

political affairs

APRIL 1961 • 35 CENTS

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

[1] Notes of the Month

HERBERT APTHEKER

[21] The Question of an Anti-Monopoly Coalition

JAMES E. JACKSON

[34] The Cuban Revolution (II)

VICTOR PERLO

[46] The General Crisis of Capitalism Deepens

[60] Inside the Soviet Economy

**LESSONS OF THE STEEL RANK-AND-FILE
MOVEMENT**

By A. Krchmarek

[11-20]



ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

NEWLY-ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

VOL. XL, No. 4

APRIL, 1961

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER; Associate Editor: HYMAN LUMER

Notes of the Month

By The Editorial Board

LENIN AND THE NEW EPOCH

April marks the 91st anniversary of the birth of the great working-class leader, V. I. Lenin. The fruits of Lenin's towering genius are today evident in the fact that socialism embraces fully one-third of the world's people and is fast becoming the decisive force in social development. A fitting accompaniment to this year's anniversary, therefore, is the recent appearance of the English edition of the new Soviet manual, *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, which embodies the theoretical aspects of the new epoch in which we live.

It is characteristic of any truly profound theoretical analysis of social

development that it not only illuminates the past and present but also correctly foreshadows the future course of society, and so provides the foundation for further theoretical analysis in later stages of its development. Thus, in Karl Marx's day, free competition reigned in capitalist production and monopoly was exceptional. Yet Marx foresaw the growth of monopoly as a necessary consequence of the process of concentration of production and ownership inherent in the development of capitalism. In the 1890's, when monopoly had emerged as a prominent factor in capitalist production, Frederick Engels, in *Socialism: Utopian*

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.

208

and Scientific, was already dealing with the formation of trusts as a manifestation of the greatly increased socialization of production which had taken place.

This was the foundation on which Lenin, writing at a time when monopoly had not only become the dominant feature of capitalism but had already led to the outbreak of World War I, based his brilliant study of modern imperialism. In *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, he elucidated the distinctive feature of monopoly capitalism as a new stage in capitalist development, as the economic basis of imperialism. He showed that it is monopoly capital, with its drive for control of sources of raw materials and lucrative foreign investments, which is the source of colonialism and vastly intensified national oppression, and the breeder of imperialist wars to redivide the world.

But Lenin also recognized in imperialism the final stage of capitalism. He wrote: "We have seen that the economic quintessence of imperialism is monopoly capitalism. This very fact determines its place in history, for monopoly that grew up on the basis of free competition, and precisely out of free competition is the transition from the capitalist system to a higher social-economic order." (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, International Publishers, p. 123.) He saw monopoly capitalism as decaying, dying capitalism—as a

stage in which, on the one hand, the material conditions for socialism had ripened and in which, on the other hand, the contradictions of capitalism had become greatly sharpened and were being driven to their ultimate limits.

"It is clear, therefore," he wrote, "why imperialism is moribund capitalism, the *transition* to socialism: monopoly growing *out* of capitalism is *already* the dying of capitalism, the beginning of its transition to socialism." (*Collected Works*, International Publishers, Vol. XIX, pp. 328-329.) In short, Lenin showed, imperialism was *the eve of the socialist revolution*.

From his analysis, Lenin drew a number of basic conclusions which differed from earlier concepts. For example, Marx had believed socialism would be victorious in all or most major capitalist countries simultaneously. However, on the grounds that imperialism greatly accentuates the uneven development of capitalism in different countries, Lenin concluded that conditions for the socialist revolution would not mature everywhere at the same time, and that hence the victory of socialism first in one or a few countries was not only possible but necessary. This was, as we know, a conclusion of profound importance for the whole struggle for socialism.

Lenin's opponents sought dogmatically to hold on to the earlier ideas of Marx. And revisionism, both

in Lenin's day and since, has sought on the basis of such differences, to divide Lenin from Marx, to assert that the ideas of the two were basically in conflict, and to pose as supporters of Marx as against Lenin. But such views are totally unfounded, for it is clear that Lenin's analysis took as its starting point the basic theories of Marx, and that it was an application of these theories to a new historical situation, and hence a *further development* of them.

Lenin wrote when imperialism was the one all-embracing world system, when no force as yet appeared on the scene capable of seriously challenging it. Hence he defined the period at that time as one of wars and revolutions, marked by the inevitability of imperialist wars. Yet his conception clearly contained within itself the implications of a new and different epoch. For if imperialism was a stage of capitalism which placed the socialist revolution on the order of the day, it followed that it must embrace the victory of socialism, sooner or later, in one or more countries, and with this the breaching of the hitherto all-embracing front of world capitalism.

This began in Lenin's own time with the Great October Socialist Revolution, which he himself led, and which gave birth to the first land of socialism and plunged world capitalism into a state of general crisis—into "the period of its downfall and replacement by socialism,

the period when socialist revolutions and national-liberation movements against imperialism develop." (*Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, p. 318.) The general crisis of capitalism, born with World War I and the October Revolution, entered a new and deeper stage after World War II, which gave birth to a *number* of socialist countries and imparted a new upsurge to the national liberation movement.

The continued advance of socialism and the ever swifter march of national liberation in the years following the war were bound eventually to alter the relationship of world forces, leading to a stage in which imperialism had not only ceased to be the sole world social system, but had also ceased to be the *dominant* one—a stage in which it would be confronted by an ever greater superiority of the forces of socialism, national freedom and world peace arrayed against it.

It is just such a new epoch that has now actually come about. Its nature is summed up in the recent 81-Party Statement in these words:

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 the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of the transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

wide scale. ("Statement by 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties," *Political Affairs*, January, 1961.)

The new epoch, growing out of the new relationship of forces, in its turn gives rise to a number of basic conclusions differing from those held by Lenin to be valid in his time. These first began to receive systematic formulation at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., and were later more fully developed in the Twelve-Party Declaration. Among them is the conclusion that war is no longer inevitable and that peace and peaceful coexistence are practical, realizable goals even while capitalism continues to exist. Another is the conclusion that in a number of capitalist countries there exists the possibility of a peaceful, parliamentary transition to socialism.

Revisionist elements seek to dissociate these new theoretical concepts from Lenin's teachings. If war is no longer inevitable, they assert, it is because imperialism has changed its nature and Lenin's characterization of it is no longer valid. At the same time, dogmatists simply repeat what Lenin said forty and more years ago under quite different circumstances. They insist that since Lenin's conclusion as to the inevitability of war stems from the nature of imperialism, and that since this has not changed, war must continue to be inevitable as long as capitalism exists. They charge those who deny

this with revisionism and scrapping of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Both revisionists and dogmatists, each in their own way, arrive at the idea that Lenin's theoretical concepts are in conflict with those advanced today. And both are equally wrong. For it is clear that just as the new epoch is the inevitable outgrowth of the imperialism of Lenin's day—and above all the fruit of the great turning point in history ushered in by the October Revolution—so, too, do the new theoretical concepts flow from those of Lenin. They are firmly based on Lenin's concept of imperialism and its application in a period when the forces opposing it have gained the upper hand. They are thus a further development of his theories, just as his were in turn a further development of Marx's theories. Hence the new concepts are a demonstration of the fact that Marxism-Leninism is a living, growing body of scientific theory and not a collection of dead dogmas.

It is precisely this which stands out in the new manual, *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, and especially in its central section, "Theory and Tactics of the International Communist Movement." Here Lenin's theoretical contributions as the foundation of the present are made strikingly clear. We can therefore best pay tribute to his memory by striving to master and to develop further the theory and tactics of the present

NOTES OF THE MONTH

epoch, particularly in their application to our own country.

THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER

President Kennedy's Executive Order setting up the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity is an important partial victory in the struggle against job discrimination.

It can be of benefit not only to the Negro workers, the biggest sufferers from this evil, but to Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and other national minority groups. It will serve the vital self-interest of the white workers and of all organized labor who lose every time an employer carries through an act of divisive discrimination against a worker because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

This order comes about undoubtedly, in large part, because of the indispensable role of the Negro people in the 1960 elections, without whose votes Kennedy would not have been elected. Kennedy pledged during the campaign that, if elected, he would "tackle discrimination in every field of Federal activity by executive action." The present order can be seen as a down payment.

Secondly, the powerful influence and pressure of the Negro American Labor Council, to whose workshop conference in Washington the Presi-

dent sent a positive greeting, was not without its effects. The conference, which preceded the executive order by a few days, placed centrally in its deliberations the issue of job discrimination not alone among trade unions, but also in the Federal government and among private employers. And it spoke not only for the Negro trade unionists, the decisive backbone of the Negro people's movement, but also for important cross-sections of the entire Negro community. In addition, the burgeoning Negro movement in the South, with the pace-setting Negro student sit-ins, have already branched out into the field of job discrimination. The Negro people's movement, with increasing number of white youth supporters in the deep South, has never stopped its relentless pressure for civil rights, despite ebbs and flows.

By no means are the pressures which beat down upon the White House on this question exclusively domestic. Fourteen years ago, William Z. Foster, now chairman emeritus of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., declared that "the Negro question in the United States has become an international question." The colonial liberation movement in Africa in particular, but also in Latin America and Asia, have a positive affect upon the struggles of nineteen million Negroes in the U.S. for their free and equal citizenship rights. Finally, breathing down the neck of the Kennedy administration

and of U.S. imperialism in general is the challenge of peaceful competition from the Soviet Union and the world socialist system, where the national question has been solved, while under U.S. monopoly capitalism the national question is its Achilles heel.

Far from being a gift, willy nilly, from on high, President Kennedy's executive order is a result of mass struggles and popular pressures in no sense bounded by the water's edge of our own country.

Executive orders in this field of Federal activity are not new. President Franklin D. Roosevelt handed down the first one during World War II. Eisenhower promulgated a very much watered-down version, which, under the tutelage of Vice-President Nixon, never got off the ground. It was form without content. Unlike the Eisenhower committee, however, the Kennedy order is invested with certain punitive powers. Companies or sub-contractors doing business with the Federal government—and that would include all the multi-billion dollar war monopolies—which practice job discrimination, run the risk of having their contracts cancelled, prosecution, and must submit periodic reports of progress in compliance with the executive order.

Furthermore, this order, the first by the new President, must be considered in the context in which it was issued. The defeat of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration in the

1960 elections was a defeat for a President who, in six years of his term, had found it impossible to identify himself with the moral integrity of the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision and who regarded the Civil War defeat of the slaveowners as one huge "tragedy." Certain gestures of Kennedy—his intervention in the frame-up of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., his backing of the militant pro-labor Representative Adam Clayton Powell as chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee, his intervention against segregation by the Centennial Commission—all reflect the mandate of the people, Negro and white, for change from the racist do-nothingness of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration. Thus the conditions surrounding the issuance of the order are more favorable for its effective utilization than during the Eisenhower government.

The question is, however, what will be done with this executive order? Will it remain on paper, merely as an empty gesture, as during the previous Administration? Will President Kennedy vigorously enforce it, transforming its words into deeds? Will its issuance form an historical parallel with the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, passed in 1890, when its authors said frankly it was to curb the anti-trust sentiments among the masses instead of to curb the trusts?

The answers to these key questions

are in the hands of the working class, in particular the AFL-CIO, and of all segments of the Negro people's movement, and other democratic forces. Any concept that the order will be self-enforcing, that the masses can sit back without turning a picket sign or without initiative and united struggle, would be a surrender to self-defeating illusions. The order was won through struggle; it will be enforced through struggle. For it's the biggest monopolies that are the grand-daddies of job discrimination.

The limitations of the order provide no place for illusions. At best, it goes only part way. It cannot be viewed as a substitute for Fair Employment Practice legislation which would cover not alone contractors and sub-contractors doing business with the Federal government, but all employers whether doing business with the government or not. FEPC legislation is still badly needed.

Secondly, chairman of the new Committee is to be Vice-President Lyndon Johnson who has consistently played a role of blunting the necessary struggle against the Dixiecrats and who is authoritatively suspected of influencing civil rights legislation out of the President's "must" legislative program.

Thirdly, the order still leaves a great big loophole through which job discrimination can be imposed, namely, through political bias. The black-listing of workers because of their political views—in opposition to

the reactionary views of their employers—has become a stock means of job discrimination not only against Negro, Spanish-speaking and other minorities, but against white workers as well. This, indeed, is the fruit of the pro-fascist House un-American Committee which often operates as an adjunct to the anti-labor, anti-Negro personnel departments of the big corporations. There is no impenetrable wall between racial discrimination on the one hand and political and other types of discrimination on the other. They all operate unjustly to deny workers employment.

Finally, the failure of President Kennedy to include civil rights legislation in his "must" Congressional program, his temporizing with the school desegregation crisis in Louisiana, his cynical appointment of Charles Merriweather, the Alabama Ku Kluxer, to the Export-Import bank (which deals with Latin-American countries) these and other examples demonstrate that the President is following a policy of appeasement of the Dixiecrats, instead of tackling the G.O.P.-Dixiecrat coalition head-on, isolating and smashing it. The folly of appeasing these obstructionists was shown in the narrow escape of the President's depressed-areas bill from the furious opposition of Sen. Harry Boyd of Virginia. This appeasement attitude on the part of the President offers no guarantees whatsoever for the enforce-

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

ment of the new order, without the stepped up intervention of united mass action, especially in the deep South where many monopoly industries have sneaked away to avoid union wages and working conditions.

Once and for all a President of the United States should make a clean break with the policy that civil rights must be sacrificed in order to secure the enactment of other social legislation. This pernicious tactic poses Negro and civil rights against minimum wage, old age, health and other welfare measures, as if the former is disconnected with the latter, and plays into the hands of the racists and monopolists, who like nothing better than to divide the labor and people's movement, and to array white against Negro. Unfortunately, President Kennedy is playing the same game, and by so doing, is jeopardizing his entire, if limited, social program.

Quite the contrary, Negro and civil rights, corresponding to its centrality in both domestic and foreign affairs, should be the test of the entire social welfare program. This requires an all-out fight against the nemesis of all social legislation—the Dixiecrat-G.O.P. coalition, instead of appeasement. Considering the victorious election base of President Kennedy, among the Negroes and other minority groups, and among organized labor, few President have been in as strong a position as Kennedy for making this clean historic break from

sacrificing civil rights as the President. Failure to do so undermines the people's mandate. The new executive order offers an opportunity for the President to make a beginning in changing that age-old policy.

* * *

Coming at a time of vast and still growing unemployment, there is a dire need to put this order into practice, beginning April 10th when it takes effect. While the Negro workers are victimized with their white fellow workers because of the general economic crisis, they suffer special burdens because of racial discrimination. The proportion of Negro workers unemployed is in certain areas twice that of the white workers. Not only does this impose disproportionate hardships on the Negro families, but it further divides and weakens organized labor as a whole, and thus violates the self-interest of the white workers.

Enforcement of the new order suggests at least the following minimal considerations requiring Negro-white unity in strong mass actions and initiatives:

1. Mass pressure on Vice-President Johnson and President Kennedy to enforce the order against the big monopolists and corporations, particularly in the deep south.

2. Initiative on the part of Negro workers and their supporting white allies in and outside the labor movement in aggressively initiating cases before the new Committee.

NOTES OF THE MONTH

3. The initiative of labor and independent people's movements on a state and local scale to secure similar executive orders from governors and state legislatures and from mayors and city legislative bodies.

Negro-white unity against job discrimination should take place simultaneously with the unity of Negro-white workers in support of an overall program against unemployment and against the mass effects of the present general economic crisis. The inseparable nature of these struggles has been most effectively put forward in leaflet form by the U.S. Communist Party, an indispensable supplement to many proposals advanced by labor, Negro people and other organizations.

Special mention should be made of the sound anti-discrimination program adopted by the Negro American Labor Council at its recent workshop conference in Washington, D.C. It is a deep reflection on the top Meany officials of the AFL-CIO that the Federal government demonstrates more initiative on job discrimination than the Chairman of the AFL-CIO, even though the white supremacist attitude of Meany in no sense reflects that of the great body of AFL-CIO members, including many officials, as well as the rank and file.

It is also necessary to develop a far broader and more active campaign for Federal FEPC legislation, not to mention in the state legislatures and city councils. Job discrim-

ination should be banned from private as well as government-financed employment.

Finally, the issuance of the new executive order highlights the necessity for the most vital of all executive orders: one that abolishes Jim-Crow, segregation, and discrimination in all walks of life, political, economic, and social. The legal basis of the present executive order is the federal constitution.

The legal basis of an omnibus executive order would also be the Constitution of the United States, of which the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments form an integral part. Such an overall executive order could in one fell swoop outlaw the whole brutal and illegal jimm-crow system in the United States. Such is not only the active, unified demand of the Negro people and increasing numbers of their white allies—and such is not only the pressing challenge of this epoch. It is dictated by the mandate of the people in the 1960 election. Failure to do so only leaves favorable conditions for the numerous anti-Semitic, anti-Negro and anti-democratic fascist groups that are springing up throughout the country, as in the case of the John Birch "secret" society now with the official imprimatur of the Senate Internal Security Committee, headed by the rabid racist, Senator Eastland.

The Communist Party has an indispensable role to play in the struggle against job discrimination and

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

for the enforcement and extension of the new executive order. This role cannot be fully exercised merely as an observer or as an analyst of developments, least of all with superficial analyses. Nor can its role be fully discharged in the educational and ideological spheres, as vital as these are. For example, no greater contribution can the Party make ideologically than to show the connection between the civil rights struggle and the struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence, in particular the interdependence of the two struggles. Also the Party uniquely can help in fusing the general Negro people's movement around civil rights and human dignity with the fight against discrimination in jobs and apprentice training.

But above all, the all-round role of the Party in this movement must aim at becoming a dynamic political force, defending the militancy, united action, and independence of the Negro people's movement and championing the fundamental principle of Negro-white unity. In helping to set masses in motion, the Party must become much more an instrument of change, a Party of action. In no way can the Party display its vanguard role more effectively than by fighting for the immediate needs of the Negro workers, emphasizing the growing importance of the economic issues in the struggle for Negro rights, and in illuminating the path to wiping out once and for all job discrimination, and all other aspects of the Jim-Crow system, from the life of our country.

Lessons of the Steel Rank-and-File Movement

By A. Krchmarek

SIGNIFICANT LESSONS ARE to be drawn from experiences of the steel workers' rank-and-file Dues Protest Committee, later renamed the Organization for Membership Rights (OMR). The re-election of David McDonald without opposition to the presidency of the Union in 1961 ends one phase in the history of the movement. But it poses old as well as new questions. It provides both positive and negative lessons for the trade unions in America.

In 1957 the Dues Protest Movement emerged as a powerful expression of rank-and-file protest against the top leadership; in 1961 it is at a low ebb.

In 1957 more than 100 locals nominated Don Rarick to oppose McDonald for the presidency; in 1961 less than 20 locals nominated him, with 40 needed.

In the 1957 election Don Rarick, virtually unknown, polled 223,516 votes against 404,172 for McDonald; in 1961 he failed to be nominated.

In the 1956 steel convention Rarick voiced the moods of the steel workers and had their strong support; in the 1960 Convention he and others were subjected to physical violence in full

view of the assembly—but no one came to his defense.

The Dues Protest movement emerged in a period of relatively high production; it reached a low ebb at a time of mass unemployment and mounting problems for the steel workers.

Why and how did this happen in the space of 4 years? Was the OMR a legitimate rank-and-file movement? Was it a genuine voice of the steel workers? What are the dialectics of its rise and decline? It is now necessary to assess the meaning, role, makeup and the impact this movement has had.

A GENUINE MOVEMENT

Without any question the Dues Protest movement was a genuine vehicle of rank-and-file protest for the steel workers. It registered openly their concern and their dissatisfaction with the arbitrary action of the top union leadership in pushing through a substantial dues increase at the 1956 Convention over the deep resentment of the bulk of the membership.

The issue of a dues increase was

closely linked to that of inner union democracy. At that convention the Canadian delegates rebelled against the practice of appointment of their officers by McDonald. They fought for, and were beaten down on, the right to elect their officers.

The combination of these two seemingly simple and elementary questions provided the impetus for the emergence of a rank-and-file protest movement. The deep feeling of the workers on this issue found expression in the vote for Rarick in the ensuing union elections.

Therefore it is utterly false to designate the OMR, as some of its opponents have done, as being merely a factional group, or as being motivated mainly by personal ambition, or as a tool of the companies to split the Union. Even where signs of such tendencies may have existed, they were alien to the main character of the movement.

The leadership of this movement emerged spontaneously from the ranks, pushed to the fore by events themselves. In essence it was a raw, inexperienced leadership, but its very rawness gave it a boldness and authenticity that was real and close to the moods permeating the rank and file.

Nor did this movement achieve any high degree of organization at any time. It was actually a loose conglomeration of diverse elements and trends within the union—the spectrum ranging from the Left to

the extreme Right. From this flowed both its strength and its weaknesses, which inevitably began to show up in due time.

In an immediate sense the movement was based upon and was a reaction to issues arising out of the dues increase, and out of the erosion of inner union democracy over the years. But the roots of the movement lay much, much deeper. They went back to the time of Philip Murray's death, and to the coming to power of a new leadership which set a course away from militancy and struggle.

It was a revolt against the course pursued by McDonald,—a course which tended to ignore the nagging new problems created by swift technological changes in the industry, and understood under the general terms of speedup, work rules and above all, *automation*. The tendency of this leadership was to seek flashy fringe gains, but at the expense of struggle in the mills themselves.

McDonald's main approach to these problems was along the lines of "labor statesmanship," of a denial of the class struggle and for that matter of even the existence of classes as such. He developed the flashy concepts of "mutual trusteeship," and labor-management "partnership" (no doubt conceived by Goldberg) as guiding principles for dealing with problems arising out of the clash of interests between labor and capital. He even dramatized this

"new" concept of production relationships by touring the mills, arm in arm, with Ben Fairless, head of the U.S. Steel Corporation. It failed utterly to impress the steel workers.

Such "no-struggle" concepts by their very nature excluded the militant role of the masses of rank-and-file workers. Talks were conducted only by top executives of respective dynasties. The union leadership, in fact, viewed with fear and deep suspicion any form of mass initiative or mass activity.

The top sought to limit decisions and the initiation of all actions to the leading bodies only, under the firm control of McDonald himself. It could thereby limit to vague generalities in the face of deepening problems of the class struggle, and actually seek to rely on the goodwill and cooperation of the steel corporations to solve the many acute problems.

CHANGES IN THE INDUSTRY

But this position of the union leadership flew directly in the face of reality. Great changes were being introduced into the process of steel making. Automation and the mass displacement of steel workers by machines and new processes were creating havoc with job security even in periods of relatively high production. According to McDonald, the number of workers in basic steel declined from 571,000 in 1953 to 435,

000 in 1960.

At the same time fundamental contradictions were created by the vast increase in steel making capacity in the years after World War II, based upon expansion of facilities, building of new, modern mills, and the modernization of existing equipment. By 1958, capacity had risen to 140 million tons a year, and since then it has grown to 152 million tons. Yet actual production of steel, based upon market demand, during the past ten years has averaged only 100 million tons a year. In 1960 it was 99,300,000 tons.

Nor were the companies satisfied with merely mechanical and technological changes. They waged an insistent drive to cut down the size of work crews, increase work loads, increase speedup by all sorts of devious means, all with the aim of eliminating as many workers as they could. It became clear that an inexorable process was at work which was creating the condition for the appearance of a permanent army of unemployed steel workers. This fact had been apparent for some years.

Furthermore, despite the denial of the existence of the class struggle by the top leadership, the mills were an arena of constant struggle and turmoil in resistance to the company pressures. Spontaneous work stoppages spread throughout the industry at the mill and department levels. They were unplanned and lacked coordination, guidance and leader-

ship. They were in violation of written contractual agreements. But they were the only means by which the steel workers could defend their jobs and their working conditions. The stoppages became practically a mass phenomenon. They were a danger signal which the leadership continued to disregard.

The resentment of the rank and file grew steadily. Thousands of grievances remained unsettled. It took years for a grievance to be processed—if it was processed at all. Cynicism spread among the workers and confidence in the union leadership declined.

Then to top it all, at the 1956 Convention the leadership engineered the passage of a \$2 a month dues increase and simultaneously increased McDonald's salary to \$50,000 a year plus expenses.

It was this culmination of all these factors that gave rise to the mass indignation and ferment which found expression in the Dues Protest Committee led by Don Rarick. But while it was sparked by the immediate source of irritation, it was actually the product of rising mass discontent with the failure of the top leadership to meet its responsibilities to the rank and file, who found themselves in constant battle with the steel corporations.

This was further emphasized in the union elections when Rarick polled almost a quarter a million votes—something totally unexpected. To

this day many steel workers contend that Rarick had been actually elected over McDonald. Regardless of the outcome, however, these developments put the leadership on notice in no uncertain terms. It was profoundly shaken.

OMR AND NEW ISSUES

Despite its mass support, the rank and file movement did not consolidate organizationally. It continued to cling to the original issues long after they had subsided, and continued to lay its main stress merely upon criticism of the top leadership. This was not good enough.

Even though strongly urged to do so, the movement made only half-hearted attempts to bring forward the new, pressing issues and to initiate struggles around them. It was especially important to develop struggles inside the mills, and thus to build and consolidate the strength of the movement. In short, it was necessary to direct the main blows against the main enemy—the corporations—and in the course of this compel the leadership to fight them.

This fact was not sufficiently appreciated by the OMR leaders, and they continued to limit their effort to inner union questions, especially that of union democracy. This began to take on an aspect of a power struggle, of the outs fighting the ins, and even of factionalism, which the McDonald forces did not fail to capitalize on.

Thus, in the 1961 election the OMR found itself without the kind of a unifying mass issue that had given it birth. While it projected the 30-hour week with 40 hours' pay and other important questions, it was unable to bring its program forward in a mass way.

It should also be clear that the issue of inner union democracy by itself is not enough to stir mass support. It takes on substance only when it is related to issues of vital concern to the workers, and is tested in struggles around such issues. Otherwise it loses its mass punch and potency and tends to appear as a power struggle.

A vivid confirmation of this was given in the 1959 steel strike. The companies had anticipated that the inner union differences could be exploited by them to weaken and undermine the unity of the steel workers. This emboldened them to demand abolition of Section 2B of the contract on work rules, a direct assault on the working conditions in the mills and the union's ability to defend them.

While the strike began with a great deal of apathy among the rank and file, the work rules issue transformed the situation and welded all-out unity to meet the attack. There emerged solid support of the union leadership, which was compelled to make a fight on this key issue. The companies were forced to back down in the face of an aroused and mili-

tant rank and file. The union leadership, on the other hand, came out of the strike with its prestige considerably enhanced.

THE ONSLAUGHT

The McDonald forces had grossly underestimated the depth and the power of the Rarick movement in its early stages. They felt it was merely a temporary eruption that would soon die out or be brought under control by the leadership. As the movement's influence continued, this attitude was discarded and steps were undertaken to meet the challenge of the rank and file. There began to appear even panic in the face of this irksome problem.

A series of events of a most interesting nature began to take place, whether by intent or coincidence, but all tending to undermine and weaken the OMR. The sum total of these developments made their impact on the role and the future of the movement.

At the outset, a series of public hearings was held in 1956-57 by the House Un-American Activities Committee in such important steel centers as Gary, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Baltimore and Youngstown. The aim of the Committee was to drive out or paralyze the progressives among the steel workers, and to deprive them of the most dedicated, selfless and far-seeing groups and individuals, capable of providing ideas and initi-

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

ative. To some degree this was successful.

Secondly, local leaders of the Rarick movement were either advanced to full-time positions in the union or promoted by the company. Sometimes the two were related. Along with this, the workers in the mills found new forms of organization in their daily struggles on concrete issues, when they did not find the OMR available or suitable.

Thirdly, faced with this rank and file ferment, the union leadership began to respond with greater sensitivity to the problems of the steel workers, and to display somewhat more modesty than it had previously shown. The problems of automation, unemployment, foreign investment, etc., came up for discussion. McDonald projected the need for a 32 hour week, though only as a legislative demand and not as an economic demand.

By this time the stage was set and in the 1959 Convention a frontal attack was opened on leaders of the OMR and their locals were ordered to put them on trial, subject to expulsion. Such trials did take place but the membership refused to honor the order to expel; instead, many of the OMR leaders were elected to posts of leadership in their own locals.

This was followed in the 1960 Convention by outright physical violence committed on Rarick and others in full view of the Convention.

But no organized reaction of the membership was manifested, nor did the OMR leaders try to rouse the rank and file to react to such disgraceful conduct. However, public outcry and indignation, as well as fear of legal action, prevented further goon violence.

Nevertheless the main objective—to intimidate and silence the opposition—was achieved. It was an open threat to the locals, warning them against nominations, but in many others nomination failed by only a very few votes, indicating that it could have been won had more serious efforts had been made.

Finally, an unprecedented, all out electioneering campaign was organized by the union leadership, involving the defeat of the OMR slate. The leadership was taking no chances, leaving no stone unturned to bar rank and file nominations.

OMR'S SHORTCOMINGS

Against this tightly organized and highly coordinated strategy, the OMR forces found themselves impotent and unable to reach the steel workers with their program and their campaign. It was at this point that all the accumulated weaknesses began to show up in a glaring manner. Among those that can be listed were:

(1) Failure to develop and lead year-round struggles around grievances in the mills.

THE STEEL RANK-AND-FILE MOVEMENT

(2) Failure to develop and organize rank-and-file groups and movements in the plants and locals based upon such struggles. While in many places such groups did appear, they were not the result of organized activity of the OMR, even though supporting it in the elections.

(3) Growing divisions in the OMR leadership during this period resulting in a lack of coordination of its own activity.

(4) Failure of the OMR leaders to take the issue of terror and violence at the Convention to the membership and resorting instead, to court action as a substitute for rank and file action.

(5) While the OMR had adopted a generally good program, it failed to popularize it among the rank and file and win them for its support.

(6) A weakness of most serious proportions was the lily-white slate of OMR candidates, as well as jim crow practices by some of the local OMR officers. This was accompanied by failure to fight consistently for the rights of the Negro steel workers in the mills. This served to paralyze support by the most militant section of the rank-and-file steel workers.

(7) Above all else the OMR failed to base its activity on one or more key issues, such as could arouse the response and support of which a rank and file is capable.

GAINS WON

While an opposition slate failed

to be nominated in the elections to the top union posts, this was in no sense a full endorsement of the McDonald leadership. The vote in individual locals for McDonald and his slate was most revealing of the moods of the workers. Local after local, in all parts of the country, registered an extremely low vote, the proportion in the big locals being, for example, some 200 votes cast out of 8,000 or so members. Again, it is a warning signal.

This in itself was a censure of the tactics used. It was a completely unorganized yet evidently widespread refusal to endorse what one worker termed "a one-party administration."

At the beginning of January 1961, Don Rarick met with the international executive board of the union in Washington D.C., ostensibly to appeal his case for a place on the ballot. After the meeting Rarick stated on TV and to the newspapers that he was withdrawing pending court actions against the top leadership. He stated further that the McDonald administration is now more responsive to the ideas of the rank and file and called upon his supporters to close ranks in the face of the mounting depression and company attempts to break the union.

Moreover it emphasizes the possibilities that such movements can have in forcing a reluctant leadership to face up to the basic problems of the day and to fight on them. The situation, without a doubt, has im-

proved considerably in this sense. It is also apparent that the members of the union feel that their problems can now be tackled more effectively than in the past through the existing machinery of the union. In this sense important gains in democracy and in unity have come about.

It appears also that the top leadership has learned something from this experience. They have felt the anger and the prodding of the rank and file and they show greater sensitivity to the problems and desires of the steel workers. How much they have learned remains to be seen. There will be further testing and even greater demands on them in the days ahead. There is also a feeling of greater freedom of expression in the local union bodies.

The inescapable conclusion is, therefore, that regardless of the present status of the OMR, it has made an important and lasting contribution to the advancement of inner union democracy, in advancing the militancy of the membership and in pushing the leadership closer to the real problems of the day.

WHAT NOW?

The conditions that gave rise to this movement of the rank and file have not, however, disappeared. They have grown and become even more pressing. Unemployment has become a mass phenomenon. New technology and automation are destroying

jobs and job security. Insecurity hounds the lives not only of those who have been laid off, but of those who still work.

The great, over-all problem is that of jobs. The shorter work week with 40 hours' pay is becoming a "must" demand. To date, McDonald has only toyed with this issue, suggesting that it is solely a legislative matter. However, the issue of 30-40 must become a contractual demand "to provide more jobs for more men," in McDonald's own words.

There is now a need to develop the greatest degree of unity between the employed and the unemployed steel workers. Never was this more important. The corporations are seeking to create division and conflict among the workers, and to exploit unemployment to beat down working conditions and weaken the union.

Within the mills, the problems of new techniques, new processes, of automation and their impact on jobs and mass displacement of workers are growing day by day. The need for program, for united action by a united union on these issues is ever more urgent.

Wherever the OMR did not answer the needs of the workers for struggle, and this has been one of its key shortcomings, the workers have inevitably found other forms. The workers are acting on many issues and in many directions to defend their conditions and their

union. Therefore, rank-and-file movements will continue to develop and find expression in diverse ways, old and new.

Preparations for the battle over the next contract are already shaping up. The companies feel they can go even further in demanding contract changes than they did in 1959. They have indicated they are preparing for a long strike. They have made an intensive study of the strikebreaking methods used in the General Electric strike in 1960. This reality must be faced up to by the leadership as well as by the rank and file.

The need is urgent, therefore, to close ranks and to develop a strategy based on militant action, on the full and undivided strength of the entire union. This will be decisive.

ROLE OF THE LEFT

From the outset the progressives in the steel union gave their support to the rank-and-file movement, but without illusions. They were aware of both its strong and its weak points. They tried to give the movement depth and content as an effective instrument for the needs of the rank and file. At the same time they sought to influence other groups to develop struggles against the attacks of the corporations.

The guiding principle for the work of the Left and the progressives was the good of the union, the welfare of the steel workers.

They fought against splitting tendencies, against factional trends from whatever source. They opposed placing of personal ambitions over the interests of the union.

But it cannot be said that the Left played its role fully in this period. While they made important contributions in the early stages of the OMR movement, this was less true later. At times reactionary forces were permitted, almost by default, to influence individual leaders. There was a tendency to hold back because of difficulties, and because some of the leaders tended to veer to the Right. Yet, that is exactly the moment when the creative role of the Left was needed the most.

Nor did the progressives move into action in time to secure nominations in locals all over the country for the OMR slate. Yet, their concerted work could have helped overcome the apathy and paralysis that had set in. They could have done much to build up attendance at local meetings which could have resulted in victory instead of the defeat by a small margin which occurred in many cases.

With some good exceptions, the Left failed to develop consistent pressures on Rarick on such decisive questions as a Negro-white slate, and broad rank-and-file action to organize local OMR groups. Though relatively small in number, its efforts at the plant level could have overcome some of the shortcomings of the

OMR leaders, and helped them to find more creative channels of action. There were good examples of such progressive local initiative, but this was not uniform, and lost much of its punch for that reason.

Had this role of the Left and the progressives been more consistent, the outcome in the locals on nominations could have been different. Consequently the Left must accept its own share of responsibility for OMR's failure to get a sufficient number of locals to nominate.

Nor did the progressives challenge consistently the cold war concepts advanced by the big business reactionaries and the union leadership. The fallacy has been fostered among the steel workers that armaments and the cold war must take precedence over their own needs, and that the shorter work week must be sacrificed for cold war purposes. Far more activity, practical and ideological, is called for to combat these harmful ideas promoted by Big Business among the workers.

So too, it is necessary to bring

forward more vigorously the issues of world peace, of disarmament, of trade with *all* countries, as matters of basic concern to the country and to the workers. The steel union, in its fight for jobs and security, can set an example for all labor in promoting and fighting for a program for peace and jobs.

The need for a more active role by the progressives becomes greater as the problems of the steel workers deepen. More fundamental answers will have to be projected to meet them. The very social decay now in full tide in our national life makes it important that basic solutions must be advanced among ever larger numbers of American workers. The role of the Left in this respect is indispensable.

These are some of the conclusions that can be drawn from experiences of the steel workers' rank and file movement. As the steel workers enter upon the even more difficult struggles ahead these lessons, if heeded in time, will serve them in good stead.

The Question of an Anti-Monopoly Coalition

By William Weinstone

The 17th Convention of the Communist Party of the United States placed the struggle against monopoly as the central strategic task.

Some believe that the concept of an anti-monopoly coalition as a strategic stage of struggle is wrong because it deflects from the fight for socialism. There are also some who say: "Well, what's new about the anti-monopoly struggle? Have we not made this central for some time?"

Clearly a number of questions require explanations. What is the anti-monopoly coalition? Why is it strategic and what does this mean in practical terms? What is the relation of the struggle against the monopolies and the fight for peace, Negro freedom, labor's rights and needs and other vital issues? What is its relation to socialism?

* * *

It is, of course, true that the fight against monopoly is not new. It has been the basic fight of the Party since its foundation. This was based on the teachings of Lenin that since about 1900, the advanced capitalist

countries passed into the stage of imperialism and imperialism means briefly the domination of the monopolies in the economy and politics of the country.

The United States is the classic land of the trusts. It is the country of giant corporations which for years controlled the economy of the country and exercised the dominant position in government. But the degree and character of that domination has not always been the same, as we shall see.

"While the trusts dominate the economy of the country, small and medium enterprises still account for a large volume of production," wrote James S. Allen in *World Monopoly and Peace*: "In relation to the output directly controlled by the trusts, the output of the non-trustified sector is small. But in comparison to similar enterprises in other countries, many of the so-called smaller establishments in the United States can be considered giants."

Though their position has further declined since this was written in 1946, the small and medium busi-

nesses continue to exist and play a significant part in the economic and political life of the country, and will not be wiped out by monopoly.

Lenin wrote in *Imperialism*: "Monopoly which has grown out of free competition does not abolish the latter but exists over it and alongside it and thereby gives rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, frictions, and conflicts."

In the past, small and medium business groups, farmers, and at times labor have exercised some influence on the government, tending to curb to some extent the excessive power of Big Business. This was particularly true in the Roosevelt period, when the explosive crash of the economic system weakened the prestige of the monopolists. It revived and strengthened the long existing anti-trust feelings in the nation. "Economic royalists," "monopolists," became household words of contempt and condemnation throughout the land.

THE NEW DEAL ERA

The Roosevelt government, when it came to power in 1933, was not anti-trust, nor anti-monopoly. In fact, it was not anti-trust at any time. The New Deal—and this was true particularly in the second stage, from about 1935-1939, when the masses were in upheaval—was not directed against monopoly-capitalism as such but against its *worst excesses*. Roose-

velt sought to strengthen capitalism by means of reforms. The Roosevelt government carried further what Theodore Roosevelt with his Square Deal and Woodrow Wilson with his New Freedom largely relegated to talk. It strengthened the policy of *bourgeois reform* as a significant instrument to maintain the capitalist system. That was because of the crash of the capitalist system while the Soviet Union was making great advances through planned socialist economy.

Up to then, violence and repression was the main weapon of rule. Now this method, this tactic, long used in Europe, was intensified. It was a sign that capitalism was sick and could not, on the basis of its economy, hold the masses.

Lenin pointed out that the bourgeoisie inevitably elaborates two systems of rule—violence and reforms, often interlacing these two methods in different combinations, and passing from one method to the other, "not through the malicious design of individuals and not by accident, but by force of the basic contradiction of its own position." (From article "Differences in the European Labor Movement," included in *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, by V. I. Lenin, pp. 82-83).

The fierce opposition of large sections of the monopolists to Roosevelt was because in the first place they wanted to give as little as possible in practical reforms and sec-

ondly because they feared that Roosevelt's attacks on the "economic royalists" might stimulate the masses and small business to place greater curbs on their power. They were fearful, too, that the Communists, who were a major driving force for the changes, would grow in strength and influence and that the ideas of socialism as a result would gain headway in the country. These forces favored a fascist solution to the crisis.

The anti-monopoly struggle in the period of the '30s, mainly because of the vigorous action and unity of the masses and the leading part played by labor, particularly by the CIO, and the effective vanguard role of the Communist Party, brought substantial material and social and political benefits to the people. They included the right to organize, the anti-injunction and the anti-spy measures, unemployment and social insurance, the FEPC and other gains for the Negro people, and other democratic gains.

The working class and the Party in this period played a major role in defeating reaction, in checking fascism in the USA and in preparing the way for national unity to defeat the fascist Axis in the war. The Communist Party, the trade unions, and progressive organizations grew in strength and influence. The anti-monopoly struggle did not reach its full fruits because of illusions in the ranks of labor and within the Party itself caused by Browder revisionism, which misread the reform policy of

Roosevelt and considered that capitalism had changed its nature and that the Democratic Party had been transformed from a party of the capitalists into a people's party. The line weakened the independent action of the working class and liquidated the movement for independent political action and a Farmer-Labor Party which was in the making.

GROWTH OF MONOPOLY

For these and other reasons, during the Roosevelt period, the monopolists were not fundamentally attacked. They were in fact rescued and strengthened by government measures, and by the mergers which always grow in times of crises. Their power reached new, towering heights in the economy and in the state, during World War II and in the post-war period. Briefly, the facts are:

"Four banks and insurance companies have more combined assets today than all American financial institutions did in 1912. Ten industrial corporations make more taxable profits than all such companies did in the boom year 1929." So writes Victor Perlo in *The Empire of High Finance* (International Publishers, 1957, p. 11).

He goes on to say: "The share of the 200 largest manufacturing corporations in total manufacturing sales rose from 37.7% in 1935 to 40.5% in 1950 and 45.5% in 1955 . . . Concentration increased almost twice

as much in five years as it had during the previous fifteen years." (pp. 21-22).

From 1927 to 1952, according to the Labor Research Association's study *Billionaire Corporations* (International Publishers, 1954), the 200 largest non-financial corporations increased their share more than one-fifth. And the 31 billionaire corporations which existed in 1939, with assets of over \$66.5 billion, grew by 1952 to 66 billionaire giants with assets of \$174 billion. These 66 corporations, comprising a minute fraction of the 660,000 U.S. corporations, owned 28.3% of all corporate assets, and through such devices as interlocking directorates, affiliates, and other interconnections, controlled no less than 75% of all such assets. In turn, the control of these 66 corporate giants rested in the hands of 127 men, each a director of two or more of these companies. These men, combining the interests of the banks and industrial concerns, personify the *financial oligarchy*, which control every facet of American life today.

STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

The vast increase in the power of monopolies in the life of the country is not the only new feature of American capitalism. A second new feature is the interlocking of their power with that of the state, creating a new phase of monopoly capitalism—*state monopoly capitalism*.

State monopoly capitalism means

the complete subordination of the state to the rule of the monopolists. Lenin first noticed its appearance during the First World War and therefore extended his definition of imperialism, stating that in addition to being an epoch of great monopolies, it was also "the era of development of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism." "The Second World War," states the new textbook, *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, "accelerated the transition from monopoly to state monopoly-capitalism." It is the main trend in capitalism today, and "is a new and most important element in modern capitalism."

State monopoly capitalism arises from the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, from the rise of the world socialist system which causes a shrinkage of markets, from the aggravation of all the contradictions of the system. It is a means of guaranteeing maximum profits and to consolidate and prolong the domination of the economic and political life of the country. "Such shattering blows to the capitalist system as world wars, economic and political crises, showed the dominant monopolies that they could no longer rule by their old methods." They had to "buttress their strength with the powerful support of the state."

The control of government by the financial tycoons was amply illustrated in the Eisenhower-Cadillac Cabinet whose members held director-

ships or had official connections in 86 corporations with total assets exceeding \$20 billion dollars.

This is also true of the Kennedy Administration. Aside from the President who belongs to a multi-millionaire family, and Vice-President Johnson, who is a millionaire, the three key posts in the cabinet are held by representative spokesmen of top monopoly interests. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, was chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation, which has assets amounting to over 500 million dollars. Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense, was president of the Ford Motor Company; Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon was chairman of Dillon, Read and Company, the big international banking house.

There is also Robert Kennedy, Attorney-General, and Postmaster-General Day, who was Vice President of Prudential Life, the second largest insurance company in the country, with assets of 16 to 17 billion dollars, dominated by the Morgan interests. Kennedy's adviser for disarmament is John J. McCloy, who, until his retirement recently, was chairman of the Chase National Bank. There is also Allen Dulles, head of the C.I.A., who belonged to the law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, which represents Standard Oil and who also was a director of the Schroeder Bank, which has for years played a vast and sinister role in international affairs.

The wide extent of the big corporations' power and control is further shown by the inter-relationship of Big Business and Big Brass, and the moving in of the military men into diplomatic and political circles.

The business tycoons have the over-riding control of universities, colleges, institutes, business schools, and other branches of learning. The domination of the Board of Trustees of these bodies has been notorious since Thorstein Veblen and Upton Sinclair exposed this half a century ago. This has been stepped up considerably since then. *Billionaire Corporations* notes that they control to a large extent the financial affairs of these institutions, and the appointment of professors, instructors, and staff members. The ultra-reactionary trend in education—loyalty oaths and other witch-hunts to which the schools have been subjected—are due to their influence and pressure, in the Cold-War period.

The so-called family foundations—such as the Ford, Rockefeller, etc.—dispose of vast funds which are tax-exempt, since they are supposed to be charitable organizations; the funds, in fact, exercise major influence upon education, culture, and policy.

State monopoly capitalism has intensified the drive of U.S. imperialism for world domination, which has become the chief imperialist force in the world today, the main source of the war danger, and the

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

bastion of what remains of colonialism.

The U. S. monopolists have initiated and sustained the cold war. They have militarized the economy of the country, increased the war danger, stepped up the arms race, milked the government of billions through armament orders, subsidies, tax privileges, purchase of surplus goods, etc.

Professor Paul Crosser, in a recent work, *State Capitalism in the Economy of the U. S.* notes that "during the period following World War II more than half of the tax income of the U. S. A. has been used to finance business." (Quoted by Labor Research Association, *Economic Notes*, January 1961)

IMPACT OF MONOPOLY

State monopoly capitalism has increased the exploitation of the people through high taxes and high prices, speed-up, and in other ways. Not only the industrial and office workers, but also the professionals and intellectuals, farmers and small and medium business have felt the increasing weight of monopoly oppression. Last year business failures rose to a postwar peak of 15,500, a rise of ten per cent over the previous year and three per cent over 1958 which was a depression year. The rate of failures was 57 per 10,000, which was a twenty-year high.

In the five-year period between 1954 and 1959, the number of farms

declined by 847,000. This marks a 17.8% rate of elimination, the fastest ever recorded for a five-year intercensus period.

Gus Hall, in his report to the National Committee, detailed some of the reality concerning the living standards of the people. This reality reflects the inroads of monopoly: (see *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1961).

ATTACK ON DEMOCRACY

Big monopoly is responsible for the reactionary onslaught on democratic rights and democratic institutions.

Since Hitler fascism has been discredited, Big Business uses more concealed forms of reaction. In our country, where there are strong democratic traditions, open fascist-type organizations nonetheless exist, such as the Ku Klux Klan, the Lincoln Rockwell group, the fascist emigre organizations, and like bodies, and these will probably grow. But the main instruments of repression have been taking place directly through the government, through fascist-like laws and inquisitions, under cover of defending security and freedom. These are the forms that have been most dangerous and have done the greatest damage to our democracy.

There has been great concentration of the powers of the President and executive agencies and this has undermined the power of Congress and democratic freedoms. Thus, the

ON AN ANTI-MONOPOLY COALITION

Korean War was launched by President Truman without an act of Congress, in violation of the Constitution. There is also the operation of the CIA, with millions at its disposal, without an accounting to Congress. There is the setting up of the National Security Council, which is more powerful than the Cabinet, and the Index Expurgatorius (subversive list) by the Attorney General, the secret reports of the F.B.I. to government bodies, not to speak of their harrassment and persecutions of citizens.

The onslaught on democracy has been terrific: There is the Taft-Hartley Law, the Landrum-Griffin Law, the Smith and McCarran Acts, the anti-foreign born laws and persecutions, the violence against the Negro people, the intimidations by loyalty oaths, the inquisitions of the Un-American Committee, the approval of state wire-tapping, the curtailment of the rights of minority parties to get on the ballot, the arrests and imprisonment of Communists, peace fighters, battles for Negro freedom, etc. And there are the many thousands of workers in shops, offices, federal, state, and local governments, on stage, screen, radio, television, and the press who have been driven out of their jobs and for the most part remain blacklisted.

To this brief account of the domestic reaction must be added the reactionary role played by U. S. imperialism on a world scale. It has

become an international gendarme aiding reaction throughout the world, destroying democracy and propping up fascism and tyranny.

NEED FOR BROAD COALITION

Clearly, then, the fight against the monopoly power assumes a *new* importance. "What is urgently needed is a broad coalition of the victims of monopoly around a minimum program of action," said Hall in his report to the National Committee.

Strategy defines the "main aim of the working class at the given stage and the *chief class enemy* against whom it is necessary to concentrate at the given stage all the class hatred and the shock force of all the working people in order to overcome this enemy's resistance." (*Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, page 425). The theory and strategy of Marxism are indispensable features enabling it to play the role of vanguard. Strategy not only sets the route, it also directs the struggle for a long period of time.

The fight against monopoly capital is a fight for democracy, embracing various classes and strata, in which the working class and its allies, the mass of the farmers and Negro people, are the main force. State monopoly capitalism cannot solve the growing contradictions in the system as the revisionists think. As we have noted, it only intensifies them by sharpening the attacks on labor, and

by worsening the conditions of the other strata of the population, thus aggravating the contradictions between monopoly and the great masses of the people, in fact between monopoly and the nation.

The concentration of wealth, power, and privilege in a small handful of monopolists at one pole therefore inevitably crystallizes strong anti-monopoly opposition at the other pole, among the great masses of people for their economic and social rights, for civil liberties, for peace, for democracy.

Lenin wrote:

Capitalism in general and imperialism in particular transform democracy into an illusion but *at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses*, creates democratic institutions and intensifies the antagonism between imperialism which negates democracy and the masses who aspire to it. (Emphasis added.—W.W.)

The world Marxist movement has recognized this *new feature of the struggle* in the advanced capitalist countries.

The historic statement of the 81 Parties which met in November 1960 in Moscow declared that "the *main blow* at present is directed with growing force at the capitalist monopolies which are chiefly responsible for the arms race and which constitute the bulwark of reaction and aggression. It is directed at the whole system of state monopoly capitalism

which defends monopoly interests." (Emphasis added—W.W.)

Describing the measures essential to curb the monopolists, including nationalization of the key branches of the economy and democratization of their management, the use of the entire economy for peaceful purposes, radical agrarian reforms, etc., it stated "*all these measures are democratic by nature.*" They would not eliminate the exploitation of man by man but "they would help to isolate the most reactionary forces and facilitate the unification of all the progressive forces . . ."

These views are in keeping with the 17th Party convention resolution which defines the anti-monopoly coalition as "a strategic political concept, stemming from the realities of the class struggle of present-day capitalist society."

Now what is the content of that struggle? Aim gives the goal, content determines the road, the methods, tactics, and issues. These are not opposites but interrelated matters. The latter are not artificially formulated but arise from the objective conditions and from the specific activities of the masses themselves.

TODAY'S MAIN ISSUES

The issues and movements today are varied. They are around the questions of peace, for peaceful coexistence, disarmament, opposition to U.S. imperialist intervention in Cuba and other areas fighting for inde-

pendence, the banning of nuclear tests and weapons, the end of Jim-Crow, the preservation of democratic rights, the issue of jobs and greater unemployment relief and insurance, the shorter workday, education, culture, needs of youth, farmers, small business, etc.

It is in *persevering day-to-day work* for those immediate issues that a broad coalition can be built. The task of the advanced elements is to initiate movements where they do not exist and to support them where they do exist, involving the widest masses but paying greatest attention to the working class, the trade unions, the Negro people's organizations, and other mass people's organizations. No broad united people's movement is possible without them.

The program directed at curbing the monopolies, should also include such demands as restriction of price gouging, nationalization of key industries under democratic control, higher taxes on the profits of the corporations, basic democratic change in the South, drastic improvements in social services and social welfare, full employment through a peace economy, restoring full trade union rights, strengthening democratic rights, etc.

One may say the movements of labor, the Negro people, for peace, etc., are all independent democratic movements and have been going on for some time. What is new about

them? What have they to do with the idea of an anti-monopoly coalition?

It is true that the current movements are independent and that there always have been democratic struggles under capitalism. What is new in the central fight for peace is that peace movement embraces men and women of all strata, including sections of the bourgeoisie. In the period before World Wars One and Two, the movement for peace largely was one of the working class and intellectuals. Also, and this is important for our discussion, the people's movements are anti-monopoly in character because monopoly is their common foe. Many or most of the masses participating in these separate movements do not see their chief enemies, but increasingly they will come to understand and will be forced to fight the monopolists, because of the growing community of interests of all who suffer from their oppression. But this will take much effort by the advanced elements in the first place, because unity does not arise spontaneously. Also, because the monopolists have spent many millions to put over the hoax that their system is a "people's capitalism" and a "welfare state."

In time the movements will tend to coalesce against monopoly. This is already happening in elementary forms on some issues, as, for example, in the struggle for Negro rights. Extremely significant is the

conference called for April 14 in Chicago by the Quakers and a number of trade union leaders on the joint issues of peace, jobs, and freedom. This marks an important breakthrough of labor in the battle for peace and for Negro rights. *It is another striking confirmation of the correctness of the Party line on the opportunities, new directions, and new possibilities of battling the forces of monopoly reaction, in the new world epoch.*

The fight for a radical democratic change in the South is of central importance for the Negro people and also for all the working people, in fact for the preservation and advance of the labor movement and democracy throughout the country.

The dominant force of the South as in the nation as a whole is the millionaire corporations. The Dixiecrats and their agents could not exercise such strong influence in Congress without their alliance with the Republicans and reactionary Democrats of the North—all stooges of Big Business. That is why the fight for Negro freedom, as the 17th Party convention put it, is a struggle against the “monopolists and their Dixiecrat partners.”

It is a domestic and international issue of prime importance and great national consequence. This is also true of the peace question. This only underlines the importance of seeing it in relation to the general anti-monopoly struggle.

ON A NEW PARTY

The fight to curb the monopolists raises the need for more resolute independent political action and for the formation of a new people's party as well as for a progressive anti-monopoly democratic government. The specific steps in building a new party are complex and varied, including the utilizing of the existing two-party system to support peace candidates and to advance labor, Negro, and independent candidates.

The sentiment for independent political action and also for a new party is growing. The establishment of a new party with mass support is a difficult task, because of the power of the monopolists and cunning maneuvers of the Democratic Party which has the support of labor and people's organizations.

Agitation for a new party is necessary, but action will come when the masses are convinced by experience. Between agitation and the actual organization of a new party, there are many stages of maturing independent activities.

Here some words about the Kennedy Administration are in order. We discussed above the fact that it is dominated by Big Business, including notorious cold warriors. There have been other appointments like that of Dr. Robert C. Weaver to the significant post of head of the Federal Housing Commission, and other Negroes to appease the

ON AN ANTI-MONOPOLY COALITION

Negro freedom movement. And as concessions to the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, to the organized peace forces, as well as to influence world public opinion, there has been the selection of Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, and Mennen Williams, who have in the past voiced sentiments for a relaxation of the cold war. In the main, the latter are secondary posts under the control of Dean Rusk. As yet these political leaders have not distinguished themselves by their actions as representing a policy of accommodating our country to the new realities of the world which they have professed to recognize. Thus Stevenson's performances on the Congo have not been much different from his predecessor's, Henry Cabot Lodge.

The Kennedy Administration to date, while expressing general hopes for improved relations with the Soviet Union and taking some promising initial steps to ease matters, has not followed them up by any basic changes. The cold war and neo-colonialism still prevail, albeit with some new techniques and methods. In domestic policy, in the State of the Union address, and in other talks, President Kennedy has spoken of a crisis in our economy and in our social needs in sharp terms, but his practical programs presented to Congress by no means correspond to even minimum requirements and add up to mild reforms. The explanation of this contradiction is to be found not alone in social demagogery. It is also due to the marked tendency to conciliate the powerful reactionary bloc of Republicans and Dixiecrats in Congress, and above all to the decisive fact that it is impossible to continue the cold war, increase the already vast armament expenditure and engage in an arms race, and at the same time establish “New Frontiers” for the people at home.

It would be wrong to conclude from all this that meaningful change in the line of the government policy is impossible, as some Left-wing elements insist. Such an attitude objectively tends to check the action of the people, even though sincerely calling for it. These elements do not give, we feel, sufficient weight to the new historic fact that Big Business is *not* the sole force deciding world policy today. There is the powerful socialist world and the anti-imperialist forces which increasingly determine the course of international affairs. Also there is the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, a new economic crisis and other acute problems and in consequence a growing discontent and activity of our people—labor, Negro, peace movements, youth, the aged, etc. The forces are there, to compel re-evaluation and a change in policy, lessen world tensions, prevent war, and bring important concessions on the home front.

Hence, the American people can

influence the direction of our government's policy. It is a matter of struggle—hard, united struggle.

Most important is the role of labor, whose leadership in the main supports the cold war, armaments, and imperialism, though differentiations are taking place at all levels. *Unity of Communist, Left, socialist, and progressive trade unionists in behalf of a program of change, in fact united action by the more advanced elements, generally on the political and trade union field, would be a powerful spur for change.* The Communist Party must play a far more resolute role in achieving the widest possible unity.

ANTI-MONOPOLY AND SOCIALISM

Finally, what is the relation of the fight to curb the monopolists to the struggle for socialism? Some who tend to dogmatism and go chiefly by the past, or who have not studied or learned the lessons of the historic struggles against fascism, ask why not center the fight on socialism directly, why anti-monopoly aims? They view it as a detraction of the fight for socialism.

It would of course be wrong not to keep in mind the ultimate goal of the struggle and to lessen agitation for socialism, which is the final solution for the oppressions of capitalism. This has been done by revisionists. It is at all times necessary to keep

in view the final aims of the working-class movement and to widen the education for socialism. This is particularly important today in view of the reactionary lies about world socialism and the American Communists.

But dogmatic or sectarian views which underestimate the anti-monopoly struggle, commit two major errors. First they substitute agitation for struggle as the main means of winning the masses. It is not the classroom but the class struggle that is the primary teacher of the working class. The masses arrive at the need for socialism chiefly by way of their own political *experience*. The class struggle enlightened by the ideas of Marxism—that is the way to teach the masses of the people. And what experience is more important today than that of the battle for peace, jobs, freedom—in short for democracy?

Far from detracting from socialism, the fight for democracy advances it. As the 81-Party statement said:

"Communists regard the struggle for democracy as a component of the struggle for socialism. In this struggle they continuously strengthen their bonds with the masses, increase their political consciousness and help them understand the tasks of the socialist revolution and realize the necessity of accomplishing it. This sets the Marxist-Leninist Parties completely apart from the reformists, who consider reforms within the frame-

work of the capitalist system as the ultimate goal and deny the necessity of socialist revolution. Marxist-Leninists are firmly convinced that the peoples in the capitalist countries will in the course of their daily struggle ultimately come to understand that socialism alone is a real way out for them." (Emphasis added—W. W. Political Affairs, January 1961, page 23.)

Secondly, the fight against the monopolies, the fight for democracy, the creation of an anti-monopoly government, may serve as the bridge to socialism—as one of the vital transitional forms that leads the masses to socialism. That is because

the fight against monopolies in present-day conditions becomes more and more linked with the struggle for socialism. That does not mean that the democratic movements are merely a means of bringing the masses to the socialist revolution. They are movements of tremendous *independent* importance to the people and this must never be overlooked. However, as the textbook, *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, states (p. 603):

"Not every democrat, by far, is a supporter of socialism. But any class-conscious fighter for socialism is a consistent defender of democracy, of all the democratic interests of the working people."

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

THE CUBAN REVOLUTION: Pt. II

Since noting last month in these pages the impending danger of a United-State backed major counter-revolutionary assault upon the Cuban Revolutionary Government, the peril has become even more urgent. In an unprecedented display of contempt for world public opinion and for the legalities—not to speak of decencies—of international relations, the U.S. ruling class openly is pressing towards unleashing wholesale slaughter in Cuba. The *New York Herald Tribune*—now owned by John Hay Whitney, recently U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, and currently employed in diplomatic duties by the Kennedy Administration—serialized a five-part distortion concerning the New Cuba by Joseph Newman, having as its explicit aim the justification of such counter-revolution. The President himself announced his approval of this series; its republication in Spanish and Portuguese and distribution throughout Latin-America is to be undertaken by the U.S. government, while the mis-called Voice of America is to broadcast it.

Every propaganda means available has been employed to evoke sympathy for the murderous counter-revolutionary junta established in New York City, and the State Department expresses pleasure that since these traitors call themselves a Council rather than a “provisional government” it has abided by the letter of the law; meanwhile, the members of this junta boast that they are responsible for the sabotage and the killings—including of women and children—recurring in Cuba. Of these assorted planters, bankers and one hundred percent Freedom Fighters, the *New York Times*—that epitome of pious hypocrisy—editorializes (March 23): “Their problem, and it is clearly one with which the United States policy concurs, is to overthrow the Castro regime.”

Benediction is offered beforehand by Cardinal Spellman, who, in a rare

display of humor, suggests that he would contribute to a fund to maintain Premier Castro in an insane asylum; hurling anathemas upon one like Fidel Castro should come easily for a hierarchy which blessed Batista for twenty-five years. Cardinal Spellman’s evaluations have been consistent at any rate: he now finds Castro a fearful lunatic, and during World War II, having interviewed Francisco Franco, he reported in *Collier’s* that the fascist was “a man loyal to his God, devoted to his country’s welfare, and definitely willing to sacrifice himself in any capacity and to any extent for Spain” and that when the Generalissimo smiled “he is indeed very pleasant.”

Some of the “liberals,” smelling gunpowder from afar, are performing their tricks even before the master has called for his hounds. Max Lerner, who swallowed the CIA assassination of democracy in Guatemala, found no difficulty in consigning Castro to the darkness reserved for “Kremlin stooges”; Robert J. Alexander, in *The New Leader* (Feb. 6), while noting unfortunate lapses in U.S. policy and suggesting Berle-like changes, nevertheless manages, with something approaching a heavy-heart, to conclude: “Washington has little choice but to continue its present policy toward Cuba for a while.”

But most of this is warmed-over and nearly worn-out stuff. Castro’s Cuba is a new Cuba, really new, befitting our New Epoch. And there is a fresh and new wind blowing in our country. It started up, in these post-McCarthy years, with the tremendous revitalization of the Negro liberation movement—once again, as so often in the past, the Negro masses being pioneers in general democratic and progressive movements. It has reached broader areas in the anti-war and anti-armaments movement whose numbers and influence have grown considerably in the past few months; it has penetrated into the trade-union movement where a higher militancy and political maturity are appearing; it is very marked among the youth, especially those on campuses, where the shedding of apathy and cynicism is so clear it has even reached many among the faculties.

One of the catalysts in all this is the New Cuba. It has won the favor of the American Negro masses because it has mounted an all-out assault upon racism and discrimination and because it represents the interests and aspirations of the poor and the oppressed. It has captured the imagination of tens of thousands of our youth, because it is a movement of and by and for youth in the first place; because it is filled with idealism and self-sacrifice; with nobility and daring; with great accomplishment and greater promise and because the best of our youth always and naturally respond to such qualities. Its elan and vigor are stimulating many people who had permitted themselves to become “tired.” Its battle against unemployment;

its cutting rents in half; its war on illiteracy; its campaign to bring the best of the arts to the masses; its attack on disease and slum; its effort to bring a sense of dignity to the every-day person; its returning Cuba to the Cubans—not only the plush hotels and palaces, the "restricted" beaches and residential areas, but the whole country itself, so that the people en masse feel that now it is theirs, that they are masters, not tenants, in their own home, and that now they build for themselves and they reap for themselves and they work for themselves and not for the ermine-wrapped ones, the chauffeured ones, the loafers with their roulette wheels, manicured nails and torture chambers—all this etches the word "Cuba" into the heart of every democrat, every humanist, every informed man and woman of good-will.

Manifesting this cleansing impact of the Cuban Revolution upon our own scene—and at the same time, part of the cleansing process—are the many writings that have appeared in the most varied publications reflecting in essence a positive evaluation of that Revolution and urging that hostility towards it by the U.S. government violates our own best national interests. These include the *Christian Century*, the *Catholic Worker*, the *National Guardian*, the *New Republic*, the *Monthly Review*, the *Nation*, student publications like *Studies on the Left* (Wisconsin), *New University Thought* (Chicago), and *Controversy* (Cornell). Included are the writings of Carleton Beals, Samuel Shapiro, Richard Taber, Sidney Lens and many others, with some of whom we shall deal in the following pages. There are, of course, many differences among these writers, and they differ in significant matters from the reports and analyses coming from Joseph North and James S. Allen, in *The Worker* and this magazine.*

But their areas of agreement are more numerous and more vital for our time than are areas of difference. Sometimes the tendency—especially among friends and relatives!—is to take for granted the agreements and to concentrate on the differences. This is unfortunate as a rule; it is particularly unfortunate when those who do agree on highly significant questions, and on the most significant question—*i.e.*, the wonderfully positive character of the Cuban Revolution and the necessity to protect it against counter-revolutionary attempts, especially as these have their fount in the U.S. ruling class—are surrounded by foes, who possess a basically contrary estimate of the Cuban events and who seek to destroy the Revolution by every possible means, excluding none.

I do not mean that differences are to be covered up; they are not. They are to be exposed as clearly as may be and argued out persuasively. This

* The May, 1961 issue of *Mainstream* will be devoted entirely to the art and culture and thought of the New Cuba.

is to be done in an effort all have in common—the advancement of human welfare. Here, too, of course, sharp differences will appear, not only as to how best to make advances, but even as to what such welfare is. Let everything be argued out, but in the context of friends of Cuban freedom, independence, and social progress. As opponents of imperialist intervention against the New Cuba we must treasure the staunchest unity. There is, I think, a certain complacency in progressive circles where the great reality of the New Epoch has struck home, and where it is felt that the "forces of history" moving against imperialism assure its defeat. The reality of the New Epoch must produce not complacency but confidence; and basic to the forces of history are the men and women whose actions make that history. Of course, history is not simply made by disembodied wills; but just as certainly history does not result from the mechanical working out of forces separated from the people upon whom and through whom those forces exert and demonstrate themselves.

Today, because of the new relationship of forces in the world—which constitutes the New Epoch—such a genuine national and social revolution as that characterizing the New Cuba *can* occur and *can* succeed; but this is true only on the basis of enormous struggle. It was such struggle which made possible the success of the Revolution; it will be such struggle that will preserve the Revolution and permit it to unfold further so that both its preservation and its extension may be secured. For us in the United States who oppose colonialism, and oppose any moves towards intervention against Cuba—and it is on that elementary basis that unity needs building—the urgent task now is emphasizing points of agreement and consolidating our forces in the supreme effort to prevent the still very powerful U.S. imperialism from undoing Cuba's liberation.

This theme of unity runs through the Communist analysis of *The Cuban Revolution* (New Century Publishers, N. Y., \$1.25) made by Blas Roca, General Secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba, in his Report to that Party's Eighth Congress held last August. Early in his Report, Blas Roca said:

The motto of the imperialists, of the sell-out governing class, of the reactionaries and exploiters of every kind is: *Divide and Rule*. In logical contradiction, the maxim of the revolutionaries, of the representatives of the workers, peasants, and the people generally, the maxim of the Marxist-Leninist, is: *Unite to Triumph* over the enemies of the nation, the people and the toiling masses. This maxim guided all our activity against the tyranny, and has guided and guides today all our activity in the course of the revolution, its triumph and its development (p 31).

Roca reverted to this unity theme in the closing section of his Report where he developed the particular duties of the Party itself:

The line of the Party is to establish and reinforce cooperation and collaboration with all revolutionary forces and elements. . . . Every Communist, in his post, has to be the most vigorous enemy of sectarianism, for sectarianism is a hopeless obstacle to cooperation and coordination, it is an obstacle to unity, it destroys unity. . . . Sectarianism is division! (p. 125).

Here in the United States all of the Left must conduct themselves in the spirit of this injunction from Blas Roca for if anything can destroy the New Cuba it is only the might and the malevolence of U.S. monopoly capital exerting itself through the instrumentality of the U.S. government. To a degree what that government does depends upon American public opinion; what it is, how well it is organized, and how effectively it expresses its desires. Friends of the New Cuba who are citizens of the United States will demonstrate the quality of their friendship for this New Cuba and the depths of their own patriotism by the contribution they make to restraining intervention—in any and all guises. That is the test of tests.

* * *

Let us examine some of the most recent writings coming from friends of the New Cuba. Among those that stand out is the work of C. Wright Mills.* Mills, a professor at Columbia University, one of the best-known sociologists of the United States, and the author of several earlier volumes having wide circulation and great influence throughout the world, again in his book on Cuba has demonstrated his originality, sense of timing, attractive style, and courage. These qualities, combined with the author's standing, have made it possible for Mills to break through with a devastating critique of U.S. imperialism and a passionate defense of the Cuban Revolution among literally hundreds of thousands of Americans. A condensation of his book, appearing in *Harper's* (December, 1960) reached scores of thousands, and the book itself has been bought now by about 400,000 people.

The form of the book, while no doubt helping to account for its great popular appeal, makes careful analysis of its content quite difficult, for it consists in its greater part of letters from a Cuban revolutionist to a "Yankee"; these letters are preceded and followed by brief "Notes to the Reader" from Mills himself. There is no doubt, of course, that the letters

* *Listen, Yankee!* (Ballantine, paper, 50c; McGraw-Hill, cloth, \$4.50).

are authentic, in the sense that, as Mills assures us, they are verbatim reproductions of interviews he conducted. They reflect, however, Mills' own selection, both as to whom he interviewed and what, from his various interviews, he chose to reproduce as most reflective of what he thought were the true feelings of Cuban revolutionists and the essence of their movement. In this sense, what one must deal with is the substance as conveyed through this peculiar form, remembering that Mills himself does not hold with the substance in every case. Unfortunate, because simply quite untrue, is the remark in one of the letters that the Communists in Cuba "did not play any part at all in the making of our revolution" and that, indeed, they were rivals of Fidel Castro, "for over five years before we won"; the seriousness of this error is compounded, for in Mills' final "Note to the Reader" he himself says the revolution was made entirely by non-Communists "against Communist Party opposition" and he cites the altogether tendentious and distorted writings of Theodore Draper—which slander the Castro movement as well as the Cuban Communists—to support his opinion. Since somewhat similar—although less extreme—views are expressed by several other writers whose work we shall notice shortly, we choose to examine this idea at a later point.

Serious as this error is, and reflective of the anti-Communist view which mars all of Mills work to date,* it nevertheless does not negate the main content of Mills' work—an excoriation of U.S. imperialism and a ringing defense of the New Cuba. It may be noted, by the way, that Mills' attention to and condemnation of the realities of American imperialism represent a new development for him; perhaps the essential failing of his other books is that while all of them are highly critical of the American status quo, none came to grips with the fact of imperialism as decisively characterizing that status quo. In *Listen, Yankee*, Mills leaves no one in any doubt that it is the exploitative practice of American monopoly capitalism—that it is U.S. imperialism—which has enslaved Cuba hitherto. Nor does he leave any one in any doubt as to his own view that Cuban freedom and sovereignty could not begin to be complete unless the grip of those monopolies upon the Cuban economy and politics were eliminated.

These are big strides forward for Mills, but there are additional advances in this work. He announces himself as for the Cuban Revolution, and as recognizing that anti-Communism is counter-revolution. He states that parliamentary forms *may* be veils behind which any real freedom is nur-

* The present writer examined this body of work in his *The World of C. Wright Mills* (N. Y., 1960, Marzani & Munsell).

dered, as happened in pre-Castro Cuba; he insists that in the present revolutionary situation an election would offer counter-revolution the opportunity to institutionalize itself and legalize itself.

Mills always has insisted on the relevance of Marxism to today's world, though himself rejecting it; he repeats his insistence on Marxism's relevance and emphasizes this point. He adds that it is the ideas which are officially acceptable and intellectually respectable in the United States today which are the really irrelevant ones, so far as grasping reality is concerned. His book is strong on the essential quality of the support given the Cuban Revolutionary government by the Socialist states; without this support, he affirms, the depth of the Revolution and its accomplishment would not be possible.

Mills advances a long way through his Cuban experience towards comprehending the terrible difficulties the Soviet Union faced in building socialism in a war-devastated country surrounded by a hostile world and subjected to intervention and boycott. He does this both explicitly and even more clearly in an implicit fashion, when he observes that the difficulties of social transformation in Cuba are infinitely less now that one-third the world is socialist and powerful and ready to assist the Cuban people.

While Castro's Cuba has helped Mills crack through several limitations of his genuine radicalism, it did not succeed—so far as this particular book shows, at any rate—in overcoming Mills' blindness where the Negro people are concerned. In his other critiques of the American social order, the central failing of that order—the jimm-crow system—went unnoticed. Similarly, in his book on Cuba, though the question of building Negro-white unity has been basic to Cuban revolutionary efforts, though the Castro government is dedicated to and has accomplished much in wiping out all discrimination, and though this plays an outstanding part in the attitude of the U.S. ruling class towards the New Cuba, the whole matter is simply omitted. As might be expected, this question is dealt with carefully and rather fully in Joseph North's *Cuba: Hope of a Hemisphere* (International Publishers, N. Y., 95c, paper, \$2, cloth) in a chapter, "The Negro in Cuba." North found that "in the new Cuba, the head of the air-force was a Negro; the head of the army, a Negro; the chief of the Oriente contingents of the armed forces, a Negro." And, as he shows, this question is not confined to top-level offices; on the contrary, the Cuban Revolution has set itself as one of its most urgent duties the utter extermination of all segregation and racism. This is really tremendous news for the Western Hemisphere in general and for the United States in particular; non-Communist friends of the Cuban Revolution, Mills included, have tended to ignore this at great cost to their full comprehension

of the nature of the Revolution and of its challenge to U.S. imperialism.

As a final note on Mills' book, I would remark that it is a tribute to the American people, that some 400,000 of them have found their way—through the venomous press, television and radio systems that systematically falsify—to Mills' book. This makes it a consequential social force in its own right; and for the United States today, it is a force overwhelmingly of a positive character.

Very much more limited in circulation, but more profound in analysis, is the work of Professor Paul A. Baran, of Stanford University. In his pamphlet, *Reflections on the Cuban Revolution* (Monthly Review Press, N. Y., 35c), Baran, whose writings are illuminated by the Marxist component, emphasizes the decisive importance of the New Epoch and the new relationship of forces in the world for the nature and success of the Cuban effort. His estimate of the Cuban Communists falls short of the truth, but it is much nearer reality than that offered by Mills and at least denies that the Cuban Communists were foes of the Revolution. Also, while Mills seems to indicate that the Communists' role was diminishing as the Revolution was proceeding, this stark error does not appear in Baran. On the contrary, as Baran sees, the extension of the Revolution—necessary to its preservation—naturally tends to add weight to the role of the working class and the Communists.

But the main point with Baran, as with Mills, is that he has been inspired by the democratic release that the Revolution has meant for the Cuban masses; he is thrilled by the leaps they are making in education, health, culture, standard of living, dignity. He knows that without "the heroism, endurance, and toil of the Russian workers and peasants in the era of the Five Year Plans" these achievements in Cuba would not have been possible, and when it is required in most academic circles in our country to picture the U.S.S.R. as the great obstacle to human progress and freedom, it is important to have a Stanford professor clearly affirm that the truth is the opposite of this stereotype.

Above all, Baran urges the necessity of preventing another Spain or another Algeria in Cuba; such a development may unleash world war. Such a development certainly would throw back the Cuban Revolution many years, if it did not drown it in blood and it would intensify reaction in our own country as surely as the Algerian war has in France.

An analysis not dissimilar from that of Mills and Baran has also come from Douglas R. Dowd, professor of economics at Cornell. This was published in one of the many new magazines and papers being issued on American campuses as part of the change now well advanced on those campuses;

it is called *Controversy** and appears in the fourth number of that magazine (Feb. 8).

Professor Dowd states his position in this way:

I do not believe that Castro and his supporters are angels, nor that their revolution is flawless, or without serious problems; nor do I believe that Americans actions and attitudes have been those of devils. But I do believe that American values, and American needs, taken in conjunction with the past and present Cuban situation, point to a position sharply opposed to the one we presently hold.

Professor Dowd then proceeds to substantiate this position by an historical and sociological analysis proving the domination of Cuba by U.S. monopoly interests, and showing the exploitative and aggressive character of those interests. He elucidates the abominable and tyrannical conditions established in Cuba under Batista with U.S. approval; he shows that the U.S. press remained other than hostile to Castro—generally speaking—until it became clear that the Revolution he was leading was not a palace one but a real one and that it aimed at the firm independence of Cuba which could not be established without eliminating the alien corporate ownership of Cuba's wealth and resources. The social and economic accomplishments of the Revolution are stated and the vital importance of aid from socialist countries noted. Very important is Professor Dowd's insistence that U.S. policy toward Cuba has hurt the American economy and the American people more than it has the Cuban.

He rejects the monstrous caricatures of a "Communist Cuba" that pass for truth in the U.S. newspapers and he adds, in a most significant paragraph:

Why should there not be Communists participating in Cuban public affairs, as there are in most countries of the world, including most countries of the NATO alliance? The cold war extends throughout the world, but not all countries have seen fit to follow the American example summed up in the term McCarthyism, annoying though such sentimentality must be to J. Edgar Hoover and Senator Dodd.

The writings of Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy on the Cuban Revolution have been very important. Their book, *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolu-*

* Published, in mimeographed form, twice a month and obtainable by subscription for 75c; address *Controversy*, c/o K. Metzner, Physics Dept., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

tion, published soon after their visit there in March, 1960, established their strong sympathy for that Revolution. Significant areas of disagreement between their interpretation of the event and the interpretation of Marxist-Leninists were analyzed very ably in the pages of this magazine last October by James S. Allen.

Since their March, 1960 visit, Huberman and Sweezy were able to visit Cuba again and they have reported on their new findings at some length in their *Monthly Review* for December, 1960. Here, in a footnote (p. 411) they reject the criticisms made by Allen and reiterate that the Cuba they first visited was a socialist society; that the Communist role was a distinctly minor one—if not a negative one—in that Revolution; that the advances made in the months from the Spring to the Winter of 1960 certainly had made Cuba a socialist society and that Communist persistence in denying this was "mere verbal gymnastics" attributable to the ulterior motivation that Communists must not "admit that it is possible for socialism to be built under non-Communist leadership."

We would remark: In their own December, 1960 article, Huberman and Sweezy emphasize that inside Cuba "events moved with astonishing speed" since their last visit. They go on to state that on their first visit the "private sector of the economy" did in fact predominate, and that the question of planning was still being debated. They note that strong anti-Communist feelings were prevalent; that diplomatic relations had not been established with any of the Socialist countries, and that then "socialism was not even included among the ultimate goals of the Revolution." They also add, in this December article, that the role and the weight of the urban working class in the Revolutionary movement has increased in the last few months as the revolutionary content deepened.

After saying all this they observe that their idea that the Cuba of March, 1960 was in fact a socialist society was held then to be a "novel idea"; I would suggest, on the basis of what Huberman and Sweezy themselves now say, as to what Cuba was at that time and the nature of the changes they have seen since, not that their idea was so much novel as that it was—as James S. Allen insisted—wrong. If this is not so, then their own testimony as to what existed in March, 1960 and in December, 1960 and what the weight of these changes amounted to, really does not make sense.

Furthermore, it is unworthy of Huberman and Sweezy to attribute differences in analysis between themselves and Communists to ulterior or invidious motives on the part of Communists. Marxist-Leninists may have held and may still hold that one does not have a socialist society in Cuba for no other reason than that that is what they believe, just as, we suppose,

Huberman and Sweezy felt and feel otherwise because that is how they evaluate the evidence for themselves.

Marxist-Leninists—and the most authoritative expression of opinion is that given by Blas Roca in the aforementioned book—see Cuba as a national-democratic country and see this achievement as the result of an anti-imperialist, national-liberating, agrarian, anti-feudal, democratic revolution. Such revolutions always have—and had in Cuba, from the beginning—the full support of Communists—in fact, the essential development of the present Revolution is an unfolding of the program of the Popular Socialist Party as enunciated for a generation. In the battle against the Batista tyranny, in the forging of popular unity in support of the July 26 movement, in direct participation in the guerrilla fighting, in rallying support for the guerrilla fighters among the populace, the Communists were in the forefront. And in doing all this, dozens of Communists paid the supreme sacrifice, yielding up their lives under torture rather than give information to the sadistic lackeys of American monopoly.*

Mis-estimates were made by Communists, of course, as by others, including those of the July 26th Movement; and these have been noted and analyzed. Thus, on the one hand there was an underestimation of the role of boldness, of the ripeness for dramatic and heroic *action*; on the other there was an underestimation of the requirements of forging real organized mass support and of the need to build such support by long and hard work if one was to accomplish a progressive and democratic revolution. But the chief forces of the Revolution—the July 26th Movement, the Popular Socialist Party, and the March 13 Directory—all played vital parts and there is glory for all and gratification for all in the great achievements of that Revolution. The Revolution was based on unity; its continued success requires that unity. Anything which undercuts it serves reaction.

As the Revolution advances, its social content deepens and less weight will adhere to the private sector of the economy, both in the cities and in the country; with that, too, undoubtedly, the class content of the State will more and more move to that of the working class and peasant in full and unquestioned control. This, however, is a process and is still unfolding; meanwhile the multi-class nature of the Revolution is a fact and a fact important to the defense of the Revolution; meanwhile the mixed character of the basic economy is a fact and a fact important to the stability of the Revolution. Haste and adventurism can only do harm; indeed, in the

* Documentation of this may be found in the North book and in the Roca volume. See also the articles in *Political Affairs*, April, 1952, October, 1954, December, 1958, February, 1959. It is distressing that where negative assertions are made concerning Communists—even by such writers as Mills, Huberman, Sweezy—no documentation is offered or, apparently, is felt to be needed.

face of the highly-organized counter-revolutionary movements now being mounted they can be disastrous.

Guevara himself noted that “the laws of Marxism are present in the events of the Cuba Revolution, independently of what its leaders profess or fully know of those laws from a theoretical point of view”; he went on to define “our national revolution” as “fundamentally agrarian, but with the enthusiastic participation of workers, people of the middle class, and today [early 1960] even with the support of industrialists.” He, too, as every bonafide Cuban Revolutionary leader, ended his analysis with the imperative need for unity, “For the old, the very old imperial maxim of ‘divide and conquer’ remains, today as yesterday, the basis of imperialist strategy” (*Studies on the Left*, Vol. I, No. 3).

Again, let us here, where our work is so much less difficult, though, perhaps, not less important, heed the admonition of the magnificent Cuban revolutionaries and concentrate upon those elements that unite us, rather than divide us. The crux of the matter was well put by Huberman and Sweezy in the closing sentences of their article in the *Monthly Review* for December:

We are for an end to colonialism, not only in Asia and Africa, but in Latin America, as well. And the success of the Cuban Revolution is the beginning of the end for imperialism in the Western hemisphere.

Only one force seriously jeopardizes the success of that Revolution, and that force is U.S. imperialism. We, here, in its home, must fight unitedly, clearly, and broadly against that force, in favor of our own national interests and, therefore, in behalf of the Cuban Revolution and the heroic Cuban masses.

The General Crisis of Capitalism Deepens

By James E. Jackson

This article is re-published from the World Marxist Review of January, 1961; we feel its probing analytical quality merits this effort to extend its readership. In addition, the article became newsworthy when Harry Schwartz, the anti-Soviet expert for the New York Times, chose to use it to maintain his consistent record of distorting the truth; Schwartz did this by quoting one or two lines out of context with the intent of conveying ideas other than those in the article itself—the Editor.

A GENUINELY REVOLUTIONARY policy must be elaborated on the basis of a correct Marxist-Leninist analysis of the times. For only if the conditions in which the working-class movement develops are precisely assessed is it possible to define the most effective ways of achieving the ultimate aims of the Communists. Let us recall what Lenin said: "Only an objective consideration of the sum-total of reciprocal relations of all the classes of a given society without exception, and, consequently, a consideration of the objective stage of development of that society and of the reciprocal relations between it and other societies, can serve as a basis for correct tactics of the advanced class." Consequently, a scientific characterization of our times presupposes an analysis of both the *new developments* in capitalism and

the *new correlation of forces* between the two diametrically opposed world systems—capitalism and socialism.

We find this analysis in the Statement of the November 1960 Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Worker's Parties, which contains conclusions of fundamental significance for the working-class movement in elaborating a correct political line. And one of the most important of these conclusions is that the general crisis of capitalism has entered upon a new stage.

THE WEAKENING OF THE IMPERIALIST SYSTEM IN CONDITIONS OF PEACE

The general crisis of capitalism was defined by Lenin as the period of "the disintegration of capitalism on a world scale and the

birth of socialist society." Underlying this crisis is the aggravation of the internal contradictions of the capitalist system to the point where it is no longer able to maintain its domination over individual countries, and the latter, breaking with capitalism, take to socialism. And, in turn, the existence of the socialist system and its growth accelerate the disintegration of imperialism.

Capitalist society, as we know, has passed through two stages of its general crisis. The first stage had its genesis already at a time when the laws of monopoly capitalism held *unrestricted* global sway. The outcome was that all the antagonistic contradictions of the capitalist system found their fullest expression in the world imperialist war of 1914-18. The war led to a situation in which a breach was made in the imperialist front at its weakest sector. The first socialist country was born. Capitalism, now no longer a global system, was confronted by its opposite, socialism, which began to develop though still within the frontiers of one country.

But the laws of capitalism still *predominated* on the world arena, exerting the decisive influence on international relations. In particular, the inevitable alternation of war and peace, characteristic of the imperialist era, continued. The peace-loving progressive forces were not able to avert the catastrophe of the Second World War. Yet the same laws of

capitalism, which engendered the new world war, had summoned to life also the powerful forces which, in a number of countries in Europe and Asia, were to act as the grave-diggers of the system based on exploitation. This ushered in the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism, the salient feature of which was the rise of the socialist world system over one-quarter of the globe. Since then the course of history has been shaped in growing measure by the competition between the two systems.

The stage of the general crisis of capitalism which we have now entered differs from the previous in the sense that it is not the outcome of a world war or of countries or territories breaking away from capitalism. It has set in in the conditions of peaceful coexistence and the competition between the two diametrically opposed systems, and has not been accompanied by any changes in the boundaries of the capitalist system.

DISTINGUISHED FEATURES

What, then, are the distinguishing features of this stage?

The first and main feature is the development of the socialist world system into the decisive factor of social development. In our times the sphere of the operation of the laws of imperialism is steadily shrinking, while the influence exerted by the laws accompanying the rise of the

socialist world system is growing. The peculiarities of the processes that ushered in this new stage of capitalism's general crisis are explained by the new historical laws gaining the ascendancy as a result of the rapid economic and political growth of the socialist system. Because of this the further aggravation of the crisis took place not in conditions of war, but in conditions of peaceful competition between the two systems, when the struggle of the peace-loving forces has prevented the imperialists from unleashing another world war. The march of events shows that peace is an ally of socialism, that it furthers social progress and debilitates the imperialist system.

The second feature of the new stage in the general crisis of capitalism is the considerable shrinking of the sphere of imperialist domination. Although capitalism has not suffered any territorial changes to speak of, imperialism has, nevertheless, lost ground in vast areas of the world. This is due to the sweep of the national-liberation movement of the colonial and dependent peoples who now have a powerful ally in the socialist world system. In the fifteen years since the war some forty independent sovereign states have come into being in Asia and Africa. The victory of the Cuban revolution has opened up new perspectives before the Latin American countries, giving a powerful impetus to the popular movements. And the final

disintegration of colonialism will further reduce the sphere of imperialist domination and confront imperialism with new problems.

The third feature is the continued aggravation of all the contradictions of the capitalist system—the contradictions between labor and capital, between the handful of monopolists and the people, between the developed and the economically backward countries, and the contradictions between the imperialist powers. As a result, the general instability of the development of capitalism is growing and its decay becomes more and more pronounced.

Another feature is the steady decline of the influence exerted by imperialism in world affairs. The predominant influence exerted by the socialist system on world events and the appearance on the international arena of the young Asian and African states have caused a crisis of imperialist foreign policy. Mention should be made also of such a major development as the growing crisis of internal policy in the imperialist countries, the bankruptcy of bourgeois ideology. History is steadily driving capitalism into a blind alley and its prospects, both economically and politically are dim.

And at bedrock of the general crisis of capitalism are such cardinal processes as the growing strength of world socialism, the disintegration of the colonial system and aggravation of the capitalist contradictions.

The further development of these irrevocable processes will, like an onrushing flood, sap the rotting pillars of imperialism, give rise to great class battles in the capitalist countries, and consolidate the international and internal positions of the forces of progress, democracy and peace.

ACCELERATOR OF HISTORY

The transformation of the socialist world system into the decisive factor of social development is a landmark in history. In the transition from capitalism to socialism the time is bound to come when the forces of the new system will have gained the upper hand over the forces of the old society, not only within the frontiers of a single country, but on the world arena, a time when the mounting tensions of internal and international class struggle, having reached the revolutionary "boiling point" will end in a qualitative leap. It is this moment in history that we are now witnessing.

The ascent of socialism to the position of the *decisive global factor* is a twofold process—internal and external.

The essence of the internal processes lies in the decisive victories won on the scale of the entire socialist system. One-third of mankind has got rid of capitalist exploitation. The Soviet Union has entered the phase of all-out building of com-

munism. The other socialist countries are successfully laying the foundations of socialism or have begun the building of developed socialist society.

Socialist democracy has been developed both in substance and in form.

The external background to the growth of socialism into the decisive force on the international arena is the further weakening of capitalism as a world system.

These two processes are not isolated developments simply coinciding in time; they are interactive and, in a sense, one conditions the other. The very existence of the socialist world system accelerates the disintegration of the capitalist system, while the global decline of the society based on exploitation gives impetus to the anti-capitalist forces and by so doing reinforces the positions of the new, ascending system.

These interwoven but opposite trends find concentrated expression in the *competition of the world systems*, which, while the main form, is a higher stage of the class struggle on the international arena. And in the process of this struggle socialism has become the decisive factor of social development on a world scale.

This contest is being fought out mainly in the *economic area*, and it is here that the socialist system has given the most striking proof of its superiority. In recent years the average annual growth of industrial output in the socialist countries has ex-

ceeded the rate in the capitalist countries nearly fourfold. The prospects of the socialist world system achieving absolute superiority for overall output both in industry and agriculture have become a matter of the foreseeable future. Indeed, socialism is already hard on the heels of the leading capitalist countries. The time is approaching when it will have achieved complete victory over capitalism in the *decisive sphere of human activity*—material production.

The effects of the economic competition between the two systems are felt in many of the processes taking place in the capitalist system. For instance, by expanding their foreign trade and extending economic aid to newly independent countries, the socialist states, cutting in on the old imperialist patterns of international division of labor, are restricting the omnipotence of the monopolies in the capitalist world economy.

In the *political* sphere, the growing strength of socialism is clearly visible. For one thing socio-economic possibilities for restoring capitalism in the socialist countries no longer exist. The superiority of the socialist world system also creates a new background for working-class struggle in the capitalist countries. It makes it harder for the imperialist forces to exert pressure from without in order to influence the outcome of class struggle in one or another capitalist country, impedes and at

times even precludes the export of counter-revolution. Socialism has demonstrated that it can paralyze imperialist aggression and, as the examples of Egypt and Iraq showed, frustrate their war designs. Socialism has placed on the order of the day the exclusion of war from the life of society. Its principles of peaceful coexistence are finding more and more support from countries still within the capitalist orbit.

The socialist camp firmly holds the initiative in the diplomatic sphere. Thanks to its efforts, the imperialist powers have been forced to discuss issues of vital concern to all humanity such as general and complete disarmament and the abolition of the colonial system.

The *scientific and technological* achievements of socialism are of the greatest importance. These, too, are the results of the economic and political superiority of the new system. Socialism, now in the forefront of scientific, technological and cultural development, acts as the path-finder in the new era of civilization.

The achievements of the socialist countries in recent years in economy, politics, science, technology, education and art have revolutionized the minds of people in the capitalist world. The progress registered by socialism has led to a complete change in the outlook of big segments of the population, especially among the intellectuals. This revolu-

tion in the minds of men is a powerful factor, for the new ideas are being taken up by millions of working people. Thus the economic and political achievements of socialism find their reflection also in the sphere of *ideology*. Thus socialism, which not so very long ago was a remote and abstract ideal, has grown into a real and tangible force. It will not be an overstatement to say that its ideas now dominate the spiritual life of humanity, for they alone chart the way to the realization of man's cherished aspirations.

The economic level reached in the socialist countries, their scientific and technological accomplishments, their moral and political unity and their success in the realm of ideology are ample evidence that the concentrated strength of the socialist camp is already greater than that of capitalism. Moreover, the socialist system is strong not only by virtue of its inner potential; it is reinforced enormously by the broad support accorded it by all the progressive movements of the day. As an international force the socialist system acts as a powerful accelerator of history, the march of which signifies the complete downfall of the system of exploitation.

THE TWILIGHT OF COLONIALISM

One of the more outstanding manifestations of the growing general

crisis of capitalism is the crumbling of the colonial system under the impact of the national-liberation movement. Steadily gaining momentum, this movement is becoming more and more widespread. Having begun with the political tasks, it is gradually undertaking the solution of pressing social and economic problems.

The rapid disintegration of the colonial system and the spreading national-liberation movement are closely associated with the achievements and influence of world socialism.

Were it not for the influence of socialism on the world arena, little Cuba could hardly have withstood the U.S. attacks. But as things are, the situation in this area is no longer determined solely by the state of affairs and the correlation of forces on the American continent.

Were it not for the changed relationship between the forces of capitalism and socialism, we would hardly be witnessing the success achieved by the national-liberation movement, the rise of the independent countries in Asia and Africa forming the so-called "neutral bloc," or the new social and economic developments in these countries.

True, these new countries, taken in the aggregate, cannot be described as a special kind of system. But deep-going changes of a progressive nature are taking place in their economies. In many of the underdeveloped

countries, together with private capitalists and small producers, state capitalism is developing rapidly. In the conditions of today state-capitalist forms of ownership in these countries are objectively directed against imperialist domination and help to build up the national economy, thereby strengthening the positions of those countries in the world arena.

This new and highly important trend originated in the process of the struggle for economic independence. The realities confronting them make it imperative for the young Asian and African states to build up the state sector and develop their heavy industry. And in this endeavor they can rely on the tangible aid of the socialist states. And as the world positions of the socialist system become stronger and the progressive forces grow in the underdeveloped countries, the conditions will be more favorable for them to choose the non-capitalist way of development.

The disintegration of the colonial system is bound to have far-reaching repercussions in the internal development of the imperialist countries. Although it will not lead to the automatic collapse of imperialism, it is bound to create new and insuperable difficulties for it. The independent economic development of the young national states aggravates the problem of markets in the capitalist world and make it more difficult to exploit the underdeveloped countries by exporting capital. U.S. im-

perialism, for instance, with its production capacity inflated beyond all reason on the assumption that its global economic expansion will go on forever, is faced with the by no means distant prospect of market difficulties that will severely shake the economy. All the imperialist powers are finding it harder to maneuver and solve their internal contradictions by redistributing spheres of influence and markets in the underdeveloped countries. This intensifies the cut-throat competition between the giant monopolies, who are trying to find a way out at the expense of their weaker capitalist partners. The result is the steady crumbling of the so-called "Western unity."

In this new situation the ruling bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries is intensifying the exploitation of the masses, waging an offensive against living standards and the social gains of the working class. This sharpens the struggle between labor and capital, impels the workers to fight back against monopoly capital. The growth of class-consciousness among the working people is spurred on also by the fact that the disintegration of the colonial system and the economic progress of the underdeveloped countries, by narrowing the possibilities hitherto enjoyed by the imperialist bourgeoisie to corrupt the upper strata of the working class, undermine the economic base of the labor aristocracy.

The recent events in Belgium are indicative in this respect. When the Belgian monopolies tried to make up for the considerable weakening of their economic positions in the Congo by an "austerity plan" increasing taxation and substantially cutting expenditure for public and social needs, the working people responded with a general strike that paralyzed the economic life of the country. The Belgian action was one of the numerous big class struggles which are now becoming a feature of capitalist society. These processes cannot but accelerate the disintegration of imperialism and change the correlation of forces in favor of socialism.

THE GROWTH OF THE IMPERIALIST CONTRADICTIONS

The new stage of the general crisis of capitalism is marked by a sharp aggravation of all the contradictions of bourgeois society, and, in particular, its basic contradiction—between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation. Above all, these contradictions are manifested in the growing inability of the capitalist system to use all its productive forces. More and more complaints are heard about the United States not being able to rise "above the department-store counter." Thanks to the capitalist system, the country of Edison, which has always been distinguished for the

talent of its people, has lost its position of leadership in science and technology. Its highways are jammed with millions of motor cars, yet many important scientific and technological discoveries made some 25 to 30 years ago have either remained in the freeze because they are not profitable enough for private enterprise, or have been placed in the service of militarism.

For the monopoly bourgeoisie the way out of the dead end created by the contradictions between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation is greater exploitation of the working people through state-monopoly capitalism. But this form, too, is rooted in the basic contradiction of capitalism, it can but aggravate the contradiction. The purpose of state-monopoly capitalism is to preserve private ownership and capitalist production relations. Yet it is precisely private, capitalist property that is the source of all the contradictions of modern bourgeois society. State-monopoly capitalism gives full expression to the general contradiction of capitalist development. On the one hand, it reinforces the economic and political positions of the monopolies and, on the other, it prepares the material base of socialism, leads capitalist economy towards all-round socialization of production thus facilitating the subsequent realization of the tasks of the socialist revolution.

With the growth of state-monopoly

capitalism, the general instability of capitalism and its steady decline are accentuated. A feature of postwar capitalism is the increasingly spasmodic functioning of the economic setup, the absence of stability for any appreciable length of time, deformation of the economic cycle, constant fluctuation in business activity and irregular alteration of the so-called booms with prolonged periods of economic decline and stagnation. Such features as under-employment of production capacities, militarization of the economy, deliberate wastage of a vast part of the productive forces, curtailing farm production and inflating the non-production sphere have become components of economic life in the USA. The most highly developed imperialist power, it is the country in which the economy is most distorted by militarization.

In the fifteen years since the end of World War II the USA has experienced three crises of overproduction and has again entered a period of economic decline. And this despite all the state-monopoly "props" of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations. Unemployment is still the number one problem. In 1960, even according to official figures, the number of unemployed was more than six per cent of the total labor force.

The uneven economic and political development of the principal capitalistic countries has also become more pronounced. In the past ten

years U.S. industrial output has increased at a rate one-half to two-thirds less than in Western Europe. The share of the USA in the industrial output of the capitalist countries declined from 56.5 per cent in 1948 to about 47 per cent in 1959, whereas the share of the Western European countries increased notably. The same thing is happening on the world market as well. In the early postwar years the USA was exporting more goods than all the West European countries taken together; now the exports of the latter are 2.5 times those of the United States. The dollar, which once ruled the foreign exchange markets, now finds itself in an extremely difficult situation. An unfavorable balance of payments is draining the U.S. gold reserves at a disastrous rate and experts entertain serious fears that the Administration may have to devalue the dollar.

The economic difficulties far from weakening the U.S. imperialist expansion serve to intensify it. An indication of this is the growth of investments abroad. By the end of 1959, the total foreign investments of the U.S. monopolies amounted to 64.7 billion dollars. It has been estimated that more than three-quarters of the profits made from the export of capital by all the capitalists taken together flow into the vaults of American banks and industrial corporations. U.S. imperialism is indeed the *biggest international exploiter*.

At the same time the U.S.A. invariably takes part as *international gendarme* in every operation undertaken by imperialist reaction. Whenever the ruling bourgeoisie of one or another country is unable to cope with the growing forces of democracy and progress, support is sought from the U.S. imperialists. The American finance tycoons and monopolists have been the initiators of joint action by the imperialist powers in the underdeveloped countries. U.S. imperialism is the hub, the driving force and leader of neo-colonialism.

But although it is the dominant military power in the imperialist camp, U.S. prestige in the capitalist world has declined and its leadership is questioned more and more frequently. Having passed the zenith of its world influence, the era of the weakening of the global positions of U.S. imperialism has set in. And the progressive weakening of this main bastion of the imperialist system is one of the most important and striking indications of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

A dual process is under way in the political sphere in the capitalist countries. On the one hand, part of the ruling class, alarmed by the achievements of socialism and the national-liberation movement, is searching for a way out in "emergency" measures, in acts of political recklessness and in plotting war as the way to success in the competition of the two systems. On the other

hand, the more soberminded politicians are inclining to the view that the growing strength of socialism cannot be countered only by police terror at home and use of force abroad. The labor movement should not ignore the difference between these two trends, for it cannot be indifferent as regards the *methods* used by the ruling class.

The new world situation enables the democratic forces, which have yet to say their last word, to exert growing pressure also in those countries where there are reactionary regimes. The new correlation of forces on the world arena facilitates the struggle for political democracy.

At the same time the persecution of Communists and democrats continues. This persecution, varying in form from country to country, is felt both in Spain and in the United States, in France and in West Germany. As regards the United States, here we see a steady usurpation of power by a handful of finance-capitalists and a tendency for the richest men in the country to take the reins of government into their hands. Although there has been a certain retreat from McCarthyism in its more outrageous forms, the domination of the top brass and the war-industry corporations is felt more than ever before.

The apologists for capitalism try to cover up its deep-seated difficulties and contradictions with the fiction that capitalism has "changed." Capi-

talism, they claim, has become a "people's capitalism," while some—the American economist, Adolph Berle, for instance—say that the U.S. economic system could best be described as "non-state socialism."

This is a case of capitalism being ashamed of its own name! What clearer proof could there be of the debility of the capitalist system, and a lack of faith in its own future?

THE FORCE OF EXAMPLE IS A REVOLUTIONARY FORCE

An analysis of the latest stage in the general crisis of capitalism further clarifies the prospects and forms of the working-class struggle. It enables us to deduce first of all that the chain of imperialism can be broken in the conditions of peace. It shows, moreover, that peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition accelerate the revolutionary process.

Peaceful coexistence signifies broadening and developing the class struggle in the forms most effective and expedient from the standpoint of the working class and all other working people. The revolutionizing effect of the economic and cultural advance in the socialist countries is strikingly evident today. For in our times the class struggle in the capitalist countries develops not only on the basis of the sharpening internal contradictions of capitalism, but also under the growing impact of the example of the socialist nations. And

the force of example can be truly a revolutionary force.

The progress made by the socialist countries helps the working class in the capitalist countries to intensify their struggle for both immediate and ultimate aims. And, we say with certainty that the building of socialism and communism makes it easier for us to develop our work among the masses. With the achievements of the socialist countries to point to, we can more effectively make the advantages of the new social system clear to the workers, farmers, intellectuals and especially the technicians on whom the scientific, technological and cultural achievements of socialism cannot but exert a powerful influence.

The social and national struggles in the capitalist world are taking place against the background of the changes on the world arena. Take, for instance, the struggle waged by the Negro people in the USA. None can deny that they have wrested considerable concessions from the rulers of the country in the past half century. And this advance far from causing any abatement, has, on the contrary, elevated it to record levels. The explanation is that the present struggle of the Negro people in the United States for full rights is objectively tied up with the growth of world socialism and the victories of the liberation movements in all corners of the earth. The new surge of the Negro movement derives not

only from the home situation but also from the radical changes in the correlation of class forces on the world arena.

Influenced by the achievements in the socialist countries, the working class in the capitalist countries has intensified its struggle for economic demands. In hard-fought class battles it has won concessions from the capitalists and it is resolved to uphold and augment these gains. It would be wrong, therefore, to base our work among the masses on the anticipation of a crisis of overproduction or on the absolute impoverishment of the working people.

Nor should our work among those sections of the working people who have won concessions from the ruling class be based on the assumption that they are threatened with the loss of the gains and that only by bringing this home to them can we convince them of the necessity of socialism. The mainspring of the growth of revolutionary consciousness nowadays should be not in telling the worker that tomorrow he will be worse off than he is today; it should be sought in other ways. First, it should be borne in mind that those sections of the working class which have won the greatest gains in economic struggle against capital, are becoming increasingly aware that for many of them they are indebted to the socialist world system. For the very existence of this system often compels the monopolists to make

concessions which, in other circumstances, they would not even dream of conceding. Second, growing numbers of workers in the capitalist countries are beginning to realize that the partial victories in the economic struggle will not rid them of exploitation, the scourge of unemployment, the crisis and insecurity, nor will they alter in any way their position of inequality in the capitalist system of production.

Today, as never before, big sections of the working people are entering the revolutionary struggle under the impact of the undeniable successes of socialism. In the highly developed capitalist countries the workers are beginning to appreciate that even with the productive forces at the present level of development, socialism can provide a much higher standard of living and at the same time abolish all forms of exploitation. The workers see that even the gains won under capitalist conditions can be retained only by persistent class struggle. This, in particular, explains the growing strike movement in the capitalist countries. It should be stressed, moreover, that as things are today purely political issues can be the preliminary to far-reaching social actions even without a purely economic motive to start them off.

The Statement of the November 1960 Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties emphasized that the fight for peace is a primary task of the Communist

parties. This follows from the premise that the policy of peace stimulates rather than retards the revolutionary processes, and helps to rally the most varied social forces behind the working class. The peace policy multiplies the class allies of the proletariat; provides bigger reserves for the socialist revolution and simultaneously narrows the social base of monopoly capital.

The demand for general and complete disarmament links the class struggle on the world arena and in the capitalist countries into an integral whole; it combines the struggle for democracy and the economic demands of the working people with the movement for socialism. The Communists in the capitalist countries see their job in combining these diverse aspects of the class struggle. For instance, the fight for better housing can produce results if it is combined with the fight for peace and disarmament. Given the alternative of home or the barracks, the worker always knows which to choose. At the same time the fight for peace and disarmament will help the working people in the capitalist countries to get rid of whatever jingo sentiment the bourgeoisie may have instilled into them during the cold war. In other words, it will help to strengthen the unity of the working-class movement and deepen its class consciousness.

We must help rid the working class of the illusion that militarism

means jobs and a high level of business activity. The slogan of general and complete disarmament provides the working class of the capitalist countries with an economic and political program of struggle for their immediate demands. At the same time it helps to isolate the more reactionary elements of the ruling class—the war-industry monopolies—and by so doing clears the way for the fight for democracy. In these circumstances we should not close our eyes to the prospect of powerful mass actions of the organized workers and other forces to win concession after concession from the governments and compel them to use state-capitalist measures in the interests of the people as a whole. In the conditions of today action for democracy, peace, and national and social rights can lead the masses on to the fight for far-reaching social reforms, to the anti-monopoly phase of revolution. Action of this kind paves the way for uniting the majority of the population around the working class, with a view to effecting the peaceful transition to socialism in a number of capitalist countries.

It is imperative to rally all the revolutionary forces against imperialist oppression and exploitation. These forces include the peoples building socialism and communism, the revolutionary working-class movement in the capitalist countries, the national-liberation movement of

the oppressed peoples and the various general democratic movements.

The fusing of all these forces into a single mighty stream depends not only on favorable objective conditions, but also on the correct tactics of the Marxist-Leninist parties, on their clear understanding of the unity and indivisibility of the national and international tasks of the working class.

Every turn in the situation nowadays imparts to the working class a more important place in the march of history, makes it more than ever before the core of all the progressive movements. In its struggle it pursues not only its own class aims, it stands for the progress of all mankind. This is the guarantee of the inevitable and complete victory of socialism throughout the world.

Communication

By Victor Perlo

INSIDE THE SOVIET ECONOMY

Last summer a group of economists sponsored by the Committee for Economic Development visited the Soviet Union, in exchange for an earlier delegation of Soviet economists to the United States. Their conclusions are published as the main contents of the January 21st issue of *The Saturday Review*.

My 3-month visit to the Soviet Union, as a guest of its Institute of World Economics and International Relations, overlapped that of the CED delegation. We talked with the same top officials and similar local officials, and visited similar factories and farms. I believe I talked to more workers and students.

Many facts cited in the articles check with my own observations. Some do not. One overall theme of the articles, that the Soviet economy is not heading for a crisis, will continue to grow and be a serious competitor to the United States, is by now accepted almost universally.

But other interpretations and impressions of some of the CED delegation I found inaccurate and misleading. Most of the CED economists projected ingrained prejudices in addition to their actual observations. Perhaps to prove their "loyalty," they felt it necessary to interject rather awkward and self-conscious propaganda for capitalism into the *Saturday Review*.

Only one writer presents what seems to be an objective account of what he saw, unencumbered by such considerations. George Terborgh, research director of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, limits his observations to the nine plants he visited. He notes many weaknesses, by American engineering standards, and also notes trends towards improvement.

These enterprises are run by an extremely able group of managers. These men are obviously highly trained in their profession, intimately familiar with every detail of their operations, and thoroughly practical in their approach. They would be a credit to the management group of any country. A similar comment applies to the workers. They appear to be extremely industrious, and apply themselves to their tasks with an energy and concentration seldom seen in the United States. This results, in part, of course, from the widespread use of piecework and other incentive devices.

To which I must add that nowhere in the Soviet Union did I see that energy and concentration take the form of sweat-shop type speed-up.

University of Chicago Professor Theodore Schultz appreciates "the amount and rate at which the quality of human effort entering into economic activities has been improved," as an important factor in Soviet economic growth. He even includes "Soviet ideology" as one of the reasons "for the eagerness of the people in the Soviet to acquire knowledge and skills," along with material incentives, and "expanded opportunities for social mobility."

But he qualified these visible facts with references to "forced labor" and "persecution of millions of farm people." Where does he get this? Perhaps from *Junior Scholastic*. Certainly, and admittedly, not from what he saw himself: "Surely no casual observations can detect the role that coercion plays in enforcing labor discipline." His failure to observe coercion, however, does not prevent him from speculating that there "may be" this penalty, and "presumably is" that repressive requirement, etc.

In a month's visit Dr. Schultz should have been able to observe that obvious characteristic of Soviet people in their daily life—their easiness and confidence in bearing and manner, their lack of constraint with one another and with strangers. In a word, they have precisely that general attitude which in everyday life is associated with "freedom" and "security," and which is powerful evidence against all speculations about force and coercion.

Gregory Grossman, the best-known American specialist on Soviet planning, tells of some of the changes in the system in recent years, mainly in the direction of decentralization. However, he omits that essential element, the enhanced role in planning of the people of the individual enterprise, its workers, engineers and managers. He inaccurately visualizes the changes as a mere improvement in a continuing bureaucratic process.

The vital fact is that Soviet economic planning has achieved to a high degree the practice of democratic centralism, that long sought for goal of Soviet leadership. In terms used by American unionists, Soviet planning is an outstanding example of economic democracy.

A powerful movement is sweeping Soviet industry, the Communist Brigades of Labor. It involves hundreds of times more people, a much higher level of skill and application of scientific method, and a more profound political maturity, than the famous Stakhanovite movement of the 1930's. One cannot go through a Soviet factory without seeing the banner and posters announcing their accomplishments. Somehow, none of these CED economists, in their visits through many factories, noticed the Communist Brigades of Labor, were told of them or inquired about them, or deemed them worthy of comment. Perhaps loyalty to capitalism conditions these economists so that they cannot believe that the masses can be vital, conscious forces in the economic process.

My talks with Soviet workers convinced me that the majority do feel that the industry of the country and all its institutions are collectively theirs. They do feel themselves part of the planning process. They do strive to improve pro-

duction and their personal skills in order to advance the welfare of the country and all its people, in order to build Communist society, as well as to advance their individual well-being.

This combination of individual and collective motives seems not to have been appreciated by the visiting economists. Yet, on the human side, it is perhaps the decisive difference between capitalism and socialism, and certainly a major reason for socialism's faster economic growth.

Professor Grossman got one fact wrong. He says there is but one Sovnarkhoz, or Regional Economic Council, in Uzbekistan. There were five.

Delegation leader Herbert Stein seems to be among the most obsessed with prejudices. It is only in the midst of an involved and roundabout paragraph that he concedes the system of incentives for rationalization and invention does "leave a good deal of room for individuals to originate ideas," and for their application. But he asserts the entire system of incentives for technological advance is "bookish and sentimental." Sadly, in Dr. Stein's view, its weaknesses give "little ground for complacency," because "an inefficient system run by competent, powerful, determined people may still produce results."

And may not. Competent and powerful people have all too often come to grief attempting to overcome the institutional inefficiencies and contradictions of capitalist society. The specific set of rewards for technical advance are part of an entire socialist system of planned economy, which has been bringing technical advance at a record pace because the system as a whole is harmonious.

I agreed with Dr. Stein's opinion that the particular schedule of rewards for economies in effect in factories had serious weaknesses. I discussed this with Soviet officials, as Dr. Stein apparently did. He claims they would admit no faults. But while we were both in the Soviet Union, a major Moscow conference was devoted to this question, and front-paged in the press. Existing weaknesses were criticized, and new decisions made radically broadening and liberating the system of rewards for technical progress along lines that seemed very promising. It is surprising that Dr. Stein did not notice this then nor learn of it later.

He finds: "What is missing from the Soviet story is the independent capitalist, the thrifty chiropractor who takes a flyer on Fulton's Folly, demonstrating its practical value and incidentally making a fortune for himself." The independent capitalist, says Stein, will help promote inventions better than the Communist Party, because there are "many capitalists but only one Communist Party."

Does not Stein know that the day of the independent capitalist promoter of inventions is gone, that virtually all research and researchers are owned by giant corporations, and that the subordination of invention to profit, of researchers to sales managers, of civilian to military research, are notorious features of American life today?

If there are still a few thousand very rich capitalists with enough money and power in the corporate hierarchy to promote an invention when they see a

personal profit in it, there are several million Communists (and non-Communists) in the Soviet Union with an active *social* interest in making, uncovering, encouraging, and promoting inventions for the benefit of all people.

Dr. Stein's introductory article sets a tone. It reflects the standard charge that everything in the USSR is done at the expense of the consumer. He finds the life of the Soviet citizen, "drab, dull, tasteless, graceless, conformist, devoid of individuality, creativeness, or independence."

Such adjectives have been repeated a thousand times by foes of socialism, including those like Dulles who never observed it but condemned it out of blind hatred. No doubt Stein had read and believed this before he went to the Soviet Union.

But he could not have seen it, if his eyes function normally. The flower-decked and broad-boulevarded cities of the Soviet Union in summer-time, the beautified grounds of Soviet factories, the lush countryside of Georgia, the Neva in Leningrad's white nights, and the national Opera House in Tashkent, the splendid Black Sea Coast with so many people enjoying its vast beaches and tasteful resorts, the varied styles of peasants' houses in different parts of the country, the colorful summer fruit stands, the bright new apartment buildings, the new clothing people wear, the exhibitions, museums, theatres—all these and many other features which Dr. Stein saw utterly refute this standard Western chestnut about Soviet life for anybody willing to see with his eyes instead of feel with his prejudices.

In his cataloguing of low living standards in the Soviet Union, Stein tells of a faulty light bulb on a train trip from Kiev to Kharkov. I didn't take that ride. I rode on the train with Stein from Moscow to Leningrad, the Red Arrow. It is a splendid and well equipped train. It is at least as good as our crack Twentieth Century Limited. Why didn't Mr. Stein tell about it?

There is similar nonsense from Hans Heymann who talks of the "austere, drab, and uncongenial Soviet environment." He was on a parallel air transport group's tour. He concedes the "enormous progress . . . since my previous torture four years earlier," but claims his "fellow travelers' major reaction was one of shock and dismay at Aeroflot's cavalier attitude toward the convenience of the passenger and its indifference toward the more sophisticated concept of flight safety."

I travelled on many Soviet planes, from big jets to two-engined local piston planes. I just do not know what Heymann is talking about. To one who has travelled considerably by plane at home, there is nothing startling about such travel in the Soviet Union. Similarities are many, differences secondary, the overall quality equal. Incidentally, Soviet flight hostesses give passengers safety instructions and data about the flight in considerably more detail than their American sisters.

A number of the economists contradicted this hackneyed view of a Soviet economy at the expense of the consumer. Dr. Grossman refers to "the growing attention to the satisfaction of consumer needs, qualitatively as well as

quantitatively." Leon Herman talks of the "rise in the supply of goods and services to the mass of the urban population," and of the program for workers "of a shorter work week, reduced differentials in wages, higher pensions, better housing, and a more abundantly supplied distribution network."

But he views this as motivated solely by the desire to get better performance out of the worker by improving his morale. None of the delegation realized that the basic motivation of Soviet economic planning and labor is precisely to improve living standards—in the broad sense embracing all material and cultural values. They did not even report this as the claimed purpose—although it would be surprising if they weren't told it in any of their many conversations with economic planners and officials.

Herman claims that the movement to more welfare for the "immediate future is likely to be slowed down" by counterpressures, notably the alleged labor shortage. But contrary to what Dr. Herman says, there is still a vast pool of untapped labor living on the farms, and the added labor potential is increasing yearly. Premier Khrushchev has called for even more emphasis on improving consumer welfare, and this seems to be the main trend.

Dr. Heymann says "we marveled at the irrationality of Soviet investment policy in providing a vast armada of transport aircraft to serve a mere trickle of scheduled flights." Statistics cited by him, however, compared with official United States statistics, indicate that Aeroflight carries three times as many passengers per plane per year as American scheduled carriers!

Dr. Heymann says he and his friends became so involved "vigorously justifying and defending our own institutions" that they tended to "blunt . . . critical faculties regarding our own institutions" and became "excessively sensitized to every Soviet deficiency."

His article shows he hasn't gotten over this fault yet. At the most he could see a distorted half-truth, that despite all its faults, as imagined or exaggerated by Dr. Heymann, the Soviet economy "remains a formidable competitor." But the statement is also a half-truth, because he asserts the advance is for no beneficial purpose, but solely for "political objectives . . . not compatible with our own," and "to make life more difficult for us." Its continued growth is "not an appealing prospect for us to contemplate."

I hope the majority of American economists and *Saturday Review* readers—among others—reject Dr. Heymann's misanthropic interpretation; and see instead the many benefits we can derive from Soviet economic advances. As Professor Schultz says, "we might very well gain useful insights" from the Soviet successes in improving the quality of human effort by the use of state assistance and incentives to induce workers at all levels to improve their capabilities. There are a thousand other particulars of Soviet society which could be applied here with benefit to the vast majority, without abolishing capitalism.

Let our expanding relations with the USSR be guided by the motive of mutual peaceful benefit, rather than the projection of cold-war prejudices and tensions.

READING FOR PEOPLE OF THOUGHT AND ACTION

CUBA — HOPE OF A HEMISPHERE, by Joseph North	Paperback \$.95
THE CUBAN REVOLUTION, by Blas Roca	Paperback \$1.25
THE UNITED STATES IN TODAY'S WORLD, by Gus Hall	.35
STATEMENT OF 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS PARTIES (December, 1960)	.25
THE HISTORICAL ADVANCE OF WORLD SOCIALISM, by William Z. Foster	.50
OUR SIGHTS TO THE FUTURE, by Gus Hall	.15
DECLARATION OF TWELVE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS PARTIES (November, 1957)	.10
THE SOCIALIST WAY, by N. S. Khrushchev	.05
DISARMAMENT AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY: SYMPOSIUM, edited by H. Aptheker	.75
ON THE NATURE OF FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker	.35
ON THE NATURE OF REVOLUTION, by Herbert Aptheker	.25
UPSURGE IN THE SOUTH, by Benjamin J. Davis	.15

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

TWO BOOKS ON THE NEW CUBA

CUBA — HOPE OF A HEMISPHERE

By Joseph North **Paperback \$.95; Cloth \$ 2.00**

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.