

SPECIAL ENLARGED ISSUE

political affairs

FEBRUARY 1961 • 35 CENTS

AN EDITORIAL

[1] **The New Administration**

ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

[77] **Salute to William Z. Foster**

HERBERT APTHEKER

[83] **The Civil War Centennial**

W. ALPHAEUS HUNTON

[88] **Africa and the Menace of
Neo-Colonialism**

**THE UNITED STATES IN
TODAY'S WORLD**

By Gus Hall

[5-61]

**THE NEGRO LIBERATION
MOVEMENT IN 1961**

By Claude Lightfoot

[62-76]



EUGENE DENNIS

Chairman, Communist Party, U.S.A.:

August 10, 1904

January 31, 1961

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

Notes of The Month

An Editorial

THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

THE KENNEDY Administration is taking office in the midst of mounting difficulties and crises besetting U.S. monopoly capitalism, both at home and abroad. President Eisenhower, in his farewell speeches, while unable altogether to deny these developments, nevertheless tried to paint a rosy picture of his stewardship during the past eight years. He repeated the "all's well" lullaby with which Nixon tried to ride into the White House. But daily reports on the front pages and in the business sections of the press tell quite a different story.

It is not only that production continues to decline and unemployment to rise in what is by now generally agreed to be the fourth post-war recession. In addition, this is occurring as part of a larger development which reflects a new stage in the general crisis of capitalism, more pronounced here than in any

other major capitalist country—a fact properly given much emphasis in the recently issued historic statement of the 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties of the world. A measure of this general situation may be seen in the following facts illustrating the position of U.S. imperialism relative to the socialist world and the rest of the capitalist world.

From 1925 through 1928, the U.S. share in capitalist world production was 44.3 per cent. This declined to 41.4 per cent in the crisis year 1937, and then rose to 56.4 per cent in the post-War year, 1948. It was down to less than 47 per cent in 1958, and is closer to 40 per cent today. But today the socialist world accounts for about one-third of total world-wide production. Thus, U.S. production now is only one-third, or less, of total world production, in contrast to over 40 per cent a generation ago.

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.



These figures reflect the fact that the rate of growth of production in the United States is but a fraction of that in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Thus, in the USSR, the growth rate is about 10 per cent a year; for the past eight years it has averaged less than 2 per cent in the USA. Furthermore, U.S. rate of production growth lags seriously behind that achieved in other major capitalist countries, notably Japan and West Germany.

The altered position of U.S. monopoly capitalism is organic to all major contradictions afflicting it. Internally, it is expressed in the mounting struggles of the working class against sharpening attacks upon their living standards. These attacks, in turn, result from both sharper competition among the capitalist rivals and from the burdens placed on the people as a consequence of the cold war and the colossal armaments program.

The strength of the socialist world system—particularly as this contrasts with the weakening of imperialism—acts as a shield and encourages the struggles of the peoples for freedom and independence. This has been seen again, most recently and dramatically, in the blatant bankruptcy of U.S. policy in Cuba, Laos, and the Congo, and in the thrilling upsurge of the masses in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The relatively weaker economic position of U.S. monopoly capitalism also in-

fluences the sharper competition for the world market and resulting splits, such as the the U.S. and its "client" States, the six-power bloc headed by West Germany, and the "outer-seven" grouping dominated by Great Britain.

At home, the struggles of the Negro people—influenced by this new relation of forces in the world, by the struggles of the peoples of Africa, in particular, and the alliance of the Negro liberation movement with the labor movement—also is a major force which will confront the new Administration.

The Administration also will face growing pressures from the rising fear of thermonuclear warfare and the gathering sentiment for peace among the American people. These feelings and fears are not yet fully expressed in an organized peace movement nor through mass organizations, especially the trade-union movement; nevertheless, the tendency has been clearly in the direction of growth and there is every reason to expect that this tendency will gain additional strength in the months ahead.

* * *

It was the working class, the Negro people—north and south, most significant minority groups, among them the Jewish people, and the more advanced peace elements which account for the shift in 1960 of nearly ten million votes from the Eisenhower banner to that of the

Kennedy ticket. These groups, with the election over, are determined to press forward for the collection of promises made during the campaign and in the Democratic Party's platform. To some degree, they already are making their voices heard, although by no means with sufficient volume, nor with an adequate degree of organization.

The Cabinet chosen by Kennedy, and his other appointments, as well as the various reports of task forces designated by him, show no great surprises. They confirm the correctness of the election policy of the Communists, based on the general line worked out at the 17th National Convention of the Party over a year ago.

That policy held, first, that Kennedy and the Democratic Party are representatives of monopoly capital as are the Republicans. Second, it held that the polarization that became marked in the Franklin Delano Roosevelt era was continuing; and in the 1960 elections the manner in which trade unionists, the Negro people, other significant minority groups and liberal, progressive and peace forces tended to reject the Republican Party was even stronger than in 1948, 1952, or 1956.

Third, it held that therefore it was necessary for the most conscious forces to work among and through these masses to advance the people's program for peace, civil rights, civil liberties, economic welfare and social progress. Fourth, it insisted that these

forces *could* be effective and *could* influence both the elections and the policies of the Administration and of Congress after the elections—and that the degree of impact would depend largely upon how much independent grass-roots organization appeared. Finally, the Party held that the current situation makes possible and necessary educational efforts on the need for a new party based upon labor, the Negro people and the farmers; but that such a Party must not be a hothouse affair and could be effectively organized only when the labor movement and all other decisive forces now working largely within and through the Democratic Party—in some cases, in the Republican Party, too—and in a variety of popular organizations, became convinced in terms of their own experiences, of the need for a new Party to fully achieve the promises made in the campaign and in the Democratic platform and additional demands dear to themselves.

The Kennedy Cabinet and other major appointments reflect the fact that the new Administration represents the interests of the big monopolies, but that it also recognizes something of the pressures of the masses who elected Kennedy. His task force reports show a recognition that the Eisenhower-Nixon-Dulles policies have proven bankrupt and that different policies are needed both at home and abroad. But, at the same time, they do not reflect a serious break with the cold-

war policies in foreign affairs, nor such concessions and reforms at home that can only be won at the expense of the big monopolies and through the curbing of their power. To expect such changes spontaneously, without the development of greater and more effective mass struggle, is to expect the impossible.

At the same time, simply to repeat that Kennedy represents monopoly capital and to fail to see that changes *can* be brought about through popular struggle, would be equally incorrect and would represent a continuation of the futile, sectarian, abstentionist policy put forward by some during the elections. Such a policy would not advance the struggle for peace, civil rights and social advance, nor would it make possible successes in terms of the battle for a shorter work week, higher minimum wage levels, federal health insurance, adequate care for the aged, improved educational facilities, the improvement of housing, and against unemployment. Nor would it result in the people learning through their own experiences and their own struggles, without which the *actual* realization of a new mass party capable of bringing into being a government dedicated to curbing the power of Big Business and advancing to more radical reforms is impossible.

Similarly, such a policy of abstentionism and sectarianism would not advance the education of millions as to the nature of and the need for

Socialism, without which a fundamental solution of the major contradictions inherent in capitalism is not possible. On the contrary, only a policy of struggle where the masses are and for things they need and want—only a mass line—offers the possibility of effective educational work in behalf of socialism. Simultaneously, the realities of Socialism as the system which abhors war, which fights for disarmament, which consistently supports national liberation movements, which repudiates racism, and which results in the swift advance of the people's material and cultural standards, become clearer day by day; these serve as basic instruments of education for Socialism of the American working masses, too, as of the masses of the entire capitalist world.

The policy of the Communists—before, during, and after the elections—aims to defend the workers' organizations and trade unions, and to enhance their living standards. It aims for social progress in a world at peace achieved through peaceful coexistence and disarmament. It aims to advance democratic rights, and the chief component of that struggle is the achievement now of full citizenship rights for the nineteen million Negro people. It aims to create an ever more favorable climate for peace and social progress by forging the unity of the people against the handful of rapacious monopolists.

The U. S. in Today's World*

By Gus Hall

General Secretary CP, U.S.A.

I. A NEW WORLD

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 81-PARTY STATEMENT

A LITTLE MORE than a year has elapsed since our 17th National Convention took place. The basic analysis, the main direction of policy and the tactics set forth in the resolutions of that convention were firmly rooted in the overall estimate that mankind had advanced to a new and higher plateau. We recognized that "as we approach the decade of the sixties, mankind stands at the threshold of a new era." We pointed to a fundamental shift in the balance of world forces in favor of the camp of socialism, democracy, national independence, and peace.

In nature, seasonal changes occur slowly and almost imperceptibly. Yet at a specific moment in the process the balance of forces tips and we are able to state: "Now it is spring," or "Now it is summer." In the same manner, though the movements of society are more complex than the seasonal cycle in nature, life has been stacking up irrefutable evidence of a basic change in

the relationship of forces operating in the economic, political, military, scientific, and cultural fields. The evidence of this fundamental shift was already sufficient at the time of our convention for us to say: "This is a new season, a new epoch, in the history of mankind."

Since our convention, the shift has continued along its favorable course. From this we drew further conclusions which we were able to apply to the everyday activities of the Party. The nature of the changes, the present relationship of forces and the direction of events have been summed up in the statement issued by the world-historic conference of the representatives of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties.

The meeting was a voluntary gathering of 81 of the 87 Communist and Workers Parties of the world. Six parties, among them our own, did not participate because of terror and persecution, including, in our case, the existence of the McCarran Act.

The very fact that 81 Communist and Workers Parties representing 36 million members met for a number of weeks on the issues of peace and freedom, is alone of outstanding importance. There has never been such an international gathering. It was probably the most im-

* This Report to the National Committee was delivered in New York City on Jan. 20, 1961.—Ed.

portant of all time. And it set forth ~~unanimously~~ a program of vast scope. It declared:

- that mankind is now in a new epoch, in which the working class is becoming the dominant force;
- that imperialism is disintegrating and that the final hour of colonialism has struck;
- that socialism is a world system of great force, growing daily in strength and influence and increasingly determining the course of international affairs;
- that socialism is invincible and indestructible, and will triumph throughout the world.

Above all, the statement declared that it is possible at long last to end the scourge of general war in our time—that now world war is not inevitable, but can be prevented by the strength, unity and fighting spirit of the people.

That is the confident, noble, inspiring call of the 81-Party conference.

The statement has already found a warm response in the ranks of all peace-loving peoples. The reactionary imperialist press of our country, which gave considerable attention to the conference in advance, hoping and speculating on splits in the ranks of the Communists, and particularly between the Soviet Union and People's China, has been relatively silent on the document itself. Its motto is: The less said the better, in the face of this message and of their blasted hopes of disunity which were built on sand.

But the statement is stimulating and inspiring the peace forces everywhere. It will have a profound influence in America too, strengthening the forces of peace and weakening the reactionaries and warmongers who counted on utilizing differences for their war purposes. Toward that end the document should be widely circulated in all ranks of the people. All Americans should read and discuss it. And all Party members, clubs, and leaders should study it thoroughly.

The statement must be read and studied as a document which gives a profound analysis of the forces at work in the world. As such it is highly illuminating. But at the same time it can only serve as a guide for orientation. It is not a doctor's prescription and does not give a specific answer to the problems of any one country. It is the task of our Party, based on our theory and in the light of the trends, forces and experiences here, to work out the distinctive needs, policies and tactics for our own country. That is a task for us and us alone. No one can do it for us.

The fact that the document was adopted unanimously is of utmost importance, not only because so many parties are involved but also because the conditions of existence of many of these parties are so different. There are socialist countries at various stages of development, advanced capitalist countries with Communist Parties at different levels of growth

and influence, newly freed colonies, countries which are still colonial and dependent. And so on. Despite that, agreement was achieved on a far-reaching program, touching on new central problems and new conditions affecting the present and the future. That testifies to the vitality and creativeness of Marxism-Leninism.

It is a principled document. Isaac Deutscher, influenced by Trotskyism, writing in *The Reporter* of January 5, spouts much nonsense about a Right, Left and Center existing in the world Communist movement, and calls the document a "synthesis" of conflicting views of these groupings. There is not a shred of truth in this statement, made to catch the unwary, the unthinking, the ignorant.

Many of the basic thoughts of the document have been expressed in writings of Marxists during the past year—by Comrade Khrushchev as well as by a host of Marxist leaders of other parties. These thoughts are the product of an exchange of views among parties and of discussions of new developments and new phenomena carried on in many journals, over a considerable period of time. Most important, they are the result of experience. Here as always, theory is the generalization of the people's struggles. This is real, living, creative Marxism-Leninism.

Our Party has made its own modest contributions to the new world developments in its estimates of American imperialism—of its role,

its policies, etc.

It is natural that in any document of such length, drawn up by so many Parties, this or that concession or compromise in formulation or phrasing or emphasis will be made. This is permissible, even necessary. But in regard to the basic line, principles, policies and tactics there have been no concessions to wrong views. The statement is a creative Marxist-Leninist document, which rejects both the revisionist concepts of the new epoch advanced by the Yugoslav Titoists and repeated by our American revisionists, as well as the wrong view of dogmatists and doctrinaires in various parties who fell behind the times and failed to see the new features of world development, and who clung doggedly to old formulae and old concepts.

The statement affirms the correctness of the declaration of the twelve Communist Parties issued in December 1957.

In basic essence, the framework around which our 17th Convention independently built its program, policies, and tactical approach was in accord with the main analyses and line of the present statement. I refer particularly to the concept of the new epoch, to the recognition of the necessity of striking the main blow against monopoly capitalism and of developing an anti-monopoly coalition. The statement deepens these concepts, stressing the need for anti-monopoly struggle as an essential condition for democratizing the

country and creating the vital conditions for socialism. The statement underlines the fact that imperialism has not changed its nature, and stresses that U.S. imperialism is the main danger to peace. At the same time, it declares that peace and peaceful co-existence can be won, that war can be prevented by means of militant mass struggle. It urges new, wider methods of struggle, involving particularly labor, whose role is now much enhanced. It calls for digging deeper into the ranks of the people, for strengthening the role and initiative of the Communist Party. All of these things our Convention and our Party leadership have put forward in the course of the past year.

It is to the credit of the Party leadership that it rejected revisionist notions to the effect that monopoly capital has now taken a line of peace, or dogmatic views which cling to old formulations of the inevitability of war, and which doubt the possibility of peaceful co-existence or oppose placing it as the main strategic task of the present period.

This is not to say that there have been no weaknesses in formulations here and there in our views. The main weakness, however, was in the implementation of the line, with which I will deal later.

The present statement was made necessary because in the last three years, events have taken a sharp new turn, marked first by the fact that the socialist system has entered a new stage of development, and sec-

ond by the fact that the colonial people's freedom struggles have entered their final stage. Third, as a result of the increased strength of world socialism and the national freedom movements, and of other factors, there has opened up not only the possibility of avoiding world war but also the perspective in the near future of banning war altogether from the life of society. Fourth, a new document was necessary because the general crisis of capitalism, which first began with World War I and the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, and which was deepened by the Second World War and the spread of socialism to one-third of the world, has now entered a new stage. This new stage has developed not as a result of war but under conditions of peace, which shows, as Marxists have been saying, that war is not necessary for social progress, but on the contrary, peace is the best condition to further basic advance.

The new stage of the general crisis is particularly evident in our country, which shows extreme decay.

A small handful of billionaire monopolists oppress the overwhelming majority of the people. There is growing unemployment, a new economic crisis, and real hunger and privation for large numbers of our people. There is degeneration of our educational system, our culture, and our ethics, and a vast growth of corruption. On top of these severe illnesses, there is the undermining of our liberties, the growing destruc-

tion of labor's rights, the unabated, cruel oppression of the Negro people and the violent denial of their rights. And by no means least, there is the threat of a terrible nuclear holocaust which big business and big brass are preparing.

New, sharp, mass struggles of vast proportions are in the making. New opportunities, new tasks, prospects of new victories, are opened up by these historic world developments.

This sharpens the need for devoting the most serious thought to the Party's work and activities. I have often said that there is a need for boldness, creativeness and probing, for putting aside fears of the new, fears of changing old concepts. We must, collectively, do far more than *talk* of boldness. We must *act* boldly, not being deterred by the fear of making errors. We must try—and we must do so in this meeting—to find better solutions for the major tasks which face our country, our working class and our Party in the fight for peace, freedom, and social progress.

Upon all peace-minded men and women, upon all thinking people, and especially upon American labor falls a great responsibility at the present time.

THE NEW WORLD EPOCH

The basis of the conclusions of the 81-party statement is contained in its estimate of the time we live in. Describing the period since the 1957

Declaration, it states:

The chief results of these years is the rapid growth of the might and international influence of the world socialist system, the vigorous process of disintegration of the colonial system under the impact of the national-liberation movement, the intensification of class struggles in the capitalist world, and the continual decline and decay of the world capitalist system. The superiority of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism, of the forces of peace over those of war, is becoming ever more marked in the world arena.

It continues:

Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale.

It is the principal characteristic of our time that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society.

The statement also says:

Today it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism, for a socialist transformation of society, that determine the main content, main trend, and main features of

the historical development of society. Whatever efforts imperialism makes, it cannot stop the advance of history. A reliable basis has been provided for further decisive victories for socialism. The complete triumph of socialism is inevitable.

This definition of the present epoch rejects the revisionist concept that we live in a period of class collaboration between the working class and the capitalists. It likewise rejects the dogmatic view held by some, that the period we live in was embraced in Lenin's estimate of the former period, when capitalism was dominant, as one of imperialism, wars, and revolutions. In this old definition there is lacking *the main new feature of our times, the rise of a world socialist system.*

The statement, however, went beyond past declarations and pointed out that this system is now indestructible. This is of utmost importance for us because it shows anew, and more clearly than ever, that the socialist system does not need or want war, that it does not need or seek to "export" revolution in order to maintain itself and grow.

The statement says:

The time has come when the socialist states have, by forming a world system, become an international force exerting a powerful influence on world development. There are now new real opportunities of solving cardinal problems of modern times in a new way,

in the interest of peace, democracy and socialism.

Imperialism, the unrestrained world bully of yesterday, has lost its unchallenged dominance. It is torn by ever sharpening contradictions within the imperialist lands themselves, and on a world scale. To be sure, imperialism is still strong and capable of great harm. It continues on the path of war and repression, opposes disarmament, and insistently seeks to intensify the cold war. It is still a vicious foe, and this is particularly true of our own imperialism, our own greedy multi-millionaires and billionaires who have coined fabulous fortunes out of the blood of countless victims of war. But it has lost its position as the pace-setter of industrial growth and technological advance, and its dominance in the field of science. It can no longer arrogantly and brutally crush all movements which oppose its policies of oppression. Imperialism lost a potent economic weapon when it lost its monopoly over the world's markets and raw materials. The deadly weapon of economic boycott lost its teeth when the socialist world opened up an alternative market for products and an alternative source of raw materials, of funds for investment at reasonable rates of interest, of machinery and technical assistance.

Such has been the shift in the relationship between the main social

and class forces in the world of today.

The indestructible bedrock of today's reality, a fundamental law of social development that cannot be changed, blocked, or bypassed, is that today it is the world system of socialist states, as the shield and the rallying point for all progressive mankind, that is becoming the dominant force and therefore tends to determine the main content and direction of the historical development of society. And truly one can say that this is the epoch of the rapid disintegration of imperialism and the rise and consolidation of socialism.

In and of itself, a shift of dominance from one group to another does not make for a new epoch. We are not here dealing with an ordinary power struggle, the likes of which we have seen often enough throughout history. To talk about today's two world coalitions in terms of the usual "military blocs" or the usual "power groupings" is to miss the real meaning of the present-day world divisions. As a matter of fact, this is actually a way of creating a smoke screen, of running interference for the camp of imperialism, because it hides the true nature of this historic struggle. For this type of valuable service, U.S. imperialism pays an annual reward to the Yugoslav revisionists in the form of financial and economic grants.

To grasp fully the meaning of the

shift in the balance of forces of the world, one must in a basic sense understand that these two world coalitions of forces revolve around two diametrically opposite poles of society. The camp of imperialism revolves around the decaying and disintegrating system of capitalism, the economic system that history has clearly consigned to the ash-can.

The new, rising, opposite camp—the coalition of the socialist, peace, and democratic forces—revolves around the new, dominant system of socialism, an economic and political system that has opened the gateway to a future of undreamed-of social advance.

Because imperialism cannot offer a way out, it does not attract the masses of people. Imperialism gains adherents only by buying them. It attracts only those elements who are willing to sell everything, including the independence of their nations, who for personal gain become puppets for imperialism. For this reason, such alliances are unstable. They are alliances among thieves without principle.

The camp of socialism, anti-imperialism and peace, on the other hand, has a built-in source of unity and strength. Each component part both contributes and draws strength from the alliance. These elements gravitate towards this camp because they are all on the progressive side—on the right side—of history. For this reason, this camp has become

the fountainhead of encouragement, of confidence, for all progressive mankind. The shift in the balance of forces on a world scale has added a qualitatively new sense of power and strength to these struggles in all parts of the world.

The national liberation struggles have also reached a new stage. They have fought their way to where they now stand at the very gateway at which colonialism ends and liberation and independence start for all peoples and all nations. This development in itself has in no small measure contributed to the new stage in the general crisis of capitalism. Of course, imperialism has not given up and will not give up. It will resist. But when forced to give up its old, open forms of domination, it will resort to all sorts of indirect methods and subterfuges. Even after liberation, the nations and peoples involved will have to show the utmost vigilance and determination to achieve final and real independence, economic as well as political.

The forward march of socialist and communist construction has also advanced to a new and higher stage. The Soviet Union is now moving along the new and hitherto untraveled but exciting path toward a communist society. The other socialist nations—the great People's Republic of China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, North Korea, North Viet-

nam, and Albania—have solved the basic problems of socialist construction and, though at varying stages in the process, are fast moving up to the point where they also will begin to build a communist society.

There is a new interrelationship between these socialist states, a relationship that makes for the best use of the resources and skills of all for the common good.

These new stages of development are distinct, separate factors, but together they combine to produce a new epoch in the history of mankind. One may say this is truly the epoch of the rise to dominance of progressive mankind both in thought and action.

II. THE STATE OF THE UNION

For us in the United States this is the season for "state of the union" messages. But while there is a growing clamor that the people must be told "the unvarnished truth," in reality most of these "state of the union" statements, editorials and speeches are neither authentic nor accurate reflections of the *real* state of our union.

Therefore, let us here attempt to uncover some of the actual unvarnished truths of the state of the union as it sails into the rough waters of this new world epoch.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

The economy has entered its fourth slump since the end of World War

II. Industrial production is now down more than 7 per cent since last January. Steel operations have hovered about the 50 per cent mark for the last six months, and the outlook for 1961 among steel executives is one of general gloom. The auto industry has managed to squeeze out an output of 6.7 million cars in 1960, but it has done so at the expense of running year-end inventories up to over 1 million vehicles—an all-time high. Now the output of 1961 models is already slackening off and layoffs are becoming widespread. Behind this, in addition to other things, lies the cold-blooded, calculated plotting of the auto companies to have the auto workers unemployed and hungry when the contract negotiations arrive this spring.

Housing construction, which has been on the downgrade since early 1959, shows no signs of pickup. Investment in new plant and equipment is falling off. Business failures have been growing in number and size. And now consumer spending, which had been rising until recently, has joined the downhill parade.

Most disturbing of all is the spread of joblessness. Thanks to the displacement of workers by automation and other technological advances in our capitalist economy, the rate of unemployment has been creeping upward throughout the postwar period. Each downturn has left behind it a larger mass of

unemployed than before. In the last two years the rate has practically never fallen below 5 per cent, even according to the ultra-conservative government figures. Now, with the impact of falling production added to the toll taken by automation, it is already approaching 7 per cent. Even if the rate remains the same, the ordinary seasonal increases will bring the number of unemployed up to well over 6 million by February. And there is little doubt that the rate will not remain what it is but will increase in the coming months.

In addition to those out of work altogether, there are currently about 1½ million on short hours. This number, too, will grow.

Especially ominous is the rise in chronic unemployment, which has been moving upward for the past ten years. Today, more than one in every five jobless workers has been out of work fifteen weeks or longer. There is also a steady growth in the number of chronically depressed industrial areas—those classified by the Labor Department as "areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus." In some parts of West Virginia today, a point has been reached where fully one-fourth of the population is living in dire need and hunger.

Among Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers, the officially admitted rate of unemployment is two to three times as high as the national average, and the actual rate

is in many cases four to five times as high. Here, too, the problem of jobs has already become extremely acute.

Undoubtedly the downturn will continue in the months immediately ahead. How deep and how long it will be are subjects of widespread speculation in business and economic circles. Most of the "experts" believe it will end by mid-1961 and will be comparatively mild. But it must also be remembered that most of these same "experts," only a few months ago, were predicting that it would not begin until some time in 1961!

We do not propose to join in this guessing game. The precise length and depth of this downturn will be affected by a host of factors, many of them not clearly foreseeable. But whether it ends in July, in December or later, whether it is milder or more severe than the last crisis, what is vitally important is that it takes place in new circumstances and in conditions of considerably increased instability of the economy.

This is a fact which is now coming to be recognized more and more widely among business spokesmen and economists. Many of those who, at the beginning of 1960, were hailing the advent of the "Soaring Sixties," are now speaking of the "Sobering Sixties." In his recent report to President-elect Kennedy, the economist Paul A. Samuelson says:

More fraught with significance for

public policy than the recession itself is the vital fact that it has been superimposed upon an economy which, in the last few years, has been sluggish and tired.

Thus, anyone who thought in 1958 that all was well with the American economy just because the recession of that year bottomed out early was proved to be wrong by the sad fact that our last recovery was an anemic one: 1959 and 1960 have been grievously disappointing years, as the period of expansion proved both to be shorter than earlier postwar recoveries and to have been more abortive in the sense of never carrying us back anywhere near to high employment and high capacity levels of operations.

What is also significant is the growing dead weight of excess productive capacity and the failure of outlays for new plant and equipment, following the last crisis, to regain the previous peak of 1957. At the same time, the bulk of the existing investment continues to go into automation and other labor-saving devices, which can only add further to excess capacity and chronic unemployment. Productive capacity keeps inching upward even though currently at least one-fifth of it lies idle.

What is significant is that the present decline starts from a higher level of unemployment than any previous one and that, even if it should prove less severe than the last one, it is heading toward a rate of joblessness surpassing anything we have experienced since the war. What is

also significant is the growth of "sick" industries, now apparently including steel in addition to coal, textile, lumber, and non-ferrous metals, as well as the spread of chronically depressed areas to include major industrial centers like Detroit.

Significant, too, is the fact that the chronic agricultural crisis continues unabated. After a temporary upsurge during the Korean War, the condition of farmers steadily worsened in subsequent years and remains at a low level. From a peak of \$15.2 billion in 1951, net farm income has dropped to an average of roughly \$11.5 billion in recent years. The parity index, which measures the ratio of prices received by farmers to the prices they pay, fell from 107 in 1951 to an average of about 80 during the past several years. Unsaleable surpluses of farm products continue to mount from year to year. Small farmers continue to be driven off the land in growing numbers. And there is little prospect of anything more than momentary improvement.

The growing uneasiness of the economy is no less evident in the deterioration of the world position of U.S. capitalism, whose share in production and trade in the capitalist world has declined markedly in the past few years. Especially striking is the fall in steel output. A dozen years ago, U.S. production of steel was in the neighborhood of three-fourths of the capitalist world total. In 1960 it was only 42 per

cent. (In relation to the total world production, it is worth noting, it fell from about one-half in 1950 to about one-fourth in 1960.) This deterioration is most conspicuously shown in the mounting balance of payments deficit and outflow of gold—in the ever greater shakiness of the once almighty dollar.

U.S. foreign economic policy has been dictated by the considerations of the cold war. The outlay of billions a year in so-called foreign "aid" was designed to foster Wall Street's goal of world domination, and for a time it paid off. These expenditures were more than compensated by a flood of huge export surpluses and other tribute, with growing dollar shortages in the rest of the capitalist world and devaluations of other currencies under the pressure of U.S. monopoly capital. But now the shoe is on the other foot. In the last three years the number of dollars leaving the country has exceeded that coming in by more than \$11.3 billion, and well over \$5 billion in gold was shipped abroad, reducing the U.S. gold stock from \$23 billion at the end of 1957 to less than \$18 billion at the end of 1960. Today it is the mighty dollar itself which is in danger of devaluation.

The simple fact is that the cold-war policy is increasingly proving itself bankrupt economically as well as politically. It is not paying off as it once did.

To be sure, U.S. monopoly capital remains very powerful and is not

taking its reverses lying down. In particular, it has been building or buying into manufacturing enterprises abroad, and especially in Europe, with the aim of meeting foreign competition on its own grounds, capturing a bigger share of the world market, and taking advantage of the higher rates of profit yielded by investments in other countries. This growth in foreign investment is also motivated largely by the expectation that European markets in key industries such as auto will expand considerably in the near future, while American markets show little prospect of growth. The outlook of American big business, therefore, is to build its profits on foreign operations in the face of a declining economy and rising unemployment at home. However, with the growing strength of the socialist world, the accelerating disintegration of the colonial system and the rise in comparative economic vigor of its capitalist rivals, it is waging its battle under more and more disadvantageous conditions.

The signs all point to the conclusion that this fourth postwar recession takes place within a new framework, in which the long-range factors of expansion and large-scale industrial renewal are running out in the capitalist world, and first of all in the United States. This undoubtedly will leave its imprint on the recession.

All this is bound to have—and in fact is having—serious repercus-

sions among American workers. Big business will strive increasingly to overcome its difficulties, now compounded by the fourth postwar crisis, at their expense. The demand is growing for greater productivity and less wages in order to become “more competitive” with foreign producers—which not infrequently prove to be the very same American corporations making the demands! Already in 1957 more than 25 per cent of all imports into the United States came from U.S. monopoly-owned corporations. They make extra profits by holding wages down overseas, ship part of the product to the U.S.A. to be sold at high prices, and then use this to grind down the standards of their workers in this country.

Efforts are being stepped up to undermine and destroy existing work rules and other protections of working conditions in order to extract the fullest advantages of automation and rationalization for the big companies. The offensive against organized labor continues and plans are under way to intensify it. In addition, there is the threat of devaluation of the dollar with a resulting jump in prices of the necessities of life.

The American working people are already suffering growing inroads on their living standards. Of course, the vaunted American standard of living has never really been what its glorifiers have claimed. In July, 1960, the Bureau of Labor

Statistics standard weekly budget for a family of four averaged \$117, but the average weekly earnings of a factory worker with three dependents amounted to only \$91.14. And according to the Census Bureau, more than 30 million Americans were living on less than \$50 a week. Even in the “prosperous” year of 1957, the Federal Reserve Board reported, more than one-fifth of the nation's spending units had incomes of less than \$2,000 a year and nearly one third had less than \$3,000. Some 2,000,000 agricultural workers live in the most abject poverty and are denied every social welfare benefit available to other workers. And for the overwhelming majority of Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers—holding the lowest-paying jobs, last hired and first fired, living in unspeakable slum ghettos—the “American standard of living” exists only in fantasy.

Now, with the rise in unemployment and short hours, the gap between the living standards of American and European workers is narrowing. And we may rest assured that the American ruling class, to protect its profits in a period of decline, will do its utmost to drive the living standards of American workers down all the more.

Today the fight for jobs and security is paramount, and certain it is that sharp struggles lie ahead. The battle against mounting unemployment and dwindling living standards must be based first of all on

the fight for peace and universal disarmament—on putting an end to the enormous waste of an arms economy for which the working people pay dearly in high taxes, high prices and deprivation of vitally needed social services. It must place in the forefront the launching of a militant crusade for the thirty-hour week, and it must raise as a cardinal issue the fight against job discrimination. It must also place sharply the demand for a federal system of adequate unemployment compensation, covering all workers without exception and the full time that a worker is unemployed. It requires the organization of the growing mass of unemployed workers and a striving for the fullest unity of all workers, employed and unemployed. And needless to say, Communists must be found in the vanguard of the battle.

THE GROWING POWER OF THE TRUSTS

Not least among the unvarnished truths of American life is the ever-tightening grip of the giant trusts of Wall Street on our country. As a nation, we are increasingly dominated by and forced to follow the dictates of a handful of all-powerful financial empires. These have gathered into their greedy clutches our natural resources, our banks, our industries, our land, our agriculture, our railroads—the bulk of our economic wealth. And now we are witnessing, at increasing tempo, a

process of subversion of government institutions by these monopolies, who are more and more taking direct control of them and making them instruments of their drive for complete domination in all spheres—economic, political, military, etc. In short, we are witnessing the ever swifter growth of state-monopoly capitalism in our country.

Morgan, Rockefeller, Du Pont, Dillon-Read, Ford—these and others like them have become household names in our nation's capital as well as in the state, county, and city seats of government. More and more, key government posts are in the hands of their direct representatives. More and more, the government has been turned into an instrument of profit-grabbing and a source of fabulous wealth of the trusts, into a transmission belt through which an endless flood of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money passes into their already enormously swollen coffers.

Ponder just this one item: every year close to \$50 billion is spent by the federal government for military purposes—about \$4 million dollars every hour, day and night. The spending of these vast sums is controlled by these monopoly forces, who use them for their own benefit at home and abroad, and parcel them out among themselves in lucrative arms contracts, with only the smallest crumbs slipping by them in the form of subcontracts.

These same monopolies—the big

banks, insurance companies and industrial corporations—today hold the major part of the \$300 billion of outstanding IOU's of the federal government, commonly known as the national debt. On these holdings, they collect the bulk of the \$9 billion a year which is paid out in interest—more than ten cents of every dollar taken in by the federal government. They hold additional billions of dollars in IOU's from state and local governments, in the form of bonds issued for schools, roads, hospitals, transit systems, etc. If we add to this the huge and growing mass of private debt, these trusts collect interest on the bulk of a total of nearly 900 billion dollars of outstanding debt.

Through the state-monopoly conspiracy, the trusts dictate government policies on taxes, tariffs, prices, subsidies, interest rates and a host of other items, and all the dictation is designed to accomplish one thing—to siphon money from the pockets of the people into their own.

This growth of monopoly power and its increasing capture and use of government institutions to bolster its profits are by no means signs of good health of American capitalism. On the contrary, these developments flow from weakness and desperation. They are proof that capitalism cannot continue to exist as it has in the past, but must more and more rely on the resources of the state to keep it going at the expense of the people.

Since this growth of power and wealth comes out of the hides of the great majority of our people, these state-monopoly policies and practices come into ever sharper conflict with ever larger sections of the people, who are increasingly becoming victims of this conspiracy. A point has now been reached at which big business behaves as if it has foreclosed on the mortgage and taken complete charge.

The people of the United States must find the unity and strength to reverse this process. What is urgently needed is a broad coalition of the victims of monopoly around a minimum program of action. This coalition can and will form around many different issues. It will express itself and crystallize on many different fronts. But as these movements gather forces and draw lessons from their skirmishes, they will all move in the direction of an anti-monopoly people's coalition, a coalition that will act through mass struggles as well as through electoral channels to limit the depredations of the monopolies and to use the resources and institutions of the government for the benefit of the people. Such a coalition will fight to restrict monopoly price-gouging, to nationalize key industries under democratic control, to do away with the waste of fifty billions a year on armaments, to make drastic improvements in social services and social welfare, to strengthen democratic rights, and to attain

similar goals.

The Wall Street trusts rob not only the American people, but those of other countries as well. Their global plunder and kleptomaniac have brought the wrath of the world's peoples down on our heads. The prestige of the U.S.A. as a nation is today at its lowest ebb.

The national liberation movements, which have risen so spectacularly, are directed against the monopoly bandits who come from beyond the borders of these countries to rob them of their natural resources, to compel their people to work for the barest pittance, and to block the development of their national economies.

Wall Street has now become the world center of such colonial banditry. American corporations have now acquired, even according to the grossly underestimated official figures, some 30 billion dollars of direct foreign holdings—two and one-half times what they were ten years ago. There are rich rewards from such holdings running into billions of dollars a year but these go solely into the bank accounts of the gluttonous rich. The people, on the other hand, are called on to pay the cost of these operations.

As it does in the domestic field, monopoly capitalism subverts and uses the government as an instrument for this overseas banditry also. There is no other reason for the more than 200 overseas military bases, for our troops in Taiwan, for

the Seventh Fleet maneuvers, for our troops in Guantanamo, South Korea, Spain, Italy, West Germany, France, Okinawa and other places. The American taxpayer pays for all this plus for the billions in foreign "aid," most of which goes for arms and under-the-table bribes to the puppets who carry out Wall Street's policies. The monopolies have built a vast government superstructure to serve them in their overseas banditry.

This is another of those unvarnished truths.

Until two years ago Cuba was in the firm grip of the U.S. monopolies. Most operations of this kind are hidden from the people, and when some of them do see the light of day there is great amazement. Until two years ago, I am sure most Americans honestly thought that Cuba was an independent nation in the full sense of the word. Only when the Cuban people kicked out the puppet dictator Batista and began to take over their own industries, did it become clear that the United States monopolies had owned just about everything in Cuba, from banks to night clubs, from public utilities to sugar plantations, from the tobacco industry to industrial plants. So far the Cuban government has expropriated over 500 of these U.S. monopoly-owned concerns. And it is precisely because the Cubans have freed their country from the grip of Wall Street that the tremendous hue and cry and the

threat of attack on Cuba are now being generated.

As for those who maintain that the United States is not involved in any conspiracy against Cuba, we should remind them of what General U. S. Grant wrote in his *Memoirs* about the Mexican War. The United States, Grant disclosed, had provoked attack by deliberately moving its own troops into territory it knew to belong to Mexico.

Such provocative actions have become a standard type of procedure as a cloak for aggression. At all costs, we must prevent its use against Cuba—or against any other country in the future.

This is still another of those unvarnished truths.

We, the people of the United States, must find the strength and unity to disengage and separate our government and our nation from all such plundering of other countries. We must refuse to continue to be the lookout and the armed guard for the thieving overseas operations of the monopolies of Wall Street. We must unitedly repudiate and fight to reverse these imperialist policies.

We must, in particular, insist that our policy should be based on recognition of the moral correctness as well as the inevitability of the abolition of colonialism, and that we should therefore take a forthright stand on halting all policies and practices of colonialism now. We must demand that our government

cease giving assistance to reactionary anti-democratic puppets, and that assurances are established that it will not take part in any schemes to re-establish colonialism in new or indirect ways.

THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

Today the new President takes his oath of office. If party platforms were serious documents, if those elected followed the policies presented in their own campaign speeches, and if politicians took seriously the question of people's mandates, then I dare say this would indeed be a great day. However, history has taught us at great cost not to judge public officials by what they said as candidates.

There can be no doubt or uncertainty as to what the American people want. As a matter of fact, while the promises of the platforms and the campaign speeches are no barometer of the real intentions of the candidates, they are, however, a very clear reflection of the basic and earnest desires of the great masses of the people.

In a general sense, the great majority of those who went to the polls voted against the brinkmanship policies sired by Dulles and continued in the U-2 flights, the breakup of the Summit and the other provocative cold-war acts of the Eisenhower Administration.

The people voted as they did because of their rising fears of a

creeping economic crisis. And they voted as they did not because of any deep confidence in one or the other candidate, but rather because they hoped that the Democrats would do better. In the minds of most working people, their fears were symbolized by Nixon as the inheritor of the Eisenhower mantle, and their hopes were symbolized by Kennedy, although it must be recognized that many also voted for Nixon in the hope that he would live up to his promises of peace. Undoubtedly some sections of the voters were influenced by the Republican propaganda that it is the Democrats who have involved us in all wars, as well as by fears of having a Catholic in the White House. But the great majority of the people—the working class, the Negro Americans, the farmers, the national groups—placed their hopes in Kennedy.

There is nothing to be gained by trying to predict the exact course this new Administration will follow. Like those which preceded it, this Administration in the final analysis represents the interests of big business. Whether it will see the long-range interests of U.S. monopoly capital as lying in the continuation of the warlike and arrogant brinkmanship policies of the past, or whether it will recognize the new world relationship of forces and the inevitable re-evaluation that is necessary, and will therefore move in the direction of re-

ducing world tensions, of ending the cold war, of coexistence—all this remains to be seen.

If one is to judge by the men in the Cabinet and around the Administration at this moment, one would have to say that this Administration will apparently try to move in two or more directions all at the same time. This would indicate that there will be a struggle in this Administration—and this is not unimportant. After a dozen years of administrations marked by complete unity behind a reactionary brinkmanship policy, even the prospect of a struggle as to policies is of real significance to any serious student of politics. This can be an important factor in stimulating the mass participation of the people in determining the direction of policy, both foreign and domestic.

Rarely in the history of presidential campaigns or in the history of national political conventions has there been such mass activity on the grass-roots level as took place in connection with the Chicago and Los Angeles conventions. The grass-roots drive of the conscious peace forces for the nomination of Stevenson was a reflection of the very widespread and deep sentiment for peace among our people. The militant mass activities of the Negro people's movement around the conventions ploughed new ground and set a new standard for such activities. And these mass activities left their imprint on the platforms and

on the campaign, and have no doubt already had some effect on the selection of a cabinet.

The key to the direction which the new Administration will take lies in very large measure in the continuation and further development of such grass-roots movements and activities. It is this, and not the campaign promises of the winning candidates, which will be instrumental in determining the course of events.

Possibly the most striking trait of the Eisenhower Administration during the last years of its existence has been its bull-headed refusal to recognize the realities of the new world. Because of this, the policies which have been followed have created a greater and greater gulf between our country and the rest of the world. Even the bonds between the U.S. and its cold-war allies have grown thinner and more brittle. The policies of the cold war have hit one reef after another. Hence, no matter who happened to be elected President, a basic re-evaluation of where we are and where we are going had become almost unavoidable. And in a sense, the outcome of the elections and the character of the new Administration are already political reflections of the fact that we are at a crossroads moment in our history as a nation. The Eisenhower Administration has refused to recognize that the old period of continuous expansion and buoyancy, of unchal-

lenged world dominance, has come to a rather abrupt end. It has continued the cold war policies, always evil but designed in the context of an earlier and very much different balance of world forces. These have met the fate of all policies that are out of harmony with the realities of life—ignominious defeat.

To speak of a New Frontier, as Kennedy does, is good. But there can be no new frontiers along the old cold-war path. If the new Administration is to find them, it will have to chart a new course. On the basis of our own study and knowledge of world developments, we are firmly convinced that new frontiers for the United States do exist, but they can be successfully sought only if the direction of our course is towards the ending of the cold-war policies and the initiation of policies looking toward peaceful coexistence, the ending of colonialism, disarmament and peace.

The men around the new Cabinet, according to press reports from Washington, have been given secret files on our economic situation, our world relations, etc. And these files, the reports indicate, have had a very sobering effect on them. In fact, there has been a new and more sober tone in the reports of the task forces set up by the Kennedy Administration—for example, in the economic report cited above. Many of these reports are themselves already the beginnings of a re-evaluation, and they are certainly a more

realistic estimate of the unvarnished truth of our situation than we have been getting.

Exposure to such facts and truths can on the one hand give rise to hysterical acts of desperation and even provocation, and this in fact has tended to be the reaction of the Eisenhower Administration during these last months. On the other hand, they can be conducive to a calm re-evaluation leading to the charting of a new course—a course that is more in harmony with the new world. The direction which the reaction of the new Administration takes will be watched by the whole world, as well as by the American people.

However, there is one conclusion that we can draw now, and that is the unquestionable existence of new factors, providing new openings for a vast upsurge of mass activity. The recent past again gives proof that the American people do not have to be idle spectators on the sidelines. They can influence and even determine the direction of our Government's policies in the period ahead. Even more, if the fight to end the cold war is to be won, they must strive with all their energies to do so.

III. THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

THE CENTRAL ISSUE

Peace is the central, most immediate, most crucial task that faces our nation, our working class and

our Party. "The struggle against the threat of a new war must be waged now and not when atom and hydrogen bombs begin to fall, and it must gain in strength from day to day. The most important thing is to curb the aggressors in good time, to prevent war and not to let it break out." Such is the sharp warning of the 81-party statement.

The issue of peace was in the very center of the election campaign. The 15th General Assembly of the UN, which occurred in the very midst of the campaign, and particularly the speeches of Khrushchev, Castro, Nkrumah and others, thrust this issue into every home in the nation. They exposed the danger of war in the Administration's foreign policy, and thereby they did a tremendous service to our country and mankind.

Each of the two major candidates avowed that he was for peace. Nixon and the Republican Party charged the Democrats with being the war party, notwithstanding the fact that it was the Eisenhower Administration and Nixon that deliberately blew up the Paris Summit Conference in May, and have continued since along the perilous "brink of war" path, particularly in Laos, the Congo and Cuba.

The Democratic candidate, Kennedy, also tried to exploit the sentiments for peace. He inferred that the Administration had been unnecessarily provocative in regard to

U-2 and even thought that an apology should have been made by the President. He made an issue of not being committed to the defense of Quemoy and Matsu. But at the same time, he pressed for ever larger armament expenditures. Nevertheless, many voted for both Nixon and Kennedy in the belief that they would preserve the peace.

The American people are unquestionably for peace. What they do not realize clearly is that it is U.S. imperialism which is the main source of the war danger. The monopolists and the Administration have succeeded by their virtual domination of the press, radio, television and other means of communication, and also by their cunning maneuvers and demagogic peace talk, in deceiving large masses of the American people into thinking that U.S. policy is for peace and freedom. Elsewhere, this pose has been largely exposed, as is strikingly shown in the severe setbacks to U.S. imperialism in South Korea, Turkey, Japan and other countries. But this is not yet so clear to the American people.

It is our task to reveal to every American that U.S. big business and big brass are today the chief force for war, that the monopolists who exploit the American people through high prices, high taxes and huge war budgets, are the very forces that aim at world domination and world exploitation. We must make clear that their talk of defending

freedom is a fraud. We must show that by their support to dictators like Franco, Chiang Kai-shek and now General Mobutu, who dissolved the Congolese Parliament and keeps the legally elected Premier Lumumba in prison, by continuing and stepping up the armaments race, by their provocative, war-like moves in regard to Cuba—by all these and other actions the monopolists, the Pentagon and their political henchmen are sacrificing the national interests, hurting our national prestige, degrading our democratic heritage, undermining the security and liberty of every American, and jeopardizing the very existence of the American people. *The enemy of our security, freedom, and peace is not abroad. That enemy is here at home.* This must be patiently, convincingly and persistently explained to our people.

War is the constant companion of capitalism. As long as imperialism exists there will be soil for wars of aggression. Hence the need for the greatest vigilance and struggle.

But it is not true, as some have said, that as long as capitalism exists in any part of the world, war is inevitable. War can be prevented. Moreover, as the forces of socialism continue to grow, the superiority of the forces of socialism and peace will before long become absolute and, in the words of the 81-party statement, "a real possibility will have arisen to exclude world war from the life of society even before

socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world."

This means, as we said after the Summit collapse, that it is possible to compel the monopolists to retreat from their die-hard cold-war position and their refusal to disarm. The necessary forces are present on a world scale. They are present in the United States today. However, it will not come about automatically, but will require the most determined mass struggle.

As we wrote recently in a greeting to the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba:

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

We Communists must dedicate ourselves more than ever to the issue of peace. It is not only a task which rests upon us in behalf of our class and nation; it is a matter of life and death for all humanity. We Communists stand for socialism. But we have never favored war as a means of achieving it. A new world war would undoubtedly

bring about the end of capitalism, but it would also be a horrible catastrophe for all mankind.

The First World War killed vast numbers of people. Eight and a half millions died on the battlefields and over 20 million were wounded. Millions more died of hunger and disease. It lasted 51 months and destroyed over 200 billion dollars in property.

The Second World War involved 61 states and directly affected 80 per cent of the world population, with 110 millions under arms. Thirty-two millions died on battlefields and 35 millions were crippled. It lasted 72 months and destroyed thousands of cities, homes, factories, railroad lines, public buildings, and countless wealth.

A third world war—a war with nuclear weapons—would throw society back for generations. It would threaten the very existence of humanity, destroy enormous forces of production in socialist and capitalist nations alike and make it vastly more difficult to resume the upward climb of society.

The standard H-bomb of today is equal to 1,000 A-bombs of the size which virtually destroyed Hiroshima. Thousands of such H-bombs are now stockpiled, along with guided missiles and rockets. And in the next war our country would not escape the carnage; on the contrary, it would be a major battlefield. That is why the preservation of peace is not alone a matter of

class or national interest, but of the fate of humanity itself.

Everything possible must be done to press the new Administration to end the cold war, to work for a new summit conference and negotiations in good faith at all levels to settle the major issues which threaten war.

The crusade for peace must enlist the support of every public official, local, state and national. The call for peace must be heard in union halls and at shop gates, in the press and from the pulpit, on radio and television. The cry for peace must echo from the city and the countryside, from the young and the aged, from people in every walk of life. It must become so powerful, so irresistible, that it will change the course of our government to one of peace.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE —WHAT IT MEANS

The fight for peace is a fight for peaceful coexistence between the capitalist and socialist nations. It is either peaceful coexistence or annihilative war—there is no other choice.

The idea of peaceful coexistence is spreading among the people. It will grow. The rabid reactionaries and warmongers fear it; that is why they are misrepresenting and distorting this great principle of international relations, giving it a sinister and bellicose interpretation. Today an attempt is being made to

twist the idea of peaceful coexistence, as expressed by our Party and in the 81-party statement, into a new device of the cold war—in fact, into a conspiracy directed against the United States.

Thus, the *New York World-Telegram*, on January 14, in a front-page syndicated article by Ray Cromley headed "U.S. Reds Trained for Co-existence," says "that the Communist Party has gone all out to train American reds in the strategy and concepts of what Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev calls peaceful coexistence."

Imagine the terrible crime! The U.S. Reds, the Communists, are plotting peace! This is Cromley's great "revelation," which he supports by quoting a so-called "secret document." And what is the "secret" strategy, according to this warmongering hack? That, according to the alleged secret document, "eventually the Americans can be made to retreat from their present course without a major war, because of the new world relationship of forces in which the socialist forces are dominant." Such are the supposed secret instructions from Moscow!

Now it happens that I wrote the substance of this quotation myself in an article on the Summit collapse which was published as a pamphlet. But I did not say that *Americans* can be made to retreat from the war policy. On the contrary, I said that the American people can force the

U.S. *monopolists*, the U.S. *imperialists*—*big business* and *big brass*—to retreat from *their* cold-war, brinkmanship policies. Big business and the American people are not the same. They are the very opposite.

The writer goes further. He states that in the alleged secret document the Communists say that "peaceful co-existence is a temporary aim." This is a fraud. Peaceful co-existence, in the view of the Communists, is a long-range policy which will prevail as long as capitalism exists alongside of socialism. And that is not a brief interval, for while capitalism is a doomed system, its ultimate, complete disappearance is a long and complicated process. Peaceful coexistence is not a tactic or a maneuver. It is an historical necessity while different social systems obtain in the world.

Finally, again quoting the alleged secret document, this poison-pen hack writes: "Peaceful co-existence means competition or class struggle between the two systems economically, ideologically, and politically." With this, the so-called secret document stands completely exposed as a fake. For the words he quotes are words of the 81-party statement and the Appeal to the Peoples of the World, documents which have been published throughout the world. And this idea is repeatedly stated in our own convention resolution and policy statements. What this hack left out, however, as stated in the Appeal, is the following:

The historic debate between the old and new systems, between socialism and capitalism, should be settled, not by a world war, but in peaceful competition, in a competition as to which social system achieves the higher level of economy, technology, and culture, and provides the people with the best living conditions.

A small omission indeed!

Of course the class struggle will continue under conditions of peaceful coexistence. That has existed for hundreds of years, long before socialism appeared in the Soviet Union. Of course the battle of ideas will go on. That is an unchangeable law of life, essential to social advance. Only a decadent ruling class which has lost faith in its cause ~~can~~ the battle of ideas.

The fight for peaceful coexistence must be based on a struggle for concrete demands. The new Administration must be pressed to move in the following direction:

1. To begin immediately to dismantle the whole system of overseas armed bases and camps. They are needless and useless for the defense of the United States. They are sources of irritation that endanger the peace of the world. And they are a waste of the taxpayers' money.

2. To end all squabbling and obstruction by our representatives and to reach agreement to abolish all nuclear testing now.

3. To put an end to all policies of brinkmanship and the fomenting of increased world tensions. To

work to remove one by one all the sources of irritation and to accept as our policy the outlook of peaceful coexistence.

4. To take up seriously the task of disarmament, and to plan now for the use of the billions being squandered on arms for houses, hospitals, schools, roads and other social service and social welfare needs.

5. To end the Dulles-Eisenhower era of war alliances and war pacts, and to eradicate all tendencies toward war, whether big or small, whether brush fires or world conflagrations.

Of special importance is the fight for general, universal disarmament under international control. This the profit-greedy monopolists resist with all their strength. But it can be won. More and more the armaments race is being recognized by our people as a race to death. More and more it is being recognized that armaments are a terrible burden on the whole economy and particularly on the working people.

Disarmament must be approached as essential for the development of a peace policy. Steps toward disarmament must be viewed as a prerequisite to peace, not as a final stage to be put off until peace is won. The arms race is a move toward war and itself increases the danger of war. It does not provide real national security, nor is it a deterrent against war. Continuing to pile up ever more deadly armaments is not the road to peace.

Of most immediate importance in the struggle is the movement to ban nuclear tests and outlaw nuclear weapons. This must be pressed with the greatest vigor, because it is the most terrible hazard to life and health.

Recently, the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, established by the Fund for the Republic, predicted that if the arms race continues, "Eventually most human life will be underground, confronted by arsenals capable of destroying all life over the land areas of the earth. . . . From that time onward it will be simple to adjust ourselves to living in deeper holes." This report—*Community of Fear*—expresses what is universally felt—that there is no more urgent task than to end the arms race and to carry on the fight for disarmament.

THE PEACE MOVEMENT

There is no doubt that we have in the United States a considerable number of movements and organizations involved in the struggle for peace and that these are growing in number and scope. They operate on a year-round basis, surging up at times of critical danger of war. Peace activities take place in the most varied quarters and include a great variety of actions—mass marches, demonstrations, peace walks, picket lines, postcard campaigns, letters to Congressmen and senators, delegations, meetings, and many others.

Involved in these actions are social and professional bodies of a general character, such as church groups, organizations of scientists, community institutions, fraternal and other societies, which express themselves for peace in various ways and press on particular issues.

There are also organizations specifically devoted to peace, including church organizations like the Quaker Committees for Peace, women's bodies like the International League for Peace and Freedom, pacifist organizations like the Fellowship of Reconciliation. There are such organizations as the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, committees for peace and friendship with Cuba, and many others that play a militant role, far greater than in the past, not only speaking and appealing for peace, but acting. Thus, one group recently endangered their lives to protest against nuclear tests by sailing a ship directly into the zone of one such test.

Important as these organizations and actions are, it must be said that the American peace movements and actions still lag behind the level of the world struggle for peace. And it must be said that considering the central role of U.S. imperialism and the seriousness of the war danger, they have not yet reached the volume, scope, and militancy which the situation imperatively demands.

It is necessary to widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make

it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people. It is essential to reach not only the organized but the unorganized masses. What is required is the creation of a mass grass-roots movement for peace and disarmament involving literally millions of Americans.

It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth and yes, even children—into the struggle. Peace is an issue for all strata of the people without exception — for industrial workers, white-collar workers, the Negro people, farmers, intellectuals, businessmen, industrialists, people of different political views, of different creeds. The fight for peace is basic to the cause of progress and socialism. But it is not itself a socialist or communist cause. The peace movement is the broadest, most all-embracing democratic movement we have known.

It is essential to give full support to the existing peace bodies, to their movements and the struggles they initiate, to building and strengthening their organizations. It is particularly important at this time to get the widest unity and community of effort around such actions as the coming Easter March or in regard to Cuba and other critical areas where peace is threatened.

It is not only essential to support existing peace organizations on the basis of their programs. *It is also*

necessary to recognize the need for additional peace organizations, possibly of the type of the British Peace Council which reacts to all major issues of peace and which serves to promote the unity of the peace forces generally.

John Gollan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain, described this organization as one which tries "to conduct continuous activity for peace on all major international issues, not engaging only in spasmodic campaigning on particular aspects of the peace struggle, important though these may be. It imposes no ban and proscriptions and invites all who want to join in its activities. It recognizes the key importance of winning the organized labor movement to action for peace. It is the only organization linked with the peace movements in all other countries through its association with the World Council for Peace."

The rise of such a peace organization would in my opinion help all organizations and would at the same time be a substitute for none.

It is absolutely necessary to stress the weakness of labor in the peace fight, which hurts the entire struggle. This meeting must serve to give every stimulus to this critical sector. This weakness is due in part to the pre-occupation of the unions with immediate economic struggles and with the attacks of the monopolists, but chiefly it is due to the role of Meany and other labor leaders who

work hand-in-glove with the rabid pro-war forces, who are aggressively anti-Soviet and anti-Cuba, and who energetically promote the cold war. An especially outrageous example of their actions is the recent organization by the leaders of the ILA and the New York Teamsters' Council of a boycott on the handling of Cuban goods.

These labor leaders support bigger armaments programs, appealing to the workers on the grounds of jobs. There is, however, the beginning of a turn, of a breakthrough in labor's ranks on the peace issue. There are labor leaders who oppose the viciously hostile stand of Meany, who would like to see a relaxation of tensions, and who have gone themselves or aided others in the sending of labor delegations to the Soviet Union. The number of such leaders will grow. It is both necessary and possible to win the rank and file and all realistic peace-minded labor leaders away from the disastrous pro-war policies of Meany and Company.

To a growing extent, labor can be won to support trade with the socialist countries, to expand delegations, and to take other actions. Communists and progressive trade unionists must realize their duty in the field of the peace struggle and relate it to the critical economic and social questions — unemployment, wages, etc.—which the unions face.

With the emergence of the new nations of Africa and with the advance of the struggle against colo-

nialism, the Negro people are moving increasingly into the fight for peace. This is indicated by P. L. Prattis' article in the January 14 issue of the *Pittsburgh Courier*, which calls for an end to the cold war and for honest negotiations with the Soviet Union.

That the Negro people want peace and freedom was strikingly expressed in the demonstrations for Castro in Harlem, and now in their support for Lumumba. But many Negro leaders still hold off from taking a stand on the cold war, and even fall in line with the anti-communism of the State Department, thinking that it will assist their struggle at home.

Finally, some words on the role of the Communists. We Communists seek to be the most active fighters for peace. We want peace because it is vital for all humanity. Like all people we want to live. And peace is the best way, the best condition for advancing socialism in our country.

In the peace movement, Communists work loyally to carry on the policy agreed on by the movement itself. The Communists have their own concepts of the nature of peaceful coexistence and of imperialism, and their own ideas on other issues. But they do not seek to impose these on the peace movement. Whatever the Communist Party has to say on issues, it says independently under its own auspices. It does not regard the peace organizations or any

other organizations as a "front," a "cover," a means of propagating its own ideas and aims.

It recognizes that there are many views—pacifist, Christian, socialist, trade-union, liberal, etc.—in regard to questions of war and peace, socialism and capitalism, U.S. imperialism and its role, the role and policies of the Soviet Union, etc. It does not regard the peace organizations as the battleground for settling such ideological questions; these are matters of individual opinion and individual debate, not questions at issue in the immediate struggle. On questions of the best way to fight for peace, the Communists seek to attain the widest unity and agreement by democratic discussion.

The Communists and other fighters for peace have been made a target of attack by the Un-American Activities Committee and other reactionaries for a good many years, and this has been stepped up recently. The aim of such attacks is to split and destroy the peace movements. Anti-Communism is a vicious weapon against peace, and all honest people can be brought to realize this.

In the name of anti-communism, Communists, militants and progressives have been eliminated from the labor and other organizations only to the detriment of these organizations. The fear that Communists seek to control organizations by devious tactics is absolutely false. They seek solely to serve these organiza-

tions in every possible way. The screening of organizations, the establishment of bans, is undemocratic and harmful. Anti-Communism must be opposed on grounds of democracy, as well as of the sheer practical necessity of involving all forces in the fight for peace, and particularly such dedicated forces as the Communists.

At the same time, while opposing undemocratic measures, Communists will not be provoked into separating themselves from the peace bodies, but will do everything to point out the harm done by the rabid anti-communists, and to convince the rank and file members patiently and persistently of the need for unity and democratic procedures. Above all, Communists will intensify their work for peace, and their efforts to build up peace organizations. Fighters for peace need not be socialists, but all socialists, all Communists, must be the most active fighters for peace.

We regard peace as the paramount issue in American political life. We dedicate ourselves fully to this task. We claim no monopoly and seek no narrow partisan advantage in this issue of issues. We do this as a challenge to all others to do likewise, to compete in devotion and service in behalf of peace. This is our position!

IV. END JIM CROW NOW

THE TIME IS RIPE

History has now reached the door-

way marked: "End colonialism now." This is not an idle wish or hope. Rather, it flows from the fact that life has now developed to the point where an end to colonialism is both a practical possibility and an absolute must. The balance of forces has reached a point where nothing can stop this next step in the forward march of civilization. The anti-imperialist coalition of the socialist world, the national liberation front, the working class of the capitalist countries, and all progressive mankind, with its ideology of freedom, independence and internationalism, is now in a position of ever greater command over imperialism with its ideology of great-power chauvinism, racism, and jingoism. Civilization is confronted with the abolition of colonialism as a matter of immediate urgency. And from it all mankind will benefit.

With the emergence of the new, proud, independent nations of Africa and Asia, the evil ideology of racial superiority has received the most shattering blows in all parts of the world. The United States is not insulated and cannot ignore the fires of freedom and independence burning abroad. We are directly affected on two fronts. As the main world center of colonial exploitation, the United States is forced to recognize this development and to give ground. And further, the United States must now, in the context of this new world situation, resolve the most explosive and burning issue on the do-

mestic scene, namely, putting an end to the policies of discrimination, Jim Crow and racism inflicted on our 18 million Negro citizens. The new era demands of us as a nation a fresh look, a new evaluation, a new understanding of this question—an understanding commensurate with an epoch that is witnessing the end of colonialism in all parts of the world.

As we know, colonial oppression and discrimination against Negro Americans are very close relatives. The oppressors are one and the same: U.S. monopoly capitalism. Hence the slogans: "End Colonialism Now in the World" and "End Jim Crow Now in the United States" are inseparable, twin slogans. The latter corresponds to the balance of forces in the United States, and is therefore a proper and realistic outlook.

The Negro people's movement for full equality continues to gather forces and supporters. Its militancy and sense of dedication provide an inspiration to all honest Americans.

There is also a slow but continuing advance in the understanding of sections of white Americans, both as to the inevitability of the ending of Jim Crow and as to the involvement of their own self-interest, and hence concerning the need of entering this struggle.

The recent events at the University of Georgia indicate the presence of all of these factors. The calm confidence and heroism of the two young Negro students, Miss Charlayne Hunter and Mr. Hamilton Holmes,

is symbolic of the heroism of the Negro people and its movement. The viciousness of the racism is written in the faces and actions of the rock-throwing hoodlums. The growing understanding of some sections of white Americans is symbolized in the petition of the faculty of the University, which over 300 signed, as well as in the petition signed by a sizeable section of the students. They called for the return of the expelled students and a return to law and morality in Georgia. This is the beginning of something new and important in the South.

To keep up with the rest of the world, Jim Crow must go now! To fulfill this historic task, there are many roadblocks that our people must surmount, political as well as ideological. We Communists must become a more effective force in helping our people to destroy these barriers. In an overall sense we must help the working class, the Negro people, the youth, our intellectuals, to see the new elements in the picture, and the new policies and tactics that are needed if we are to use the new objective possibilities presented by the present epoch.

In the very center of this new understanding must be the recognition that for all of us—Negro and white—our freedom, equality, self-dignity, standard of living, happiness and security are all indivisible.

As our 17th Convention resolution, *The Negro Question in the United States*, says: "Not only the

working class, but all social classes and currents which are in any way restricted in their democratic development by the reactionary monopolists, have a stake in the cause of Negro freedom."

Working together, a number of factors—the new balance of world forces and especially the position of the United States within it, and the growth of monopoly domination within the United States itself—have made clearer who is the central adversary, who is the main culprit. The developments of this new epoch in the United States tend to focus the attention of all the victims on the oneness of the opponent. The tentacle that blocks the unity of the people of the Congo and thereby holds back the ending of colonialism, the tentacle that helps with arms and encourages war in Laos or supports the colonial powers in their desperate efforts to hold on to their colonies, the tentacle that upholds the Dixiecrats and in fact the whole Jim Crow system, the tentacle behind the layoffs, speedup and high taxes, the tentacle behind the generals who advocate war now and the arms drive—all these tentacles, while they affect different sections of the people and different parts of the world, are in fact attached to one body, that of U.S. monopoly capitalism. We must do more to make this clear. We must bring home the lesson: when one tentacle is destroyed, it weakens the grip of the rest and, conversely, if one is permitted to be

strengthened, it strengthens the grip of all the others.

In a new way, we must bring home the lesson to the working class and the trade unions that in facing the problems of today, they cannot make headway or even preserve their hard-won gains if they overlook and sacrifice the rights of their Negro brothers. They cannot ward off the blows from their own heads if they turn their eyes away when blows are rained on their Negro brothers. A union that closes its eyes while Negro workers are laid off because of automation is helpless when the layoffs hit other sections of the workers. It deprives itself of the unity and strength which it needs to fight when that happens. The simple truth is that white workers cannot form an alliance against the monopolies that oppress them if they permit these same monopolies to oppress the Negro Americans.

The new epoch brings with it hard struggles. U.S. capitalism is already striving to pass the effects of its setbacks in the world to the people in the form of speedup, wage cuts, layoffs, inflation, high taxes, etc. And it will continue to do so. No amount of appeasement by the unions or the white workers when the blow is directed against the Negro workers is going to change this. The only thing that will be effective against this monopoly force is unbreakable unity of all workers, and not least, unity of Negro and white.

Hence the self-interest of the U.S.

working class that is inherent in the struggle for equality for Negro Americans takes on a new meaning in this period. The Negro people need the support of the working class in their struggle for equality. And it is now easier, because of the objective developments, to hammer home the lesson that the working class in this period needs unity with the Negro people. And so, because of the sameness of the enemy, the interests of the victims become more and more clearly indivisible.

This new period also places new questions before the leaders of the Negro people's struggle. It has been the custom in the past to speak out militantly, courageously for equal rights in the United States. But this has always been weakened by simultaneously expressing support to the foreign policies of the very oppressors of the Negro people. This serious contradiction is now becoming more evident. It is increasingly difficult to ignore the oneness of the body from which emanate the various tentacles of oppression. It now becomes clearer that the success of their struggle for equality and freedom requires that these leaders detach themselves from any support to the foreign policies of U.S. imperialism.

What we said in our 17th Convention resolution is more true than ever. We wrote: "The Negro movement's need and possibility for sympathetic alliances do not end with the nation's borders." We

wrote further: "The international aspects of the Negro question are of major importance in the struggle for equality at home, favorable to wresting concessions from the ruling class." And we urged that: "The Negro movement will be further strengthened as it forges bonds of conscious alliance with the rising colonial, semi-colonial and newly independent nations of the world: the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America." We added that "the Negro people must come to look with favor upon the socialist world," which has ended for all time national oppression and enmity between peoples, and wiped out discrimination on national, racial, or color lines. The socialist world has been the best friend and most reliable ally of the oppressed colonial peoples, contributing immensely to their rapid advance to freedom and independence.

We have always understood that the self-interest of the working class, the youth, the intellectuals and the farmers are in close harmony with the historic task of ending Jim Crow now. But the objective developments make it easier for the great masses of Americans to understand this in a new way. We, as a vanguard party, must accept the responsibility of bringing this deeper understanding into the broad ranks of the masses and thereby raising the struggle to end Jim Crow now to new heights.

The Democratic Party and Presi-

dent Kennedy made far-reaching promises on civil rights in the election platform and during the campaign. This won Kennedy the votes of the overwhelming majority of the Negro voters, notwithstanding his unsavory selection of Lyndon B. Johnson as candidate for Vice-President. The votes of the Negro people and labor were decisive in his victory.

It is imperative that these promises be kept! There have been retreats, compromises, and capitulations on the question of Negro freedom in the past. This only brought disaster to our country. It must not be repeated. The Negro people and all democratic-minded people must insist that the reactionary policy of "not antagonizing the South," on the alleged grounds that struggle with the Dixiecrats would divert from the so-called domestic issues, must be abandoned. The Negro question is also a domestic issue—in fact a central one. The sooner this is realized and the sooner the Dixiecrats and racists who lead the main committees of Congress are challenged, the quicker will progress be made in the sphere of social welfare and other domestic needs.

The President of the United States has the full authority as well as the historic precedent to end Jim Crow now by executive order. And the executive arm of our government has a clear-cut mandate of the people to take a bold and decisive step to do so.

Such a precedent was set by President Lincoln when he issued the Emancipation Proclamation. Such authority flows from sections of our Constitution, and specifically from such laws as the Reconstruction Statutes passed in 1871. These state that whenever insurrection, violence or unlawful combinations or conspiracies so obstruct the execution of the laws in a given state that any group is thereby deprived of its rights, and whenever the authorities of such a state are unable or fail to protect these rights, "it shall be lawful for the President, and it shall be his duty, to take such measures, by the employment of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by any other means, as he may deem necessary, for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence or combinations."

The mandate for such action was again reaffirmed in the Democratic platform, as well as the promises in the Republican platform.

It is only this kind of resolute action that will be in keeping with the new era we live in. The concept of gradualism was always wrong, but there is reason today to be even more sharply critical of it than in the past. In fact, in the framework of today's situation, to defend gradualism is to protect Jim Crow, to shield it from the tempo of developments of the new epoch. It would indeed be an odd contradiction that while in the

world colonialism is being ended now, we should look upon the ending of Jim Crow and segregation as a slow process which will take ages.

SOME KEY ISSUES

The executive orders must start with a complete and absolute guarantee of the right to vote and hold office. The right to full suffrage is closely connected with the right to hold a job, to get an education. It is not accidental that the areas of industrial desolation are often also areas where the majority of the citizens are denied the right to vote.

Two examples from life should suffice to nail down the importance of this question. For the first time, Kennedy carried some Southern states only because of the heavy support of the Negro voters, and this is also true in several key industrial states of the North. Second (and this shows how keenly the Dixiecrats understand the potential of this issue), there is the hysteria and the inhuman ejection of Negro farm families from the land in Tennessee for the sole crime of indicating their intention to exercise their Constitutional rights by voting in the local and presidential elections.

The question of the right to vote for the Negro people in the South is of cardinal importance to every question in the political field and

to every section of the population.

This is a year of reapportionment of electoral districts in most states, flowing from the population changes as indicated in the 1960 census. The politicians are busy plotting the most brazen gerrymandering in our history with the aim of making it impossible for the Negro people, as well as other minority groups and the working class, to elect their own representatives. This only demonstrates further how indivisible are the rights and interests of these sections of our people.

In speaking about reapportionment, there is no rhyme or reason in permitting the Southern states to have representatives in the halls of our Congress who presumably represent their people but in actual fact are chosen in elections in which large sections of them are barred from voting. In the apportionment, the Federal government should, in accordance with Section 2 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, cut down the number of representatives to correspond to the number allowed to vote.

There is no dearth of laws on the statute books that guarantee equal rights to all citizens. What is wrong is that most such laws remain on paper. There is a need and a demand and a movement for unconditional compliance with these laws. There is no reason why there should not be a secretary of civil rights in the President's Cabinet. And for most of these laws to have any mean-

ing there must be suitable bodies of enforcement in each city and state.

A central task at the present time is the fight for jobs. This is obvious from the figures which we have given on the high rate of unemployment among Negroes. It is essential to have an over-all national program, as well as programs for specific areas. State and local Party organizations should work this out.

The fight for jobs for Negroes is of course related to the general struggle against the growing economic crisis and unemployment, but any general program to cope with these must include particular demands regarding the needs of the Negro people, which must receive the utmost consideration, especially as to their implementation. Let me cite some examples:

The Federal government gives billions of dollars of business to corporations. Why should not the demand be made on the Federal government, on Senators and Congressmen, that the names of corporations which do business with the government be prominently published so that people's committees could police compliance with Federal laws barring practices of discrimination?

City governments, like New York and others, also carry on extensive business running into millions with corporations and business houses. Why should they not do likewise?

There is the matter of the execution of the F.E.P.C. laws already on the books in many cities and states,

and there is the big unfinished job of enactment of a federal F.E.P.C. law.

There is also the fight, carried on in the years of the Big Crisis and since, for jobs for Negroes in the big corporations and commercial establishments that carry on extensive trade in the Negro communities.

There is the question of opening up new job possibilities in the depressed areas both in the South and in the North.

There are the questions of seniority rights, apprenticeship training, and many others.

The fight for desegregation in the schools remains a major task. While every assistance must be given to the central battleground—the South—where desegregation is opposed with savage violence by the state and city governments in defiance of the Constitution and the Supreme Court, this fight is not a southern struggle alone. Full desegregation is an issue in the North as well. It is an issue in New York City and surrounding areas, in Philadelphia, in Chicago and a host of other cities.

There is also the struggle against discrimination in housing, whose effects are becoming more and more acute as the Negro people are increasingly crowded into the shameful ghettos in our cities. This discrimination, which also serves as the excuse for school segregation in the North, has become a number one issue in one northern industrial city after another.

THE PARTY'S RESPONSIBILITIES

Our Party has made and is making important and unique contributions to the struggle for equal rights. Our task as a vanguard Party is to disclose the deep wells of strength on which this struggle can draw, to show the oneness of this movement with the movements of other forces, and to help keep all eyes on the center of the enemy forces. We can do this best if we are an active part of the struggle for jobs, if we take an active part in the campaign for proper reapportionment, if we are part of the struggles for housing without discrimination, if we are part of the struggles for F.E.P.C. laws, and finally, if we are part of the mass campaign for executive action to end Jim Crow. In short, we can fulfill our responsibilities if we are an integral part of the Negro people's movement and struggle for complete equality.

It is essential, however, to lift the level of our work to greater heights. We must *concentrate* on this task which means that *all* the main forces of the Party must regard the fight for Negro rights as of crucial importance. It is not a subsidiary task, it is not "another" task; it is a primary, fundamental, front-rank Party task of the highest order.

~~We must restore~~ the full crusading spirit of our Party on this issue. It is essential for the Negro freedom struggle and for America that more

and more Communists be in that great battle. Communists help to bring clarity and direction where there is confusion as to the line of march. They contribute resoluteness and militancy where there is timidity and uncertainty. They bring unity—unity among the Negro people, unity of Negro and white, unity of the Negro people with labor and all democratic sections of the population.

Communists have no interests that are alien to the Negro people's aims and struggles. They regard the unity of all strata of the Negro people as essential to victory though they consider it necessary to bring forward increasingly the weight and leadership of Negro workers, who are the largest stratum of the Negro people, who are in heavy industry and who are the best organized section with 2,000,000 in the unions.

Communists work to carry out the programs of the Negro people's organizations. True, they have differences with the policies of some right-wing, reformist types of leaders who fear mass struggle and tend to limit and curb it. They criticize such policies in the interests of victory. But at all times, they seek to present constructive measures which aid the struggle and which build the Negro people's organizations and their unity.

Communists seek to educate the Negro working class on the necessity for socialism, to bring to the Negro workers the great ideas of Marxism-

Leninism, which have emancipated millions. The more such class conscious workers there are, the better for the struggle.

The Communists can be counted on for a continuous, unyielding ideological battle against racism, against every manifestation of "white supremacy," against all forms of white chauvinism, including its subtler forms which find reflection at times even in our ranks. We also oppose narrow nationalist views in the Party and thereby work for the firmest unity of Negro and white.

V. THE TRADE UNIONS

A NEW EMPHASIS IS NEEDED

While preparing this report, I tried to transfer my thoughts back to the local union halls of the steel workers, miners, structural iron workers and lumber workers—the locals where I used to be active in past years. I tried to visualize myself giving leadership and understanding to their problems, not in general terms but by focusing attention on the specific problems and issues facing the working class and the trade unions of the United States today. And this reflection had a sobering effect.

One need not dig deep to realize that we do not have all of the answers to some very serious and difficult problems that are facing the working class and the trade unions

today. There are many new, complicated questions to which the old answers, some of which we repeat so often, are really no solution.

So I saw myself out there with these workers, blasting away at the leadership of the unions. I called them "seat warmers," "class collaborationists," "bureaucrats" and "swindlers." The workers did not get angry, but they said the following: "Alright, wise guy, we will go along with you and maybe even add a few juicy adjectives of our own about the leadership. But what is it that you propose to do?" Ignoring this, I continued to speak about the need for rank-and-file committees, about the need to kick out the old leadership, etc. But the workers countered by saying: "We did that last year. But how do you see our difficulties? Concretely how do you propose to solve them, because if our local and district leaders had the answers, they would do something, and if we the workers had the answers, we would be the leaders and we would not be asking you for the answers. So again, concretely, what do you propose to do? We are willing. Go ahead and lead us."

So I became concrete. I spoke about the 50 per cent reduction in steel production, about the fact that there is unemployment not only in Ohio but in Pittsburgh, Chicago and elsewhere. The workers answered: "We know that. We read the same papers. But what is it you had in

mind?" They continued: "We know we are in trouble and to tell the truth we can't figure out exactly why and we do not know what to do about it. We are willing to listen to anything that sounds realistic and responsible, but please, no lectures or general advice. We get enough of that from the so-called labor experts. Further, you say our union is bankrupt and in a crisis. We get that same line from the reactionary press every day. So why should you add to it? And frankly, before you get so critical about our unions, what is it you have in mind? What is it that you propose to do?"

As a Party and as individual Communists in the unions, we must say exactly what it is we have in mind. How do we propose to lead and to find solutions to these questions? But before we go on, it is necessary to note that these workers said something else. They said: "And don't say socialism is the answer. It is a nice idea. Maybe it works in the Soviet Union and China. Maybe it's something to think about, but anyway the American people are not ready for it. So in the meantime, what do you propose?" I replied: "Yes, it's indeed worth thinking about. It's the final and only complete answer. But I will agree it is not the immediate one."

I know some of our comrades will say, "That sounds like an introduction to a policy of pure and

simple trade unionism." I don't know about the "pure" side of it. But I do know that this is an introduction to the need for a fresh Party policy and a basic shift towards work that starts from the practices and problems, yes, of everyday unionism. This is an introduction to a sharp turn of emphasis, to a policy of concentration on working with the working class and trade unions and giving specific as well as general leadership. If we are ever seriously going to make shop talk Party talk, we will have to make Party talk shop talk from now on!

Because of certain shortcomings in our work, we must, in a fresh way, fight to give life to some elementary Marxist concepts. We are a working-class Party. The working class—white, Negro, foreign-born, American-born, old, young, men, women—should be the very center and heart of all our work, our activities and our thoughts. This has not been so for some years, and frankly it is not so now.

On the other hand, in the years of its greatest advance, our Party did center its work on the unions and shops. The whole Party engaged in this work. Community organizations helped in concentration work and distribution of material, and every Party leader was familiar with developments in the unions and shops. Now this has been reduced to a mere departmental activity.

The problems and difficulties and weaknesses of the working class are *our* difficulties, the difficulties of *our* class, of *our* family. We are going to work *with* them on these problems. We are not working *for* them or merely preaching, lecturing or advising them.

We are not a built-in opposition. We are not professional cranks, gripers and bemoaners. We are for rank-and-file movements, but not as ends in themselves. And we will not reduce our relations with the labor movement to the level of automatically and always being for a policy of the "ins" getting out and the "outs" getting in.

If we do not have all the answers, to say the least it is unbecoming to behave as if we do. There are some tendencies in our ranks to assume a literary critic-to-author relationship in our attitude to the unions and their problems. The literary critic, in many instances, blasts away at the author unmercifully while knowing that he himself could not even do as well. Our relations, on the contrary, must be partisan, warm, frank, and modest.

We do not have all the answers but we do have full confidence in this fact: If we work with the workers and the honest trade union leaders, we will not only make an important contribution, but we will find answers and solutions to the many vexing problems that now plague them.

In view of the limitations of time, I shall indicate just one general situation that the trade unions as well as we ourselves must tackle. This is the situation flowing out of the new world relationships created by the changed operation of the uneven development of capitalism. For a long time this uneven development has worked in favor of U.S. capitalism, and has been a pillar of strength for it. Now the signs point to the fact that it is beginning to work in the opposite direction. Basically these problems arise out of the new stage reached in the general crisis of capitalism. Let us list some of them.

1. There is serious unemployment. There is a creeping stagnation in industry after industry.

2. Automation and other technological advances continue to throw more and more workers out of their jobs. During the past eight years at least two million jobs have been lost permanently because of this.

3. The growth of U.S.-owned overseas production continues to aggravate the problem of foreign competition and the loss of jobs of American workers.

4. As the steel industry built up inventories prior to the 1959 strike, so the auto corporations have now piled up over a million cars in preparation for contract negotiations. This type of thing is repeated in one industry after another.

5. The employers are on the offensive. Strikes are getting longer and

more bitter. Some major strikes have been smashed for the first time in 20 years. Some unions have been crippled. Company unionism has made a successful appearance for the first time since the '30's.

6. Rising prices are steadily widening the gap between the cost of living and wage levels.

7. There is the Landrum-Griffin law, as well as the Taft-Hartley law and other restrictive measures tending toward government control of the unions.

I am sure you will agree that these facts, taken as a package, present a new set of problems. The trade unions and their leaders have not really tackled these questions and so have not come up with answers. Each trade union tries to deal with them in a piecemeal fashion, and that is no path to solution.

We have a general approach that is basically sound. It includes such demands as: a 30-hour week; a much higher minimum wage; government controls to transfer some of the super-profits from automation to the workers and the public in the form of price cuts and wage increases; higher unemployment compensation to be paid as long as one is unemployed; reduced taxes on workers and higher taxes on the big corporations; a large public works program of housing, roads, hospitals, schools, etc.; reduction of armaments, opening up trade with the socialist world; and other similar demands.

These, in turn, are part of a more basic approach presented in our 17th Convention resolution, *On Trade Union Problems*. The resolution said: "Organized labor cannot content itself with mere defense against the growing torrent of blows rained on it. On the contrary, if it is to defeat these and move forward it must launch a counteroffensive—a crusade for advancement of the well-being of our country's working people." Such a crusade, uniting and utilizing labor's strength to the full in an all-around struggle for the above and other demands can, we firmly believe, vastly alter the picture.

These are all sound proposals and offer a valid basis for action, but we know they are not the full answer and are only general in character.

We also know from experience that for labor to meet this new offensive of big business, there is an absolute need for a fresh look at the problem of unity within labor's ranks as well as at Negro-labor unity. The labor movement must understand that this challenge places before it the historic task not only of uniting its ranks to fight for its very life but also of taking the initiative in uniting all the victims of monopoly oppression in a general offensive against it. There is a need for militant leadership. There is a need for an active grass-roots movement bringing together the union members, their families and communities.

THE STRUGGLE AHEAD

We are now in a period of sharpening class struggles. The need for militant, forward-looking leadership and organization of these struggles will become ever more urgent. This challenge is not only a test for the trade unions; it is a test for our Party. The objective developments and the subjective attitudes which exist are both very favorable.

Wherever union members have been given any leadership and real demands to fight for, they have demonstrated militancy and determination and a readiness to strike and to hold out for a long time both to defend their existing gains and to fight for new gains. In bitterly fought strikes, workers have demonstrated great courage and perseverance. Even under bad leadership and under conditions of disunity, workers have shown a readiness to fight. This was true even in General Electric. The defeat of the General Electric strike certainly cannot be attributed to the unwillingness of the workers to fight. The strikes and struggles of the past year show that we must not overestimate the persistence of the effects of corruption in the ranks of the working class in America. It is the readiness of the workers to fight for their unions, for their gains, and for better conditions which is the dominant feature of this period. The militant strike of the tugboat workers in

New York, the solidarity of labor behind it should dispel any lingering doubts on this score.

It has been shown that when workers are in a fight, are united, and are demonstrating determination and militancy, they can reduce to a minimum the damage of incompetent and even corrupt leadership.

Further, though restrictions still exist, it has been shown that it is easier than before for progressives and Left workers to be active in the unions and in strikes, and to play an important role in cementing the unity and determination of the workers and to influence events in their unions, provided only that they work correctly.

The most important thing is to build, unite and enlarge the family of active, progressive unionists who display independent initiative towards influencing others and affecting events and policies. It is also important for the Party as such to issue more material on its views on important questions. Of course, neither task can replace the other.

The progressive forces naturally must take a critical attitude to the top hard-bitten class-collaborationist leaders, particularly the cold-war anti-Communists. But Communists and progressives must be distinguished first of all by the proposals they make on what is to be done and by their efforts to win the membership for their proposals. That is the best way for the members and lower leadership to change policies

and where necessary to change leadership.

We must educate and help our trade unionists to be dedicated union members, active pluggers for the interests of their fellow workers and their union, staunch and selfless fighters for the grievances of the workers and in strike struggles, trained and skillful and informed about the problems confronting the workers, good friends with the workers in the shops and also outside of the shops. All of that is basic and absolutely essential.

But if we stop there, we stop short of being Communists. A Communist must be something more than that. He must provide the workers with perspective and political understanding. To do that, he must find a way to circulate the Party press and literature. We need more pamphlets such as Mary Marcy's old pamphlet "Shop Talks On Economics and on Socialism." The Party outside must help him. He must recruit. He must raise the level of political understanding of the workers on the basis of their experience.

Under present conditions, however, a Communist cannot go around doing all that and retain his job. But he can and should become an intimate friend of the more advanced workers inside and outside the shop. He should develop relations in which they visit each others' homes, go out together with their families, discuss questions together, and exchange literature. He should introduce his

friends to his ideas. At first he will have a group of progressive friends, and later a group of Communist friends within the shop.

At the same time the Party itself, through its press, articles, and leaflets, must carry on a steady campaign of explanation and activity on the most important issues facing the workers today. Our Party and the press in particular must react and reflect every struggle, no matter how small.

One word of caution is necessary in regard to emphasis at the present time. While it is essential for our Communist trade unionists to take up both economic and political questions, they must not leave political questions such as peace to times of emergency or the question of independent political action to election time. That's often too late. Such questions must receive year-round attention so that the workers are prepared for times of crisis.

Yet, important as the political questions are, *the greatest weight falls on the union and economic questions—jobs, wages, relief, union rights, strikes—which are becoming increasingly acute.* Communists must be resolute, outstanding fighters for these. Without this stress as a foundation, work on political issues is difficult, if not impossible.

Economism has been an evil in our trade union work. But the charge of economism has also been thrown about loosely and very often unjustly and in a way which has lessened our effectiveness in day-to-day union ac-

tivities. This concept must not be treated dogmatically. At a time of sharpening class struggles, or when the working class is under attack on the economic front, our major efforts must be directed toward winning the battles immediately at hand. Such efforts at such times are not economism but correct Marxist-Leninist policy. To do otherwise is to miss the boat. Because of the nature of the problems of the new period, there is a close interrelationship between economics and politics and one leads to the other.

The problems of the working class and the trade unions must be brought to the top of the agenda in all meetings of clubs, sections, and all state and national bodies of the Party.

VI. THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

The fight for democratic rights includes not only the struggle for Negro freedom, which is central. It embraces also the general struggle against mounting reaction in the country, flowing from the stepped-up cold war, from the growth of state-monopoly capitalism, militarism and bureaucracy.

The assault on democratic rights is directed not only against Communists, though they are the most sharply attacked. It has spread more widely to all democratic strata—the unions, peace leaders, youth leaders, the foreign-born, the Jewish people and others. We said from the very

outset of the intense reactionary offensive, which began in 1948, that the attack embodied in the Smith Act, the McCarran Act and anti-communism generally is not a question for Communists alone, but a democratic question which must be the concern of all. This has proven true.

Spearheading the attack are the un-American Activities Committee and its Senate counterpart, the Internal Security Committee, both of which wage an increasing assault on the liberties of Communists and all other Americans. Both are monstrosities which must be abolished. These have found support in the Supreme Court which has given way to reaction by 5-4 decisions in some recent cases, reversing or weakening progressive measures of 1955-56 which curbed McCarthyism. The attack is also sparked by the White Citizens Councils and Ku Klux Klan in the South, as well as by Nazi formations like that of the peanut Hitler, Rockwell, who is financed by ultra-reactionary elements and which makes a specialty of fascist-like attacks on Jews. Anti-Semitic hate literature and acts of anti-Semitic vandalism have been growing.

A serious force for reaction and fascism in the country is the existence of innumerable fascist refugee groups, who are used by reaction as shock troops for violent demonstrations against the socialist world and against all people's movements. They are a center of counter-revolutionary activities undoubtedly financed by

Project X. The same is true of the counter-revolutionary Cuban refugees who are being trained for guerrilla warfare against the Castro government.

The Party, together with all progressive forces, must work to repel this undemocratic wave with far greater vigor. The Party is strengthening its own defense work, and it is essential that all progressives rally against the McCarran Act and the Smith Act membership clause, which are now before the Supreme Court. Greater aid must be given to the foreign-born. The fight against anti-Semitism must be made an important, inseparable part of the democratic struggle. Our press must devote much more attention to it. Such poisonous boils as the Rockwell Nazi movement must be energetically fought. Anti-Semitism and the spreading of hate-literature must be outlawed.

VII. THE YOUTH

An area in which there is considerable growth of activity and of new organization is amongst our youth. This increased activity and ferment is a reflection of the growing problems the youth of today face. For some time now the rosy outlook of "unlimited opportunities for everyone" has become less real, and has become dimmer and increasingly out of reach for a growing number of youngsters. For the young generation there are no assurances of a job or

profession. The lists of available jobs have disappeared from the campuses. At the same time, the disruption and uncertainty created by the draft continues to plague our young men and to add to their other problems.

On the other hand, the constantly rising tuition fees place college education out of reach of growing millions. Also, there is a new and steadily growing category of young men and women who have never held a job, who have no prospect of ever having one. This is especially true among the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youth.

The rate and duration of unemployment among youth are steadily increasing. In some industries where automation has created havoc, there exist, for the protection of those employed, union contract provisions which bar the hiring of any new workers and in some cases bar specifically the hiring of anyone under 30 years of age.

There has been a considerable amount of activity, especially in and around the colleges, in the first place in relation to the sit-ins and discrimination, as well as for peace, abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and on other issues.

Not since the '30's has there been such a growth of student organizations as now. One of the biggest organizational developments on the campuses is the building of liberal student political parties. This started in the West, spread to the Midwest and now has taken root in the East.

These act fairly consistently on peace, civil rights and civil liberties, and very often serve as rallying and co-ordinating centers for all of these activities on the campus.

There is a mushrooming of Marxist- and socialist-oriented groups on the campuses in all parts of the country, and we have witnessed the emergence of a new and very successful progressive youth paper.

These developments so far have had very much of a spontaneous character. However, the Chicago Youth Conference and the setting up of a national organizing committee constitute an important step toward filling the organizational vacuum that has existed. This vacuum has always been a weakness, but in the light of the rise of movement and activity among the youth, it has become a serious political question.

The Party must give much higher priority for the work among youth in all fields of endeavor.

VIII. OUR PARTY

UNITED FRONT IS THE KEY

Our Party has had a healthy and a fruitful year of work. We have successfully preserved and further consolidated its basic unity. We have further improved our mass contacts and have participated to a greater extent in the struggles for peace, Negro rights, and labor's interests in local struggles of many kinds, and in the 1960 election campaign. And because of this we have become a

greater factor in the life of the American people. The process of rebuilding and remolding our ranks has proceeded along the correct path laid out by our 17th National Convention. The outlook of "one Party, one policy, one leadership, moving in one direction" has become the motto in our ranks over this past period. Wherever there has been a challenge to the policies flowing from the 17th Convention, the membership and leadership have rallied in a most impressive manner to their defense.

The process of consolidation and remolding has not taken place without struggle or effort, and there has been and still exists a need to eradicate shavings and elements of revisionism and dogmatism in our work. These we will discuss later in this report.

In the main, the period since the last National Committee meeting in March has been one of internal consolidation and reorganization, even though it also witnessed a beginning of more serious participation in mass work. There is nothing strange about that. We have been through a whole decade of severe attacks and persecution, unprecedented in our country. And for several years of that decade—1956 to 1959—we also experienced a severe internal crisis, which further weakened and in some places virtually wrecked the Party. During a large part of this decade, the main leaders of the Party were in prison. Some, including myself, returned only recently. Our

dear, brave, able Comrade Henry Winston is still in prison, to the shame of our country. So, too, is Comrade Gil Green, while Comrade Bob Thompson is on conditional release—both of them first-rank leaders. In addition, Comrades Foster and Dennis have both been out of the actual work because of serious illness. All this has created a severe gap in leadership.

This period did tremendous damage, serving to fragmentize the Party. Many Party organizations were left without trained leadership, some without any at all. Many members became dispersed and detached (some still are); the authority of leadership was weakened; tension, friction, and factionalism existed, all of which diminished the mass mobilizing power of the Party. We have therefore had the task of rebuilding, and still do to a large degree.

But the enemy did not destroy us. The Party lives and is active. It grows in depth and it will grow in breadth too. Let there be no mistake about that! We are now entering a new stage—a stage of the unfolding of the mass work and influence of the Party, of its upbuilding politically, organizationally, and numerically. The Party *can* be built under the circumstances prevailing in our country. The conditions of the new epoch make it more essential than ever. They also create better conditions for its rebuilding, remolding, and growth. But this will re-

quire sustained work, great self-sacrifice, and above all the collective, united effort of members and leaders, working together with our sympathizers and supporters and enlisting the aid of the class-conscious workers of the country, Negro and white. For the Communist Party is not an organization for itself. It is the creation and instrument of the working class, its highest type of organization.

What is the road to building the Party and its influence? It is the course indicated by the 17th Convention, that of establishing mass ties more energetically than ever with the people's organizations, above all in the trade unions and the shops, with the organized and unorganized working-class masses. It is the course of identifying ourselves wholeheartedly, as individuals and as a Party, with the needs and aspirations of our shopmates and neighbors. Without that we cannot even begin to speak about building the Party. Without thus identifying ourselves with the masses we can only be an isolated, meaningless sect.

The monopolists know this, and that is why they have passed a hundred laws designed to isolate the Party. Of course, there are today members and local Party groups that have established mass ties, but they are still few and too fragile and their work is not sustained. Ties with the working class particularly are weak.

To establish such contacts under present-day conditions is not easy. It requires many-sided activities, including personal contacts of all kinds—as neighbors, friends, shopmates, etc. Above all it requires political contacts on the basis of *struggle*.

There are some who abstain from struggle or just wait for it to take place spontaneously. There are others who think engaging in struggle or being a party of action means spouting phrases, such as "U.S. imperialism is the reactionary center of the capitalist world." Now this is true. But does it tell us what we should do? Not in the least. The repetition of such phrases, in place of discussing the concepts they embody and using them as a basis for action, is not leadership. To repeat phrases is easy. To do that one need not study our science. One need not painstakingly study the people's movements, their moods, their feelings or their thoughts.

It might save time and money if we simply replaced such "leaders" with standard tapes, and if people could dial a number, say "CP1111" and get a taped answer. Instead of the weather report or the time, the tape would perhaps have something like this: "In these revolutionary times of upsurge of the masses, everything is going our way. The bourgeoisie is shaking in its boots because of objective and subjective factors, that is, if seen in the

context of the new situation and without the corrosive effects of the capitulatory elements of the dogged dogmatist and the sectarianism of the sects." And the voice might continue: "And now if you will repeat with me, 'Every day in every way the overthrow of capitalism is closing in on us.'"

Such canned answers cannot build the Party because they do not and cannot give leadership in struggle. On the contrary, they isolate us from the masses. In fact, I dare say, the Univac will never replace live, human Communist leadership.

I have been witness to meetings where a member who has the most valuable experience to report, experience which embodies the essence of what 90 percent of our discussion should be about—that is, the experience of working politically with the people—instead proceeds to present a mass of abstract phrases and thereby unknowingly robs the whole club of that which is the very essence of our existence. There is something wrong with us when we tend to make empty phrasemongers and windbags even of the very best comrades.

I repeat: we must be a party of struggle, of mass struggle, of united front action on the widest possible basis.

That is our central task. That is the main road to rebuilding the Party and its influence. That is the heart of our vanguard role today. We have always been forefront

fighters for the united front. We must re-establish that.

To carry on mass work, however, requires a correct appraisal of the situation. Concepts like "vanguard role," "open role," "independent role," have no meaning if debated in a vacuum. There are certain hard facts of life we must take fully into consideration before we can come to correct conclusions as to how these concepts appear and the forms in which they will come to life. What are some of these?

a) At this point we are a small party.

b) We do not enjoy full legal status. Our members cannot openly work in industry, in professions or in government. Our members cannot openly be members of unions or members of most mass organizations.

c) Our country has gone through 20 years of relatively high employment that has left its impact on our people. Most of the trade unions and people's organizations are under conservative and even reactionary leadership and a majority of the workers are still unorganized.

d) There is no independent political party of labor.

e) There is as yet no mass socialist consciousness in the U.S.A.

On the other hand there are many positive facets that must be taken into consideration. American workers are militant. There is a rising Negro people's movement. There is a stirring amongst the youth. There

is a wide peace sentiment and a growing, although scattered, peace movement. We have in the United States a strong, deep democratic tradition, and we now have a united Communist Party. And together with this we must recognize the difficulties U.S. capitalism faces in this new epoch, and the fact that the big struggles lie ahead.

Only on the basis of this assessment can we decide what we can do and what we cannot do, how we can do these things and how we cannot do them, what is within the realm of reality and what is in the realm of fantasy. Only on this basis can we then work out concrete policies and methods of mass work and Party building.

We cannot ignore the virtual illegality of the Party. We must fight for our full legality with far greater energy than we are now exacting. We must fight for it both for ourselves and as part of the battle for general democratic rights. But at the same time, we must consider the existing semi-legal conditions of our work, tactics, relationships, etc. We must fight against anti-Communism, but at the same time we must not ignore its harmful effects on good people.

It is interesting that Lenin in his day considered day-to-day, mass revolutionary work as the major task of a Communist Party. He also observed that one of the most difficult things for the Marxists of the advanced capitalist countries was to

learn how to carry on such concrete daily activities. Possibly this was Lenin's way of politely saying that we tended to be Senator Klaghorns.

This weakness shows up in the lack of understanding of the very nature of a Leninist party and the concrete activities that flow from its very character. It shows up in our serious neglect of tactical questions and it shows up very definitely in a lack of understanding of the role of the clubs. To cover up for a lack of concrete tactics, we issue general slogans and offer canned phrases. Some cover the weakness of lack of concrete mass united front work with empty bombast. Very often efforts to work out tactical approaches are slandered as opportunism and capitulation. Because of this, we can very often have seeming general agreement on policy, while in actual fact there are serious differences which concrete application and the working out of tactical approaches would bring to the surface.

Our Party can grow, and can become an important political factor, only if we firmly build its relations on a united front basis. This must be done on every level, but in the first place and at all times on a grass roots level. Historic busses of favorable objective conditions can come and go but we will not be able to ride them unless we are part of and have a oneness with our shopmates, neighbors, and friends.

In essence, united front relations

are political. It is a process of joining hands, of uniting forces in struggle around specific issues. That means unity with trade unionists, liberals, socialists, Catholics, people of diverse political opinions or none at all. The concept of united front, however, is not a momentary tactic or something to be applied only when a particular issue arises. But in too many instances this is how it is used. Some issue agitating the masses appears. The club, section or state leadership only then begins to look around to see whom to approach, whom to unite with on an emergency basis.

The united front must be a *way of life* for our Party, for each member and for each club. Such relations must be nurtured and cultivated at all times. Our personal character as individual comrades and the image of our Party which is presented to broad circles must live and breathe this approach, so that when an issue does appear we will be in a position to deal with it as a natural event in the course of our regular relations with our unions, churches, or neighborhood organizations. The united front is not something to be pulled out of the files when an issue emerges.

United front relations in struggle must necessarily start from the self-interest of the people we are working with, which in most cases will be our own self-interest as well. But what will not be the same for us and those we are working with is the

understanding of these self-interests. Because of our experience as Marxists our understanding will have deeper roots and wider implications, but our relations with masses must be on the level of *their* understanding of their own self-interest. That is a basic Marxist proposition.

It must also be recognized that the level of the masses' understanding of their self-interest is often reflected in illusions of all kinds. We must accept this as a fact of life and understand that people will not shed these illusions simply on the basis of our preaching to them. That will take place only on the basis of their own experience together with our aid and participation. It follows that we must try to understand these illusions and their sources. But we must work with people even when they hold on to their illusions. We must work with them in forms and on levels they are prepared to accept. We must understand the nature of their illusions even though we do not accept them as ours.

All tactical considerations must be geared to this basic Leninist concept of our Party's relations to non-Party people.

As we have said, struggle does not by itself disperse illusions. It is necessary for Marxists to help draw the lessons from the struggle. This also is not a simple matter of "one and one makes two." The illusions do not all disappear at once. The lessons of a specific experience may help to shed illusions on one par-

ticular front. And a good leader, working closely with the masses, will almost sense when a new level of understanding has been reached, and will therefore raise the work to that new level and continue from that point.

In this context we can work realistically for recruiting into the Party, which is very important, though of course it is only one feature of Party building. Here I think it necessary to state that it is possible to recruit into the Party at all times and under all conditions. The nature of this recruiting will vary but *recruiting into the Party must never be stopped or halted*. The fact is that there is a need to raise the question of recruiting sharply at this specific moment.

The problem is not one of sending people into organizations. Many are already there. The central question for us is to help our members, our clubs, our leaders, to carry on political activities where they are, and under the specific conditions that face them, which are often difficult conditions. This is the nub of the problem.

Here is where we must work out the application of our policy. Here is where the vanguard role meets the test of life. Here is where the policies of the united front meet the test of reality. Here is where theory and practice meet. Either our policies are compatible with reality and thus become a lever to set masses in motion, or they are not compat-

ible, in which case theory bounces back into the rarified atmosphere of abstractions and remains a toy and a source of amusement for a circle of windbags. Then practice remains a conglomeration of isolated incidents and fragments without unity of understanding, without general direction, and consists of individual actions carried out separately like sparks without a flame.

At this meeting we want to re-establish fully the basic concept that this is the most vital element of our work—to build united front relations at every level, starting with the grass-roots level, starting with united front relations first of all on a person-to-person basis and where possible on a group basis. We must re-establish the concept that this is the rock foundation of everything we do, that only this gives purpose to our Party, to our clubs. This must become the main feature of all our discussions, all our educationals and classes. This must become the criterion for promotion to leadership. At the same time, we must admit that this is the most complex and difficult of all questions facing us, because here is where our policies and strategic concepts must be elaborated into realistic tactical approaches. This is where the tedious, painstaking core of Communist work lies.

We have been insisting that the mass struggle, the united front struggle, is the essence of the vanguard role of the Party. Some see

it otherwise. They think that the key is the independent work of the Party, or its open, public role. Others, in reaction to this, lay the weight on the united front, and pay too little attention to the independent role of the Party. One says we should issue a Party leaflet. The other says we must work for some united front committee on a particular issue. There is a counterposing of approaches here, which our convention resolutions warned against.

We must see the matter in this way: The day-to-day mass struggle, the building of mass ties and united front work, in labor and people's organizations, in workers' neighborhoods—that is the key. United front means *action*—action for the people's needs.

Is independent agitation essential? Of course. It must be continued and expanded. If done properly, it helps vitally to serve the mass struggle. But independent agitation is *part* of the mass work—not the whole of it. Public activities are *part* of mass work, not the whole of it. All activities must serve the mass struggle; all must be designed to bring about the involvement of broad masses, and the development of greater clarity, unity, militancy among them.

These activities must not be a substitute for united front struggle. Otherwise we shall be reduced to mere agitators, to a party of declarations and statements, not of action.

Internal work and internal discus-

sion are necessary for the development of mass struggle. So too are classes, the study of theory and other such activities. Independent activities and united front struggles, inner and outer work, are the two inseparable sides of our struggle to win the masses and to build the Party. Enough of one-sidedness! Enough of counterposing! Everything for the closest contact with the people and their organizations, for improving the conditions of the people, for aiding their struggles to win their urgent demands! Everything to strengthen their organizations, their unity, their militancy, and to teach the need for socialism, for the Party.

Lenin once wrote:

“Communists must not stew in their own juice, but learn to penetrate into prohibited premises where the representatives of the bourgeoisie exercise influence over the workers; and in this way must not hesitate to make certain sacrifices and not be afraid to make mistakes, which are inevitable, at first, in every new and difficult undertaking. The Communists who do not want to understand this and who do not want to learn how to do this cannot hope to win the majority among the workers; at all events, they hinder and retard the work of winning this majority.”

THE NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY

Flexibility in regard to forms of united front activities is absolutely

necessary, as well as in regard to the different organizations of the people. This is especially important in times of upsurge when the struggles of the peoples are on the rise and new sections join in the movements and struggles. It is likewise very important where there is a rise of the reactionary offensive against the people and their organizations.

At the same time, however, flexibility has nothing in common with capitulation or liquidation. I say this now because there is a need to recognize and admit some past errors in this respect. This is necessary in order to find the path of correction.

It is true some Left organizations and committees had outlined their purpose and did not reflect the new developments of the day. In fact, some of them had become roadblocks on the way to ties with broader masses. However, this correct assessment was distorted and before anyone was clearly aware of what had happened, it had become an excuse for those who tended to capitulate, which they used to justify the cry: "There is no place for any Left-oriented or Left people's organizations in the United States." This was in fact a serious and a fundamental mistake. This error helped greatly to disperse the forces closest to us, our most reliable allies in our mass struggles.

We should have fought this liquidationist wave, which began in the first stages of the cold war, not

dogmatically standing pat and failing to see the new problems created by reaction (which happened in many cases) but by giving leadership to our comrades in these organizations to help them better avoid the direct blows of the reactionary drive and make the necessary changes and modifications to render these organizations even more effective in moving ever wider circles into struggle.

It is not enough for us to admit these errors. A correction must be made in the character of our concrete work.

There is a broad and a steadily growing body of progressive, Left and socialist-minded elements in and around every sphere of activity. This is so in the electoral field, in the struggles for equal rights, civil liberties and peace, in the labor, youth, women's, national group and other movements. They are not a coherent or organized force and therefore are not able even to begin to exert their potential influence. We are a part of this force. We want to work with these elements. We are not interested in taking over their organizations or taking posts of leadership away from them. We want to help build the Left and progressive forces into a powerful voice, a potent factor in influencing and moving broad masses, one which can truly help decide the course of events in our land. It is also necessary to find avenues of unity with forces in moderate, pacifist and

Right-led Socialist groupings. This is absolutely essential.

I repeat, this is essential not as a substitute for broad mass organizations and movements, but as a means of stimulating, clarifying and mobilizing them.

PARTY BUILDING

It is not only necessary to have a correct policy. We need correct organization. We have worked on this question during the year. You are all acquainted with it and I need not go into it at great length. We must not only tighten our organization from top to bottom. We must make it a day-to-day fighting body. We must develop, train and draw in younger forces. We must raise our theoretical work to a really high level. Some important beginnings have been made by the National Committee in the issuance of the outline on *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* and other outlines, in articles and in training classes.

We have to give central attention to the Party club. We must carry through a concentration policy and we must more effectively streamline the organization so that leadership may better reach and aid the clubs and members. We must further improve the work of our comrades in industry in the day-to-day class struggle and in their political work by systematic attention to their work, problems and education.

Of outstanding importance is wid-

ening the scope of our agitation and improving our leaflets in content, form and distribution as well as increasing our public activities. On these matters some progress has been made.

Of foremost importance is the building of our press. This is a cardinal, number one task. It is a task of all Party leaders, all Party members. We must not simply indulge in making plans. We must carry out these plans in the most resolute fashion, with full check-up and control. We must arouse the spirit of self-sacrifice in the fulfillment of this undertaking.

There has been some improvement, some progress by the management and in some districts. But it is not commensurate with the need. The press has improved in readability and popularity, but much more has to be done here. We must surround the paper with a network of committees, Party and non-Party, and we must make Sundays once more a regular day of canvassing and distribution. And in all this the leading comrades, national committee members, district organizers and district committee members, must lead by practical example. We must raise to the level of highest honor the work and achievements of press building.

I stated earlier that we have had to conduct a struggle against elements of revisionism and dogmatism. As we know, revisionism often leads to a hunt for a will-o'-the-wisp,

for a false sense of respectability, the kind of respectability to be gotten in our capitalist society only at the cost of complete surrender. It underplays and in effect denies the vanguard role of the Party and the more advanced Left forces. It leads to a false hunt for broadness of contact of the movement, projecting a "broadness" that is completely out of focus with the objective possibilities or the actual relationship of focus with the objective possibility of softness, surrender to difficulties, dragging behind the masses, and a lack of militancy. It leads to conservatism and accommodation to restrictions and enemy attacks.

Right opportunism often speaks of working with the masses, which is correct, of ties with the masses, which is also correct. But it forgets that this work must have the aim of moving the masses forward, not of adjusting the vanguard to the most backward elements. Contact with the masses can be at the tail, as well as at the head. If dogmatism runs away from or stands aloof from the masses, Right opportunism drags behind—and that too is a way of isolating oneself.

In general, the main ideological influence on our working class and the people, as well as on our own work, is that of Right opportunism. Was not this the ideological weakness that prompted ideas like: "Peace is here to say. All we have to do is learn to live with it." Or ideas that: "The policy of building

an anti-monopoly coalition is in contradiction with policies of peaceful coexistence." Or that it is "in contradiction with the policies of the Negro people's movements and struggles." Was not this the ideology behind proposals that: "The time is ripe for an all-class national front?" Is not this the essence of Bittelman's revisionist "welfare state in a vacuum" idea? Even the infantile arguments against the projection of shop clubs had its source in this Right-opportunist, revisionist road although there were also some based on sectarian concepts of exclusiveness. If we had accepted this kind of advice, there is no doubt that our work would be wallowing in the mire and quicksands of opportunism and revisionism.

During the same year, certain elements espousing sectarianism, infantile doctrinairism and dogmatism made a number of rather serious and persistent sallies against our policy, in the form of direct as well as flank attacks. Some of these very quickly developed into anti-Party campaigns. Others remained on the level of persistent internal opposition to almost all policies of the Party. In fact, it is necessary to take note that there are some members of this very National Committee who, during this whole year since the Convention, have voted against every major and even minor policy question presented by the Party leadership.

Much of this weakness is infantile

doctrinairism. Some, of course, is of the dogmatic and sectarian variety. But in life these weaknesses very often join hands. We must see that during this past period, in specific areas of mass work and in the case of some districts, sections, clubs and individual comrades, dogmatism and sectarianism have been the main danger. And there are some unstable comrades who have the faculty of expressing both Right and Left dangers within a period of one week.

As we know, dogmatism and sectarianism are blind to new features of the environment. They go by old slogans, old lines without regard to the new. They go by the book and by past experience, forgetting that Marxism-Leninism is based on concreteness, on dialectics, whose heart is change—change on the basis of struggle. Dogmatism and sectarianism are the material sects are made of. They constitute a wall, invisible but as real and as effective in separating us from the masses as a solid brick wall would be. They undermine contact with the masses and the development of the united front. They reduce the Party to a mere agitator, a mere declaimer.

Was it not this ideological weakness that led some to waver and doubt, if not to oppose the correctness of our line on the new epoch, on peaceful coexistence, and on the possibility of preventing war? Was it not likewise this weakness which led some, in the election campaign,

to take the position of sitting it out or boycotting the elections and in some cases, even worse, of voting for the counter-revolutionary Trotskyite candidates? And for those naive people who fell for the sweet words of the Trotskyites in the election campaign, let me quote from their election platform. Speaking about the socialist nations, they said:

"It is obvious that these lands suffer from bureaucratic police regimes that stifle freedom of thought and expression, not only in politics but in many other fields. The Russian people, the Chinese, the Eastern Europeans will most certainly rectify matters. Their tendency to do so has already been amply demonstrated in the uprisings in East Germany, in Poland and Hungary."

Did we not also meet the weakness of dogmatism and sectarianism in the field of youth work, and in much of the discussion on the role of the Party?

During the past ten years, the enemy has added to its arsenal in the attack against us. They now have a small group of concealed cadre in the mass movements, trained to use both Right- and Left-sectarian tactics to isolate and destroy these movements. In every mass movement, when these special enemy cadres use left-sectarian tactics; the Trotskyites are always on hand as willing tools, and because of this close working collaboration with the enemy, they sometimes

even appear outwardly more successful than we are.

From all this, it should be crystal clear that we must continue to struggle on two fronts. This is not because we want to balance books but because the challenge to the Party's policies come from two directions. We must be alert to both. But we will strike back and direct our main blow against that weakness which at the moment is the most serious. And we must be realistic and flexible enough to know that the direction from which such challenges come can change very quickly, and therefore our struggle must change accordingly.

WORK OF THE LEADERSHIP

I want to say a few words about the work of the leadership during the past year. Just last week an enlarged secretariat meeting concluded a self-critical review of this question. I should like to tell you about it.

Now, modestly, we said some positive things about our work. But mainly we were very self-critical. It was our estimate that we have followed a basically correct Marxist-Leninist course during the year. Our leading cadre has grown and matured and has further unified its ranks. And we have somewhat improved our collective work.

But there are some very serious weaknesses that must receive our attention. Let me just list them without elaboration.

1. There has not been enough leadership given to the development of mass work in the central areas of labor, Negro rights, peace and electoral activities. The secretariat has been too much tied up with details and internal problems at the expense of our overall leadership in these fields of mass activity.

2. There has not been enough attention and care to assuring the carrying out of our decisions and plans. We have been severely lacking in checkup as a way of political work.

3. The relations of our national leadership to the work of the districts have been weak and very unsatisfactory. Too often leading comrades go into the districts as if they were business executives visiting their district managers. Or still worse, most comrades don't go to the districts at all. It is our opinion that in the future leading comrades must go into the districts for periods of at least two weeks at a time, to work with the district leaderships on day-to-day problems. Comrades from the national office will be assigned to specific nearby districts as part of their regular work.

4. There is insufficient self-criticism. Most comrades as yet fear and shy away from this practice. We must strive to reach a point where self-criticism becomes a central feature of our work, and as natural as boasting.

5. There are as yet reflections of many ideological weaknesses in the

leadership. Some of these take on the character of a lack of sensitivity to elements of white chauvinism as well as attitudes of paternalism towards our Negro comrades. There are also influences of bourgeois nationalism and a weakness in the struggle against it. Characteristics of a non-working class nature remain in the form of stubbornness, lack of self-discipline, like continuously coming late to meetings, subjectivity, and individualistic and bureaucratic leanings. These must all be brought to light of day and fought out chiefly, though not solely, by ideological means.

The secretariat has set up a task force, a committee to come in with a full plan for reorganization of the work of the center to make it more effective, both organizationally and politically.

Finally, we fully recognize the absolute necessity of further improving the collective work of the leadership in matters of relations, divi-

sion of work, methods and attitudes. This is vital if we are to continue the process of unification, rebuilding and remolding of the Party.

* * *

Let me close with these thoughts. The new epoch places a heavy responsibility on our people, our working class and on all forward-looking Americans, but especially on our Party.

We accept this task and responsibility in the firm conviction that we are on the right side of history. The world marches irresistibly towards peace, freedom and socialism.

We are a small party now but the future is with us. We represent the best national interests of our people—the noble aim of peace. And we will work to realize the age-old dream of the American people of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness on a new plane—on a plane that matches the level of social advance which distinguishes the new epoch.

The Negro Liberation Movement Today

By Claude Lightfoot

THE YEAR 1960, one of the most revolutionary years in all of human history, has passed into the Abyss of Time. Future historians will refer to it as one of the turning points of history.

As we embark upon 1961 it would be well to review some of the main events in terms of the Negro liberation movement in 1960.

New forces arose within the Negro liberation movement that made of it the most dynamic and compelling force on the American scene. Not since the birth of the CIO in the mid-thirties have forces emerged that captured the imagination of so many people.

THE STUDENT MOVEMENT —ITS SIGNIFICANCE

The southern sit-in movement, organized and led by southern Negro students, was the most important development during the year. The far-reaching nature of this movement was analyzed by Benjamin J. Davis, former Communist city councilman in New York: "Our country is in the midst of a national crisis. It is at once a constitutional and a moral crisis. It is symbolized in the fact that the right to drink a cup of coffee has suddenly become the front-line test of the whole Jim Crow system."

Negro southern students added new dimensions to the Negro movement providing the highest form of dedication and militancy to be seen since the almost forgotten days of the Civil War and Reconstruction. Seventeen hundred jammed southern jails rather than be pushed off from their goals.

Moreover, to demonstrate their unbreakable will, many students refused to be bailed out of jail. They put their careers on the line, as many were expelled from schools for their participation. The student movement profoundly affected all segments of American life. White students, north and south, who hitherto had not been too articulate as a social force, found new inspiration to demonstrate their identification with noble purposes. The most conservative forces within Negro life, especially those centered around the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People were shaken from their lethargy and compelled to acknowledge new techniques and methods of struggle, namely mass action.

Another force of great potential power, which eventually will be decisive in the conduct of freedom's business, was the Negro workers. The birth of the National Negro Labor Council in Detroit on May 30,

1960 was an event of great historical importance. It signaled the growing independence of the Negro workers in the trade-union movement. It provided Negro workers with the organizational machinery through which they can exert great influence on problems in the trade unions and the whole Negro liberation movement.

The rise of the sit-in movement and the birth of the NNLC were supplemented by the united efforts of three great centers of Negro activity around the Republican and Democratic Party conventions. These great centers, the NAACP, the Southern movement represented by Dr. Martin Luther King and the Negro workers led by A. Phillip Randolph—despite variations in some approaches to problems, were able to unite their forces and organize for the first time mass marches upon the conventions.

THE IMPACT ON THE POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

The power and impact of the Negro movement, supported by many pro-democratic forces and aided by the international situation, helped write the platform of the two major parties. These were the most advanced platforms since the Reconstruction period. The effectiveness of the sit-in movement was demonstrated in the Democratic Party platform: "The peaceful demonstrations for first-class citizenship which

have recently taken place in many parts of the country are a signal for all of us to make good at long last the guarantees of our Constitution."

Against the background of the foregoing, the Negro movement, through its participation in the election campaign and its effect upon the outcome, has set the stage for advancing new propositions in 1961.

What was the nature of the Negro people's participation in the campaign? By following an independent policy, they forced Kennedy to retreat from appeasement of the Dixiecrats and to make the most forthright statements ever uttered by a Presidential candidate on civil rights. He was compelled to shift gears in the middle of the campaign. The Presidential candidate had earlier chosen a path aimed at conciliating the Dixiecrat South. His selection of Lyndon Johnson as a running mate, his appointment of the Dixiecrat Senator Smathers from Florida as his campaign manager in the South, were the fruits of this policy. But such a policy began to backfire and Kennedy was forced to take stands and make statements that were geared more toward pro-democratic forces. Thus: "When our next President takes office in January 1961, he must be prepared to move forward in the field of human rights in three general areas—as a legislative leader, as chief executive, and as the center of moral power of the United States."

DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE SPEAKS

Regarding moral power, he said: "He must exert the great moral and educational force of his office to bring equal access to public facilities from churches to lunch counters and to support the right of every American to stand up for his rights, even if on occasion he must sit down for them."

In other campaign speeches he pledged not to wait on Congress but to take executive action in every sphere of governmental activity. Everyone concedes that Kennedy's intervention on behalf of Dr. Martin Luther King was a prime factor in his securing such a high percentage of the Negro vote. Indeed the Kennedy campaign pledges exceeded those of Abraham Lincoln in the elections of 1860.

By a combination of political and direct mass action, the Negro movement in 1960 was an unusually important factor in determining the electoral outcome. It is generally estimated that eighty percent of the Negro vote went for Kennedy. In some areas the percentage was even higher. The Negro vote was more than the balance of power in such key states with high electoral college votes as Pennsylvania, Michigan and Illinois.

NEGRO VOTERS' WEIGHT

It has been recognized for some

time that in ten states which have a combined electoral college vote of 232, in a close election the Negro vote is decisive. The results of the 1960 elections confirm this truth a thousand times. However, what was unexpected was the growing role and importance of the Negro vote in the South. It is generally estimated that without the Negro vote at least three southern states carried by Kennedy would have been lost. This is a new phenomenon, which, if pro-democratic forces build on in the future, will open up new possibilities for a democratic advance of the whole country. It portends the decline of the Dixiecrats in the South, just as the expansion of the territories led to the demise of the power of the slaveholders in another period of American history.

From the foregoing it should be clear that events and developments at home and abroad in 1960 have laid the basis for approaching problems of civil rights in 1961 in a more fundamental manner.

FREEDOM'S DEMANDS

In 1960 the Negro movement gave birth to the slogan of "Freedom Now." The raising of this slogan brings to mind the slogan issued several years ago by the NAACP of "Free by '63." That "Free by '63" slogan was never implemented by a clear definition of objective and subjective factors which would make

it a practical political possibility. Hardly anyone therefore paid any attention to it. Now a new slogan is raised. The question arises: Is the concept of "Freedom Now" a realistic possibility or are we whistling in the dark?

It is the firm conviction of the American Communist Party that both slogans are practical and realizable. These slogans can and should be advanced in the context of a generally favorable objective situation.

The relationship of forces throughout the world, coupled with the situation here at home, opens up possibilities that a year ago would have seemed fantastic and impossible. During 1960, 16 African nations won freedom from colonial domination. The masses arose against tyranny all over the world. Even in countries like South Korea and Turkey, which were led by so-called strong-men, regimes were changed. All over the world young people took a direct hand in leading freedom's fight. This general onslaught throughout the world for freedom leaves the world imperialist system in a state of general decay. World imperialism and colonialism is in an advanced stage of disintegration.

SOCIALIST SYSTEM BECOMING DECISIVE

This fact has supreme meaning for freedom fighters everywhere. The

new world situation reveals that new forces are in firm command of the march of history. The growing collaboration between the socialist world and nations formerly dominated by imperialist powers constitute a decisive force. They have placed before the UN and the world at large the slogan: End colonialism now. When, therefore, the slogan is raised in America of "End Jim Crow Now" or "Freedom Now" they are in accord with the general trend of world development. The continuance of the Jim Crow system in America is incompatible with restoring American moral and political prestige in the world. The continuance of the jim crow system in America is incompatible with the basic national interest. And those who seek to maintain the status quo betray the best interests of the American people. It is not only our good will over the world that is involved, but also our economy.

The economic foundation built up by the imperialist powers is corroding. New economic relationships with countries which hitherto were one of the main sources of wealth to imperialist countries will have to be created. Such relationships can be created only on the basis of equality and the ending of color bars. The role of the socialist world in promoting economic and cultural relationships along the lines of equality will exert historic pressures for changing racist patterns not

only in the world but in America as well. Hence strong international pressure will help create conditions to end Jim Crow in America. We have already spoken of the new situation arising from the elections which likewise creates conditions for rapid advances to end Jim Crow now.

Favorable objective conditions in themselves will not automatically lead to freedom. Subjective factors must correspond to them. In this respect leadership is decisive.

NEGRO LEADERSHIP

In the last several years, the caliber of Negro leadership has been constantly improving. But if freedom's goals are to be realized in keeping with the objective possibilities, then a much higher caliber of leadership is required.

Militancy and mass action alone will not suffice to guide a people to freedom. To be free, a people, or at least its leaders, must possess the knowledge of how to fight, whom to fight and when to fight. Leadership must possess knowledge of how to overcome ideological barriers and equip the masses with an ideology in keeping with the particular needs of the movement. The Negro movement is not presently armed with a clear ideological direction, nor does it operate from a common pattern of strategic concepts, aims and tactics.

Notwithstanding a growth toward unity of purpose and methods in the main centers of Negro leadership, the pace is far too slow and efforts are too diffused to meet the requirements of a movement which demands an accelerated struggle for freedom. Negro Communists therefore seriously recommend a conference at the summit of all significant forces and leaders in early 1961. The composition, we believe, should reflect all segments of organized and class stratification of Negro life. It should involve the top leadership of the NAACP, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, National Negro Labor Council, Southern Negro student movement, the various denominations of the Negro Church, as well as fraternal organizations. Such a conference should accord to Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois such a place of honor as is being given him in places where freedom has already been won. For example, in Africa, the voice of Dr. Du Bois is a most influential one. A leadership that refuses participation to such a world figure out of fear of the very forces who must be fought to gain freedom is too cowardly to gain freedom for anyone. Negro Communist leaders like Benjamin J. Davis, William L. Patterson and James Jackson could add tremendously to any gathering of freedom fighters. Harmful as it is to exclude Negro Communists from the movement that they have given so much to build, we, however,

do not place ourselves above the collective will. A conference such as we have been discussing should have as its central purpose a common line of direction. It could promote a higher form of unity such as we have never experienced before. It could outline a series of strategic concepts and tactical approaches. It could equip the whole movement with a greater knowledge of how to take full advantage of the new opportunities.

Such a conference, among other things, should discuss:

1. The relationship between the Civil Rights resolution in America and the world-wide fight for peace and freedom.
2. A crash political action program.
3. A crash economic program.
4. A coordinating center for civil rights activities.

WE BELONG WITH WORLD OF PROGRESS

During the post World War II years some progress has been made in the status of the American Negro. It would be wrong to ignore this fact. It would also be wrong to exaggerate the progress made because in relation to what has taken place in the world at large, our progress is being made at a snail's pace. Since 1945, over 45 nations formerly exploited and oppressed have gained national independence and freedom. The map of the old world has

changed considerably. New forces have come into the world arena and have become decisive in generating changes in society—nations which under the leadership of the working class are erecting socialist societies. This force today embraces one-third of the world. *The emergence of the bloc of socialist nations is the most important political fact of our time.* Based on this foundation, nations struggling for national independence have found the means of challenging successfully the world of imperialism with its racist concepts.

Without the aid and support of the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries and most of the colonial world would still be under the domination of world imperialism. The events in Egypt around the Suez Canal in 1956 are a dramatic demonstration of this fact. Were it not for the firm position taken by the Soviet Union and China, British and French arms would have trampled Nasser's regime to the ground as they and other imperialist powers have done so often in the past. Never before have imperialist powers had to fear reprisals.

The activities of the socialist world and the nations that have become free have been the decisive new feature generating conditions for advancing the struggle for Negro rights in the United States. The treatment of the American Negro has been the Achilles heel of the

democratic and moralistic pretensions of the imperialists who direct our foreign policy. If anyone doubts the role of the international situation in advancing the cause of Negro freedom, then such doubting Thomases should read the Supreme Court decision on desegregation where it is stated explicitly that this ruling was motivated largely out of international considerations.

It should therefore be clear that we should not view the civil rights fight in the United States disconnected from world trends and developments. However, a survey of the opinions expressed or actions taken by most Negro leaders reveals a very serious misjudgement of some of the requirements of this historical moment. Most Negro leaders generally abstain from taking positions or participating in programs which challenge the direction of American policy. Others are continuously making opportunistic proposals for the utilization of American Negroes to help carry out our Government's foreign policy which has been mainly a policy of support to the various imperialist powers.

Both of these tendencies are harmful. Neither will lead to a substantial advance of the civil rights struggle in the United States. The world being what it is today, Negro leaders cannot afford the continuance of an ostrich-like policy on the broad matters of war or peace or the ending of world colonialism. We, the

American Negro, who has been the recipient of international good will, whose struggles have been illuminated by world support, cannot afford to remain silent when our Government takes a stand in the UN in support of various colonial powers. The attitude assumed toward Fidel Castro, when that great Cuban leader came to Harlem, was a dramatic expression of the opportunist nature of many of our leaders. The Negro masses turned out to welcome Castro by the tens of thousands, while most leaders kept quiet or engaged in outright attacks on Castro, thus doing the bidding of the State Department, which attempts to isolate anyone who resists or fights against American dictation.

Fidel Castro and the new regime in Cuba has wiped out all legal and open acts of color discrimination. Today colored Cubans occupy a central role in Cuban affairs. Last year, the *Chicago Defender*, in recognition of this fact, named Castro as one of its honoraries of the year. Yet we hear strange voices among us begging for token integration for the purpose of helping to smother revolutions such as the Cuban. We may take it as an axiom that "Those who wish to be free cannot become free trying to enslave others."

Bribes and sops thrown out by the State Department, for the purpose of enlisting the aid of the Negroes to keep the Belgians in the Congo, the French in Algeria, the

British in Kenya must be turned down by any self-respecting Negro leader. Anyway, Africans aren't going to accept the American Negro in this role. Those who are contemplating playing such a role can save themselves some embarrassment. Negro leaders are going to have to stand up and be counted in the fight for peace as well as freedom.

The example of Mrs. Zelma Watson George who at the recent UN Assembly was forced to abstain along with the American delegation from voting against a resolution which called for an end to colonialism is something for all Negro leaders to note. Though forced to follow American policy, she found the means of registering a protest. Negro leaders must join other peace forces in speaking up when this government takes the wrong course in world affairs. More recently voices are being heard. For example, Mr. P. L. Prattis, editor of the *Pittsburgh Courier*, spoke up in his column "Horizon." He said:

I hope the new administration is going to negotiate from good will (as well as strength) with the Communists. It does no good to assert that all Russian leaders are crooks and liars, then build up a book to support your charge. Any political science student could build up a book on our defections, too. We haven't always told the truth or lived up to our obligations. We don't talk about these things on the theory that what the

people doesn't know doesn't hurt them. But even though I am anti-Communist, nobody is going to make me believe that all the Russians, 220 million of them, are liars. God made them, too.

Perhaps some Negro leaders do not speak out for peace or oppose some aspects of foreign policy out of fear of being labelled "disloyal" or "traitors." At a time when the survival of the nation is at stake, failure to speak out against wrong policies, even of one's own government, can be regarded as treasonable. Today, a true patriot's motto, to paraphrase Carl Schurz, should be: "Our country, may she always be right—when right keep her right, and when wrong, put her right."

Perhaps there are Negro leaders who fail to speak up because they fear this will hurt the civil rights struggle. This is a mistake. The struggle for freedom, we have already shown, is a world-wide process in which joint efforts by all is the common denominator for progress. The Negro people cannot win freedom in isolation from world peace and freedom fighters.

The injection of these truisms into the consciousness of the Negro movement is a prerequisite for an accelerated advance toward freedom in 1961.

STRUGGLE ALONE GUARANTEES VICTORY

The slogan to end colonialism

which has been raised by the world freedom movement cannot be complemented here by the slogan "End Jim Crow Now" without a crash program on the political action level. The participation of our people, the Negro people, in the 1960 elections set the stage for a massive assault against the walls of Jim Crow. It evoked from President Kennedy commitments which if carried out would result in a qualitative change in our status. Therefore, the starting point of a political action program for 1961 should be based on creating conditions to force the President to keep his promises. This in itself is going to be no small task. The President is under all kinds of conflicting pressures. And if there is any indication that we can be satisfied by small crumbs, then this is just about what will be received. The President has already broken his pledge to become a legislative leader in the fight for civil rights. His appointments for his Cabinet and various governmental departments reflects an attitude of making some token integration. Out of hundreds of appointments already made, only one, the appointment of Dr. Weaver as head of the Housing Administration, represents any change.

The President during the campaign pledged to work for a change in Rule 22 which governs the possibility of a filibuster. The Democratic Party platform explicitly states: "To accomplish these goals will re-

quire executive orders, legal actions brought by the Attorney General, legislation and *improved congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule.*" (Emphasis mine—C.L.) The ink had hardly dried on this commitment when the Democratic Senate leader, working under the supervision of the President, killed any possibility for meaningful legislation. This betrayal of a campaign commitment is the fruit of a concept which has governed the thinking of many white Americans for a long, long time.

The President and his apologists rationalize his actions on the theory that to open up a civil rights fight in the Senate at this time would place in jeopardy the Kennedy Legislative Program on broad matters such as anti-depression measures, assistance to the aged, etc. Now there comes a time in politics when timing is important. But is this a matter of mere timing? The answer is emphatically, NO! Every action the President has taken since the close of the campaign indicates that at present he is following a policy of appeasing the South. And even if he issues some executive orders, unless this approach to the Dixiecrats is changed, nothing really significant will happen.

NEGRO QUESTION ONE OF PRINCIPLE

The ideology behind these attitudes is deep-rooted in American life. It has been a historical characteristic

of liberals and many so-called friends of the Negro to disregard the Negro Question as a principled matter. Most often the attitude is to compromise it when the so-called "general welfare" is involved. This was true even during the days leading up to the Civil War and has been a costly proposition for this nation. During the first two years of the Civil War, President Lincoln refrained from touching the institution of slavery in an effort to hold border states in the Union. But, clearly, the delay in making the Civil War one aimed against slavery actually delayed the Republic's victory.

Today, as then, our nation faces a crisis, a crisis which in many respects is more far-reaching than the Civil War. Once again the Negro Question emerges as a problem related to national survival. Once again a vacillating President seeks to appease the very forces which have lowered American prestige all over the world. President Kennedy, during his campaign, pledged to restore American prestige. He must be told emphatically that the general prestige of America, its image in the world of today, cannot be restored without a fundamental attack upon the whole structure of Jim Crow. And the achievement of that goal cannot be had without a determined struggle against the Dixiecrats.

One of the principal guide points in a crash political action program

in 1961 must be *no reliance on the Kennedy Administration.* The Negro movement must develop its own attribute of self-reliance, not only in determining its own actions but also the actions of its closest allies, such as labor and other pro-democratic forces. Reliance on world freedom forces must be for the great mass of the American people, black and white, the keystone of mass struggle in 1961.

BOLDNESS NEEDED

With full confidence the Negro movement must boldly place objectives and goals in keeping with slogans and concepts such as "Free by '63," "Freedom Now" and "End Jim Crow Now."

A crash political action program requires dissatisfaction with minor concessions and impatience with those who strive to condition our struggles along such a line.

PRESIDENTIAL POWER

The President has the power to end the Jim Crow system now. We must demand that he use his powers. In 1863 Abraham Lincoln delivered a smashing blow against the institution of slavery by executive action. He did not wait upon Congress to act. He did it as commander-in-chief of the armed forces and on the basis of the necessity to win the war. Even though our country today is

not militarily at war, we face a national emergency, a national crisis. We must therefore urge and demand that the President act in this emergency no less boldly and decisively than did Lincoln in 1863. The times call for the issuance of a second emancipation proclamation.

There are those who argue that the President has no such powers, that all he can do is clean up the administrative branches of government. This is an erroneous theory designed only for the purpose of rationalizing a policy of no significant action.

Ever since the Supreme Court ruling on desegregation, Negro citizens in the South have lived under constant terror. Mobs and violence stalk through almost every southern city. In Fayette County, Tennessee, hundreds of Negroes have been evicted for exercising their constitutional right to vote. Teen-age mobs goaded on by inhuman and insane adults have become common features in southern towns and cities. Governor Faubus of Arkansas violated the laws of the land and to this day remains its Governor. White Citizens Councils conspire daily to violate the laws and to this day no one has been apprehended. In state after state, laws have been written which are in clear violation of the Supreme Court decisions.

THE EXECUTIVE POWER

In view of all these developments

no one can successfully argue that the basis does not exist for the President to act. Based on a law passed in 1871 it is possible for him to issue an Executive Order which would outlaw all Jim Crow laws, which are in clear violation of the United States Constitution.

The law passed in 1871 among other things states:

Whenever insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combinations or conspiracies in any State so hinders the execution of the laws thereof and of the United States, as to deprive any portion or class of the people of such State of any of the rights, privileges or immunities or protection, named in the Constitution and secured by the laws for the protection of such rights, privileges, or immunities and the constituted authorities of such state are unable to protect, or from any cause, fail in or refuse protection of the people in such rights, such facts shall be deemed a denial by such state of the equal protection of the laws to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States. (Emphasis mine—C.L.).

When conditions exist as described above, the President is authorized under this law to act as he sees fit. Enabling legislation from Congress is unnecessary. The law states explicitly: "It shall be lawful for the President and it shall be his duty to take such measures by the employment of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or

of either, or any other means as he may deem necessary."

The existence of this law is the means through which a speedy resolution of the whole Jim Crow system can be secured. All that is required is the will of the President to act. Hence, one of the elements of a crash political action program in 1961 is the mobilization of sufficient forces to compel the President to act to eliminate the entire Jim Crow structure in American life.

NEGRO REPRESENTATION

Another important element of a crash political action program would be a program to increase radically Negro representation at all levels of government. For all practical purposes, the Negro vote in 1960 was a united vote. As such it demonstrated its power. But in the area of Negro representation hardly any significant advances were made. The major exception to this general situation was the election of a Negro to a major state-wide office in Michigan. The election in that state of Otis M. Smith as State Auditor General is something worthy of emulation in most northern states. It is generally estimated that over 5,500,000 Negroes are registered to vote. In a number of states the Negro vote is quite high. For example:

California	425,000
Illinois	500,000
Indiana	128,500
Maryland	270,000
Michigan	340,000
Missouri	225,000
New Jersey	240,000
New York	750,000
Ohio	390,000
Pennsylvania	475,000

In some states and major cities, Negroes represent twenty to twenty-five percent of the registered voters. Yet when it comes to holding office in city-wide or state-wide departments of government, the number is pitifully small. Moreover, in a number of concentrated Negro areas, Negroes are without adequate representation. Before the present census, which will result in a change in some congressional districts, it was estimated that there were over ten congressional districts in which Negroes constituted the majority of the voters. These were districts in addition to the four which are already represented by Negroes in Congress. In 1960 during the primaries some feeble challenges were made, but nowhere was a breakthrough achieved. If there is any area which dramatizes the futility of gradualism, it is in respect to representation at the congressional level. In 1928 Oscar DePriest was the first Negro to be elected to Congress since the 1890's. Since then three more

have been elected, making a total of four in 32 years. If this present pace is continued, it would take another sixty or seventy years just to achieve what existed in the Reconstruction period. Obviously it is pure phrasemongering to talk about "Freedom Now," "End Jim Crow Now," if there is no adequate program for advancing Negro representation at all levels of government. During the presidential elections, A. Phillip Randolph and a number of other Negro leaders formed an organization called "The Non-Partisan Crusade to Mobilize Negro Voters." This was a welcome development, but hardly meets the problem of Negro representation. We will make no significant advances in representation until our entire people understand why Negro representation is necessary to freedom. We will make no real progress until Negro politicians are brought more under the control of the voters that they represent. At present too many of them are subservient to the will of the big city machine bosses. And as long as this situation prevails, patronage and offices will be doled out on an unequal basis. This, therefore, is a problem that should engage the attention of every Negro leader in the country. The ability of our people and leaders to solve this problem will be the answer to the question posed by the late Walter White, "How long the Promised Land?"

In respect to political action, the gerrymandering of districts must receive the immediate attention of Negro leadership in every state, county and city. Efforts no doubt will be made to slice districts up in such a way as to reduce the possibility of increasing or even maintaining Negro representation. The example in Los Angeles where several newspapers sponsored a conference for the purpose of mobilizing the Negro community as well as sympathetic whites to resist unfair gerrymandering of Negro areas must be followed in every community.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOBS

The downturn in the economy, which in the month of December reached a 20-year record of unemployment, has ominous meaning for every Negro community throughout the country. The problem of unemployment in a Negro community is or should be of concern to every stratum of the population. Negro business, which in the Negro ghetto is entirely dependent on the Negro market, will be greatly affected by the growing number of unemployed. Hence, unemployment here must become a people's issue, an important part of the whole civil rights struggle. For the special condition facing the Negro community is a by-product of discriminatory hiring practices in our country. In fact the Negro community is already in a state of depression. According to

spokesmen for the Urban League: "Negro workers not only in New York City but throughout the nation are going through a 'real depression,' with upwards of 14 per cent of the Negro working force unemployed. The Urban League labor experts point out that while the Bureau of Labor Statistics' November report showed 6.3 per cent of the nation's total labor force unemployed, twice the percentage of Negroes are unemployed. The critical nature of this problem is noted by A. Philip Randolph, who stated recently: "The problems of the Negro today are as critical as they were just after the Civil War." We need a crash program to provide Negroes with the skills required by automation. "What appears as a recession for white workers is a depression for Negroes," Mr. Randolph declared.

NEGRO COMMUNITY DEPRESSED AREA

President Kennedy has appointed a panel to make a survey of the problems in the depressed areas of the country. This task force, headed by Senator Douglas of Illinois, presented a report and set the norms or standards with which to measure whether an area is depressed or not. The following criteria are presented:

A distressed area is typically a pocket of chronic unemployment which persists even during relatively prosperous times in the rest of the nation. It is

especially hard hit in times of recession. Currently, when the unemployment rate nationally is over 6 per cent, the distressed area rate is over 10 per cent and in some instances as high as 20 per cent. *General economic recovery can be expected to reduce the unemployment rate, but not enough to enjoy a fair share of the nation's prosperity.*

By these standards every Negro community in America constitutes a depressed area. And because of discrimination in hiring practices the problem is more acute than ever in areas commonly called depressed. A standard program here would require what is generally done in other areas but also a powerful assault on job discrimination. Despite the existence of F.E.P.C. laws in over thirty states, the President's Committee on Government Contracts is forced to state: "Job discrimination against Negroes is the country's most destructive social and economic program." Hence when A. Phillip Randolph calls for a crash economic program for Negro life, he is putting his finger on the Number One problem in the fight for equality. A crash program in this regard is a prerequisite for accelerating the whole struggle for freedom. The coming National Workshop and Institute on Racial Bias in Labor, Industry and Government, sponsored by the National Negro Labor Council, can powerfully stimulate a broadside attack on job bias in all aspects of

American life. Its findings and deliberations no doubt will provide the strategical and tactical handles to carry this struggle into life in every community of American life.

SPEED THE OFFENSIVE

To accelerate an offensive along the whole front of Jim Crow and segregation requires that every issue such as housing, jobs, schools, gerrymandering, the right to vote, etc., be viewed in a new setting and methods employed in keeping with the new possibilities and opportunities.

We Communists urge the people, Negro and white—and particularly we urge the white people to demand an end to this shame of our country—to call upon the President to issue a ringing proclamation:

a) Nullifying all existing Jim Crow, discriminatory, and segregation laws and practices as contravening the U.S. Constitution. Such nullification to cover housing, jobs, schools, public transportation or conveniences, and all other Jim Crow manifestations.

b) Declaring the intention of the President to use the offices of the Attorney General, the courts and all Federal police powers to enforce the terms of the proclamation. Deny recognition to elected officials of states, elected on the basis of disfranchisement of citizens in violation of the U.S. Constitution.

c) Instructing the Attorney General's office to begin legal actions be-

fore the Federal courts in accord with the 14th Amendment, to enforce the reduction of Congressional representation from all states that restrict the voting rights of Negroes; to outlaw all poll taxes; to force the liquidation of terrorist organizations like the Ku Klux Klan and White Citizens Councils.

It is also imperative that Negro liberation forces give consideration to streamlining the various organizations which compose this movement. There is a great need for much better coordination and the development of the capacity for total mobilization of the Negro community. The degree of success registered by the actions before the two party conventions show why this is so important and also how it can be done.

The marches on the conventions were organized by three forces, namely, the NAACP, labor forces around A. Phillip Randolph and the Southern Christian Movement around Martin Luther King. No one of these forces alone—not even the NAACP—could have organized these significant actions. Moreover, all three, without the participation of the Negro church, would have been greatly weakened. Hence, the times and new opportunities require greater cooperation between various segments of the Negro movement and greater mobilization of the entire Negro people. Events of 1960 point the way toward achievement of these goals.

Salute to William Z. Foster

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

ON JANUARY 12, 1961, William Z. Foster, Chairman Emeritus of the Communist Party of the United States, arrived by plane in Moscow, U.S.S.R. He was taken aboard and off planes en route on a stretcher and was immediately taken to a hospital in Moscow, where he will happily spend his 80th birthday on February 25. This trip signalled his latest heroic battle and an unprecedented victory over the Department of Justice, which has held him on two untried indictments under the infamous thought-control Smith Act, since 1948. The U.S. government had admitted on numerous occasions, after court-appointed doctors examined him, that he was too ill to be tried, yet it was never willing to release him from the charges and bail which virtually made him a house prisoner. But Bill Foster, with the determination and courage so characteristic of him in his long life of struggle, fought it through to the U.S. Supreme Court and won his right to travel in search of health. He went on board a plane called "The Flying Dutchman," with a triumphant wave of his hand and a broad smile to all of us present there. On his hard-won passport it said: "William Z. Foster, American."

Tough native roots produced Bill Foster, Communist, who has carried forward the great traditions of Syl-

vis, Parsons, Debs, Haywood, Moon-ey, Ruthenberg, men of heroic mold who fought to end the exploitation of the American working class by the employers and to build socialism in America. He is flesh and blood of the American people. He knows the life of a worker not from books alone, but from his lifetime of experience, as his own book, *Pages From a Worker's Life*,* abundantly proves. He was born in Taunton, Mass. But his father, an Irish immigrant, could not make a living there and they moved to the slums of Philadelphia. At seven he sold newspapers. At ten he was compelled to leave school and go to work. His first contact with a strike was that of the carmen of that city. His youthful sympathies were aroused by the hard-fought steel strike of 1892, at Homestead, Pa.; a railroad strike led by Eugene V. Debs, and the march of the unemployed in 1892 under "General" Coxey. Little did this thin, poorly clad, underfed youth imagine that within twenty-five years he would lead the greatest steel strike this country had seen, or be arrested, as Coxey was, for leading unemployed workers to demand action by their elected officials.

By the time he was 19, he had

* A new edition of this book—both cloth and paper-bound, will be issued very soon by International Publishers, New York City.—ed.

joined a union, tried to organize the Third Avenue lines in New York City, and been fired. He was a natural student. He read incessantly, especially history and science. Then he discovered the idea of socialism. He heard a street speaker on Broad and Market Streets in Philadelphia in 1900, to whom he listened entranced. He describes this as follows: "*His proposal for the workers to take over the government and the industries and to abolish the profit system appealed to me as the only real solution and all my years of later experience in life have only confirmed this first opinion. I began to count myself, from that time on, a socialist. That street meeting indeed marked a great turning point in my life.*" Too young to vote, he walked six miles with a fellow-worker to encourage him to vote for Eugene V. Debs in 1900. Little did he suspect then that, like Debs, he would be a candidate for President on the Communist Party ticket in 1924, 1928, and 1932, inheriting the fighting traditions of Debs who ran for the last time in 1920, while imprisoned in Atlanta for his anti-war views.

At twenty he went to sea for three years, as an able-bodied seaman. Then, lured by the still adventurous West, he became a migratory worker. In sixteen years he "rode the rods" over 16,000 miles of railroad, a perilous undertaking. His escapes from death are hair-raising. He froze

both feet on one trip. He worked in logging camps, on railroad construction jobs, as a harvest hand, shepherd, fisherman, even homesteaded on free government land in Oregon. He was now a member of the Socialist Party. He read Marx's *Capital* when it first appeared here in English; he read Engels, Kautsky, and other socialist writers. Little did he anticipate that without any formal education and self-taught, his own books would number over a dozen, and more than fifty pamphlets would later come from his busy pen. Historical, biographical, analytical, of politics and economics, they are now translated into practically all major languages and read avidly by youth all over the world, especially in the socialist countries.

He was attached to the Left-wing socialist forces, who opposed war, who fought to organize industrial unions, who were internationalists; later, in 1919, they became the majority of the Socialist Party and the core of the newly formed Communist Party. My first recollection of Bill Foster was in 1909, during an I.W.W. (Industrial Workers of the World) free-speech fight in Spokane, Washington. He was there as a reporter for a Seattle Left-wing Socialist paper called *The Workingman's Paper*. He was arrested, served two months in jail, and joined the I.W.W. He was then twenty-eight years old—tall, slender, blue-

eyed, soft-spoken, and well liked by all the workers. On his release he was placed on the committee that negotiated a successful termination of the fight, with the city fathers—an indication of his organizing ability which became famous ten years later. The anti-free speech ordinance, passed at the behest of the employment agencies, who smarted under the attacks of the I.W.W., was repealed.

In 1910 he made his first trip abroad, to study the labor movement of Germany and France. Since then he has made well over a dozen trips abroad. He studied German, French, Spanish, and Italian at that time and has since mastered Russian. He felt this was necessary to understand the workers' movements of other lands. At the International Trade Union Secretariat in Budapest, Hungary, in 1911, where the top trade-union officials from every country were present, he challenged the credentials of James Duncan, Vice-President of the A. F. of L., and demanded a seat for the I.W.W. The conference debated the issue for two days and the then unknown American worker, Foster, was long remembered by all present, especially by the embarrassed Mr. Duncan.

On his return from Europe, Foster questioned the I.W.W. tactics of "dual unionism," proposing that it concentrate on organizing the unorganized and dissolve its dual unions, sending these members back

into the A. F. of L. unions of their craft, such as mining, railroad, printing, etc. He anticipated the C.I.O. by many years. He left the I.W.W. when his plan was rejected, and became an organizer of the Railway Carmen's Union in the Chicago district. He worked in the freight yards. Walking to work one day, frustrated by long hours and inactivity, he planned a campaign to organize the workers in the great Chicago packinghouses, whom the A. F. of L. had long neglected. Within the next two years he headed campaigns on a national scale, which organized 200,000 packinghouse workers and 400,000 steel workers, the first two mass-production industries to be organized in this country. Of course he did not do it alone and single-handed. It was possible first because of his faith in the workers and secondly because he secured the support of the Chicago Federation of Labor and forced the cooperation, even though grudgingly, of those unions that should be involved in such a campaign.

Workers were fired and a national strike vote carried almost 100 per cent. With the huge wartime demand for foodstuffs, the packers could not afford a strike nor would the government permit it. Instead it instituted arbitration proceedings, which were highly dramatic. For three weeks the workers exposed the conditions. Many were immigrants, many were Negroes. Foster

describes it in his *Pages From a Worker's Life* as follows: "These workers' stories were an epic of proletarian poverty, misery, and exploitation; a long recital of starvation, exhausting labor, sickness, mutilation, ignorance, drunkenness, insanity, despair and death." In December, 1917, the Federal Mediation Commission granted the right to organize and a ten percent wage increase, seniority and no discrimination. In March, 1918, the Federal War Administrator of the packing industry announced ten to twenty-five percent wage increases, *retroactive*, an eight-hour day, overtime pay, equal pay for men and women, a guaranteed five days' work a week, and lunch periods with pay. At that time such gains were an extraordinary victory. One hundred and twenty-five thousand workers of the Big Five plants received six million dollars in back pay.

While Bill sat in the packing hearings, he had a plan in his pocket for organizing steel—then the citadel of the open shop. His union continued to pay him and the Chicago Federation endorsed the campaign. Fifteen international unions agreed to a joint effort and grudgingly gave \$100 each to it. Foster remarked with bitterness: "You'd think they were setting out to organize a bunch of peanut stands instead of half a million unorganized workers."

But he proceeded, with a will

power as strong as the steel they made in the big plants. His philosophy is set forth as follows: "*I was never one of those who considered the organization of workers such a huge task. . . . The problem in any case is to develop the proper organization crews and systems and the freedom-hungry workers, skilled and unskilled, men and women, black and white, will react almost as naturally and inevitable as water runs downhill.*" The *New Republic* referred to him and his work as "a miracle of organization."

By June, 1919, there were 100,000 workers in the unions and a 95 per cent strike vote followed the refusal of arbitration. By September 30, there were 365,000 workers on strike in fifty cities in ten states. Twenty workers were killed. Terror reigned. Picketing and meetings were forbidden. Foster was pictured as the chief Red in America, starting a revolution for the Bolsheviks of Russia. After three and a half months, in spite of the magnificent unity of the workers as long as possible, the strike ended in January 1920. But Foster had blazed a trail. Sixteen years later, the C.I.O. followed much the same plan, and supported with a half-million dollar organizing fund, built a steel workers union. Philip Murray, President of that union, once said: "There's one Communist my door is always open to, Bill Foster, for what he did for the steel workers." His battle-cry, "Organize

the unorganized into industrial unions," became the watchword of the C.I.O. campaign.

Up to 1920 Foster's whole attention had gone to the problems of union organization. He was a labor leader of the highest calibre. But he was also a Socialist. In 1921, he visited the Soviet Union as a reporter for the Federated Press. He was tremendously interested, as were all progressive Americans, in this new-born workers' republic, although he was sceptical of socialism developing in any but a highly developed industrial country. He saw it was a hard and bitter struggle but became convinced that those resolute people, not unlike the steel and packing house workers here, could win through to socialism. He saw it as "*just what I have been fighting for all my adult life. What mattered the difficulties of the situation? My class was fighting a desperate revolutionary struggle and my place was in its ranks to help however I could. I must stand shoulder to shoulder with the embattled Russian workers, win, lose, or draw. I became convinced that the workers would eventually win.*" It was that simple forty years ago to Bill Foster, American worker, Socialist, and internationalist. He knew unhesitatingly which side he was on, anywhere in the world—on the workers' side against the landlords, bankers, capitalists, and for Socialism.

Bill Foster was greatly pleased

to discover that Lenin, the great leader of the October Revolution, agreed with him on what had been disparagingly dismissed by many Left-wing groups here as "boring from within"—or working in the existing trade unions. Lenin's views were widely quoted in Left-wing circles and this helped to build the Trade Union Educational League of which Foster was then Secretary. It played an active role in the coal strike in Illinois in 1922, in a building trades strike in Chicago. Foster was welcomed everywhere by militant workers, his labor reputation was nationwide. In 1922, during a railroad workers' strike of 400,000 men, Foster was kidnapped in Denver, Colorado, and dumped out in the desert of Wyoming, and in 1923 he was shot at by a gunman, while speaking at a workers' meeting in Chicago. He was arrested in 1922 as a result of a Communist convention at Bridgeman, Michigan. He had joined the Party in 1921. But he was acquitted of a charge of criminal syndicalism.

"Save the unions" became the slogan of the late twenties, with a drive for company unions and open shop let loose everywhere. Then the Hoover depression hit the nation. Unemployed demonstrations and hunger marches were organized by the Communist Party. The first national demonstrations were organized in March 1930, which brought nearly two million workers

into the streets. Foster, with Robert Minor, Israel Amter, and Harry Raymond, were arrested and jailed in New York City, in a march on the City Hall, leading 110,000 workers. These demonstrations laid the basis for relief, W.P.A. and P.W.A., unemployment insurance, etc. They netted the working class millions of dollar in relief, jobs, and insurance. "The Right to Work or Bread" was won with the leadership of "Reds" like William Z. Foster.

In 1932 his hard life of overwork and privation, struggle, and jailings took its toll and he suffered his first heart attack. His illness necessitated a long period of inactivity, hard for him to bear, and he found an outlet then in writing. His books include *The Negro People in American History*, *American Trade Unionism*, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, *History of the Three Internationals*, *Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement*, *History of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.*, *From Bryan to Stalin*, *Pages from a Workers' Life*, *The Great Steel Strike*, *The New Europe*, *The Twilight of World Capitalism*, *Organizing the Mass Production Industries*, and *Misleaders of Labor*. Besides these are a host of pamphlets and articles, too numerous to list here. In spite of the handicap of increasing illness he continues to be a prolific writer on all current subjects, and even when he was no longer able to use

his right hand he dictated to others.

William Z. Foster has not been able to travel and speak publicly in late years, handicapped by his serious illness. In all his younger years he was a man of action, having contact with thousands of American workers. Therefore it is a real treat for him, a wonderful way to celebrate his 80th birthday on February 25, to be able to revisit the pioneer land of socialism. His last visit there was before the war. He will find a new world and hear of its great accomplishment in every field of human endeavor. It is a wonderful experience, a culmination and fruition of one's lifetime of struggle for Socialism, to be able to see it in reality with one's own eyes. All his many American comrades, friends, old-time fellow-workers wish him well on this happy birthday and a return to health, in the peace and joy of a socialist land. The best present all of us here can make to Bill Foster there, is to pledge to work harder and more resolutely among the American people, for peace, democracy, and socialism in our own country. His great deeds in the class struggle of the workers of America can never be forgotten and are an inspiration to give us strength, courage, and wisdom to complete the historical task of building socialism in this, his native land. Love and good wishes and salute to a true son and leader of American labor, William Z. Foster.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL

Seven years ago, the Virginia Legislature, in the process of "modernizing" and "streamlining" its list of legal holidays decided to drop Thomas Jefferson's birthday, but to retain Robert E. Lee's.

A reactionary ruling class, having policies and desires which violate true national interest and affront human feelings, naturally finds embarrassing the progressive, democratic, and revolutionary traditions of the country it bestrides. This truth has been dramatically emphasized in the tremendous propaganda campaign being conducted around the Centennial of the Civil War (1961-1965). It is really not possible for the rulers to ignore so enormous and transforming an event as the Civil War, costing, as it did, the lives of 600,000 Americans. Hence, they have taken the bull by the horns and are trying to turn the commemoration into an orgy of chauvinism, an apologia for treason, a celebration of counter-revolution. In doing this, they are spitting in the faces of nineteen million Negro citizens, insulting all democratic-minded Americans, desecrating the grave of the martyred Lincoln, and repudiating the historic content of the great Civil War, as he enunciated it at Gettysburg, namely to vindicate "the proposition that all men are created equal," and, in that vindication to assure our nation "a new birth of freedom" so that the cause of popular rule "shall not perish from the earth."

Just as the decisive rulers of our country today prefer Franco to Castro, so out of our past they prefer Jefferson Davis to Thomas Jefferson, and Robert E. Lee to Frederick Douglass. Just as monopoly capitalism finds it natural now to unite politically with feudal powers, so it finds it natural to unite ideologically with the slavocracy. Examining the pronouncements of the federal government, of the state governments, and the enormous propaganda output of the ruling circles induced by the Civil War Centennial, it is clear that what is desired is the triumph of Dixiecratism today to assuage the "terrible tragedy" of the Confederacy's defeat yesterday.

The official line was laid down in President Eisenhower's proclamation designating the Centennial; it was repeated in the ceremonies simultaneously and "impartially" held at the tombs of Grant and Lee; it is being

reiterated, with "scholarly" trimmings—notably in the disgusting writings of Bruce Catton—in every media of mass propaganda. This line is: "let bygones be bygones" (as Eisenhower also urged with reference to the Nazi leaders); praise for the "splendid courage" and "devotion to principle" shown by "both sides"; the conflict as a lily-white one, with the Negro—if mentioned at all—appearing as an object, not a subject of history (hence, it was fitting that Eisenhower's official Centennial Committee was all-white); the conflict as a "tragic mistake" reflecting the "evil influences" of "fanatics" on "both sides"; the War resulting from a failure of democracy; above all, an equating of "both sides" and a concerted effort to hide any hint of the real nature, sources, conduct, consequences and meaning of the great event.

Accompanying this desecration of the Centennial is an aggressively racist campaign, both official and non-official. Southern states—Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama—have appointed Commissions charged with the duty of justifying segregation and racism and have appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars for the propagation of these ideas—especially in the North. A magazine—*South, the News Magazine of Dixie*—is now issued every other Monday in Birmingham devoted exclusively to this purpose; delegations consisting of State officials and provided with public monies are now touring dozens of communities—especially in the North—defending discrimination.

* * *

Certainly the centennial of the Civil War needs commemoration, both in terms of an occasion to ponder the realities of our nation's past and the lessons these offer for the needs of the present. Those realities and lessons challenge the values and purposes of the present rulers; no wonder they systematically lie and distort them. What are some of these realities and lessons that partisans of equality and democracy should understand?

First, the origins of the war in the conspiratorial and counter-revolutionary purposes and acts of the slave-holding oligarchy must be emphasized. Here can be brought to the fore, from our own history, where the source of violence lies when considering great social movements—with the forces of reaction which turn to force to stem social progress if they feel that no other method will succeed and if they possess the power to offer such violence. Included in the concept of the counter-revolutionary origins of the Civil War, is the unpopularity of secession with the vast majority of Southern people—in the first place, the 35 percent who were Negro, but also the majority of white people. This latter point is of the greatest importance

in combatting the myth of a monolithic, "solid (white) South," which tends to identify the traditions of the South with the purposes of the slaveowners and to make Southernism and Dixiecratism identical. The South was and is an intensely divided society and it has developed many traditions—of rich and poor, of slave and master, of worker and boss, of field-hand and overseer, of Negro masses and white elite. The rich have ravished the South; but they are not the South.

Nothing more dramatically illustrates the centrality of the Negro question in American history than the Civil War. For here one sees that the special oppression of the Negro people and the racism derived from and bulwarking that oppression, basically caused that War and very nearly drove this Republic to suicide.

The actualities concerning the decisive role of the Negro masses in the fighting of the War and in its outcome—as organizers, agitators, soldiers and seamen, workers and guides, pilots and scouts—constitute a shattering blow against racist mythology and smashing refutations against chauvinism. At the same time, the inextricable unity between the salvation of the Union and the elimination of slavery demonstrates again the central nature of Negro history for all of American history.

While fundamental to the sources of the War was division between Negro and white, equally basic to the winning of the War was the achievement of Negro-white unity. That achievement was very far from perfect, but the great fact is that saving the United States in 1861-1865 did require Negro-white joint struggle; it required that the Negro and the white fight together and die together if the scourge of slavery was to be removed from both, if the cause of democracy was to be advanced and if the integrity of the Republic was to be preserved.

The class character of the War, in terms of its conduct, is a dramatic feature. In the South, the common belief was that it was "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight"; there popular disaffection, from both Negro and white, was a basic cause for the complete defeat of the Confederacy. In the North, too, this being a bourgeois-democratic effort, it is noteworthy that it was the working and farming masses—native and foreign-born, Negro and white—who bore the greatest share of the burden of winning the battle. It was the rich who fought the war in the counting-house; and it was from among the rich and the officer caste that one found the greatest proportion of copperheadism and treason. Where one had organized working-class elements, as in the early trade unions, these participated often en

masse—sometimes retaining their organizational identities—in defense of the Republic.

The significant pro-Union role of the Marxist component of the working class, on the international theatre—led personally by Karl Marx through the First International—is relatively well-known. Less well-known is the sectarianism that appeared among some in the United States, invoking the name of Marx, which put forth the position that a Marxist could not choose between two sides in a war, one of which was led by slaveholders and the other by capitalists. Happily, at this time Marx was alive and when appealed to on this point, confessed astonishment that anyone could possibly think that in his name could be justified abstention from a war where the question of the fate of chattel slavery and the concepts of democracy as enunciated in the Declaration of Independence were at issue. It is in this connection that Marx enunciated the great truth: “Labor with a white skin cannot emancipate itself where labor with a black skin is branded.”

The fact of international solidarity—regularly made grounds today for charging “seditious conspiracy”—is central to the history of our Civil War. Generally speaking this demonstrated itself in mass support as contrasted with governmental coolness if not hostility (one exception, for particular reasons that space does not permit developing, was Czarist Russia, whose government *and* people favored Lincoln); especially important was popular support in Great Britain, France, Canada and Mexico.

The War throws light on the process and meaning of Revolution. What begins as a counter-revolutionary effort, develops through necessity and struggle, into a revolutionary one, destroying slavery, preserving an advanced bourgeois-democratic republic, vindicating the ideology of the Declaration of Independence, pushing forward the forces of productivity as represented by industrial capitalism versus slavery, and making possible strong efforts for further significant working-class and democratic advances.

Not least important in this revolutionary process was the role of the Executive in advancing it—through specific acts by the President; and the role of Constitutional Amendment, especially the Thirteenth, wherein several billions of dollars worth of private property were confiscated on the grounds that continued possession thereof was adverse to social health and to human progress.

Finally, of outstanding importance in any contemplation of the Civil War's Centennial is the War's unfinished business though ten decades have passed since its beginning. It is this, of course, which basically explains the total commitment of the ruling class' propaganda apparatus to the com-

memoration. This is not a matter for antiquarians and it is not a matter of tradition alone, no matter how one interprets tradition.

This is, and most decisively for the present, a question of recognizing and evaluating the unfinished business of the Civil War. The Amendments resulting from the War remain fundamentally only paper directives, for the real freedom of the Negro people has not yet been won and their citizenship still is largely denied. In political and social and economic life, segregation—the filthy offspring of slavery—remains dominant, and ideologically, racism also remains undefeated.

It is because of this that Lincoln's Gettysburg Address still rings with the most intense and current meaning. The real commemoration of the Civil War is a renewed dedication to the promises evoked by the Martyr a century ago and a determination to achieve on a level appropriate for our time the complete and absolute freedom, the perfect equality of Negro men and women in every sphere of life.

* * *

The Centennial has but begun; with Eisenhower and the dispensations he made, it has begun very badly. But changes were made so far as the Republican Administration was concerned; let the necessary changes be made now in the remaining years of the Centennial. President Kennedy must re-examine the Eisenhower Centennial Commission and appoint one of men and women—Negro and white—who will aim at the vindication of Lincoln and Douglass, not Davis and Lee. As in all other phases of American life, this change *can* be made, but it will not come of itself. The Kennedy Administration will move on this matter, in a popular and democratic and progressive direction—as on all other matters—only to the extent that mass pressure and demands make it so move.

In every popular organization—Negro and white, and in every public facility, from school to library, the demand should arise for this democratic and anti-racist kind of commemoration of the Civil War. In trade unions, in Jewish people's organizations, in churches, in community forums, in various civil rights and civil liberties organizations, the task should be undertaken of commemorating the Civil War Centennial in the spirit of the Gettysburg Address and in the spirit—and the enforcement of the letter—of the Civil War Amendments.

By W. Alphaeus Hunton

DURING THE PAST YEAR the anti-imperialist revolution in Africa has entered into a new phase. The significant fact concerning the achievement of political independence during 1960 by some eighty millions of Africans is that the present twenty-six African-governed states, comprising more than two-thirds of the total population of Africa, have for the first time in modern history regained the power of exercising sovereign control over the major part of the continent and of *determining for themselves*—if they use their power effectively—the further course of the revolution for the complete liberation of Africa.

Some seventy-seven million Africans yet remain under alien rule and they include the forty-two millions in Algeria, South Africa and South West Africa, the Portuguese colonies and Rhodesia. Racist dictatorship by the resident white minority, coupled with heavy European and American investments in these territories—with the war in Algeria now in its seventh year and mass murders and jailings occurring periodically to maintain the *status quo* in the others—marks them as especially grave threats to the whole of Africa and the peace of the world. And we must, of course, include among these danger areas the former Belgian Congo, whose independence

was in effect quickly snatched away when it was seen that Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba was not content with being merely an obedient care-taker for the vested interests of *Union Minière* and its fellow-exploiters of the country.

How will the independent African states with their 165 million people face the problem of bringing all the rest of the continent under the banner of freedom? Will the wave of political advance sweep irresistibly onward, or will its momentum be dissipated by cross-currents of compromise and capitulation and by a strong undertow of African disunity?

Sékou Touré, President of the Republic of Guinea—whose government and people have demonstrated *in action* the real meaning of no compromise with imperialism—has predicted that all of Africa will be free within five years. But, needless to say, there are those in Johannesburg, Paris, London, Washington, and elsewhere who are thinking and planning otherwise. At the very time when the admission of the new independent African states into the United Nations was being loudly acclaimed last year, there came to light a counter-revolutionary conspiracy, backed by a coalition of the imperialist powers, to employ the facade of African political independence in many of the newly sovereign states,

especially those of the so-called “French Community” as an instrument for blocking further advance toward real freedom and for preserving and extending the essential element of imperialist control, economic domination, in Africa. The general outlines of the conspiracy became evident during the recent UN General Assembly deliberations on what to do about the Congo and the accreditation of its UN representatives, and on the issue of the proposed referendum in Algeria under UN supervision.

NEW TACTICS

The strength of the African nationalist movement, together with the power of the socialist world which supports its aims, has made it necessary today in most of Africa for the colonial powers to abandon their customary procedure of answering freedom demands with bullets. With the exceptions already noted in Algeria and elsewhere, they no longer openly oppose political independence; instead they endeavor to arrange that in the emerging states, power is handed over to African leaders who will continue to keep them subservient in fact to their former colonial masters. So long as no African finger is placed on their mines and other holdings, they are quite willing for new flags to be raised over African capitals and for the representatives of the new states

to take their seats in the United Nations.

The European masters, however, are compelled in turn to yield a larger share of their African spoils to the bigger boss, the United States, upon whom they are dependent for help in salvaging what they can of their dwindling empires. Thus, colonialism tends to assume an international form. Collective arrangements replace unilateral control. The capitalist powers seek to coordinate their efforts toward maintaining their control and promoting their further exploitation of African resources, though not always succeeding in hiding the stresses and strains resulting from the dominating role of the United States in the partnership.

In the sphere of foreign private investment there has emerged in the last few years an increasing number of multi-national and multi-million-dollar mining, oil exploration, and other undertakings in many areas of Africa. Liberia's rich iron ore deposits, for example, are being worked by a combination of American, Canadian, and Swedish interests in partnership with the Liberian government, and with a West German steel consortium entering a \$50 million bid to join the party. In Gabon, one of the new French community republics in West Africa, a U.S.-French syndicate is exploiting the Mekambo iron ore deposits, with Bethlehem Steel Corp. holding a 50 per cent interest. In the

same territory another Franco-American consortium is concerned with manganese extraction, and in this the U.S. Steel Corp. holds 49 per cent control.

The big FRIA bauxite mining and refining project in Guinea, launched a year before its independence, is also dominated by American capital, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. (48.5 per cent), but it includes French, British, Swiss, and West German interests. In Mauritania, further to the north on the west coast, French, British, Italian and West German companies have combined in one more iron ore extraction project.

In South Africa, American capital plays an increasingly influential role in mining as well as manufacturing and secondary industries. An American, Charles W. Engelgard, has lately become chairman of the important Rand Mines group. The new £100 million South African mining investment program, announced last December at the very time when the revolting racism practiced by Verwoerd and his government was once again being assailed in the UN General Assembly, is typical of the monopoly interests' cynical indifference toward human values and human life. In the same category is the manner in which French and American would-be investors have pressed their oil hunt in Algeria despite the clear warning from the Algerian Provisional Government

of the folly and danger of this action.

In keeping with its policy of giving a helping hand to investment projects abroad in which American interests have a financial and/or raw materials stake, as in South Africa, Rhodesia, Liberia, and the Congo, the World Bank, whose President, Eugene Black, made a personal tour of Africa last year, has assisted these new joint-investments. A \$35 million loan went to underwrite the railway and other basic services required by the manganese-extraction syndicate in Gabon, and \$66 million for the same purpose went to the international trust, MIFERMA, in Mauritania. When American corporations last year evinced concrete interest in the Volta River project and formed a consortium with British and Canadian interests to handle the aluminum smelter construction, Ghana finally received long-sought assistance from the World Bank to the amount of \$39 million for the project, plus \$45 million in U.S. and British loans.

Europe and America need Africa's raw materials, it is said over and over again *ad nauseum*. What does Africa need? The answer, explicit or implied, is that what is good for Europe and America must perforce be good for Africa. Many Americans and others who have the reputation of being "liberal" and "progressive" in their approach to African problems are found wanting

on this test; they, too, subscribe to this colonialist notion.

AMERICA'S NEW FRONTIER

The men from Washington and Wall Street move in before the departing colonial officials (those not remaining as "advisers" to the Africans) can get their baggage out. "Africa is America's new frontier for trade and investment," said W. Clifford Shields, president of Farrell Shipping Lines, addressing the National Foreign Trade Council three years ago. "American government and business men are recognizing fully that continent's great strategic and economic importance." A chorus of other American voices have taken up the refrain.

The British flag was yet aloft in Nigeria last year when agents of the Ford Foundation and Rockefeller interests, among others, arrived for on-the-spot investigation of investment possibilities, and when the Bank of America and Chase Manhattan Bank in Lagos opened their doors for business.

Everyone read the fantastic story last July of Edward Detweiler's bid to buy up control of the Congo's entire mineral, oil, and hydroelectric resources. But little was heard of other more solidly-backed proposals which were made at the same time by the J. H. Whitney interests (John Hay Whitney, at the time U.S. Ambassador in London*) and

the finance house of Dillon-Read (Douglas C. Dillon, at the time U.S. State Department Under-Secretary**). The representative of these American financial giants was Mr. John Ganshof Van der Meersch, who in 1959 formed the American-Eurafrican Development Corporation "with the object of meeting the financial needs of emerging African nations when the former colonial powers left" (*West Africa*, July 30, 1960). Who is this enterprising gentleman? He is an American citizen whose father, Walter Ganshof Van der Meersch, was the Belgian Resident Minister in the Congo charged with handing over authority to Prime Minister Lumumba.

Another example of the new missionaries of American capitalism is Mr. Anthony Marshall, one-time U.S. Consul in Istanbul, and presently, with his father, a member of one of the important New York Stock Exchange firms. His enterprise, known as the African Research and Development Company, established early last year, proposes to serve as the financial representative or intermediary for American corporations interested in investing in or trading with African countries.

It is customary to describe United States policy in relation to Africa as being confused and uncertain, twisted this way and that by the

* Now publisher of the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*.
** Now Secretary of the Treasury.—Ed.

dilemma of choosing between alienation of the African nations and alienation of America's European colonial allies. Though perhaps true in some respects, this description is basically false in that it represents the United States as an innocent bystander on the sidelines of the African revolution, and hides from the world—and above all from Africans and Americans themselves—the fact that the primary determinant of United States government policy with respect to African problems is that country's *own economic stakes and aspirations* in Africa.

THE CONGO QUESTION

Mohammed Yazid, Information Minister of the Provisional Government of Algeria, told the National Press Club in Washington last December that the United States expressed anti-colonialist sentiments one day a week and supported colonialism the other six days. President Eisenhower came briefly to the UN last fall to proclaim, in somewhat vague and general terms, his government's support for African freedom and progress. But when it came down to concrete questions of the Congo and Algeria in the General Assembly, the U.S. delegation was invariably on the side of the Africans' oppressors and exploiters.

On the Congo question the United States assumed openly and aggres-

sively the role of chief strategist and director of the shameful manipulations whereby the United Nations assisted in pushing aside the democratically elected Congolese Parliament and the popularly supported administration of Prime Minister Lumumba in order to hand over absolute control to Congolese servants of Brussels and Washington.

The months preceding the declaration of the Congo's "independence" were characterized by much United States activity which foreshadowed the shape of things to come. In March the State Department arranged for the transfer of senior foreign service personnel from Brussels to Leopoldville, and for numerous Congolese political leaders to come visit in the United States. In April came the announcement of new loans totalling \$40 million from the World Bank (European and American banks participating) for bolstering up the economy of the Belgian Congo, followed in May by a U.S. mission's visit there to determine what American technical and financial "help" would be required after independence.

It was to preserve the economic dependence of the Congo upon the West that the UN intervention requested by Lumumba to repel Belgian aggression was used instead to strip him of power and deliver him finally as a prisoner into the hands of the Congolese renegades. By early November the United

States, to quote the *Christian Science Monitor* (Nov. 7, 1960), had "emerged in the position of backstopping the Kasavubu-Mobutu-Bomoko faction publicly in the United Nations. . . . Clearly, observers say, the stakes must have been regarded as huge in Washington."

Having provided the money for the United Nations' representatives in the Congo to pay Mobutu's counter-revolutionary army, and having forced the handing over of Congo's seat in the UN to Kasavubu's representatives, the United States government proceeded to defend the arrest and jailing of Lumumba as legally justified and to express "every confidence in the good faith of Belgium in its desire to be of assistance in the Congo." Assistance, yes, to the enemies of the independence and territorial integrity of the Congo.

Despite loud and indignant protests from several African and Asian states against these United States maneuvers and against putting the United Nations at the service of the imperialists, the latter were able to get what they wanted done in the Congo—at least for the moment—due, in large measure, to the division in the Afro-Asian group of members caused by the defection of the newly admitted African states of the "French Community."

Sékou Touré in his address to the General Assembly on October 10 had warned:

The massive entrance of African states (into the UN) has to be viewed with caution. In point of fact, some feel that they can disguise behind noisy applause their secret desire to ensure African votes in the United Nations which can be used not for the emancipation of Africa and the struggle for world peace, but solely for their own specific needs and causes—in other words, the strengthening of their economic positions primarily in Africa and Asia.

EUROPEANIZED AFRICANS

When Guinea, alone of all the French colonies in Africa, voted for independence by saying "No" to De Gaulle's constitutional proposals in October 1958, Léopold Sédar Senghor, now President of Senegal, is said to have remarked, "Poor Sékou. Never again will he stroll up the Champs Elysées." The comment reflects a basic difference between African leaders such as Sékou Touré and Modibo Keita, President of the Republic of Mali, and other leaders such as Senghor and Mamdou Dia of Senegal or Dr. Felix Houphuet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast. The former have their roots in Africa. The latter, by background and association, tend to identify themselves with the French élite.

"We are Africans," declares Guinea's President, "our problems are African, our thoughts and our objectives are fundamentally African. We do not and never will re-

nounce, for any subsidy whatever, our origin and our personality, because there is no dignity for any people who lack consciousness of and respect for their personality and their liberty."

At the celebrations of the proclamation of independence, last year at Dakar, Abidjan, Brazzaville and other capitals of France's ex-colonies, while joyous throngs hailed the reconquest of their freedom, various African leaders used the occasion to eulogize General de Gaulle and all that the French, so they said, had done for the advancement of their countries to independence. Worse, these orators avoided even mentioning that it was the militant struggle of the African people themselves that had brought them their freedom. They said not a word in memory of the African martyrs slain by the French during the bloody repressions in the Ivory Coast, Madagascar and elsewhere during the 1940's and earlier.

Yet, regardless of whether the leaders to whom power is transferred are ready to betray their responsibility, it must not be forgotten that the accession of each African state to international sovereignty is a victory for the people, a victory for the whole of Africa in the fight against imperialist domination. Political independence, though not a final goal in itself, opens the door to cultural, social, and economic independence. Those who try to put

their foot in the door and keep it from being opened wide will sooner or later be pushed out of the way by the African masses. For they insist on freedom meaning something quite different from what it does to the striped-pants gentlemen who scurry back and forth to consult their master in Paris.

WHICH WAY NIGERIA?

Africa's most populous country, Nigeria, is another newly independent state counted on by the neo-colonialists to assist them in their counter-revolutionary schemes. "There is a danger," says the British journal, *West Africa* (Oct. 1, 1960), "that too many people outside Africa are expecting Nigeria not only to make a major contribution to African stability but to give a new lead to the continent to reverse some present tendencies which are arousing uneasiness."

The political party at the helm of the Federation of Nigeria has its main support in the most politically and socially backward regions of the country, the feudal North. The Nigerian leaders' current aloofness to proposals for a strong union of African states gets a nod of approval in western capitals. So also do statements like that of the Finance Minister, Chief Festus Okotie-Eboh, during his visit to the United States last year: "We do not believe in nationalizing things that do not belong

to us. We believe we have a stable government and investors who put their money in Nigeria can keep it, invest it as they wish, and take away any profits whenever they wish."

American business interests appear to be taking Chief Festus at his word, and Liberia has reason to fear for the loss of its pre-eminence as the chief West African repository of U.S. private investments. Besides the examples of this investment zeal previously mentioned, let us note the more than \$2 million put into the establishment of four Pepsi-Cola bottling plants in various parts of Nigeria last year, accompanied there and elsewhere in Africa by a big sales build-up campaign featuring trumpeter Louis Armstrong singing, "You Like Satchmo, Pepsi brings you Satchmo, so you like Pepsi."

A good many Nigerians, however, are not at all happy about either Pepsi-Cola or the present course of the Nigerian government. There have been strong demands for the nationalization of foreign industries, notwithstanding what the Finance Minister and other leaders may say; for the replacement of the British civil servants yet remaining in many key posts by Africans; for putting a stop to the widespread graft in political circles and public affairs, and to the scandalous waste of state funds on Hollywood-type residences and over-size American automobiles for government ministers. Striking railway workers

clashed with the police last year and picketed the residence of the Minister of Labor demanding the release of their jailed leaders. And police using tear gas were required to disperse a crowd of some five hundred university students who descended on the Federal Parliament in Lagos last November, shortly after the attainment of independence, protesting against the military agreement concluded between Great Britain and Nigeria without public debate or sanction.

Unless deep-going reforms and changes of policy occur speedily, one is likely to see far more serious challenges to governmental authority developing in Nigeria.

RESISTANCE TO NEO-COLONIALISM

Indispensable in the designs of the neo-colonialists are the voices and UN votes of their African collaborators. The exposure, condemnation and elimination of this pro-imperialist African support is thus a centrally important task of the hour confronting all Africa. This task is a three-fold one, national, continental, and global. The three levels of action are inter-dependent: unless all go forward simultaneously, each supporting and gaining additional momentum from the others, there cannot be a positive victory registered on any one of the levels.

First, on the national level there is the internal fight within the vari-

ous African states against political leaders who are only the servants of foreign interests. A rising tide of protest can be expected against the continuing poverty and misery of the African masses which stands in such shocking contrast with the ostentatious luxury enjoyed by the privileged governing group. This mass upsurge cannot be curbed or sidetracked by jailing and proscribing the more outspoken and militant malcontents; others will come forward in their places. Nor can the U.S. State Department, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and others buy off the African labor movement, and bar it from achieving its goal of all-African trade union unity and fulfilling its vanguard role in the fight for genuine independence.

As crisis situations develop within the various states, the label "Communist" will, of course, be pinned willy-nilly on all opponents of neo-colonialism. Former Secretary of State Herter, commenting on President Nkrumah's speech to the last UN General Assembly in which he sharply criticized the UN operation in the Congo, said that the Ghana leader had "marked himself as very definitely belonging to the Soviet bloc," while American radio commentators, following the same line, called Nkrumah's speech a "carbon copy" of Khrushchev's. And in the Congo, Mobutu told reporters last October, "The only thing that up-

sets Mr. Tshombe is the presence of the Communists—and that goes for me, too."

Socialism, the systematic development of a nation's resources under the people's own management and by productive means belonging to them collectively, is, indeed, the only path which can lead African and other unindustrialized countries up out of the quagmire of colonial exploitation. But before they can express themselves in favor of socialism or any other economic program, the African masses must first get rid of those at the top who have been placed there for the very purpose of smothering democratic expression.

The second aspect of the fight against neo-colonialism entails the consolidation of effective united action among the independent African states that are firmly committed to an anti-imperialist stand, in order that they may defeat the new threat to their freedom. There was quick recognition of the urgency of such action in Accra, Conakry, Cairo and other African capitals. The meetings of the leaders of the "French Community" states last November and December at Abidjan, Nouakchott (Mauretania), Paris, Tunis, and Brazzaville — with Belgium's agents, Mobutu, Kasavubu, Tshombe, and Kalondji as prominent participants at the last-mentioned conference—were answered by the meeting of the Presidents of Guinea,

Mali, and Ghana at Conakry just before Christmas and by the larger gathering of heads of African states at Casablanca in January.

The Premier of Nigeria, Alhaji Abukakar Tafawa Balewa, says, "We do not like African governments condemning other African governments." But when certain of these governments, after achieving independence, have yet failed to recall their troops who are fighting with and for the French in Algeria, just as they did in Indo-China, it is hardly to be expected that they will be treated with respect and politeness by those who support the liberation of Algeria. Addressing the UN Political Committee during the debate on Algeria last December, Ishmael Touré, speaking for Guinea, declared, "African solidarity must not be sentimental in relation to a problem that is essentially political and which may directly determine the very future of the African continent. . . . Either we support the struggle of Algeria or we are instruments for the maintenance of foreign domination in Africa. Either we are for the final triumph of Algerian independence or else we are against the rehabilitation of the African personality."

The third and final facet of the marshalling of forces against the plotters of African neo-colonialism pertains particularly to the responsibilities of the peoples of Britain, France, and—above all—the United

States. It is essential that the working class and liberal forces of these and other Western countries understand fully and clearly the serious menace to world peace represented by these plotters and their machinations. It is imperative that the democratic forces of the West take action to prevent their governments from making Africa a Cold War or Hot War battleground under the pretext of saving Africa from the Communists.

In Algeria, in the Congo, and in the ex-French Cameroons—where a five-year long war against the French and against the puppet-regime of Ahidjo backed by French troops still continues despite the murder of two of the foremost Cameroonian patriots, Ruben Um Nyobe and Dr. Felix Moumie—in all three embattled countries the common, all-important issue is the right to the free and democratic exercise of political self-determination. In all three cases the United States and its dependencies in the United Nations opposed the exercise of this right, while the Soviet Union and the other socialist members of the world organization consistently supported it. In all three cases and everywhere else in Africa it is *Western* domination that the people are fighting to get rid of. Let the democratic forces of the West join with the African people and with their socialist supporters in saving Africa *for the Africans*.

TWO BOOKS ON THE NEW CUBA

CUBA — HOPE OF A HEMISPHERE

By Joseph North

Paperback \$1.00; Cloth \$2.50

In this splendid work of literary reportage, Joseph North gives a stirring account of what he saw and heard in revolutionary Cuba during his recent extended trip to that island.

Among its nineteen chapters are "Meet the Victorious Rebels"; "A Talk with 'Che' Guevara"; "What Cuban Communists Said"; "The Negro in Cuba"; "Why Cuba Expropriated"; "What the Revolution Is"; "Think, Americans!" and many others.

Joseph North is a seasoned and skillfull correspondent and his on-the-scenes reportage from the most important fighting fronts of the world have won him wide acclaim. His most recent book is NO MEN ARE STRANGERS, also published by International Publishers.

THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

By Blas Roca

Paperback \$1.25; Cloth \$2.50

This new book contains the complete text of General Secretary Blas Roca's comprehensive report to the Eighth Congress of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba, and provides a searching Marxist analysis of theory and practice which guided Cuba's revolution. It discusses the roots, character and aims of the revolution, its tasks and achievements, its class forces, its allies and enemies, the handling of the vital land question, how unity was forged, and the role of the working class and the Communist Party. It is indispensable for a basic understanding of Cuba's Revolution.

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway

New York 3, N. Y.