumes major importance since it is, in the last analysis, on its base that there is effected and realized the social division of the means of production and

*All the concepts considered here (average profit, price of production, etc.) are essential and we cannot of course carry them back to their foundation. Let us recall therefore that they are studied in the greatest detail by Marx, especially in the third volume (Part I) of *Capital*, of which a thorough knowledge remains indispensable. The question of the relations between the price of production, value and the formation of the average rate of profit has, incidentally, been the object of a remarkable analysis by Jean Benard in his excellent work on *The Marxist Conception of Capital*, Chapter 5, sections 3 and 4 (Paris, 1952).

of the labor force. By way of the average rate of profit, it is the law of value, through the intermediacy of the price of production, which assures the regulation—blind, of course—of all capitalist production.

Let us emphasize the fact, however, as M. Rosenthal has noted in his book cited above, that the notion of average profit goes beyond the purely economic framework, and thus takes on an essentially political and even philosophical meaning:

The determination of the price of production—the sale of goods not according to their immediate value, but according to the cost of production plus the average profit—implies that industrial capitals are tightly bound to each other, and that the profit of all the capitalists, obtained by the exploitation of all the workers, is, as it were, poured into a common reservoir, from which each capitalist draws out a profit which corresponds to the weight of his capital. The average rate of profit is the index of exploitation of the workers, not by an individual capitalist, but by the whole of social capital, by the whole class of the capitalists.

In the system of monopoly capitalism, it is generally assumed (although this question does not seem to have been the object of sufficient study) that the law of the average rate of profit persists, but that its

effects are seriously disturbed by the possibility which the monopolies possess of imposing prices above value and of retaining for themselves extra surplus value and differential profits.

How is it then with regard to maximum profits? One can assume that the average profit still holds good, but that it now constitutes only a “lower” limit. The difficulty is not that, but lies in knowing if there are as many rates of maximum profit as there are monopolies, or if there can be envisaged an equalization between these different rates, leading in this way to a sort of average among the rates of maximum profit. There is nothing absurd in such a hypothesis: the contradiction between the words “average” and “maximum” is entirely verbal in this case, and should not frighten us. Maximum profit, corresponding to a specific economic category, implies the idea of a maximum rate of profit, from which it is quite possible to envisage a sort of average, or in any case a median. This is all the more conceivable because the monopolies are very far from suppressing all competition, but succeed quite often in merely carrying it to a higher level. On the other hand, the recent evolution of capitalism shows a very sharp tendency toward the setting up of inter-monopoly understandings, along with a relatively rational transfer of surplus

value in favor of the monopolies, partly through the judicious use of nationalization, partly through the interplay of taxation, of the state budget and of public investment. Under these conditions, the bonds which unite the different monopolies are tighter than they may seem at first glance, and one can thus quite easily conceive of a certain tendency toward the equalization of the rates of maximum profit; this tendency not preventing, of course, the persistence of important differences among the real rates for each branch of industry dominated by the monopolies.

Here theoretical analysis does not allow us to go much further, as long as statistical documentation is lacking. Only the elaboration of a certain number of profound monographs on the chief branches of industry and, within these branches, on the chief monopolies as well as on the most important non-monopolist enterprises, will permit us to see clearly into this, and to leave the domain of the “possible” or even of the “likely” for that of certainty.

REALITY AND NECESSITY OF MAXIMUM PROFIT IN THE PROCESS OF REPRODUCTION

It is, moreover, into difficulties of the same order (but less serious) that we are now going to run with

regard to the reality of maximum profit itself.

In truth, the question is less one of knowing whether the factors contributing to the formation of maximum profit exist than of demonstrating that the existence of maximum profit, thus defined, is truly “necessary” for the realization of extended reproduction, without which the capitalist system quite clearly could not function.

On the first aspect of the question, there cannot be a great deal of discussion: the importance of inflation as an arm of the class destined to ruin whole categories of the nation to the sole advantage of the capitalists is already well known. It is the same with regard to the distortion between agricultural and industrial prices, as well as the transfers of surplus value. The difficulty in the matter consists in determining the importance of the role played by profits of expropriation, that is, profits not proceeding, even indirectly, from surplus value.

On the second aspect—the objective necessity of maximum profit—the answer to the question is still more ticklish. As we have already said, we are in a domain where any calculation is at this time impossible. Statistics concerning profits and their breakdown are neither false nor misleading, but non-existent. On this point, studies which are otherwise interesting (as well as

subject to criticism) are almost completely silent.

Nevertheless, the conjunction of theoretical analysis and the examination of certain facts should allow us to advance an answer.

Marx has shown how technical progress carries with it an increase of constant capital relatively greater than that of variable capital. This growth in the organic composition of capital leads to a lowering of the rate (not of the mass) of profit, in spite of the not at all negligible action of a large number of opposing factors.*

Statistically, the law of the tendency to a fall in the rate of profit has been verified for the United States, from 1920 to 1952, by the economist R. P. Chapman ("The Banker's Dilemma," *Harvard Business Review*, July, 1953). Furthermore, the entire evolution of modern industry is unquestionably going in the direction of a considerable elevation of the organic composition of capital, as a result of the overwhelming acceleration of technical progress. The emergence and the anticipated developments of automation can only accentuate this distortion between constant and variable capi-

tal. This distortion threatens to become all the more serious since the "moral wearing out" (obsolescence) of machines, well before the physical wearing out, is translated into increased expenditures in constant capital. Against this development, the classical defense reaction of the monopolies (economic Malthusianism) runs the risk of becoming impracticable, as much because of the increased possibilities of substitution (new products) as of the more and more urgent necessities of the competition between the two systems, capitalism and socialism.

In these conditions, the investments to which the monopolies must henceforth proceed are ever more burdensome. One could multiply examples.

MAXIMUM PROFIT IS LINKED WITH STATE CAPITALISM

This growth of investments tends to confirm the thesis according to which the average profit is no longer sufficient. The objective behavior of the monopolies goes in the same direction.

Thus it is that for the French steel industry, the main part of the modernization was realized to the extent of 65 per cent by budgetary credits (war damages, "loans" from the modernization funds, from the funds for economic and social development, etc.), and at the rate of barely 5.9

*Among the causes which counteract the law, Marx cites principally: increase in the degree of exploitation of labor, reduction of wages below value, lowering of the price of the elements of constant capital, relative surplus population, foreign trade, increase of capital by stocks. See on this point Chapters XIII and XIV in Part 1, Volume III of *Capital*.

per cent by the "effort" of the stockholders.

Of the 836 billion francs of the value of American (Marshall Plan) aid, 37 per cent went to the nationalized power industries, which in reality play a foremost role in effecting transfers of surplus value to the profit of the monopolies, which have also benefitted directly from this aid ("Sollac" received 20 billions, "Usinor" 15 billions, etc.).

Of course, it is not possible to prove, in the mathematical sense of the word, that without "aid" and transfers of this sort, the monopoly sector could not have proceeded to extended reproduction. On the other hand, it hardly seems serious to pretend that all this was not necessary for investment and is to be interpreted purely and simply as an enormous increase of that part of profit destined for the personal enjoyment of the capitalists.

In fact, the determination which the monopolies put forward to obtain unceasingly new tax concessions, to extract every kind of subsidy,** to maintain the price schedules of the nationalized industries at levels hardly compatible with the operation of the enterprises and, finally, to control more and more

tightly the state apparatus—these are so many elements that tend to prove that the securing of maximum profit actually corresponds not only to a reality but to an objective necessity of modern capitalism.

The study of military expenditures in the capitalist world reinforces this impression, all the more since it is less and less easy to impute them solely to the objective necessities of national defense.

In France, the gross total of military expenditures, from 1949 to 1959 inclusive, amounted according to the official figures to 12,757 billion francs. Of course, a large part of this sum has been devoted to operating expenses which, at the outset, do not profit the monopolies. However, a document of the Ministry of Finances, bearing on the period 1956-59, shows that of a total of 6,465 billions in military expenditures, 2,080 (more than 32 per cent) went to equipment (in 1959 this proportion amounted to 33.1 per cent).

In the United States, from 1947 to 1959, expenses for national security totaled 417 billion dollars, which represents the fabulous sum of 187,650 billion francs. In the United States, even more than in France, military expenditures for equipment attain impressive proportions; for the year 1958 alone, the total outlays devoted to rockets (space rockets excluded) amounted to about 3,000 billion francs (48.5 per cent of the

**A study of the Economic Center of the C.G.T. allows us to establish that in 1956 the total of tax exonerations and subsidies profiting the capitalists and farmers in a direct fashion amounted to at least 700 billion francs.

total budget of France).

In such conditions, it can be said without exaggeration that the militarization of the economy forms an integral part of the "normal" operation of modern capitalism, which, incidentally, is not without posing difficult problems at a time when general disarmament is on the order of the day and peaceful coexistence is tending to assert itself.

For this whole collection of reasons, we feel, in conclusion, that the idea of "maximum profit" as a fundamental feature of monopoly capitalism, indisputably constitutes a *new* concept which should not be confused with current concepts of "highest profit" or even of "superprofit," to the extent that superprofit is always derived from surplus value.

In the second place, we feel also that the present methods of monopoly capital, and in particular played by the state in its service, tend to confirm that the monopolies objectively experience the necessity of realizing maximum profit to assure extended reproduction "more or less regularly."

NEW STATISTICAL INVESTIGATIONS ARE NECESSARY

However, we must honestly recognize that in the present state of statistical research, this affirmation

falls within the realm of the "probable" and not that of the "certain."

Incidentally, if certain examples—those of France, the United States, etc.—fit well with the direction of the analysis in question, it is not altogether the same with other capitalist countries. West Germany, for example, has done much better in the last ten years "to assure more or less regularly" extended reproduction; but one cannot invoke in this case the role of military expenditures (at all times rather feeble), nor the exploitation of colonies, nor even the impoverishment of the "majority" of the population. It is true that, in an inverse sense, it has gambled on American aid as a basis; one might then perhaps speak of surplus value on the international level. Be that as it may, this example shows that in such a matter, things are not simple.

In insisting on the new fact that the monopolies strive (and this is quite exact) to exploit the "majority" of the population, it is necessary just as much to remember that the exploitation of the working class remains, despite everything, the absolutely essential and fundamental element of capitalist exploitation. In our opinion, the importance of the intensification of labor (acceleration of the cadence of work and return to a longer duration of the work week), as well as the enormous advance in productivity (notably in

France, Japan, West Germany and Italy), should not be underestimated, since they explain in a very large measure the considerable advance in production realized during these last few years in these countries.

Despite these last observations, the concept of maximum profit, such as we have attempted to define precisely, should not in our opinion be abandoned. Quite the contrary, it seems to us necessary to elucidate the problems which it poses, in such a way as to be able to utilize it (other than as a slogan) with all the desired benefit.

For example, we know that in theory, in the capitalist system, prices correspond to the equation: price of production = cost of production plus average profit.

If, as we think, maximum profit really corresponds to present-day reality, it is clear that this equation should be modified. This poses

problems which it will be necessary to resolve.

Likewise, if it is verified that maximum profits includes elements divorced from surplus value (let us call them "n"), the traditional formula for the rate of profit $m/(c + v)$, where m represents the surplus value, c the constant capital and v the variable capital, should become $(m + n)/(c + v)$. One sees all the consequences of such a change, particularly in the series of equations on the extended reproduction of capital, the turnover of capital, etc.

This is why we cannot better conclude this brief essay on maximum profit than by emphasizing that this idea, long neglected because of its seeming banality, ought to become as quickly as possible the subject of detailed studies, industry by industry, in the majority of the main capitalist countries.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE BOMB AND IMPERIALISM

I

On August 6 and 9, 1945, the United States Air Force hurled the two atomic bombs it then possessed upon the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; as a result, 115,000 civilians were killed at once—additional thousands died thereafter from awful wounds, and to this day some Japanese die as a direct result of those bombings.

When World War II began, and prior to America's entry into it, President Roosevelt addressed a note to all the belligerent powers pleading with them not to bomb unfortified targets and to take care that casualties among civilians be kept at a minimum. In fact, however, indiscriminate and terroristic bombings became a major element in Nazi and fascist warfare as practiced in Poland, Greece, Holland and elsewhere; and was indulged in also by the British and their allies in Germany, Italy, and the Balkans. As the war enveloped the U.S.S.R., the slaughter of civilians from the air and by ground forces became a systematic preoccupation of the Nazis. Meanwhile, in Asia, the Japanese imperialists long had bombed indiscriminately the Chinese mainland. The United States when joining the war, entered at once into the practice of indiscriminate bombings of occupied centers in Europe and in Asia, especially employing fearful fire-bomb raids upon great cities, like Tokyo and Dresden.

There was one Power—and only one—which throughout the war made it a practice to confine its fire to military targets and that was the Soviet Union. Its air force, in particular, devoted itself almost entirely to direct support of its ground troops; what strategic bombing the Soviet planes did was aimed at knocking out major military installations.

It is an ironic and tragic thing that the culminating horror in this

catalogue of atrocities fell upon the American Republic which, in visiting two Japanese cities with portable crematoria, consumed in their flames the lives of over one hundred thousand men, women, and children.

No argument is needed to establish the decisive quality of the decisions to bomb the two Japanese cities. This is of great interest in itself; it has, furthermore, important lessons applicable to comprehending the world today and useful for guiding current struggles for peace and disarmament.

Although all the archives concerning these decisions have not yet been opened and although the whole matter has been shrouded in the "top secret" category, certain highly significant matters appear to be established. First, it is certain that Japan was near surrender by the summer of 1945; this point is documented thoroughly in Michael Amrine's very useful book, *The Great Decision* (Putnam, N. Y., \$3.95). It is reaffirmed in the interviews with James F. Byrnes, then Secretary of State, Lewis L. Strauss, later head of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Leo Szilard and Dr. Edward Teller, leading scientists connected with the bomb's development, and Ralph Bard, then Under-Secretary of the Navy, published in the *U.S. News and World Report* (Aug. 15, 1960). The editors wrote: "As these men look back, there is broad agreement that . . . at the time the bomb was dropped, Japan was already beaten." By early July, 1945, the United States had intercepted and decoded messages from the Japanese Foreign Ministry to its Ambassador in Moscow indicating a clear desire to sue for peace; as the weeks went by, and before August, 1945, these messages became more and more desperate.

At the Yalta Conference, held in February, 1945, the Soviet Union had agreed to enter the war against Japan and had set its date as August 8, 1945. On July 16, 1945, the first atomic bomb was tested, successfully; from July 17 to August 2, the Potsdam Conference, involving Stalin, Churchill and Truman, met. Here Soviet entry against Japan was reaffirmed and the date firmly set; but the Soviet Union was told nothing about the A-bomb, except for a highly cryptic remark made by Truman to Stalin (according to Truman), which Truman himself admits that Stalin probably did not understand.

Japan having sought, with desperate urgency, surrender terms early in July, 1945, and with the Soviet Union pledged to enter the war on August 8, it was perfectly clear that the end for Japan was imminent, and that the Soviet entry would be the finishing blow. The bomb on Hiroshima, however, was dropped on August 6; and then, after the Soviet Union made her

move in accordance with agreement, the bomb on Nagasaki was dropped on August 9. In other words, the two atomic bombs were hurled so that their falling bracketed the date upon which the USSR entered the war. Professor P. M. S. Blackett, the distinguished British scientist, in his book, *Fear, War and the Bomb* (N. Y., 1949, pp. 135-39) elaborated on this point of the time coincidences and concluded that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima marked the opening salvo of the Cold War. Given the fact that Japan was at her last resources in July, that she was suing for peace, and that the entry into combat of the massive might of the Soviet Union would have had to be decisive in forcing her to early and complete surrender, it would seem that the atomic bombs were hurled at Japan not in order to "save American lives" in an "invasion" projected for the following Fall, but in order to intimidate the Soviet Union and to keep Japan and as much of the Asian complex as possible as the exclusive preserve of American surveillance.

That which appears likely from the mere chronology and basic data offered above, seems to be confirmed by the explicit statements of American officials directly involved.

Henry L. Stimson, Truman's Secretary of War, in his own memoirs (*On Active Service*, N. Y., 1949, pp. 637-38), called the atomic bombings in Japan "a badly needed 'equalizer' in the diplomatic struggle with the U.S.S.R." Professor Richard N. Current, in his careful biography of Stimson, concludes with obvious regret that the evidence shows that Stimson at the time, "did indeed hint that Russia and not Japan was the real target of the atom bomb" (*Secretary Stimson: A Study in Statecraft*, Rutgers University Press, 1954, p. 237).

James V. Forrestal, then Secretary of the Navy, stated in his diary, under date of July 26, 1945 (p. 78 of the *Forrestal Diaries*), that he had spoken to Secretary of State Byrnes, then at Potsdam, and "Byrnes said he was most anxious to get the Japanese affair over with before the Russians got in, with particular reference to Dairen and Port Arthur. Once in there, he felt it would not be easy to get them out."

Dr. Leo Szilard, in the *U.S. News and World Report* interview to which reference has already been made, recalls that when he projected the idea of demonstrating the power of the atomic bomb in a publicly-announced experiment, rather than through the devastation of Japanese cities, "the first thing that Byrnes told us was that General Groves [head of the Manhattan District, which developed the A-Bomb] had informed him that

Russia had no uranium." Szilard found this highly dubious, but he makes clear that on the basis of this idea, the highest U.S. authorities thought they had in the A-Bomb a permanent hold upon a monopoly of effective power. Hence, Szilard stated, "Byrnes thought that the possession of the bomb by America would render the Russians more manageable in Europe." For this, apparently a "little slaughter" would be the clincher; at any rate these considerations were put forward by way of refuting the Szilard idea of a demonstration of the bomb arranged in such a way that human life would not be taken.

It was President Truman, of course, who made the ultimate decision as to when and how to use the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, but the policy-making body that recommended its use against a Japanese city, without prior warning, was an eight-man committee, consisting of Byrnes, Stimson and Bard, Stimson's Assistant, George L. Harrison, Byrnes' Assistant, William L. Clayton, and three scientists—Drs. Vannevar Bush, Karl T. Compton, and James B. Conant. Only Bard urged an alternative course, and this he put in writing on June 27—almost a month after the committee had filed its recommendation. This, too, is published in the *U.S. News and World Report* of August 15, 1960; it urged that "before the bomb is actually used against Japan that Japan should have some preliminary warning for say two or three days in advance of use." Bard said that a sense of "humanitarianism and fair play" was behind his proposal; but he, also, had in mind the Soviet Union, and in this very proposal seems to be advocating a course that might be taken without letting the USSR know of it, while posting Japan—that is, a course to be taken unbeknown to an ally and known to the foe. Specifically, he urged that: "Following the three power conference [at Potsdam] emissaries from this country could contact representatives from Japan somewhere on the China coast and *make representations with regard to Russia's position* and at the same time give them some information regarding the proposed use of atomic power, together with whatever assurances the President might care to make with regard to the Emperor of Japan and the treatment of the Japanese nation following unconditional surrender." (Italics added—H.A.)

It is to be noted that most of the scientists connected with developing the Bomb did not want it to be used on a living target; they desired that a demonstration of its power be made and that in this way, the bomb might possibly save lives rather than destroy them. On July 12, 1945, Dr. Farrington Daniels, Director of the Metallurgical Laboratory of the University of

Chicago, polled 150 scientists, then working on the A-Bomb project, as to how the bomb should be used. Results showed that 124 of them favored some kind of demonstration of the weapon, prior to its use against human beings. Scientists, led by Drs. James Franck and Leo Szilard formed a Committee on Social and Political Implications, drafted a formal memorandum urging that the bomb be demonstrated publicly first and that then, after its awful power was clear to all, a final ultimatum be served upon the Japanese Government. But this was rejected; indeed, Dr. Szilard remains doubtful to this day that the President ever saw this memorandum.

Norman Cousins and Thomas K. Finletter discussed this Franck-Szilard plan in *The Saturday Review* on June 15, 1946. It was their opinion then that the U.S. government had to reject the proposal: "No, any [public] test would have been impossible if the purpose was to knock Japan out before Russia came in. . . ." They went on to say that the atomic bombings of Japan might be defended on the grounds "that we avoided a struggle for authority in Japan similar to what we have experienced in Germany and Italy, that unless we came out of the war with a decisive balance of power over Russia, we would be in no position to checkmate Russian expansion."

It is unlikely that Messrs. Cousins and Finletter would still persist in these views, but it is indicative of how widespread they were at the time that both men committed them to print in 1946. After the Soviet Union had endured over thirty million casualties—seventeen million killed—and the complete devastation of one-third of its territory, it is really instructive to see such stout liberals as Cousins and Finletter joining with Henry Luce in an effort to assure that the next hundred years were to be The American Century!

Professor Blackett is supported by all available evidence—the Cold War's first blows were very hot ones; that they consumed the lives of 115,000 Japanese people was purely incidental to the requirements of *hochpolitik*. The story is of some consequence also, not only in revealing something of the reality of "Western humanism"; it is of basic importance in demonstrating who was responsible for beginning the Cold War.

A further point needs adding. Efforts at "justifying" the destruction of Hiroshima, always leave out Nagasaki. But while one city was destroyed on August 6, the other was done to death on August 9. No one, however, has affirmed that there was any doubt after Hiroshima on August 6 and after the USSR entered the war against Japan on August 8th that Japan's

surrender impended. What possible reason, then, can there have been for bombing Nagasaki on August 9?

Michael Amrine, in his book, tells us that even Air Force generals were shocked at the slaughter of women and children that marked the Hiroshima atrocity, but in terms of responsibility it is at least to be noted that this bombing was weighed for many weeks, and was taken at the decision of the President. But the Nagasaki bombing, as Amrine also shows, was done on the responsibility of operational military commanders; it was not the result of top-level decision. It seems to have been a kind of "frightfulness" reflective of militarism gone mad and of an anti-Sovietism reaching the point of utter fanaticism.

From this point of view, it is relevant to note that the President has hinted that he leaves to area commanders the decision as to when and whether to use nuclear weapons; more explicitly, the *New York Times*, October 7, 1958, quoted General Earle E. Partridge, in charge of the North American Air Command, that his command was authorized to use nuclear weapons in combat without specific authorization from the President.

In all the writings on "The Great Decision" no mention is made of the decisive role that white chauvinism played in launching the bombs. But surely the fact that one was slaughtering tens of thousands of colored peoples—as a way of impressing the Soviet Union—weighed heavily in the minds of the U.S. rulers.

From what is already known about the use of atomic bombs against Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it is clear that nothing but the might of the socialist world, the developing strength of the national liberation movements, and the gathering will for peace among the vast majority of mankind in general has restrained and can continue to restrain imperialist rulers from doing again what they did in 1945. Hence, again one comes to the great lesson of our time: our epoch is one in which the popular forces seeking peace and freedom can gain their aims and can thwart imperialism's drive for war and reaction.

II

Not very long ago, this country's leading professional Sociological Society produced a fifty-year index of its *American Journal of Sociology*, covering the years 1895-1947. In this stout volume there were three refer-

ences to Marx and Marxism, and no reference at all to Lenin or Leninism.

Since all sociology has been a continual dialogue—or debate—with Marx—the founder of the *Journal of Sociology*, himself, Albion W. Small, referred to Marx as “the Galileo of the social sciences”—three references to him and his work in the course of fifty years would seem to be few enough, even for the Un-American Activities Committee. But no references at all to Lenin in five decades of professional writing on social questions is a striking reflection of the timidity and aridity characterizing so much of that writing.

Even in the best of that writing, currently being produced, one finds this same ignoring of Lenin—including the work of C. Wright Mills, for example. Mills, being among the very best in this country, by no means ignores Marx, but in all his published books so far, he mentions Lenin exactly once, and then quite parenthetically and not accurately.

One of the results of this omission is that the body of respectable and professional writing by U.S. social scientists—again, not excluding Mills—ignores the realities of American imperialism, or, in the worst instances, denies the existence of so subversive an entity.

In particular, one has extended discussion of “under-developed” countries, by which is meant areas and peoples long subjected to colonial domination—in one guise or another. The choice of such a descriptive phrase neatly ignores the fact that these areas have been and are over-exploited, and therefore remain “under-developed”; the phrase also hides the fact that the metropolitan powers, with their highly developed industries and techniques, owe much of this development, where their systems are based on the private ownership of the means of production, upon the exploitation of the rest of the world, and especially the colored peoples of that world.

The United Nations informs us that yet today six out of every ten human beings in the world are habitually hungry, and that about 55 per cent of the world’s adult population remains illiterate. It adds that the problem of the especially exploited and deprived majority of mankind has been intensifying since World War II, for the richer countries are getting richer and the poorer countries are getting poorer. Hence, on a “free world” scale, one has continuing confirmation of Marx’s observation concerning the law of intensified relative impoverishment of the masses, given the existence of capitalism.

As the year 1960 dawned, an editorial in the London paper, the *New*

Statesman (Jan. 2, 1960) indicated that among the British liberal intelligentsia this exploitative relationship is comprehended. Said that journal:

Few tears will be shed for the Fifties. Cynical, materialistic, selfish, the decade made the rich richer, the poor poorer. To the advanced countries of the West, it brought unprecedented prosperity, *achieved largely at the expense of the vast and growing proletariats of Asia and Africa* (italics added—H.A.).

Occasionally one will get this kind of admission directly from the masters themselves, although this was more common in the literature of dawning colonialism and imperialism, during the 18th and 19th centuries. Still, there are occasional slips of the pen even in our own more sophisticated and demagogic century. Thus, in the autobiography of Frederick Jessup Stimson, that former U.S. Ambassador to several Latin-American countries admitted: “But we Nordics are all living on the cheap labor of the tropics—we whites by the sweat of the brow of the blacks” (*My United States*, N. Y., 1931, p. 203).

More recently, when President Eisenhower returned from the Paris Summit Meeting that he had torpedoed, it will be remembered that he stopped off in Portugal; the press here reported that the atmosphere in fascist Lisbon refreshed the General and gave him added zest as the First Soldier in the Free World. Understandably, the fascist dictator, Salazar, was concerned about the African possessions of Portugal—what with all the “trouble” on that continent; the First Soldier reassured him, therefore, that the United States government viewed with the “greatest sympathy” Portugal’s desire for continued undisturbed control of its vast African empire. Reporting this from Lisbon the *New York Times’* correspondent, Benjamin Welles, noted that the viability of Portugal’s economy—what there was of it—depended overwhelmingly on its continued feeding upon the labor of Africans.

The latest developments in the Congo Republic have forced similar confessions concerning the sharp dependence of the Belgian economy upon the super-exploitation of the wealth and the peoples of that former colony.

This relationship was analyzed classically, of course, by Lenin in his *Imperialism*. In that work, Lenin emphasized particularly: “Under the old capitalism, when free competition prevailed, the export of goods was the most typical feature. Under modern capitalism, when monopolies prevail, the export of capital has become the dominant feature.”

As monopolization has intensified, this process has multiplied, and the United States holds a pre-eminent position in its development. This is one of the **deepest realities of U.S. imperialism** and is of decisive consequence to the economy of our country and to the nature of the Government's foreign policy. It may be of some service to readers if the latest data on capital outflow and related phenomena are brought together.

True it is that the volume of U.S. foreign trade, in merchandise, is enormous; it is, indeed, greater than that of any other country in the world, and has more than doubled since the 1930's. Its dimensions will be indicated in appropriate figures for the last two full years: in 1958, imports totalled \$12.9 billions and exports, \$16.2 billions, or a combined total of \$29.1 billions; in 1959, imports equalled \$15.3 billions and exports \$16.2 billions, or a combined total of \$31.5 billions. (*Survey of Current Business*, Dep't. of Commerce, Feb., 1960).

The scale of U.S. investments abroad, however, has more than quadrupled since 1939; moreover, *the volume of business done, in terms of sales, by foreign-based United States corporate subsidiaries already is greater than the combined total of U.S. exports and imports in any one year.*

Of the greatest significance is the fact that U.S. long-term foreign investments far exceed the *combined totals* of all other countries in the world. According to U.S. Government figures (always very conservative on this matter), the growth of U.S. direct investments abroad has been as follows: 1940, \$7.3 billions; 1950, \$11.7; 1955, \$19.3; 1958 (latest year for which full figures are available), \$27.0 billions (*Survey of Current Business*, August, 1959; *Statistical Abstract of the U.S.* 1959, p. 871).

The government declares that the average *yearly* net outflow of private capital from the U.S., in the decade, 1946-55, came to \$1.6 billions; according to the government, this jumped, in 1956 and 1957, to a yearly average of \$4.3 billions. These figures are gross underestimations, based purely on book value. *Fortune* magazine (January, 1958), stated that the true value of annual foreign investments in 1956 and 1957 was \$6 billions, rather than the \$4.3 given by the government. This means, of course, that the real value of foreign investments is much more than that stated in the official figures cited above; but how much more is not known.

The increase in the *rate of profit* from foreign investments since World War II, has been *five times greater* than the increase in the rate of profit from domestic investment; hence, according to the government, profits from foreign investments constituted 8 per cent of all U.S. corporate profits

in 1950, and 15 per cent of all such profits in 1957. The lion's share of overseas investments is held by the 200 largest corporations; because of this, according to Victor Perlo in his invaluable book, *The Empire of High Finance*, about 25 per cent of their profits comes from foreign investments.

The most recent data on export of U.S. capital made up a front-page story in the *Wall Street Journal* (May 11, 1960). Headlined, "Yankee Firms Channel Rising Share of Funds into Factories Abroad," the story said: "The trend toward larger U.S. business outlays overseas is bound to continue and perhaps accelerate, most authorities agree. An official at the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of N. Y. asserts that his bank receives five inquiries about foreign operations today for every one it got five years ago." The Commerce Department stated that there had been, ever since World War II, a **steady rise** in the percentage of total capital outlays sent overseas by American corporations; that this reached 15 per cent of total capital outlays in 1957 and 17 per cent in 1958. And: "It is probable that the proportion continued to increase in 1959, but a figure is not yet available."

Such overseas investment, said the *Wall Street Journal*, was done almost entirely, of course, by the very large corporations; and the largest corporations invested even greater proportions of their capital outlays abroad than did relatively smaller firms. Thus, Goodyear planned to spend almost 50 per cent of its capital outlay in 1960 overseas; General Motors about 60 per cent; Firestone, about 30 per cent; Kaiser Aluminum, about 80 per cent; Parke, Davis, about 55 per cent; etc. Clearly, too, this is a development of the greatest direct consequence to American workers and the trade union movement.

These past realities and present conditions tempt monopolists in the United States with vistas of even greater power and more fantastic profits in the future. In the diplomatic field, the result may be summed up in the words of Big Business' most glamorous magazine—*Fortune* (February 1957):

The U.S. has had a hand in making and unmaking several governments since World War II. U.S. ambassadors are today "running" more countries than the record will ever show. Through USIA, Americans are laboring not only to "make friends" but to mold the group and individual minds of millions to U.S. ends. Officially and unofficially, Americans around the world are working to build anti-Communist

unions and smash pro-Communist unions. They instruct and indirectly command foreign armies. They manage and sustain national economies.

Quantitatively, this is new—and particularly for the United States it is, historically speaking, rather new. But in quality, the new thing in the world is not poorly-disguised colonial domination; qualitatively, the new thing in the world, so far as this matter is concerned, is the fact that the peoples of so many of these “made and unmade” governments are and have been actively taking a hand in determining who runs their own countries. This is what is really new and decisive in our truly New Day; the money-changers are being driven out of the last temples.

By B. Ryurikov

LENIN MORE THAN ONCE wrote about “old” words acquiring fresh meaning and a new life under new historical conditions; and one such word, undoubtedly, is *humanism*, for there are few others which have been hammered and bandied about as zealously by the hypocrites and swindlers, servile professors, theologians, publicists, and other past masters at adorning bourgeois mendacity with handsome words. If they are to be believed, humanism consists of all-conciliating tolerance and the ability to rise above the “narrow,” “party” interests and aspirations.

Scientific communism has enriched and lent fresh content to the very conception of humanism. Replying to the liberal publicists who had condemned class “narrowness” and imagined that they had “risen above” all “party spirit,” attaining the heights of a “universally human” point of view, Lenin wrote:

“You are mistaken, my dear sirs. That point of view is not universally human, but universally slavish.”

These lines were borrowed from the article “Memories of Count Heiden,” a brilliant pamphlet in which Lenin exposed the falsity of bourgeois-landowner “humanism” aimed to soften the features of the oppressor classes with the cosmetics of gen-

Humanism in Our Epoch

tility and decorum. It is to Lenin that history is indebted for the cleansing of humanism from putrid, bourgeois hypocrisy. Continuing the cause of Marx, he linked humanism with mankind’s most emancipating and creative movement, with the movement of socialism. True humanism lies in the complete and all-round delivery of man from exploitation and oppression, in the creation of a society in which the free development of each is indivisible from the development of all.

“The chief aim of Lenin’s life was universal human welfare,” wrote Maxim Gorky. “I cannot imagine him without this splendid dream of the future happiness of all people, of a bright and happy existence.” But this was not the affection which oozed conciliatory unction, urging forgetfulness of the obstructions in the path of a real man’s happiness. To love man and strive for his universal welfare means striving to rid him of all that fetters and oppresses him. Writing about Lenin to Romain Rolland, Maxim Gorky remarked: “I loved him with especial tenderness and depth for his hatred of suffering, for his implacable opposition to all that mutilated man.”

Real love of man can tolerate no diffusion, no uncertainty, or passiv-

ity. As Lenin pointed out, it was only socialism "which could save perishing culture and perishing mankind." This task demands great decision, clarity of ideas and singleness of purpose. Futile sighs alone over the evil past, and mere dreams of a good future can accomplish absolutely nothing. The Utopian socialists were inspired by the loftiest of ideas, but their socialism "could point to no effective way out. It could neither analyze the essence of hired slavery under capitalism, discover the laws of its development, nor find the social force capable of becoming the creator of the new society." (Lenin)

Marx and Engels termed communism *the real humanism*; and this concise formula is fraught with great meaning. Communism makes humanism *real*, linking it with concrete action to achieve human happiness by means of *those social forces* that are capable of securing the liberation of labor and a happy life for the people in actual fact. Scientific communism has demonstrated the importance for the welfare of mankind of the development of material production and of social relations, and placed the struggle for man's happiness on a sound basis. It has waged a stubborn ideological struggle against individualistic philosophy which divides man, and shown that the real well-being of the individual can be secured only through the liberation of the *masses*

and the growth of their welfare.

Far from condemning people to passivity, recognition of the validity of social development taxes their social conscience and activity to the utmost, while uniting their efforts: the greatest humanism is not to be found in passive commiseration, but in recognizing the worth of the popular masses, the chief builders of history. It is there that supreme confidence in man is to be found, confidence indivisible from exaction; for while lavishing concern on man, society is deeply interested in deriving the benefits of all his capabilities and talents.

* * *

Mouthing platitudes about the human soul, moral concepts, and human ideals, various "ethic socialists" in the bourgeois countries are now trying to pit their teachings against the too "austere" and "earthly" conceptions of Marxism-Leninism with the aim of draining the real content from the socialist outlook, to reduce it to abstract and noncommittal phrases about "transformations in the spheres of the spirit," and lead the masses away from political and economic struggle against the exploiter classes and all forms of social and national slavery.

Lenin revealed the significance of socialism as a truly universal human aim. "It is *only* socialism that will bring the swift, real, and truly mass participation of the majority of the population and later of the entire

population in the present advance in all spheres of social and personal life."

It is this forward march that indivisibly fuses the development of *the productive forces*, the basis for the rising welfare of the masses, with *the spiritual progress* of society, and the growth of a new social awareness and culture.

Lenin who laughed at the liberal ideologists for their pompous phrases about "eternal" and "universally human" values, etc., created ideological values truly eternal, and really universally human in the loftiest and most honorable sense of these words. It is only the people who are eternal and immortal, and socialism spells happiness, welfare, and all-round development of the masses. From the humanistic movements of past centuries and the works of the great thinkers and artists of former eras Lenin drew all that was progressive, all that could serve to move society ahead. He perceived that the humanists of the past, though weak in positive conclusions, had exerted enormous, progressive influence through their criticism of the old world, through the austere pathos of their wrathful exposures. A magnificent example of Lenin's ability to carry the critical content of the humanistic legacy to its logical end is his essay on Leo Tolstoi.

The Russian liberals dubbed Tolstoi "the great conscience," and debated "the concepts of good and

evil," etc. Their efforts in this direction were as zealous as their persistence in evading all *the concrete questions* of democracy and socialism posed by Tolstoi as living images in his works: his attitude to the state, the church, capitalism, and the private ownership of land. Unmasking the liberals and exposing the flaws of reactionary "Tolstoism" with its characteristic idealization of the patriarchal relations, Lenin determinedly stressed the chief and most progressive elements of Tolstoi's works, the things nearest to us: his fervent defense of the oppressed, his sincere and vehement protest against bourgeois-landowner violence, against the autocracy and the church. The proletariat has availed itself of Tolstoi's legacy not to limit the masses to self-perfection, to persuade them to heave endless sighs over the "Godly life," or to content themselves with imprecations against capital and the power of money, but to teach them to fight and build a new society in struggle, "a new society without penury for the people, without the exploitation of man by man" (Lenin).

Socialist humanism whose ideas are being implemented in the struggle of the working class and all the toilers is intrinsically alien to the trend of isolation, of limiting itself within a narrow confine of adherents. It is just because this humanism is *the highest type of humanism* that its ideas are addressed to the

widest and spreading circles of the masses. Socialism and communism are the bearers of splendid progress in all spheres of social and personal life, and the principles of socialist humanism, therefore, are gaining a growing hold on the masses the world over.

And that is precisely why the reactionary pen-pushers, the knights of the servile pen, are sparing no efforts to undermine all confidence in Lenin's humanism. In his book, *Leninism*, Alfred Meyer, regarded as a specialist on scientific communism at Columbia University (U.S.A.) and publishing his anti-communist fabrications with money furnished by the infamous Ford Fund, attempted to prove that Leninism was inhuman and followed in the footsteps of the Jesuit fathers. "Politics are immoral in the eyes of the Leninists," he wrote (translated from the Russian). "And, on the other hand, all political means are permissible if only they promote the achievement of the correct (in the view of the Leninists) aims."

"Lenin," insisted Meyer, "was convinced that the end justified any means, and that the latter served as the sole justification for the former." (Translated from the Russian). "In the name of the Party he consciously and deliberately sacrificed friendship, warmth, and beauty." (Translated from the Russian).

This is an old trick! How often

have bourgeois immorality, cynicism, and unscrupulousness of means been attributed to the Communists. The principles of Machiavelli and the Jesuits were not invented by the Communists, but by the champions of feudalism and later of the bourgeoisie, by those who evolved a ramified system of deception, hypocrisy, and violence in the name of "sacred causes," and practiced it for centuries. Such a system is only natural in the affairs of the reaction, but the greatest liberation movement in history repudiates both filth and blood, the lie and oppression—the marks of the enslaver's morals.

The reactionaries have more than once attempted to discredit socialism, now pointing to the activities of the Bakuninites, now to the adventurous methods of certain small Russian revolutionary circles in the 1860's and 1870's. But everyone knows that Bakuninism and the cynical methods of Bakunin's agents in Russia (of the Nechayevites) was determinedly opposed by Marx. Who does not know that Lenin condemned the adventurousness and the game of firecracking of groups and circles whose theory and practice reflected the weakness and disunity of the pre-Marxist, pre-proletarian movement of liberation?

Urging the people to learn by the experience derived from the revolutionary struggle, Lenin stressed that only *expedient* resistance to the re-

action could serve the revolution. The effects of single contests by individuals were usually negative, since "they directly produced only short-lived sensations, and indirectly led even to apathy and passive anticipation of the next *duel*." Lenin and the Party, therefore, rejected the adventurist methods, putsches, and individual terrorism as things that fettered the revolutionary activity of the masses, impeded the growth of their revolutionary awareness and initiative.

The proletariat and the toiling masses in their wake are a rising and growing force. "*Honesty in politics is the result of strength, hypocrisy—the result of weakness*," wrote Lenin (the emphasis is mine.—B.R.). Replying to a chorus of reactionary pen-pushers in 1917, Lenin stressed that the proletariat regarded the methods applied by the reactionaries as unworthy of itself. "Never shall the proletariat resort to slanders. . . . The proletariat shall not bring slander to bear, but the word of truth."

Pursuing its inhuman policy, imperialist reaction consistently resorts to the lowest and most inhuman means of attaining its aims.

The bourgeois politicians openly trample upon morals and justice, never hesitating to break their own laws. When the American brass hats dispatch their planes on flights of espionage, and the government officials of the U.S.A. at first cyni-

cally deny that anything of the sort has happened, and later, when pressed into a corner, equally cynically declare that these provocations were perpetrated for the sake of peace and the safety of mankind, they show the whole world just *who* can be accused of modelling their actions upon the principles of Machiavelli and the Jesuit fathers.

The noble and humane aims of socialism cannot be served by means demoralizing to the masses, sullyng and detrimental to our great cause. "Morals serve to elevate human society to a higher plane, and to free it of the exploitation of labor . . . Communist morals are founded on the struggle to strengthen and consummate communism" (Lenin).

Marxism and Leninism combine the heights of Socialist ideals with the utmost *activity* for their consummation.

Real humanism is optimistic, but this optimism has nothing in common with the promulgation of sweet and complacent illusions. How many "humanists" there are who fervently reiterate that the meek, instructive word is the only weapon worthy of the humanist! It would be very good, of course, to build all the relations of mankind on the principle of kindly agreement alone. But he who is not indifferent to the interests of the people has no right to forget, that all sorts of blackguards still abound in this world.

The reactionary scoundrels, impe-

rialist adventurers, colonialist bandits, organizers of anti-popular conspiracies, etc. would like nothing better than to have the progressive forces defend the position of humility and non-resistance to evil. The events of our times cannot help but remind us that bellicose misanthropy has yet to be overcome by humanism. The people fighting for their happiness must be able to defend their gains with a firm hand—that too is a commandment of true humanism.

N. K. Krupskaya recalled that Lenin was fond of taking long walks in the woods on his birthdays. During such outings he would say what moved him mostly. "The spring air, the new-born foliage of the trees, and the swelling buds—all this created a special mood, propelling his thoughts ahead so that he yearned to peer into the future." Walking through the woods one day, on such an occasion, "he remarked, in connection with some invention, that the new inventions in science and technics would make the defense of our country so mighty that any assault upon her would be quite impossible. Then our talk turned upon the theme that power in the hands of the bourgeoisie was used for the oppression of the toilers, but that when power came to the hands of a conscientiously organized proletariat it was used for the eradication of all exploitation and to put an end to all wars. Ilyich's voice

grew quieter and quieter, sinking almost to a whisper, as always when he spoke of his dreams and greatest aspirations."

Lenin never believed that eternal peace would descend on earth by itself, but thought of how to use the force of socialism to foster peace and eradicate war from the life of society. That is the essence of active humanism, while false "philanthropy" which lulls and disarms by preaching the futility of violence in general is nothing more than a strategem of the enemies of humanism!

Lenin's humanism, faith in progress, in mankind's strength to check the forces of evil rendered his views exceedingly far-sighted, allowing him to peer far into the future. V. I. Anuchin, a writer engaged with lore and regional studies, related how V. I. Lenin took part in a discussion on literature under socialism while in exile in Krasnoyarsk in 1897. When a stirring conversation on socialist society ensued, one skeptic, a budding Menshevik, contributed his "spoon of tar," exclaiming:

"Dreams! All dreams! Where's their sweet reality?"

"Yes, dreams, young man!" Lenin flashed back. "They're dreams! For without dreams man must turn into a brute. Dreams make for progress! And the greatest dream of all is socialism. . . ."

"And you'll keep dreaming un-

der socialism, too, I suppose?" smirked Skornyakov, not at all taken aback.

"Do you think we'll just be smacking our lips over the trough, grunting over our abundance? The realization of our dream of socialism will open new and grand prospects for the boldest of dreams. . . ."

The Soviet people has not only had the good fortune to witness the realization of this great scientific forecast and bold revolutionary dream, but to participate in its consummation under the leadership of the Communist Party. It sometimes occurs that life casts fresh light on theoretical premises already known, lending them a fresh and special tone; and the scientific formula known to us from the books then seems to burst forth in new and vivid colors.

Anticipating the enormous progress of the forces of production under socialism, Marx said that this would stimulate the spiritual needs of each personality. He believed that the reduction of the toil of society to a minimum was the most important condition for the development of the individual. Free time, in his words, was "leisure time . . . and the time for loftier occupations." Do we not see for ourselves how the workday has been systematically reduced in the interests of the people in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries where the working people are giving ever

wider attention to "the loftier occupations," using their growing leisure not only to rest, but also to study, engage in sports, and to learn more about the theatre, music, and literature?

In the plan for the article "The Next Tasks of Soviet Power," on which Lenin worked in the spring of 1918, we find the following words: "The immediate aim . . . 6 hours of physical labor plus 4 hours of administering the state." Just a few words, but what a brilliant prospect they outline for the development of society. Here we see the forecast of a sharply reduced workday, which was a bold dream indeed in the Russia of those grim years of war. Here, too, we see the forecast of the total participation of all the working people in social and state activity, the distinguishing feature of the unprecedented flowering of the new, socialist democracy. And the things Lenin foresaw more than 40 years ago have already come to be, and are being implemented right now, in our own great times of gradual transition to communism.

Socialism has secured a swifter development of industry and culture than capitalism. Socialist society has offered the possibility to tap and use the natural riches of the country, and to accelerate the development of all branches of the national economy more fully and on a far wider scale. It has furnished the conditions for the flowering of

scientific creation, for all-round technical progress, and fresh successes in culture. The human riches of Marxism-Leninism have found their most vivid reflection in socialist construction. All the good things, all the splendid and bright things produced by the world of socialism are being produced for the benefit of man!

As far back as 1917, even before the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin wrote that under the conditions of popular supervision and control of labor and consumption, evolving from socialism, the attempt to shirk social obligation would decisively come to be the exception to the rule and that "*the necessity* to conform to the simple basic rules governing any human communion would soon come to be a *habit*."

Lenin more than once stressed the menace presented to socialism by the petty bourgeois, private-ownership element. "The power of the habit of millions is the most fearful force," he wrote, with the influence of this stagnant element in mind. But an enormous force, this time creative, is presented by the power of

fresh habits, the force of the Soviet socialist traditions, and the new moral standards. The millions have long formed a habitual love of free, creative labor, of conscientious discipline, of collectivism and comradeship; solicitude over society's common gains, they have learned selflessly to cherish its interests. And the growth of this force has shown the enormous path traveled by human society in its development, how true humanity has triumphed, overcoming self-adulation, greed, and the old attitude to toil.

"... *The Communist ideology is the most humane ideology in the world*," said N. S. Khrushchev. The struggle for peace, for socialism, free labor, national liberation, the free development of the individual, and the flowering of culture is the struggle for man, for his happiness, and his future. And no matter what difficulties may arise in his path, the man of our times looks confidently ahead, for Marxism and Leninism have illuminated the path to a bright future, and hundreds of millions are bravely advancing on that path today.

TWO RECENT TITLES

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: 1763-1783

By Herbert Aptheker

Price \$3.50

This second book in Dr. Aptheker's History of the American People answers such questions as: Was the American Revolution really a REVOLUTION? What were its sources? Did class divisions within the colonies determine its nature? Did the majority of American people support it? How did the Committees of Correspondence and the Continental Congress come into being? How were Tories and traitors treated by the military? What was the role of the Negro people, free and slave? What was the relation of slavery to the independence struggle? These and many other questions are answered in a Marxist analysis that makes this book indispensable. An International title.

COMPOSER AND NATION: THE FOLK HERITAGE IN MUSIC

By Sidney Finkelstein

Price \$4.00

This study surveys four centuries of music, focusing not only on the great 19th century composers who consciously allied their art with national tradition, such as Smetana, Dvorak, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, but throws light on the masters who wrote during the period of the rise of modern nations, such as Vivaldi, Handel and Bach. The author treats in a new and fresh way with the classic era of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, and uncovers the social and psychological issues that affected the work of the romantic composers like Schuman, Chopin, Berlioz, Wagner and Brahms. He also discusses the moderns, like Debussy, Mahler, Stravinsky and others, and appraises American jazz, contemporary Soviet music and other musical developments. An International book.

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

Important New Book—

A SYMPOSIUM

DISARMAMENT and the AMERICAN ECONOMY

Edited by **HERBERT APTHEKER**

**Studies in the Ideology, Politics and Economics
of Disarmament in the U.S.A. by**

HERBERT APTHEKER: The Ideology of Disarmament

JAMES S. ALLEN: The Politics of Disarmament

ROBERT W. DUNN: The Colossal Cost of War Preparations

JOHN EATON: Economics of the Fight for Peace

JURGEN KUCZYNSKI: Peace and the Economist

HYMAN LUMER: The Economic Role of Armament Expenditures

VICTOR PERLO: Economics of Disarmament

GEORGE S. WHEELER: War Production and Employment

Paperback: \$.75

AT MOST BOOKSTORES

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.